

Report to Glossop Vision Survey Board

By Sarah Porru – Glossop Vision Project Officer

January 2008

Glossop Vision Resident Survey

5000 surveys were distributed via the Glossop Vision newsletter in July and August 2007. The results of this have now been analysed and compared against the results from the 2005 and 2006 survey. A commentary on the outcome together with results tables are attached. (Appendix 1).

The survey results have been circulated to relevant Council Officers for information and consideration of the results and subsequent action.

It is recommended that the Board receive the survey reports and be invited to bring any comments and proposals for action to the next meeting.

1. Introduction

1.1 This is the third annual Glossop Vision Survey. The surveys completed in 2005 and 2006 were distributed by post, with freepost return envelopes, to 5000 Glossop residents chosen at random from the electoral register. The 2007 survey was distributed as a tear out section of the Glossop Vision newsletter. This was delivered by post to a mailing list of approx 1000 residents who expressed an interest in taking part in future surveys. The remaining surveys were available to residents from local shops, libraries, doctors surgeries, leisure centres and community centres. Residents could return completed surveys to Municipal Buildings reception or use the freepost address provided.

1.2 The aim of the survey was to:

- Assess, and raise, awareness of Glossop Vision.
- Measure levels of customer satisfaction with relevant areas of service
- Enable comparisons with other survey outcomes
- Enable consideration of further action
- Identify resident's priorities and the extent to which issues impact on their quality of life
- Provide information on resident views and priorities at a town wide and ward level

1.3 The full 2007 survey results are shown at Appendix 1. This report addresses the overall results and makes a comparison of the results against those from previous years.

2. Profile of Respondents

- 2.1 Only 231 responses were received, representing a 4.62% response rate. This is a poor response in comparison to the return rate of 24% in 2006. The low response rate may be a result of the changes to distribution noted above and therefore it is recommended that any future surveys are posted directly to residents chosen randomly from the electoral register and include freepost return envelopes.
- 2.2 The percentage of valid responses from men and women were 39% and 61% respectively. In terms of age range:
- 41.9% were aged over 60, of which 28.2% were aged over 65.
 - 18.9% of respondents were aged 35-44.
 - 15% aged 45-54
 - 15.4% were under 35.
 - 8.8% were aged 55-59
- 2.3 Responses were received from residents across the wards in Glossopdale, with responses from Glossop being the highest at 35.5% followed by Hadfield at 18.4% and Simmondley at 13.2%. These three areas also returned the highest level of responses in the 2006 survey. (See Appendix 1, Question 9, for a full breakdown).
- 2.4 34.2% of respondents were in full time employment and 16.2% worked part-time; 30.3% were self employed and 11.4 % were retired. 1.3% were long term sick and 3.9% were not working for 'other reasons'; 2.6% 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:

- 83.3% said 'Yes' (24.7% in 2006)
- 11.5% said 'No' (68% in 2006)
- 5.3% were unsure

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

- 91% had seen a Glossop Vision Newsletter (69% in 2006)
- 91% had read about it in a newspaper (76%)
- 84% had read about it in Connect (78%)

- 25% had heard about it on the radio (14%)

Whilst these responses appear to demonstrate a strong increase in awareness in comparison with responses from the 2006 survey, the results should be treated with caution. It should be remembered that the 2007 survey was distributed with the Glossop Vision newsletter and this itself would have helped to raise awareness. On a positive note, the results do show an increase in awareness across all media with 91% of respondents indicating they had read about Glossop Vision in newspapers

3.2 Question 3 - Top Four Public Service Standards

Respondents were asked to indicate which four of the ten Public Service Standards they thought were most important. The results for all years are shown below:

	2007	2006	2005
Street Cleanliness	81%	81%	84.4%
Dog Fouling	61%	72%	65.3%
Highway Maintenance	60%	65%	63.8%
Gully Emptying	61%	45%	42.3%
Street Lighting	30%	37%	37.4%
Fly Tipping removal	38%	36%	43%
Overhanging vegetation	35%	28%	26.5%

Street cleanliness, dog fouling, gully emptying and highway maintenance continue to be considered as the top four issues of importance.

3.3 Question 4 - Town Centre Attractiveness

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

- More than half, 58% said they found it attractive. This is a slight increase on previous years. (53.4% in 2006 and 50.8% in 2005)
- Of the 40.3% who found it unattractive, 3.5% said it was very unattractive.

3.4 Question 5 - 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:

- 59.7% replied that it had stayed the same. This compares with 61.8% in 2006.
- 26.9% of respondents felt it had improved compared to 27.2% in 2006.
- 12.7% felt it had 'got worse' (10.9% in 2006)

3.5 Question 6 - Satisfaction with the Way High Peak Delivers Services

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the way High Peak Borough Council delivers named services.

(a) Parks, Open Spaces, and Play Areas

81% of respondents expressed satisfaction with 27% of these being very satisfied. 9% were dissatisfied. The figures show a year on year improvement in the number of people satisfied with parks, open spaces and play areas. 64% expressed satisfaction in 2006 with 18% dissatisfied, whilst 59.9% were satisfied and 19.6% were dissatisfied in 2005.

(b) Street Cleaning

51% of respondents were satisfied, with 5% of these being very satisfied, 34% were dissatisfied, with 9% of these being very dissatisfied; some 19% were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

The results indicate a slight decline in satisfaction when compared to the 2006 figures when 54% of respondents indicated they were satisfied.

(c) Waste Collection

67% of respondents were satisfied with this service. This also demonstrates a slight decline in this service 83% were satisfied in 2006, 82.5% in 2005.

(d) Keeping Public Areas Free of Litter

41% of respondents were satisfied, with 5% of these being very satisfied. 41% were dissatisfied with 13% being very dissatisfied.

The results show a decline in satisfaction with Street Cleansing when viewed alongside the 2006 results when 48% of respondents were satisfied. 32% were dissatisfied.

3.6 Question 8 - Frequency of Incidents in Neighbourhood

Respondents were asked to cite how frequently they thought specified incidents happened in their neighbourhood.

Some questions relate directly to Liveability topics i.e. rubbish or litter lying around; dogs fouling the footpaths and parks whilst others ask questions about noisy neighbours and teenagers hanging around. This information will be passed to the Community Safety Team to assist in safety audits of neighbourhoods.

An analysis of the responses to these questions shows that:

- 76% of respondents reported cars parking on pavements very or quite often.
- 70% of respondents reported that there were dogs fouling the footpaths very or quite often. Although the number of people reporting this as occurring very or quite often has fallen over the past three years. The issue was also a major concern in 2006 when 73% reported this occurring very or quite often and in 2005 when 76.4% reported it occurring.
- Incidents of rubbish and litter lying around also returned a high rate of occurrence. 69% of respondents reported that this occurred very or quite often. This compares with 68% in 2006 and 72.3% in 2005.
- 55% of respondents reported dogs fouling parks very or quite often. This has fallen from 69.1% in 2006 and 71.1% in 2005.

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

Responses have been ranked in order of the % of respondents who indicated they saw them as important, either 'fairly' or 'very important':

	2007	2006	2005
Fines to tackle litter, fly tipping, dog fouling	94%	96%	94.9%
Environmental clean up projects	94%	93%	93.2%
Enhancing the frequency of street cleaning	94%	91%	92%
Improving parks and open spaces	91%	94%	92.7%
Tidy business/fast food litter projects	91%	92%	91.9%
Improving highway maintenance	89%	94%	92.8%

Improvements to the town centre	88%	88%	89.5%
Improvements to the A57 corridor	84%	88%	87.7%
Community involvement/civic pride	83%	77%	80.6%
Better maintenance of street furniture	74%	73%	76.7%
24 hour reporting line	72%	74%	75.2%
Glossop in Bloom	70%	73%	74%

4. Question 10 – Feedback on services

The 2007 survey provided respondents with space to comment on the Glossop Vision programme and other council services. A full list of the comments received are included with the survey results contained at Appendix 1.

An analysis of the feedback shows that the twin bin scheme and recycling services generated the most comments. The majority of comments were requests for expanding the doorstep collections to accommodate plastic and food waste, concerns about fortnightly collections and concerns about bins being left on pavements, obstructing pedestrian access.

Litter and street cleaning issues also generated a high number of comments. A number of respondents felt that whilst town centre areas were kept clean, more attention should be given to other areas. Requests for additional street cleansing operatives patrolling areas on foot and increased frequency of rounds were also frequent. Additional litter bins were requested in parks and on footpaths in Shirebrook Park, Simmondley and Pikes Lane, Glossop.

Dog fouling was also a major concern. Incidents of dog fouling were reported in almost all ward areas with particular concern raised over dog fouling evident in childrens play areas and parks. Responses highlighting incidents of dog fouling and litter also demonstrated a demand for more enforcement against offenders.

Comments about the town centre improvement scheme or overall Glossop Vision programme were generally positive and the improvements were predominantly seen as a good investment, boosting tourism and local economy. Community led environmental improvements, such as those implemented as part of the bloom programme or volunteer ranger schemes, were considered to contribute to a sense of civic pride. Criticisms about the town centre were focused on poor shop frontages detracting from the improvements and the high number of take away outlets and estate agents.

A large number of respondents commented that investment is too heavily focused on Glossop town centre and that investment is also needed in other areas. Hadfield and Simmondley were most frequently cited as being in need of greater attention and investment. Other respondents commented on the need for investment at Harehills to complete the riverside walkway through the town.

The improvements at Manor Park were also well received however other parks were considered poor in comparison. Requests for new equipment were made for Bankswood Park and Gamesley and Padfield play areas.

Blocked gullies, cars illegally parking on pavements and traffic congestion in the town centre were also reported. A number of requests were made for free car parking in the town centre and additional parking facilities following the closure of the Howard Town Mill car park.

5. Overall Comment and Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 This was the third time the Glossop Vision survey has been conducted however there has been a considerable reduction in the number of surveys returned in comparison with figures from previous years and therefore direct comparisons should be approached with some caution. It is recommended that any future surveys are posted directly to residents chosen randomly from the electoral register and include freepost return envelopes.
- 4.2 The majority of responses were received from residents in central Glossop (Howard Town ward), Hadfield and Simmondley. This pattern is also evident in 2005/2006 returns however, of these three wards, Hadfield returned the highest number of responses in previous years compared to Howard Town in 2007.
- 4.3 Street cleanliness, dog fouling, gully emptying and highway maintenance continue to be the top four issues of importance in terms of public service standards. In addition a slight decline was recorded in standards of cleanliness and satisfaction with street cleaning. It is recommended that these services continue to be reviewed and built on in future years to increase satisfaction levels.
- 4.4 Further consideration needs to be given to issues of dog fouling, gully emptying and cars parking on pavements as the survey highlighted high levels of concern for these issues.
- 4.5 The results of the survey will be circulated to all relevant service areas for consideration. The results will also be communicated to the Glossop Vision Board.
- 4.6 The Glossop Vision town centre improvements are due for completion in 2008. It is recommended that the survey be repeated in 12 months time in order to allow for further comparison and analysis.