

## **Summary of comments from the 2018 PIP Focus Groups**

### *Objective 1:-*

Expand the What Will We Do section.

Possibly mention obesity rates of children and young people.

More qualitative data would be beneficial so that the measures are not just numbers.

Explain the acronyms.

Explain where the statistics in the Measures section came from.

Apparently there is a lack of adults playing with young children and a lack of provision for this which impacts on their development. Therefore the statistics should be for more than just sports.

An example of how we were going to increase capacity in sports clubs would be useful.

More Measures to link all the boxes together ie show how you are going to measure the successes.

### *Objective 2:-*

The 'type' of planning applications should be included in the 'How Will We Measure Success' section.

A Community Forum could help the economy so that the community can communicate what they would like to see in the city centre which therefore gives them a voice and an opportunity for inclusion.

Working smarter in partnerships gives more opportunities also, such as vacant buildings, and tourism related ventures such as canal boats, the Linen Centre and the Mill.

Higher and further education statistics are to be included for training students.

Late teens and early twenty-somethings should be targeted for entertainment in the city centre, such as gaming and busking.

### *Objective 3:-*

The What Will We Do section doesn't contain a lot about health and well-being – it seems to focus a lot on the environment instead.

The information needs to remain within the theme with an in-depth understanding provided for the ratepayer, so the wording here may need to be revamped.

Reference should possibly be made to cybercrime and online bullying and around education for young people using social media.

The community hub may need explained more and it needs to be made clear that this will not be achieved within a year – and instead explain the milestones that will be captured for this.

A measure for the CCTV in Lisburn would be how much additional coverage it provided.

By including a measurement on domestic burglary, it was thought that this could set the Council up for failure as they cannot control crime. It was suggested that this be worded in a different way.

It was felt that this objective lacked coherence as there are very different measures in it.

It was proposed that the measures should be listed on a priority basis.

There were comments on the Council not being as innovative with the recycling as other organisations and that maybe more needs to be done with educating children on where waste goes.

#### *Objective 4:-*

There needs to be a measure for the most vulnerable citizens.

An indicator regarding the health inequalities, especially on the Lisburn side may be needed.

Less waste discarded would be a useful measure.

Could air pollution be mentioned as it is a health and well-being issue which can lead to diseases?

#### *Objective 6:-*

It was suggested that the What Will Success Look Like section be expanded – possibly to include staff absence rates so that the stakeholders can see this. The delivery of these needs to have interaction with the users and providers and satisfaction and motivation will be measures of these.

#### *General Comments:-*

It was suggested that there is reference made in the plan as to what the Community Plan is responsible for as the public may be unsure about this. There may need to be references throughout the PIP to say 'look to the Community Plan for more detail'. This could also be mentioned on page 21 under the Why have these objectives been chosen.

Regarding certain projects not being mentioned in the PIP – perhaps more emphasis needs to be on the fact that the PIP cannot capture everything, the projects mentioned are just one example of the work being done, and the projects are relevant for the 18/19 year only.

It might be an idea to explain to ratepayers what the Council is and isn't responsible for (i.e. traffic management, business rates etc). And then provide phone numbers to direct to the correct service provider.

Reference to the ReportAll app could be included and to make this the first point of call to lodge a complaint as it would then be passed on to the correct service provider.

Overall, the comments on the ABP and PIP were positive. The focus groups thought that the objectives were explained clearly, made sense and were set out well. There were observations to say that the document was better than last year and that it was similar to other PI plans in other Councils. It was noted that the document read easy and there was no jargon.

By having the objectives being well evidenced, the Council is beginning to show the work that it is doing on the ground. However, there were also several remarks about some of the objectives being tall orders and that the PIP is seen as a big challenge so the Council needs to be realistic as to what is achievable, especially within timescales.

There was a lot of confusion with what the Council are and are not responsible for and also what would be included in the Community Planning remit rather than in the PIP, therefore it could be sensible to differentiate between these as suggested.