Just how flawed was the council 'consultation' on Eastwood Leisure Centre Posted by Newsline - 06 Aug 2019 13:21

It has taken 10 months to attempt to get to the bottom of the claim that many made that the ERC 'consultation' was flawed. (Consultation with regards to the proposed <u>New</u> Leisure Centre)

We are still not there, however we are somewhat closer to discovering the facts.

Re: Just how flawed was the council 'consultation' on Eastwood Leisure Centre Posted by Newsline - 15 Aug 2019 10:48

'Would not have made an impact on the final result.'

The result was billed that an overwhelming number of respondents wanted a leisure facility built anywhere other than at Eastwood Park.

The council used this to support their mantra to attempt to push through a new mega build on a green field.

(Now we must remember this was a world wide vote, anyone was eligible to vote and the above chart reflects just that, a world wide vote)

Re: Just how flawed was the council 'consultation' on Eastwood Leisure Centre Posted by Newsline - 15 Aug 2019 11:00 Question.

Why remove 123 votes - after being identified as having been part of multiple votes from one person.

'response from IP addresses already captured numbered 620.'

Lets remove the **123** from this total (which the council did on their graphs).

Why then not remove the other 499 (that had already been captured)

Were the 499 not removed as they supported a new mega build????????

Re: Just how flawed was the council 'consultation' on Eastwood Leisure Centre Posted by Newsline - 15 Aug 2019 11:08

Remember the council said 'Would not have made an impact on the final result.'

Re: Just how flawed was the council 'consultation' on Eastwood Leisure Centre Posted by Newsline - 15 Aug 2019 11:14

If we were to remove the (questionable 499?) the graph would look like this.

1,058 versus 1,040

Not a very overwhelming result we would have to suggest.

Re: Just how flawed was the council 'consultation' on Eastwood Leisure Centre Posted by Newsline - 15 Aug 2019 16:28

The question remains, was the ERC consultation not only flawed in how the questions were framed, as many think, was it also flawed by the council interpretation of the results?
