APPENDIX 2

RESIDENTS SURVEY: METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

2.1
This section contains notes on the conception, design, construction, operation and analysis of the Residents Survey from a technical point of view.

BACKGROUND

2.2

The Long Melford Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) started in December 2016 with an application to the planning authority for a designated area to be the subject of the Plan. That was granted in February 2017, and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) began to gather evidence from public meetings, forums with local businesses and a wide range of meetings with stakeholders in the community. These provided a rich stream of issues, problems and suggestions to be considered for the Plan. By February 2018 plans were being made for a village-wide survey of residents' opinions to consolidate and give weight to the information gathered so far.

2.3

Twelve years previously between 2005 and 2007 Long Melford had developed a Parish Plan (PP2006) with similarities to the new Plan. That earlier plan included several surveys. Among them was a very successful household questionnaire with an outstanding rate of response. It would be valuable if a similar level of success could be achieved again in 2018.

2.4

It was obvious at this stage that a full Residents Survey, if it were to be done, would be on the critical path among the tasks needed to complete the Plan. Careful management would be required to achieve it without losing time waiting for resources or delayed decisions.

WHAT KIND OF SURVEY?

2.5

Designing good surveys is an art as well as a science. People are not generally fond of filling-in paper forms, but telephone surveys may be still less popular. Subtle compromises are needed between making the questions few, short and snappy, and on the other hand finding that what comes back does not discriminate enough to be useful, and may have been subject to gross misunderstandings.

2.6

In February 2018 the NPSG had more or less decided to follow the example of PP2006 and use a paper questionnaire form to be distributed by hand around the village. The decision about how to get the data back and analyse it was still up in the air.

2.7

The obvious choice was to follow the advice of Community Action Suffolk (CAS) who have helped many village teams with their plans. CAS have a standard questionnaire software product "QA" available on-line at http://qa.1sixty.net.

THE QA ON-LINE OPTION

2.8

QA is a versatile piece of software based on the Internet. Given a user account, the village team can design its own questions and arrange them as it wishes in sections within the questionnaire. Paper copies of the forms from this design can be printed, and the system generates separate passwords for all the respondents.

2.9

Data capture is through the Internet. Either the respondent themselves uses their password to call-up the questionnaire on-screen and fill it in, or else the paper form is filled in and has to be collected by someone else. The collector then uses the specific password for that respondent to put the data in through the net.

2.10

Analysis is relatively simple. The questions are set up with a fixed range of possible answers. These may be as straightforward as Yes/No, or allow many options, with either "Choose One", or "Tick all that apply". The first stage of analysis summarises the responses to that specific question according to the options chosen by the respondents. Further stages are possible, linking two or more questions together, so that for example you can discover how many of those who said "Yes" to Question 1 also said "North", "South", "East" or "West" to Question 2.

2.11

These analysis results are only available on-line (though they can obviously be captured by the screen-print function). There is no way to export the full database for deeper analysis in another system.

EVALUATING QA

2.12

The freedom to specify whatever questions may be required is vital. One of the major features of the QA system is that the designer can shuffle the questions and re-define the possible answers as well as the sections and sub-sections of the questionnaire at will. However, although there are several allowable types of question, it is extremely awkward to incorporate "ranking" questions, where people are asked to arrange a set of options in their personal order of preference.

2.13

Open-ended questions (expecting plain text as an answer) are almost impossible. There are no facilities at all for analysing the results.

2.14

Printing paper copies of the questionnaire is possible, but they are cramped and unattractive to look at unless a great deal of further editing is done to improve the layout.

2.15

Data entry of the results has to be done through the Internet. That is good if you can rely on your respondents to have Internet access, and a modest fluency in IT. Even if you can't, and have to collect paper forms and use a data-entry team to transfer the information, the Internet input means that it is not difficult to find helpers, and there is no problem of scale.

2.16

As far as it goes, the analysis feature of the QA system is good too. It is easy to use, though it gets tedious when answers to more than two questions need to be related. It does not make it at all easy to generate cross-tabulations or to do even simple statistics if they are required. As stated above, it has no facilities for dealing with spontaneous text comments.

2.17

Considering all the above, it was decided not to proceed with CAS and the QA system.

THE ALTERNATIVE

2.18

If the QA system was not to be adopted, the questionnaire would have to be designed as a normal paper document. Fortunately, a volunteer was available with the necessary document-design software and using it would avoid the constraints inherent in the QA layouts. Doing the work in-house would take about the same effort overall to produce an attractive result.

2.19

Similarly, if the QA on-line database was not to be used, some other database system would be required. The same local volunteer had many years of experience in designing databases, and was able to help. Using "Filemaker Pro", a well-established piece of software, it was then not too hard to generate a new custom-built system to match the questionnaire design as it developed.

2.20

The questionnaire was seen as having "a mere twenty questions" so to begin with the database structure was expected to be quite simple.

2.21

The tricky part of this approach is the data-entry stage. With a home-made database it was unlikely to be possible to put it on the Internet. There would therefore be no opportunity for respondents to enter their own data (this looks like a restriction, but is probably a good feature!).

2.22

A data-entry team of volunteers would be required, using a segmented version of the new database. There

"IN 2006 SOME 77% OF HOUSEHOLDS HAD FILLED IN AND RETURNED A VERY LARGE AND COMPLEX QUESTIONNAIRE"

would be challenges of installing that on a variety of personal computers, and of specialised training for the data-input task.

THE CHOICE

2.23
The most important concerns in making a decision were:
- Ease of use:
  The quality of the questionnaire document must be very good in all respects, to encourage the highest possible completion rate.
- In-depth analysis:
  In 2006, the database results had been exported from the VA system (a precursor to the QA software) to a Filemaker database for analysis. This had been instrumental in achieving the depth and quality of reporting characteristic of PP2006.
- Keyboard volunteers:
  In 2006 it had been possible to recruit a team of 14 data-entry volunteers who had handled all the input for a larger and more complicated questionnaire form than was now proposed.
- Time for development, testing and deployment:
  According to the schedule, the questionnaire was to be distributed in May 2018, and if at all possible, the results should be available by the end of June. This was a much shorter timescale than had been achieved in 2006.

2.24
On 28th February 2018 the committee felt that the overriding concern was to achieve a good response. In 2006 some 77% of households had filled in and returned a very large and complex questionnaire. There seemed to be a chance of achieving much the same in 2018 if the same methods were adopted.

2.25
The elements of the decision were therefore:
- The questionnaire form would be designed along the same lines as in 2006, with a large typeface and adequate room for handwritten answers. Document design and layout would be done in-house, using the text of questions, instructions and other material defined or chosen by the committee members.
- A large team of volunteers (approaching 100 people) would be needed to do house-tohouse deliveries and to collect the questionnaire forms after they had been filled-in. This labour-intensive method had been the key to the high response rate in 2006.
- There was no point in trying to use on-line data entry direct from the public.
  ◦ If that were the only method available, response would be very poor, and would also be biased away from the substantial elderly population in Long Melford.
- If direct on-line data entry was an option, it would be impossible to keep track of who had completed the form and who had not. The 'chivvying' role of the volunteers in 2006, handing out the forms and collecting them back, could not be effective.
- A second and much smaller team (perhaps 20) of volunteer keyboard operators would be recruited to transfer the written answers from the questionnaire forms into the database.
- One person would be responsible for the design and construction of a Filemaker database to contain the questionnaire answers. This would be used both for data entry (using a set of screen layouts to match the paper forms) and later for analysis of the results.

DESIGN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

2.26
Once it was agreed that the questionnaire should be distributed as a paper document, many design decisions fell into place:
- It would be printed in colour on A3 sheets folded and stitched to A4 size.
- A highly-legible font was essential (Lucida Grande 12 pt.), and suitably large spaces allowed for hand-written answers.
- The questions would be organised in four sections

dealing with Housing, Traffic and Parking, Services and Facilities, and General.

- Great care would be given to explaining on the form the purpose and context of each of the questions.
- Equal care was needed to make the instructions to the respondent clear and simple. This was obviously to do with choosing the words, but also highlighting them in colour and italics.
- With colour available, a handful of photographs of local scenes were added to improve the visual appearance and to 'pace' the text.

2.27
It appears from residents' comments at the time and from the overall success of the survey that the one-off design of the questionnaire document helped in making it acceptable to the residents.

2.28
The process of developing the questions in the various working groups, assembling them into a coherent 12-page document layout and passing it on to the printer was completed before the end of April 2018, two months from the start.

DATABASE OPTIONS

2.29
The QA database (had it been used) is not accessible to the end user for anything other than putting data in. Even the designer of a new survey has no control over its deep structure, though she or he can obviously choose parameters, section titles and question types from the range provided. That deep structure by necessity has to be a complex abstraction to cope with the needs of a wide range of surveys each with their own special characteristics.

2.30
The situation with Filemaker Pro was entirely different. The complexity of the new database only had to reflect the complexity of the concepts expressed in this particular questionnaire, with no concern about future generalisations. One of the key decisions by the NPSG was that residents would be treated as individuals

and each given their own copy of the questionnaire. There would be no attempt to link them together in households or any other grouping. This makes sense when the purpose is to elicit individual opinions. (It would not, of course, be adequate if a census were being attempted of motor vehicles or of housing stock.)

2.31
The result was a very simple database structure with essentially one large table holding all the fields required. The pattern was:

Field type	Number of fields
Text	112
Number	30
Timestamp	3
Summary	15
Calculation	8
Total	**168**

2.32
The total number of fields may be surprising, considering that there were only twenty questions on the form. Most questions, however, had several options or suggestions on different lines and generally each of those lines requires its own field in the database to contain the responses for that particular line as distinct from the others.

2.33
The majority of the fields were coded as text to aid understanding and accuracy of data input. There is, for example in the Transport section a question (TP1, part 3) which asked "Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statement:
'The village should have safe cycle routes or cycle lanes'"

2.34
In the database there is a field to hold the responses, and it is named 'TP1_3CycleRoutes'.
It is a text field, and the entries in that field are in the form "1_Strong agree", "2_Agree", 3_Disagree", and so on…

2.35

Simple number fields were used for recording the rankings of people's preferences. (There has to be a separate field for each option put forward in the question, so there are many more numeric fields than questions of this type.)

2.36

Timestamps were part of the administrative structure of the database, so that the creation and completion of each record (i.e. one specific questionnaire form) could be known if needed.

2.37

The *Summary and Calculation fields* were used in analysis.

GETTING TO THE PEOPLE

2.38

The questionnaire forms were distributed throughout the village starting on 10 May 2018. Each volunteer distributor was assigned a street or other well-defined set of dwellings and was asked to make several visits to each front door. The first was to pass over as many questionnaire forms as there were residents at that address of the age 15 years and upwards. Further visits (agreed whenever possible with the residents) were made to collect the completed forms in separate blank envelopes for anonymity.

2.39

The result was a stream of hundreds of completed questionnaires beginning a few days after the distribution, and continuing to the end of the month; 31st May 2018.

2.40

The questionnaire forms (in their blank envelopes as collected) were physically shuffled and then taken from the envelopes, numbered and bundled in sets of 25. These batches of 25 were then distributed to the data-entry keyboards by a co-ordinator and subsequently collected back again to the centre.

THE CHALLENGE OF DATA-ENTRY

2.41

The database design included specialised screen layouts for data entry. These matched very closely the layout of the questionnaire form, section by section and question by question. Most answers could be entered by mouse-clicks, using 'radio-buttons' on the layout to define the acceptable entries (e.g. 'Yes', 'No', '_blank'). A few questions required numbers instead of clicks (to handle ranked preferences) and others allowed plain text answers from the resident to be typed in using the keyboard.

2.42

Spontaneous written comments in unexpected places on the questionnaire were also keyed into the database and subsequently analysed. If a resident felt the comment worth making, it was deemed to be worth recording too.

MANPOWER ON KEYBOARDS

2.43

The time needed to complete data entry varied from one form to another depending particularly on the amount of text (if any). The average was around 5 minutes per form at the beginning, though several keyboard volunteers became much faster with practice. With roughly 2000 forms to handle and a practical output of 10 to12 forms per hour per keyboard, the workload was somewhere between 150 and 200 man-hours in total.

2.44

Just over 20 people offered to help with data entry, using their own computers at home, with a copy of the database software. There were slight variations from person to person in the way the system was set up, depending on whether they had a Windows or Macintosh operating system, and how up-to date it was. In order to comply with software license provisions, the basic pattern was to distribute an empty clone of a restricted 'Run-Time' package that would work with this specific database and no other.

2.45

The database designer created the distribution package (in both Windows and Macintosh variants) and provided individual training sessions for each of the keyboard volunteers. Nine were up and running by 10th May 2018 to catch the first questionnaires returned, and a further ten were brought in by the beginning of June. Three others dropped out of the running for good reasons.

2.46

While a few of the keyboard volunteers managed only one or two batches, others ran up to eight or more (i.e. 200 questionnaires and over). They were busy people in their normal lives, and their commitment to the job was most impressive.

2.47

The first batch was registered as completely entered on 20th May, and the final one on 13th June.

QUALITY CONTROL

2.48

Human beings make errors. An obvious question is therefore, "How trustworthy are the results in the database?"

2.49

As explained above, the design of the database itself was intended to aid accuracy at every stage. For the vast majority of the questions the answers could only be chosen from a pre-defined list. What's more, the data actually entered (usually with a mouse-click) was in text that corresponded to the options the form-filler had been given. This reduces errors in the first place and makes checking and correction easy.

2.50

As the first few batches came back from the keyboards, the database records were inspected and compared with the paper questionnaires. It became obvious that:

• Errors were rather rare.

• By far the commonest error was a keyboard click in the wrong place.

• Some operators were more reliable than others.

2.51

As a result, a very straightforward control policy was adopted:

• A full batch (25 questionnaire forms) would be inspected for each keyboard volunteer. That inspection would count the 'click' errors found, and correct them on the spot.

• A threshold figure would be set (10 detected errors of that type in the batch), below which performance was deemed acceptable, and no further inspections would be done for that operator. Note that each form involved over 100 'clicks', so a batch of 25 forms required roughly 2500 'clicks' in total. Ten errors in 2500 is 0.4%.

• For those with a higher error rate in their sample batch, their whole output would be inspected in the same way, and any errors found would be corrected.

2.52

This was not the most efficient scheme possible, but was simple and effective, if tedious. The outcome was to ensure an overall error rate on 'clicks' of substantially less than half of one percent (i.e. roughly one random error per two or three forms). The effects of these errors would most often be to have a '_blank' instead of the intended answer. The remainder gave a change to an adjacent option (e.g. 'disagree' rather than 'agree').

2.53

In analysis, however, as the summary numbers were counted up for each question, they were so clearly divided between the options (by at least several percent) that the small potential error from wrong 'clicks' would have had no effect on the interpretation.

ASSEMBLING THE DATABASE

2.54

The database was designed to make it easy for the keyboard operator to export the results at any stage in the format of a MS Excel workbook. The Excel files were sent by email to a co-ordinator who ran a quarantine system to keep each operator's work in storage until quality checks had been completed (including any corrections).

2.55

The keyboard team were encouraged to send interim results at the end of each batch, rather than waiting for the end. This made it relatively easy to pick up where records had gone missing or serial numbers corrupted in the stress of learning the new procedure. It also provided a safety-net back-up in case there had been loss or damage to the local databases.

2.56

Finally, when any one operator reached the end of their assigned batches, the Excel file they then generated was read back into the central database and merged with the others.

2.57

The whole process worked smoothly, and with only very minor problems.

ANALYSIS AND REPORTS

2.58

The basic approach to analysis and reporting was to summarise the numbers of answers in each category to each sub-question across the whole population of questionnaire forms.

2.59

The Filemaker Pro database software has good facilities for searching, sorting and summarising records with particular specified characteristics. It was then easy to transfer these totals and sub-totals to MS Excel spreadsheets for reporting, and in many cases to display them graphically too.

2.60

The results of this work can be seen from page 9 below.

WEIGHTING EXPERIMENTS

2.61

Three of the questions on the form called for respondents to rank several possibilities in order of their own preference using e.g. numbers 1 to 5 for five options. This type of question is a frequent source of trouble because the respondents sometimes find it difficult to work out their preferences in such detail, and can easily misinterpret the instructions. Thus, there were multiple cases of people using the number '1' twice or three times in the same ranking, or ranking only two or three of the options they were given.

2.62

It seemed possible that these irregularities in the responses might bias the analysis one way or another. If each '1' were given full value as a first preference, for example, people who had not kept to the rules would be handed an unfair share of voting influence. A rather detailed investigation was launched, in which a specially-written computer program worked out weighted values for the preferences expressed on each questionnaire so that the total score for each person was the same, but the distribution between the options followed whatever indications they had given.

2.63

It became clear quite quickly that with these database results, any reasonable weighting scheme would give exactly the same summary ranking as the original simple totals. The bias effect was there, but too small to have a noticeable effect.

2.64

For that reason, the results published below in this appendix do not include the weighting experiments. The historic results are still available on file, however, if required for inspection.

APPENDIX 2 | CONTINUED...

CONCLUSION

2.65

The Residents Survey was an outstanding success. From the decision to go ahead with an in-house design at the beginning of March 2018, full results were available to the various Plan working parties by the beginning of July 2018. The population of village residents expressed their views with admirable clarity; with approximately 2,655 questionnaires distributed and 1,995 completed and returned, the response rate of 75% is outstanding.

2.66

This could not have been achieved without the dedication and hard work of a very large number of villagers, who volunteered their services for questionnaire distribution and collection and for data entry from the filled-in paper forms to the database.

SURVEY RESULTS

2.67

This link will take you to the original questionnaire document:
http://www.longmelfordnp.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/LMNPQuestionnaire.pdf

2.68

The questions on the questionnaire form fall into four sections:
*   Housing
*   Transport and Parking
*   Services and Facilities
*   General

In this appendix, each section of results begins on a fresh page.

2.69

For each question and sub-question on the form, the numbers of responses in each category are summarised in a table. Generally, the rows match the options offered in the question and the columns the

various responses (Yes/No/blank, Good/Indifferent/Bad/blank. etc.). Wherever possible each number is followed by a percentage, to assist in interpretation.

2.70

The total number of questionnaire forms returned was 1,995. This was 75% of the approximate 2,655 questionnaires distributed.

2.71

In a few of the questions (e.g. H5 about whether housing should be reserved for local people) at least some respondents either misunderstood the instructions or chose to ignore them, producing some apparently illogical results. Nevertheless, those results have been included in the tables on the following pages as they give the best information available about the wishes of the people concerned.

2.72

It has not been possible to present the very large number of written text comments in this appendix. But we hope to make them available on the web site in due course.

HOUSING

H1 Several smaller developments or one big one?

Please put numbers 1-5 to rank these options in order of preference where 1 is your first choice and 5 is your least favourite choice.

Rank >	1	% of 1995	2	% of 1995	3	% of 1995	4	% of 1995	5	% of 1995	0 (blank)	% of 1995	Total
Max 20	1331	67%	253	13%	107	5%	52	3%	94	5%	158	8%	1995
Max 40	373	19%	1147	57%	68	3%	75	4%	84	4%	248	12%	1995
Max 60	107	5%	88	4%	1353	68%	24	1%	129	6%	294	15%	1995
Max 80	54	3%	64	3%	36	2%	1380	69%	157	8%	304	15%	1995
Over 80	67	3%	10	1%	11	1%	22	1%	1572	79%	313	16%	1995
Total	1932		1562		1575		1553		2036		1317		

H2   What kind of homes?

What do you think are the village's housing requirements for the future?
Please tick one box per row

Rating >	Very much needed	% of 1995	Yes, needed	% of 1995	Needed but not much	% of 1995	Not needed	% of 1995	Blank	% of 1995	Total
Flats	182	9%	376	19%	557	28%	572	29%	308	15%	1995
Bungalows	478	24%	669	34%	414	21%	221	11%	213	11%	1995
1-bed houses	228	11%	485	24%	557	28%	394	20%	331	17%	1995
2-bed houses	529	27%	866	43%	268	13%	134	7%	198	10%	1995
3-bed houses	427	21%	740	37%	407	20%	194	10%	227	11%	1995
4-bed houses	83	4%	262	13%	598	30%	811	41%	241	12%	1995
Sheltered housing	425	21%	698	35%	388	19%	284	14%	200	10%	1995
Housing reserved for Key workers	291	15%	477	24%	437	22%	523	26%	267	13%	1995

H3   Who are the new homes for?

With any new development in Long Melford, what type of ownership do you consider most important?
Please tick one box per row

Rating >	Very important	% of 1995	Fairly important	% of 1995	Not important	% of 1995	blank	% of 1995	Total
Privately owned	707	35%	818	41%	357	18%	113	6%	1995
Privately rented	193	10%	1000	50%	662	33%	140	7%	1995
Affordable housing	1356	68%	443	22%	143	7%	53	3%	1995

H4   How much affordable housing?

Are you happy with the Babergh District Council policy that 35% of any new housing development should be 'affordable'? Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'

Response	Number	% of 1995
Yes	1079	54%
No	865	43%
blank	51	3%
Total	1995	100%

If your answer is 'No', what other proportion would you suggest?
(Please select one)

Response	Zero	% of line total	01% – 10%	% of line total	11% – 20%	% of line total	21% – 35%	% of line total	Left subtotal	more than 35%	% of line total	blank	% of line total	Line total
'No'	63	7%	145	17%	163	19%	24	3%	395	458	53%	12	1%	865
Note that a few people who answered 'Yes' or 'blank' also made a suggestion.														
'Yes'	1	0%	4	0%	3	0%	11	1%	19	19	2%	1041	96%	1079
blank	3	6%	1	2%	1	2%	4	8%	9	6	12%	36	71%	51
Total	67	3%	150	8%	167	8%	39	2%	423	483	24%	1089	55%	1995

H5 Housing reserved for local people?

Do you feel that some of the affordable housing provided in new developments should be reserved for local Long Melford people? Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'

Response	Number	% of 1995
Yes	1810	91%
No	141	7%
blank	44	2%
Total	1995	

If your answer is 'Yes', what proportion of the whole development would you suggest should be reserved? (Please select one)

Response	01% - 10%	% of line total	11% - 20%	% of line total	21% - 35%	% of line total	more than 35%	% of line total	blank	% of line total	Line total
'Yes'	171	9%	432	24%	502	28%	671	37%	34	2%	1810
Note that a few people who answered 'Yes' or 'blank' also made a suggestion.											
'No'	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%	1	1%	136	96%	141
blank	2	5%	1	2%	6	14%	6	14%	29	66%	44
Total	174	9%	434	22%	510	26%	678	34%	199	10%	1995

H6 Should our plan allocate actual sites for development?

Do you agree that the village neighbourhood plan should allocate actual sites for potential development? Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'

Response	Number	% of 1995
Yes	1798	90%
No	121	6%
blank	76	4%
Total	1995	

H7 Whereabouts should new developments be?

Assuming that sites are to be allocated for development in the LMNP, what types of sites would you prefer to see allocated? Please put one tick to show your preference in each pair

	First option preferred	% of 1995	Second option preferred	% of 1995	blank	% of 1995	Total
Brownfield OR Greenfield	1602	80%	140	7%	253	13%	1995
Within a short distance of the village centre OR further away	858	43%	934	47%	203	10%	1995
On the main roads into village OR not so visible	303	15%	1465	73%	227	11%	1995
Large sites OR small or medium-sized sites	74	4%	1717	86%	204	10%	1995

TP1 Road safety?

Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:
Please tick one box per row

	Strongly agree	%	Agree	%	Disagree	%	Strongly disagree	%	blank	%	Total
The village needs 'traffic calming' measures in key places.	959	48%	597	30%	277	14%	119	6%	43	2%	1995
Hall St. should be a 20mph zone.	716	36%	561	28%	491	25%	184	9%	43	2%	1995
The village should have safe cycle routes or cycle lanes.	543	27%	734	37%	462	23%	183	9%	73	4%	1995

TP2 Safety on the pavements?

Considering pedestrian safety in the village, these suggestions are:
Please tick one box per row

	Very important	%	Fairly important	%	Not at all important	%	Better not at all	%	blank	%	Total
Pedestrian safety in key places (e.g. an island in the middle of a busy road).	1288	65%	550	28%	82	4%	39	2%	36	2%	1995
Light-controlled crossings for pedestrians in key places.	1028	52%	709	36%	158	8%	61	3%	39	2%	1995
Pavements without parked cars and level enough for children's and old people's wheeled vehicles.	1280	64%	505	25%	105	5%	42	2%	63	3%	1995

TP3 Car parking?

Please answer 'Yes' or 'No' to whether you favour the following:

	Yes	%	No	%	blank	%	Total
A new off-street car park nearer to Hall Street than the Old School car park?	1471	74%	457	23%	67	3%	1995
Parking subject to time-limits in Hall Street? (with resident scheme for houses/businesses)	1060	53%	853	43%	82	4%	1995
Clearly-marked parking bays in Hall Street?	1305	65%	613	31%	77	4%	1995
More posts along Hall Street to prevent cars blocking the pavement?	1509	76%	423	21%	63	3%	1995
Residents' parking schemes for selected streets around the wider village? (e.g. St. Catherine's Road)	1356	68%	543	27%	96	5%	1995

VILLAGE SERVICES AND FACILITIES

SF1   Which of our services and facilities matters most?

Please rank the following services and facilities in order of need if funds were available to improve them.
Put numbers 1 to 6 to show the order of your preference, where 1 is your first choice and 6 is your least-favourite choice.

Ranking	1	% of 1995	2	% of 1995	3	% of 1995	4	% of 1995	5	% of 1995	6	% of 1995	0 blank	Total
Doctors' surgery	1409	71%	330	17%	79	4%	55	3%	31	2%	59	3%	32	1995
Primary school	409	21%	967	48%	227	11%	158	8%	116	6%	62	3%	56	1995
Library	54	3%	120	6%	485	24%	557	28%	584	29%	123	6%	72	1995
Village halls and meeting rooms	79	4%	163	8%	509	26%	622	31%	464	23%	90	5%	68	1995
Public open spaces	213	11%	264	13%	537	27%	365	18%	486	24%	69	3%	61	1995
Other (please write below)	56	3%	38	2%	51	3%	46	2%	56	3%	522	26%	1226	1995

Note: although in this question there were 769 positive ratings of "Other", only 481 of them (63%) also defined what "Other" they referred to. The rest left the suggestion space blank.

SF2   What about our doctors' surgery?

The surgery may have to increase capacity. With development will come increased demand. How can the surgery best meet that demand?
Please put numbers 1 to 3 to rank the following in order of importance to the village, where 1 is your first choice and 3 is your least favourite choice

Ranking	1	% of 1995	2	% of 1995	3	% of 1995	0 blank	% of 1995	Total
If possible, extend the existing surgery	1211	61%	423	21%	280	14%	81	4%	1995
Build on a new site within the village	453	23%	877	44%	545	27%	120	6%	1995
Open a third surgery (in addition to LM and Lavenham)	342	17%	506	25%	1032	52%	115	6%	1995

Are you a patient of the Long Melford Practice?
Please answer Yes or No:

Response	Number	% of 1995
Yes	1515	76%
No	439	22%
blank	41	2%
Total	1995	

SF2 continued...

If your answer is 'Yes', how do you view the trend in the standard of service provided by the surgery over the last two years?   Please tick one of the following boxes:

Trend -> patient?	The service has improved	% of line total	Stayed about the same	% of line total	Has deteriorated	% of line total	blank	% of line total	Line Total
'Yes'	126	8%	648	43%	676	45%	65	4%	1515
Note that a few people answered 'No' or 'blank' and still gave an opinion:									
'No'	0	0%	4	1%	7	2%	428	97%	439
blank	3	7%	10	24%	12	29%	16	39%	41
Total	129	6%	662	33%	695	35%	509	26%	1995

SF3 What are your thoughts on the school?

How would you rate the importance of our primary school and pre-school to the village?
Please tick one box per row :

	Very important	% of total	Fairly important	% of total	Not at all important	% of total	blank	% of total	Total
Primary school	1682	84%	201	10%	45	2%	67	3%	1995
Pre-school	1442	72%	400	20%	54	3%	99	5%	1995

If you have a child/children of primary school age, does he/she/they attend our village school?
Please tick one of the following boxes:

	Yes	% of line total	No	% of line total	Not applicable	blank	Total
Child attends LM primary school	111	41%	162	59%			273
[no child that age]					1481	241	1722
Total	111	5.6%	162	8.1%			1995

People whose children attend the primary school were invited to comment, and 89 did so.

If you have a child/children of pre-school age, does he/she/they attend our village pre-school? Please tick one of the following boxes:	Yes	% of line total	No	% of line total	Not applicable	blank	Total
Child attends LM pre-school	24	14%	151	86%			175
[no child that age]					1523	297	1820
Total	24	1.2%	1512	8.1%			1995

SF4 Do we need a new village hall?

If funding were available, would you support the creation of a new multi-purpose village hall and community centre, with outside facilities and parking? Please answer 'Yes' or 'No':

Response	Number	% of 1995
Yes	990	49.6%
No	872	43.7%
blank	133	6.7%
Total	1995	

If you answered 'Yes', what services should be provided there? Please tick one box per row:	Essential	% of 1995	Important	% of 1995	Yes OK	% of 1995	Not needed	% of 1995	Blank	% of 1995	Total
Sports hall	343	17%	475	24%	261	13%	135	7%	781	39%	1995
Library	228	11%	450	23%	387	19%	149	7%	781	39%	1995
Parish council office	146	7%	345	17%	496	25%	214	11%	794	40%	1995
Heritage centre/museum	158	8%	415	21%	467	23%	160	8%	795	40%	1995
Meeting/event rooms	340	17%	469	24%	298	15%	115	6%	73	39%	1995
Other…	82	4%	71	4%	24	1%	77	4%	1741	87%	1995

Notes: a)   There were 216 comments in the 'Other' space, recommending extra features.
b)   Most, but not all of the 'No' voters for a new hall left all options blank. (About 90 (i.e. 10% of them) did not, but entered some preferences.)

SF5 What about leisure?

How would you rate the importance of our primary school and pre-school to the village?
Please tick one box per row:

	Essential	% of 1995	Fairly important	% of 1995	Not at all important	% of 1995	blank	% of 1995	Total
Play equipment in parks	767	38%	922	46%	175	9%	131	7%	1995
Outdoor sporting activities: e.g. ball games, a BMX track	489	25%	959	48%	401	20%	146	7%	1995
Other activities for under-18s	775	39%	946	47%	132	7%	142	7%	1995
Activities for 65s and over	648	32%	1083	54%	143	7%	121	6%	1995
Public seating and toilets in Hall Street	1049	53%	643	32%	238	12%	65	3%	1995
Cricket club	362	18%	1072	54%	402	20%	159	8%	1995
Football club	401	20%	1068	54%	370	19%	156	8%	1995
Other	94	5%	79	4%	92	5%	1730	87%	1995

Note: There were 199 comments in the 'Other' category.

SF6 How green is our village?

If funds were available, how important is it to you to enhance, preserve or introduce any of the following to promote our environment?   Please tick one box on each row:

	Essential	% of 1995	Fairly important	% of 1995	Not at all important	% of 1995	blank	% of 1995	Total
Recycling facilities	1321	66%	532	27%	52	3%	90	5%	1995
Public footpaths	1402	70%	485	24%	40	2%	68	3%	1995
Public green spaces	1403	70%	472	24%	34	2%	86	4%	1995
Allotments	575	29%	1056	53%	241	12%	123	6%	1995
A community orchard	195	10%	664	33%	994	50%	142	7%	1995
A green burial site	261	13%	773	39%	819	41%	142	7%	1995
Electric car-charging points in public places	344	17%	866	43%	669	34%	116	6%	1995
Electric car-charging points in new developments	452	23%	826	41%	587	29%	130	7%	1995

GENERAL QUESTIONS

G1   What is your gender?

Please tick one box

Gender	Number	% of total
female	1043	52.3%
male	929	46.6%
other	2	0.1%
blank	21	1.1%
Total	1995	

G2   What age group are you?

Please tick one box

Age band	Number	% of total
15 - 17	35	1.8%
18 - 24	79	4.0%
25 - 44	310	15.5%
45 - 59	453	22.7%
60 - 74	714	35.8%
75 - 84	290	14.5%
over 85	88	4.4%
blank	26	1.3%
Total	1995	

G3   How long have you lived in Long Melford?

Please tick one box

Years	Number	% of total
00 - 01	120	6.0%
01 - 05	367	18.4%
06 - 15	453	22.7%
16 - 25	343	17.2%
26 - 50	461	23.1%
51 or more	219	11.0%
blank	32	1.6%
Total	1995	