

## **INTRODUCTION**

This report summarises the responses to the Stokenchurch Village Survey 2015, which ran for an 11-week period between April and July 2015. The survey was organised by the Stokenchurch Community Action Forum, with the active and financial support of Stokenchurch Parish Council.

Stokenchurch Community Action Forum (and its forerunner the Stokenchurch and Radnage Community Action Forum first formed in 2002) comprises a group of local people and has the following formal constitutional objective:

*Taking into account the aspirations, needs and priorities of the community, as expressed via the community questionnaires and by other means, to further the social, economic and environmental well-being and quality of life of those living or working in the parish of Stokenchurch.*

To accomplish this, it seeks, as appropriate, to work in partnership with the Parish Council and other agencies and organisations, but is independent of them.

## **SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

The focus of the 2015 Survey was on on-line responses using SurveyMonkey, although hard copies could be obtained and returned via the library, medical centre and Parish Council office. The survey was widely publicised via a flyer and other content in the Chiltern View magazine (delivered to most households), websites, noticeboards and an item in the Bucks Free Press.

Similar surveys had been carried out in 2003 [report published in 2004] and 2007, although these were entirely paper-based and involved delivery of a survey form to every household, and also covered the parish of Radnage. One other difference was that the 2015 survey invited individual responses (including from young people), rather than just one per household as in the 2003 / 2007 surveys.

## **RESPONSE RATE**

Overall, there were 399 responses, the vast majority of these on-line. However, 87 responses did not proceed beyond the first three 'About you' questions, so the number of what are henceforth referred to as 'meaningful responses' was 312.

This is a lower response than for the previous surveys. Even on the most generous interpretation that each response came from a different household, 312 equates to only 14% of the estimated 2290 households in the parish (2011 Census figures). The 2003 and 2007 surveys received responses from 674 and 407 households.

Assessed against the number of individuals (and discounting the 6 meaningful responses received from under 18s), 306 responses from over 18s equates to only 7% of the estimated 4357 people over 18 in the parish (2011 Census figures).

The survey was also clearly unsuccessful in reaching young people.

## ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

### Section A – About you

#### Q1: What is your full postcode?

399 respondents answered this question. The one respondent with an obviously out-of-parish postcode did not get beyond the 'About you' questions.

#### Q2: What is your age?

399 respondents answered this question. As noted above, only 312 proceeded beyond the 'About you' questions, and there were only a handful of responses from under 18s. In the table below, the age profile of meaningful responses from over 18s is compared with the estimated age profile of the population based on 2011 census figures.

Age	Number who began the survey	Number who got beyond the 'About you' questions	Considering just the responses from over 18s	Estimated age profile of over 18s in local population
11 or under	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
12 to 17	9 (2.3%)	6 (1.9%)		
18 to 29	35 (8.8%)	23 (7.4%)	23 (7.5%)	14%
30 to 49	169 (42.4%)	130 (41.7%)	130 (42.5%)	37%
50 to 64	104 (26.1%)	85 (27.2%)	85 (27.8%)	28%
65 to 79	75 (18.8%)	63 (20.2%)	63 (20.6%)	16%
80 or above	7 (1.7%)	5 (1.6%)	5 (1.6%)	5%
Total	399	312	306	

This would suggest an under-representation of the 18 to 29 age group in the responses received.

#### Q3: How long have you lived in the parish?

398 respondents answered this question. In the table below, a separate breakdown is given for those who proceeded beyond the 'About you' questions.

Length of time lived in parish	Number who began the survey	Number who got beyond the 'About you' questions
less than a year	13 (3.3%)	8 (2.6%)
1-3 years	43 (10.8%)	35 (11.2%)
3-10 years	84 (21.1%)	69 (22.1%)
10-20 years	102 (25.6%)	75 (24.0%)
more than 20 years	156 (39.2%)	125 (40.1%)
Total	398	312

In the absence of baseline data to compare it against, it is not possible to tell if our sample is representative, but it is reassuring that responses were received from across the spectrum of newcomers to long-stayers.

## Section B – The good and the bad

### Q4: What are the three best things about living in this area?

309 respondents answered this question. Some respondents listed less than three, so there were a total of 876 items.

As far as possible, responses were categorised in a similar way to the 2007 survey, to aid comparison. The table below shows the percentage of items in each category for each year.

Although the question did not specify that respondents should list their three items with the most important first, it is perhaps reasonable to assume that most people would have, so an analysis of just the first box answers was also carried out.

	2015					2007 for Stokenchurch and Radnage combined	2015
	1 <sup>st</sup> box	2 <sup>nd</sup> box	3 <sup>rd</sup> box	total	% of total items	% of total items	% of 1 <sup>st</sup> box items only
countryside and nature	147	64	42	253	28.9	28.3	47.6
sense of community / village feel	63	57	67	187	21.3	14.5	20.4
accessibility	29	79	50	158	18.0	15.7	9.4
schools	11	17	29	57	6.5	3.6	3.6
peace, quiet and safety	22	17	21	60	6.8	8.9	7.1
other amenities, including shops, pubs, play, library etc.	17	41	35	93	10.6	6.2	5.5
commons	6	9	7	22	2.5	0.6	1.9
medical facilities	4	6	7	17	1.9	2.2	1.3
family nearby	4	1	2	7	0.8	1.4	1.3
other answers	6	6	10	22	2.5	18.6	1.9
Total	309	297	270	876			

The comparison with 2007 can only be approximate due to inevitable variation in how the analysis was done, but the same general picture emerges: the area is valued for the combination of countryside and accessibility, and its retention of a sense of community and an adequate range of amenities. The analysis of 'first choices' would suggest the countryside environment is particularly valued.

### Q5: What are the three worst things about living in this area?

295 respondents answered this question. Some respondents listed less than three, so there were a total of 753 comments. However, 16 of these were that there were no or no more bad things.

As far as possible, responses were categorised in a similar way to the 2007 survey, to aid comparison. The table on the next page shows the percentage of items in each category for each year.

Although the question did not specify that respondents should list their three items with the most important first, it is perhaps reasonable to assume that most people would have, so an analysis of just the first box answers was also carried out.

	2015					2007	2015
	1 <sup>st</sup> box	2 <sup>nd</sup> box	3 <sup>rd</sup> box	total	% of total items omitting 'none' responses	% of total items	% of 1 <sup>st</sup> box items only, omitting 'none' responses
traffic noise, almost entirely from M40	81	31	15	127	17.2	14.1	28.0
lack of local facilities and amenities	32	33	26	91	12.3	6.3	11.1
<i>of which, this number related specifically to facilities for young people:</i>	13	14	10	37			
<i>and this number related specifically to lack of café:</i>		10	1	11			
shops, mostly relating to lack of, and quality, but also some fears over impact of Tesco	21	21	19	61	8.3	11.5	7.3
speeding	25	21	9	55	7.5	6.4	8.7
public transport	23	20	11	54	7.3	6.8	8.0
anti-social behaviour	25	13	6	44	6.0	6.0	8.7
parking issues	12	11	14	37	5.0		4.2
dog mess	8	9	14	31	4.2		2.8
litter	10	12	8	30	4.1		3.5
crime and lack of policing	11	10	4	25	3.4		3.8
schools, almost entirely relating to lack of secondary school	6	12	6	24	3.3		2.1
condition of roads and pavements	5	9	9	23	3.1		<2
traffic congestion	4	9	9	22	3.0		<2
unkempt or untidy	4	5	6	15	2.0		<2
perceived lack of community spirit	1	6	7	14	<2		<2
overdevelopment fears	6	4	3	13	<2		2.1
weather	7	4	2	13	<2		2.4
access to medical facilities	3	5	5	13	<2		<2
cost of living	3	3	2	8	<2		<2
internet shortcomings	1	2	2	5	<2		<2
air quality	0	2	3	5	<2		0
remoteness	1	0	1	2	<2		<2
'none' [i.e. there are no / no more bad things]	6	4	6	16			
other answers	0	10	15	25	3.4		0
Total	295	256	202	753			
Total omitting 'none' responses	289	252	196	737	100.0		

Traffic noise from the M40 looks to be by far the biggest single negative issue, especially when having regard to the 'first choice' answers. The lack of various amenities and facilities remains an issue, as do speeding, poor public transport and anti-social behaviour. (But note that there were also 5 citations of public transport in the 'best things' question.)

The comparison with 2007 needs to be treated with caution, but it might suggest that traffic noise has become an even greater problem since then.

**Q6: What ONE facility or service, whatever it may be, do you feel is most lacking from the parish?**

250 respondents made suggestions. Given the broad wording of the question, it was inevitable that the responses were quite diverse. The facilities or services suggested by 5 or more respondents were as follows:

- leisure / sports facilities for all ages: 53 (21.2% of suggestions) including 26 specifically for a gym;
- a greater number or variety of shops: 36 (14.4%);
- a café or coffee shop 33: (13.2%);
- improved bus routes or frequency: 28 (11.2%);
- more activities or facilities specifically for young people: 24 (9.6%);
- greater police presence: 14 (5.6%);
- a secondary school: 12 (4.8%);
- a NHS dentist: 7 (2.8%);
- other, made up of about 20 other items or issues: 43 (17.2%).

**Section C – Planning and development**

**Q7: All of Stokenchurch parish is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and some of it is also Green Belt. Part of central Stokenchurch is also a Conservation Area. Taking all this into account, which of the following most closely reflects your views on the desirability of building more houses here?**

304 respondents answered this multiple-choice question:

want as few as possible	114 (37.5%)
happy to accept a limited number, as long as Green Belt / AONB are not harmed	183 (60.2%)
would like to see significant growth, even if this means inroads into the Green Belt / AONB	7 (2.3%)

It is clear that very few respondents actively desire significant growth. Caution must apply to further interpretation, but perhaps the results indicate that overall opinion isn't totally anti-development.

**Q8: Would you support housing or other development on the following types of site? – select all which apply.**

249 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option.

intensification of existing development, for example replacing one dwelling with two on similar footprint	141 (56.6%)
change of use from commercial to housing	196 (78.7%)
building in gardens	42 (16.9%)
use of some of the public green spaces within the settlement boundaries	9 (3.6%)
extending the built-up area into the countryside	27 (10.8%)

Over 60 respondents did not select any of the options; whether this arose from a conscious lack of support for any of the options, or from simply skipping the question, cannot be known. The preference exhibited for intensification on existing development footprints is broadly consistent with responses to the previous and subsequent questions.

**Q9: Are there any sites within the parish where you think housing or other development would definitely be acceptable and appropriate? Please give details:**

116 respondents gave an answer to this question, but of these, 45 simply stated there were no such sites, and 11 more responses were 'don't knows' or were miscellaneous observations. So only 60 respondents actually suggested sites, some more than one, amounting to 71 site suggestions. 27 suggestions related to conversion of business sites to residential.

Of other sites, those suggested by more than 3 respondents were: on the eastern edge of Stokenchurch to the north of the A40 (8); to the west of the village alongside the A40 (8); down Park Lane opposite Longburrow Hall and playing fields (8); in the vicinity of the care home on Ibstone Road (4), and to the east of Mill Road (4). It should be noted that many of these sites would amount to an extension of the built-up area into the countryside, an option that overall was supported by only 10% of respondents.

**Q10: If there were to be any significant housing development in the Stokenchurch area, how important do you feel it would be to expand or improve the following infrastructure?**

304 respondents answered this question, although not all expressed a view on every category of infrastructure. The table below shows, for each category of infrastructure, the number and percentage of respondents selecting each level of importance. To assist comparison, the final column gives a 'weighted average score', calculated by allocating 4 points for 'very important' down to 1 point for 'very unimportant', and then determining the average.

	Very important [4]	Fairly important [3]	Fairly unimportant [2]	Very unimportant [1]	Number of respondents scoring this category	Weighted average
nursery education	119 (42.3%)	121 (43.1%)	25 (8.9%)	16 (5.7%)	281	3.22
primary schools	174 (60.8%)	74 (25.9%)	19 (6.6%)	19 (6.6%)	286	3.41
secondary schools	164 (57.9%)	62 (21.9%)	37 (13.1%)	20 (7.1%)	283	3.31
local medical facilities [but excluding A+E]	189 (64.7%)	73 (25.0%)	15 (5.1%)	15 (5.1%)	292	3.49
public transport	173 (58.4%)	86 (29.1%)	26 (8.8%)	11 (3.7%)	296	3.42
road network	79 (28.5%)	98 (35.4%)	82 (29.6%)	18 (6.5%)	277	2.86
other community facilities, e.g. halls, library	81 (28.9%)	115 (41.1%)	70 (25.0%)	14 (5.0%)	280	2.94
shops	106 (36.9%)	99 (34.5%)	67 (23.3%)	15 (5.2%)	287	3.03
employment opportunities	111 (39.4%)	100 (35.5%)	57 (20.2%)	14 (5.0%)	282	3.09
other - please specify in the box below	17 (51.5%)	8 (24.2%)	2 (6.1%)	6 (18.2%)	33	3.09

Of the 33 respondents who entered a score for other infrastructure, 29 specified what they were referring to. The commonest suggestion was for leisure facilities (including play areas, gym, parks) (13); others mentioned by 2 or more people were: adequate parking for new houses (4), improved policing (3), better broadband (2), sewage / drainage system (2), café / pubs (2).

A natural reluctance to deem any infrastructure as very unimportant may have led to a narrowing of the spread of weighted average scores, all falling at the 'important' end of the spectrum. But, taking account of the proportions of 'very important' scores in each category in conjunction with the average score, it is apparent that expansion or improvement of schools, medical facilities and public transport is seen as being of greater importance in connection with any significant growth, than expansion or improvement of the road network and community facilities.

**Q11: If there were to be any significant housing development in the Stokenchurch area, how important do you feel it would be to provide the following categories of dwelling?**

298 respondents answered this question, although not all expressed a view on every category. The table below shows, for each category of dwelling, the number and percentage of respondents selecting each level of importance. To assist comparison, the final column gives a 'weighted average score', calculated by allocating 4 points for 'very important' down to 1 point for 'very unimportant', and then determining the average.

	Very important [4]	Fairly important [3]	Fairly unimportant [2]	Very unimportant [1]	Number of respondents scoring this category	Weighted average
affordable housing (rented or shared ownership) specifically restricted to local people	117 (40.9%)	100 (35.0%)	37 (12.9%)	32 (11.2%)	286	3.06
low cost housing (rented, shared ownership and market) available to all	57 (21.0%)	68 (25.1%)	87 (32.1%)	59 (21.8%)	271	2.45
flats	22 (8.8%)	78 (31.2%)	98 (39.2%)	52 (20.8%)	250	2.28
family dwellings (2-3 bedrooms)	93 (33.0%)	145 (51.4%)	33 (11.7%)	11 (3.9%)	282	3.13
larger dwellings (4 or more bedrooms)	38 (14.8%)	104 (40.5%)	76 (29.6%)	39 (15.2%)	257	2.55
homes for older people	77 (28.2%)	129 (47.3%)	40 (14.6%)	27 (9.9%)	273	2.94

The results would appear to indicate that provision of 'family dwellings' and homes for older people is seen as more important than of larger dwellings and flats. There also appears to be significant support for housing specifically earmarked for local need.

## Section D - Transport

**Q12: Recently, two movable speed signs have been installed in the parish. Do you think this was a worthwhile initiative?**

300 respondents answered this question, with the following yes / no split:

yes	220 (73.3%)
no	80 (26.7%)

Respondents were given the opportunity to explain their answer if they wished. 130 did so.

73 comments were from respondents who thought the signs were a worthwhile initiative, and can be summarised as follows:

- 38 asserting that they have at least some effect;
- 8 saying they have an effect, and more such signs are needed;
- 7 saying they have an effect, but they should be bigger;
- 6 saying they have an effect, but need to be backed up by other measures, especially speed cameras;
- 7 believing they have now gone or are broken;
- 1 saying they had not seen them;
- 6 other comments.

55 comments were from respondents who thought the signs were **not** a worthwhile initiative, and can be summarised as follows:

- 25 asserting that they make no difference;
- 3 strongly asserting they had no effect ('waste of money');
- 1 that speeding is not an issue;
- 8 saying that only other measures, for example speed cameras or traffic calming, will make an impact;
- 7 believing they have now gone or are broken;
- 5 saying they had not seen them;
- 3 saying they need to be bigger;
- 1 saying more are needed in order to have an effect;
- 2 other comments.

2 other comments were from respondents who had offered no view on whether the signs were a worthwhile initiative, because they hadn't seen them.

The number of respondents who do not seem aware that the signs are moved around the village seems quite high, and might highlight the need for more publicity. However, two or three people definitely were aware of this, and indeed cited it as a good thing.

**Q13: Is there anything else you feel should be done to combat speeding?**

189 respondents answered this question, although 12 said no more should be done, with another 3 of the view that speeding is not an issue.

Of the 174 comments containing suggestions, about 57 (32.8%) advocated permanent speed cameras, 40 (23.0%) more police checks, 25 (14.4%) humps or rumble strips, 11 (6.3%) other calming measures such as priority chicanes, and 12 (6.9%) signs or speed indicating devices of various sorts. 6 respondents explicitly recorded their opposition to speed humps, 4 people mentioned the A40/B482 junction as a particular issue, and there were 19 other miscellaneous suggestions, of which perhaps the most intriguing was a system which changes the traffic lights to red for a vehicle passing a monitoring point above the speed limit. Figures are only approximate because some respondents made more than one suggestion.

#### Q14: Are you happy with road maintenance in the area in which you live?

301 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option. An identical question was asked in the 2007 survey, so those results are included for comparison.

Option	2015 results	2007 results for Stokenchurch parish
roads are well maintained	33 (11.0%)	10.2%
road maintenance is adequate	125 (41.5%)	45.3%
road maintenance leaves a lot to be desired	143 (47.5%)	44.5%

Whether these results indicate an acceptable level of satisfaction is perhaps a matter of opinion, and responses will also have been influenced by how respondents interpreted the phrase 'area in which you live'. Compared with 2007 they are essentially unchanged.

#### Q15: Are you happy with pavement maintenance in the area in which you live?

295 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option. This question was not asked in 2007.

pavements are well maintained	34 (11.5%)
pavement maintenance is adequate	172 (58.3%)
pavement maintenance leaves a lot to be desired	89 (30.2%)

It appears that respondents are happier with the condition of pavements than roads.

### Section E – Schools and youth

#### Q16: Are you satisfied with the home-to-school transport provided by the local authority?

296 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The answer options were designed with the aim of separating informed neutral views from 'don't knows'. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents selecting each option, with the right hand column showing the proportions after omitting those with no experience.

Option	All respondents	Omitting respondents with no knowledge of home-to-school transport
no opinion because no experience of home-to-school transport	202 (68.2%)	[Not applicable]
satisfied	32 (10.8%)	32 (34.0%)
neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	27 (9.1%)	27 (28.7%)
dissatisfied	35 (11.8%)	35 (37.2%)
Total	296	94

So opinion appears to be evenly spread.

Respondents were invited to explain their reasons. 64 comments were made, although 21 of these were merely to explain why they had no current experience of home-to-school transport provision. Of the remaining 43 comments, by far the greatest issue was the perceived high cost (26 comments); there were also 5 comments bemoaning the fact that secondary pupils had to travel so far and / or out of the village at all; and 3 comments about a lack of **any** provision, irrespective of price, for their particular circumstances.

**Q17: Are you satisfied with the new school meals service for reception, year 1 and year 2 pupils?**

297 respondents answered this question. The answer options were designed with the aim of separating informed neutral views from 'don't knows'. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents selecting each option, with the right hand column showing the proportions after omitting those with no experience.

Option	All respondents	Omitting respondents with no knowledge of year 1 and 2 schools meal service
no opinion because no experience of the new school meals service	231 (77.8%)	[Not applicable]
satisfied	39 (13.1%)	39 (59.1%)
neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	22 (7.4%)	22 (33.3%)
dissatisfied	5 (1.7%)	5 (7.6%)
Total	297	66

Respondents were invited to explain their reasons. 29 did so, although 13 of these were merely to explain why they had no experience of the new school meals service. Comments from the other 16 respondents made 18 points: unsurprisingly, most were in line with the generally favourable opinion expressed above, with 11 giving sometimes very enthusiastic praise for the scheme in general, but there were 2 observations about a lack of space and staff to properly run the scheme, 2 about the time it took to implement it, and 3 suggesting such provision is unnecessary.

**Q18: Are you aware that there is a Drop-in Youth Club at Bartholomew Tippings on Friday evenings, suitable for the 11-18 age group?**

295 respondents answered this question with the following yes / no split:

yes	137 (46.4%)
no	158 (53.6%)

Interestingly, none of the 5 12-17 year olds who answered this question were aware of the Club.

**Section F – Policing priorities**

**Q19: Thinking of the parish as a whole, please select from the list below, the THREE issues that you feel would most benefit from increased attention by the police.**

299 respondents answered this question. Despite the instructions, some selected more or fewer than three issues from the list. In total, the 299 respondents made 899 selections. The table below shows the number and proportion of respondents choosing each issue amongst their priority selection.

anti-social behaviour	170 (56.9%)
drug abuse	69 (23.1%)
parking (including pavement obstruction and school parking)	161 (53.8%)
burglary	158 (52.8%)
speeding and other driving infringements	176 (58.9%)
litter and fly-tipping	136 (45.5%)
other (please specify)	29 (9.7%)

Of the 29 'other', 6 were expansions of listed issues, 3 were about policing method, 3 were not pertinent to question; the genuine extra issues specified more than once were dog fouling (7), horses and carts (3), dog theft / attacks on animals (3).

A similar question was included in the 2007 survey, asking respondents “what are the top three priorities that you would like to see being dealt with by the neighbourhood policing team?” But that was an open, rather than a multiple-choice question, with the responses allocated to categories during analysis. The fundamentally different format means that any comparison should be treated with great care, but the following table shows the apparent ranking in importance derived from the 2015 and 2007 responses, omitting ‘other’.

Issue	Apparent ranking of importance in 2015	Apparent ranking of importance in 2007 (Stokenchurch parish)
anti-social behaviour	1=	1
drug abuse	6	3
parking (including pavement obstruction and school parking)	3=	5
burglary	3=	4
speeding and other driving infringements	1=	2
litter and fly-tipping	5	6

With the above proviso about exhibiting caution, it appears that parking may have become a greater perceived issue, and drug abuse a lesser issue, compared with 2007.

## Section G – Waste and environment

### Q20: Are recycling facilities adequate in your area?

Between 290 and 296 respondents answered the three sub-questions. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option. An identical question was asked in the 2007 survey, so those results are included for comparison.

Facility type	2015 results		2007 results for Stokenchurch parish	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
kerbside collections	276 (93.2%)	20 (6.8%)	68.1%	31.9%
local recycling facilities (e.g. Mudds Bank)	254 (87.6%)	36 (12.4%)	83.5%	16.5%
disposal sites (e.g. High Heavens, Bledlow Ridge etc.)	282 (96.2%)	11 (3.8%)	86.4%	13.6%

These are extremely good ratings, and the new kerbside collection regime and improvements to High Heavens which have occurred since 2007 have evidently been well-received.

**Q21: In the last two surveys, a number of environmental issues were identified. The main ones are listed below. Please select the THREE items that you believe should still be at the top of a priority listing.**

295 respondents answered this question. Despite the instructions, some selected more or fewer than three issues from the list. In total, the 295 respondents made 881 selections. The table below shows the number and proportion of respondents choosing each issue amongst their priority selection. The same question (apart from the lack of an 'Other' option) was asked in the 2007 survey, so those results are included for comparison.

Issue	2015 results	2007 results for Stokenchurch parish
traffic noise from M40	202 (68.5%)	56.4%
traffic noise from other roads (A40 etc.)	47 (15.9%)	22.7%
atmospheric pollution from traffic	85 (28.8%)	30.9%
parking at school run times	114 (38.6%)	23.5%
parking on pavements	119 (40.3%)	37.5%
litter	91 (30.8%)	30.4%
fly tipping and abandoned vehicles	58 (19.7%)	32.2%
dog fouling	130 (44.1%)	30.4%
light pollution	15 (5.1%)	7.1%
farm smells (muck spreading etc.)	15 (5.1%)	28.9%
other (please specify)	5 (1.7%)	n/a

Each of the 5 'other' issues was different.

Compared with 2007, it would appear that parking at school run times and dog fouling have become greater perceived issues, and fly tipping and abandoned vehicles lesser issues.

## Section H - Health

**Q22: Do you think that the village dentist should be allowed to offer NHS treatment?**

299 respondents answered this question with the following yes / no split:

yes	98.3%
no	1.7%

Respondents were invited to expand on their answer if they wished. 53 did so. Unsurprisingly, given the near unanimous 'yes' verdict above, these were almost exclusively supportive, suggesting a range of benefits which would arise from such local provision. But 6 respondents indicated that they were perfectly happy with their current NHS or private arrangements.

All the responses (in anonymised form) have been forwarded to the dental practice and David Lidington MP.

**Q23: How would you rate the overall level of service provided by Stokenchurch Medical Centre?**

293 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option.

excellent	85 (29.0%)
good	115 (39.2%)
adequate	62 (21.2%)
less than adequate	27 (9.2%)
very poor	4 (1.4%)

Respondents were invited to expand on their answer if they wished. 90 did so, some making more than one observation. By far the biggest category was 58 negative observations about the waiting times for appointments and not being able to get them at convenient times; there were 14 negative comments about poor or unhelpful communication by receptionists or unhelpful telephone and on-line booking systems; there were 3 comments relating to privacy, either arising from the layout of the premises or receptionists asking questions about sensitive medical issues. Countering this, there were 19 observations praising the standard of medical care, and 5 felt that the issues that did arise stemmed from the lack of resources and the practice thus being overstretched.

All the responses (in anonymised form) have been forwarded to the Medical Centre Practice Manager and the Patients Participation Group.

**Q24: Recently, two defibrillators have been installed in the parish (one outside Longburrow Hall and one outside the Kings Hotel). Do you think this was a worthwhile initiative?**

290 respondents answered this question with the following yes / no split:

yes	270 (93.1%)
no	20 (6.9%)

Respondents were invited to expand on their answer if they wished. 69 did so, some making more than one observation. The observations can be categorised as follows:

Summary of observation	Number
comments acknowledging their potential value, including some personal experiences of where defibrillators have or would have saved lives	12
criticism of chosen locations: either too close together, or too central and remote from likely need	10
respondent had been unaware of existence / more publicity needed	23
ignorance of how to use them / more training needed	24
more requested, including suggestions of locations	6
not justified / 'waste of money'	5

It would seem there is a need for more publicity and information in relation to this worthwhile initiative.

## Section I – Parish Council

**Q25: Did you know that Stokenchurch Parish Council is responsible for the cemeteries, the allotments, Longburrow Hall and the Studley Green Community Centre, the 3 play areas, some of the street lighting and the commons (including tree maintenance); and that it is consulted about planning applications, but has no decision-making powers?**

295 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents agreeing with each statement.

I knew all of this	102 (34.6%)
I knew some of this	133 (45.1%)
I knew very little or none of this	60 (20.3%)

Any conclusion about this finding depends on what level of awareness one wishes to aim for.

**Q26: The Parish Council income from Council Tax, which funds much of what the Parish Council does, equates to an annual contribution of about £13 per person (of all ages) in the Parish, or £34 from every Band D household. Do you feel that this represents value for money?**

295 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option.

very good value	57 (19.3%)
good value	107 (36.3%)
average value	87 (29.5%)
poor value	7 (2.4%)
very poor value	7 (2.4%)
no opinion	30 (10.2%)

**Q27: The Parish Council is being encouraged to take on some of the responsibilities currently undertaken by the District and County Councils, such as grass-cutting. This may result in better service delivery, but could also involve an increase in the parish element of Council Tax. Are you in favour of the Parish Council taking on such extra responsibilities?**

291 respondents answered this question, which included a 'Don't know' option. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option.

yes	187 (64.3%)
no	38 (13.1%)
don't know	66 (22.7%)

Respondents were invited to expand on their answer if they wished. 88 respondents did so; the analysis below considers the yes / no / don't knows separately.

Of the 65 yes voters who made a comment:

- 25 welcomed the idea, believing service would be better as a result;
- 28 supported the idea, but only if it was 'cost-neutral' and neither they as a council tax payer, or the parish council, were out of pocket;
- 4 supported the idea as long as the parish council could demonstrate it was done better;
- 2 wanted local contractors to be used in any parish council contract;
- 2 suggested that local people / volunteers could play a part;
- and there were 4 other comments.

Of the 13 don't knows who made a comment:

- 9 would only support it if 'cost-neutral';
- 4 said they needed more information before they could come to a decision.

Of the 9 no voters who made a comment:

2 believed a service delivered by the parish council would be worse, irrespective of cost;

5 opposed it, because they believed it would inevitably increase nett cost to them or to the parish council;

and there were 2 other comments.

There was 1 comment from someone who had not given a yes / no / don't know answer, and this again referred to the issue of overall cost neutrality.

**Q28: The Parish Council uses the following methods to give out information and to publicise events. Which of these do you see regularly? – select all that apply:**

282 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents seeing each communication medium:

village notice boards	109 (38.7%)
Parish Council website (www.stokenchurch.org.uk)	113 (40.1%)
Parish Council Facebook page	61 (21.6%)
Chiltern View magazine	210 (74.5%)
Bucks Free Press	82 (29.1%)

This might suggest that the Parish Council should continue to use a wide range of communication methods, because all appear to reach significant proportions of the population.

**Q29: How could the Parish Council improve communication with the residents of Stokenchurch?**

145 respondents answered this question. 20 said that communication was currently satisfactory, so there is no need to improve it; and 15 made general comments or observations. The 131 suggestions made by the other 110 respondents can be categorised as follows:

30 suggestions about e-mail, including e-mail alerts or newsletters;

18 suggestions of occasional leaflets or flyers;

16 suggestions of a regular parish newsletter delivered to homes;

14 suggestions about more or 'better' use of Facebook;

13 suggestions that the website could be improved;

10 suggestions were about more notices or posters around the village or more notice-boards;

8 suggestions to put more information in Chiltern View;

8 suggestions of using twitter;

5 suggestions of a face-to-face 'surgery';

3 suggestions of a table at the fetes;

3 suggestions were about the need for more information about the councillors, especially at election time;

2 suggestions of engaging with the school;

1 suggestion of more regular use of Bucks Free Press.

**Q30: The Parish Council meets on the first and third Wednesdays of each month at 7.30pm at Longburrow. Have you ever attended a Parish Council meeting, and if so, what was your area of interest? – select any that apply.**

283 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents selecting each option.

have never attended a Parish Council meeting	186 (65.7%)
a planning issue	41 (14.5%)
a local issue of particular personal interest	46 (16.3%)
general interest	42 (14.8%)
any other reason for attending (please specify below)	19 (6.7%)

Only 7 of the 19 'any other reason for attending' responses gave such a reason (the skate park being the only issue mentioned by more than one person); the other responses covered a range of reasons for why people did or could not attend, or had to attend since they were or had been on the parish council, plus a few comments relating to timing / content / publicity.

**Q31: Generally, how good a service do you think the Parish Council provides?**

287 respondents answered this multiple-choice question. The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents indicating support for each option.

excellent	37 (12.9%)
good	170 (59.2%)
adequate	72 (25.1%)
less than adequate	7 (2.4%)
very poor	1 (0.3%)

Respondents were invited to expand on their answer if they wished. 22 did so. 5 comments were simply a 'confession' by the respondent that they felt ill-equipped to make a judgement because of a lack of awareness of what the parish council does; 4 were simply giving praise. Within the other comments, the only theme shared by more than two was a desire that the Parish Council should be made up of all sectors of the community, particularly in terms of age - 4 respondents made an observation of this sort.

(Q32 gathered contact details of anyone potentially interested in becoming a parish councillor in the future. 38 people supplied contact details, and these have been passed on to the Parish Council.

Q33-37 asked for volunteers for various local organisations and for anyone interested in becoming a part-time firefighter at Stokenchurch. A total of 23 expressions of interest were forthcoming, which have been passed on to the relevant organisations.)

**Q38: This space is available for you to comment further on any of the issues covered in the survey, or to tell us about anything we have omitted.**

54 respondents used this space to make a total of 70 comments. The biggest category was 12 comments expressing appreciation for the chance to give their views and for the good work of those who keep Stokenchurch 'such a nice place'. The rest were extremely wide-ranging; the only issues raised by 3 or more people were: a desire for more community events, concern that the village was at risk of being spoilt by overdevelopment, the state of roads and pavements, 'don't overlook the concerns of the hamlets', instances of late night noise and anti-social behaviour in various places, and Tesco (both anti and pro!).

(Q39 gathered details of anyone willing to be contacted in the future by e-mail for further research. 119 people supplied details which will be kept on file for this purpose.

Q40 was the Prize Draw entry: 131 people entered.)

**NEXT STEPS**

The findings of the survey will be assessed, the issues meriting attention identified, and potential actions to address these issues devised. These may be actions that the Community Action Forum can take itself, or assist others to deliver; or they may be for other bodies to progress, in which case the Community Action Forum will encourage / lobby accordingly. This Action Plan will be a living document, updated periodically, and made public alongside the Survey Report.