

Glossop Vision Survey Report to Glossop Vision Board – July 2006

1. Introduction

1.1 The first Glossop Vision liveability Survey was completed in March 2005. The survey was repeated in March 2006. The survey was distributed to 5000 Glossop residents. Names were provided by Derbyshire County Council and chosen randomly from the electoral register.

1.2 The aim of the survey was to:

- Assess, and raise, awareness of the Liveability Programme
- Measure levels of customer satisfaction with relevant areas of service
- Enable comparisons with other survey outcomes
- Enable consideration of further action to support the implementation of the Liveability Programme
- Identify the level of support for enforcement and other Liveability issues
- Identify resident's priorities and the extent to which issues impacted on their quality of life
- Provide information on resident views and priorities at a town wide and ward level
- Identify residents interested in receiving Liveability newsletter; participating in further survey; and/or taking part in small discussion groups around service improvements

1.3 The Glossop wide results of the 2006 survey are shown at Appendix 1. This report addresses the overall results and makes a comparison of the results from the 2005 survey.

2. Profile of Respondents

2.1 1,204 responses were received, representing a 24% response rate. This is a reasonable response from a random, unsolicited, survey and is a slight increase on the 2005 response rate of 22.3%

2.2 The percentage of valid responses from men and women were 38.9% and 61.1% respectively. In terms of age range:

- 41.9% of respondents were aged 35-54, of which 21.5% were aged 35-44
- 27.5% were aged over 60
- 20.4% aged 45-54
- 18.9% were under 35 with 5.3 % of these being aged 18 - 24
- 11.8% were aged 55-59

2.3 Responses were received from residents across the wards in Glossopdale, with responses from Hadfield being the highest at 27% followed by Simmondley at 16.4% and Old Glossop and Howard Town at 12.6% and 11.6% respectively. This pattern of responses is also evident in the 2005 returns. (See Appendix 1, Question 10, for a full breakdown).

2.4 40.4% of respondents were in full time employment and 16% worked part-time; 15.5% were self employed and 18.4 % were retired. 2.2% were long term sick and 6.1% were not working for 'other reasons'; 1.4% were unemployed.

3. Responses to Questions

3.1 Questions 1 & 2 - Awareness of Liveability and, if so, how

Respondents were asked if they had heard of Glossop Liveability before they received the survey. The results were:

- 68% (790) replied 'no'
- 24.7 % (297) said 'yes'
- 6.2% (75) were unsure

These results demonstrate a slight increase in the number of people who had heard of Glossop Liveability in the 2005 survey when 74.8% said no, 19.6% said yes and 5.6% were unsure. It should be noted that the question asked about awareness of Glossop Liveability and not Glossop Vision. As 'Glossop Vision' branding is widely used for projects it is recommended that future surveys ask if people have heard of Glossop Vision rather than Glossop Liveability.

Those who had heard of Glossop Liveability were asked indicate how. A range of options were given. Respondents could indicate all that applied.

- 78% had read about it in Connect
- 76% had read about it in a newspaper
- 69% had seen a Glossop Vision Newsletter
- 14% had heard about it on the radio
- 10% had attended a consultation event.

The results show an increase in awareness via written media. The largest increase can be seen in those people who indicated they had read about Glossop liveability in Connect where the response in the 2005 survey was 56.8%. Awareness via newspapers and newsletters also increased from 68.9% and 63% respectively in 2005.

Whilst the results show a slight increase in comparison with results from the 2005 survey, levels of awareness remain relatively low. The outcome suggests there is value in continuing to use a range of methods to disseminate information and that more needs to be done to communicate and promote Liveability projects.

3.2 Question 3 - Top Four Public Service Standards

Respondents were asked to indicate which four of the ten Public Service Standards, recently approved for Liveability', they thought were most important. The results for both 2005 and 2006 are shown below:

	2006	2005
Street Cleanliness	81%	84.4%
Dog Fouling	72%	65.3%
Highway Maintenance	65%	63.8%
Gully Emptying	45%	42.3%
Street Lighting	37%	37.4%
Fly Tipping removal	36%	43%
Overhanging vegetation	28%	26.5%

Street cleanliness, dog fouling and highway maintenance continue to be considered as the top three issues of importance however the issue ranked in fourth position has changed from fly tipping in 2005 to Gully emptying in 2006 with a considerable change in percentage figures. The increase in the number of residents indicating dog fouling as an important issue should also be noted.

3.3 Question 4 – Awareness of enforcement

Respondents were asked if they were aware that Glossop has an Enforcement Officer. 56.2% said no, 35.6% said yes and 8.3% were unsure.

When asked if they thought the work of the Enforcement Officer is helping to improve the area 58.8% of respondents were unsure, 22.9% said no and 18.2% said yes.

Again the figures suggest a low level of awareness regarding the work of the Enforcement Officer and that more needs to be done to communicate this message.

3.4 Question 5 - Town Centre Attractiveness

A question was asked as to whether respondents found Glossop town centre attractive. The results were:

- Just over half, 53.4% said they found it attractive, with 2.9% of these finding it 'very attractive'. This is a slight increase on last year's results when 50.8% indicated they found it attractive and 1.7% found it very attractive.
- Of the 46.6% who found it 'unattractive' 4.7% said it was 'very unattractive'.

The survey did not seek to ascertain what features people found to be attractive or otherwise. It is not known if responses were based solely on the physical features of the town centre or an overall view taking into account things like litter; traffic; etc.

3.5 Question 6 - Changes Over Last 12 Months in Standards of Cleanliness

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt standards of cleanliness in public areas over the last 12 months had improved, got worse or stayed the same.

Responses were as follows:

- 61.8% replied that it had stayed about the same
- 27.2% of respondents felt it had improved with 2.5% of these saying it had improved a great deal
- 10.9% felt it had 'got worse' with 2.7% of these feeling it had got 'much worse'

These figures also indicate a slight improvement on the responses received in the 2005 survey when 63.8% replied it had stayed the same, 22.3% of respondents felt it had improved with 2% of these saying it had improved a great deal and 13.9% felt it had 'got worse' with 3.4% of these feeling it had got 'much worse'

3.6 Question 7 - Satisfaction with the Way High Peak Delivers Services

This question contained an extract from that asked in Corporate Health (BVPI) and Citizens Panel surveys. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the way High Peak Borough Council delivers named services.

Key Liveability topics, or issues that may impact on them, were used in the Glossopdale survey, namely:

(a) Parks, Open Spaces, and Play Areas

64% of respondents expressed satisfaction with 11% of these being 'very satisfied'. 18% were dissatisfied with 6% of these being 'very dissatisfied'. The figures show an improvement in the number of people satisfied when compared to the 2005 results when 59.9% of respondents expressed satisfaction (8.9% of these being 'very satisfied') and 19.6% were dissatisfied.

(b) Street Cleaning

56% of respondents were satisfied, with 5% of these being very satisfied, 24% were dissatisfied, with 7% of these being very dissatisfied; some 19% were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

Again the results indicate a slight improvement on the 2005 figures when 53% of respondents indicated they were satisfied however it should be noted that in 2005 6.4% of the respondents indicated they were very satisfied.

A large increase in satisfaction is evident when viewing the percentage of those who expressed a view either way. In 2005 this was recorded as 58.6% increasing to 70% of respondents indicating they were satisfied or fairly satisfied in 2006 i.e. excluding those who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

(c) Waste Collection

83% of respondents were satisfied with this service (82.5% in 2005)

(d) Keeping Public Areas Free of Litter

48% of respondents were satisfied, with 5% of these being very satisfied. 32% were dissatisfied with 9% of these being 'very dissatisfied'; some 20% were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

The results show an improvement in satisfaction with Street Cleansing when viewed alongside the 2005 results when 44.6% of respondents were satisfied (3.5% of these being very satisfied), 34.7% were dissatisfied.

Again a noticeable improvement can be viewed when looking at the percentage of those who expressed a view either way, 56.2% were satisfied in 2005 compared to 60% in 2006, i.e. excluding those who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

3.7 Question 8 - Frequency of Incidents in Neighbourhood

Respondents were asked to cite how frequently they thought specified incidents happened in their neighbourhood. They were included in the Liveability Survey given the close link between the perceptions and experience of crime and anti-social behaviour and the Liveability agenda.

The Community Safety Team will be able to use the information collected to assist in safety audits of neighbourhoods.

Some questions relate more directly to Liveability topics i.e. rubbish or litter lying around; dogs fouling the footpaths and parks. An analysis of the responses to these questions shows that:

- 68% of respondents reported that there was rubbish or litter lying around very or quite often. (72.3% in 2005)
- 73% of respondents reported that there were dogs fouling the footpaths very or quite often. (76.4% in 2005)
- 69.1% of respondents reported that dogs were fouling parks very or quite often. (71.1% in 2005)

3.8 Question 9 - Importance to Quality of Life of Issues Addressed by Liveability

Respondents were asked to indicate how important the issues being addressed by Liveability are.

In all cases the overwhelming majority of responses indicated that they were very or fairly important.

Responses have been ranked in order of the % of respondents who indicated they saw them as important, either 'fairly' or 'very important': (Figures from the 2005 survey are shown in brackets).

- Fines to tackle litter, fly tipping, dog fouling - 96% (94.9%)
- Environmental clean up projects - 93% (93.2%)
- Improving highway maintenance – 94% (92.8%)
- Improving parks and open spaces – 94% (92.7%)
- Tidy business/fast food litter projects – 92% (91.9 %)
- Enhancing the frequency of street cleaning – 91% (92%)
- Improvements to the town centre – 88% (89.5%)
- Improvements to the A57 corridor – 88% (87.7%)

- Community involvement/civic pride – 77% (80.6%)
- Better maintenance of street furniture – 73% (76.7%)
- 24 hour reporting line – 74% (75.2%)
- Glossop in Bloom – 73% (74%)

4. **Recycling and waste collection**

Questions relating to household waste collection and recycling were included at the request of Environmental Services due to the imminent launch of the twin bin scheme in the Glossop at the time of the survey distribution.

4.1 Questions 11 and 12 – levels of recycling

Respondents were asked if they currently recycle using the green kerbside box 60.9% reported using the green box fortnightly, 6.4% use the box monthly whilst 13.7% use the box sometimes. 19% stated they never use the box.

Respondents were also asked if they visit the recycling centre to recycle other materials. 61.5% do visit the recycling centre.

4.2 Questions 13 – Attitudes to recycling

Residents were asked to indicate if they considered recycling to be beneficial to the environment. 91.7% said they agreed with the statement with 56.1% agreeing strongly.

4.3 Question 14 – Recycling Information

A question was asked as to whether there is enough information about local recycling. 49% agreed with 6.3% of respondents strongly agreeing. 30.2% of residents disagreed with this statement with 20.9% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

4.4 Question 15 – Responsibility for waste.

Respondents were asked if they agreed that the waste produced by individuals is their responsibility. 76.4% of respondents agreed with 29.5% strongly agreeing. 11.2% of respondents disagreed with 12.4% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

4.5 Question 16, 17 and 18 – The council and waste collection

Residents were asked if that thought that the Council should make more of an effort to collect different types of waste for recycling and composting. 83.9% of respondents agreed that more effort should be made with 35.5 % agreeing strongly. 4.5% of residents disagreed with 11.5% of respondents neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

Question 17 asked residents if they thought a kerbside collection of garden waste and cardboard would be beneficial to them. 72.2% of respondents agreed with 30.1% agreeing strongly. 10.7% of residents disagreed with 17.1% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

Residents were asked to state how often they would need to put the black bin out if they recycle plastics, cardboard, cans, paper, garden waste and glass. 47% of residents indicated a need for the black bin to be emptied on a fortnightly basis, 38.8% indicated a need for weekly collections with 5.9% and 6.4% indicating a need for three weekly or monthly collections respectively.

5 Questions 21 and 22 - Economic Information

The 2006 survey included questions relating to residents' economic status and work location. Question 21 asked residents to indicate their economic status. The results from these questions can be seen at point 2.4 in this report. 31.9% of respondents work within Glossop. 18.5% work in Manchester and 16.7% work in Tameside. 7.4% of respondents work from home.

6 Interest in Newsletter; Future Surveys and Service Improvement Discussion Groups

The survey sought to identify potential recipients of the newsletter; those who would be prepared to complete further Liveability survey and/or take part in small discussion groups to help identify service improvements.

Responses were as follows:

- 792 respondents wished to receive future newsletters (70.8%)
- 1022 respondents were prepared to complete further Liveability surveys (88%)
- 330 respondents were prepared to take part in small discussion groups to identify service improvements (28.6%)

Databases have been created of the details of those who responded positively. From the relatively low number of respondents who had heard about Liveability before the survey a good number wish to be kept in touch and participate further.

4. **Overall Comment and Issues for Consideration**

- 4.1 This was the second time the Glossop Liveability survey has been conducted. The number of surveys returned show a slight improvement when compared to last year's figures confirming that although the levels of project awareness are low there is widespread interest in the topics covered by the Liveability programme.
- 4.2 Over a quarter of responses were received from residents in Hadfield, a pattern also evident in the 2005 returns. An analysis of issues by ward is attached to provide a breakdown of issues across different areas.
- 4.3 The increase in the number of people who indicated they had heard of Glossop Liveability should be seen as a positive improvement. However based on the levels of work carried out as part of the Glossop Liveability project during the past 12 months it would be expected that much higher levels of awareness were recorded. It is recommended that further work be carried out relating to the communication and marketing of the Liveability project particularly relating to written media as this has proved to be the most successful means of communication. Future surveys should be described as the Glossop Vision survey and not Glossop Liveability to avoid confusion and strengthen brand identity.
- 4.4 Although street cleanliness remains the number one priority in terms of public service standards, improvements have been recorded in all questions relating to standards of cleanliness in the town centre, parks open spaces and play areas. Additional capacity has been generated during the past 12 months to increase the frequency of street cleansing rounds and it would appear from the results that this had had some impact. It is recommended that these improvements continue to be reviewed and built on in future years to further increase satisfaction levels.
- 4.5 Consideration needs to be given to issues of dog fouling and gully emptying as the survey highlighted an increase in levels of concern for both issues.
- 4.6 The 2005 survey demonstrated high levels of support for enforcement of fines to tackle litter, dog fouling and fly tipping, therefore the number of respondents in the 2006 survey who think the work of the Enforcement Officer is helping to improve the area is disappointing. Furthermore fines to tackle litter, dog fouling and fly-tipping continues to be ranked as the most important quality of life issue addressed by Liveability with 96% of respondents indicating it as 'important' or 'very important'. More needs to be done to advertise how many fines have been issued and collected in order to maximise publicity and the deterrent effect. This is of particular importance in relation to fines for dog fouling.
- 4.7 The survey has identified a number residents who want to know more and remain involved, adding significantly to the current mailing list. The results

of the survey will be circulated to all relevant service areas and to Derbyshire County Council for consideration. The results also be communicated to survey respondents and the Glossop Vision Board.

- 4.8** Glossop Vision will begin to deliver physical improvements in the town centre early in 2007. This should help to further increase the profile and recognition of the Glossop Vision project and it is recommended that the survey be repeated in 12 months time in order to allow for further comparison and analysis.