

Skelsmergh & Scalthwaiterigg Parish Consultation 2015

This document attempts to identify the relative importance which respondents to the PC survey attached to the numerous issues raised in the survey document and by respondents themselves.

Table 1 lists issues raised in the survey document in descending order of perceived importance, where importance is defined as the difference, for each issue, between the number of respondents who see it as a matter that needs to be addressed and those who do not. The result is a score, and the issues are ordered on the basis of relative magnitude of scores, so that the most important one is at the top of the table with a relatively large positive score, and subsequent less important ones follow in descending order of magnitude. A positive scores indicate that more people than not regard the associated issue as important, and vice versa for negative.

Note that not all respondents answered all the questions, so the numbers don't always add up to the total of 72 returned surveys.

Table 1

Issue	a. Needs to be addressed	b. Not a problem	Score (a-b)
Local involvement in planning of new housing	63	4	59
New housing adheres to local vernacular	52	14	38
Road maintenance	49	23	26
Broadband speed	42	16	26
Speeding	45	20	25
Provision for walking / cycling	38	17	21
Housing for local occupancy	43	23	20
Affordability of housing	41	24	17
Provision of defibrillator	33	16	17
Availability of public transport	42	27	15
Mobile phone reception	39	24	15
Road drainage	41	31	10
Inappropriate speed limits	30	37	-7
New housing adjacent to existing	28	37	-19
Road gritting	25	47	-22
Provision of sheltered housing	17	46	-29
Footpath maintenance	17	55	-38
Difficulty in making journeys	9	58	-49
Meeting need for local housing	8	59	-51
Lack of local facilities	10	62	-52
Walking alone at night	4	68	-64
Antisocial behaviour	3	69	-66
Isolation	2	70	-68
Vandalism	1	71	-70
Feeling safe at home	0	72	-72

Table 2 lists issues raised by respondents mainly in Q.1 of the survey form but also in two submitted letters. Here importance is simply the number of times a given issue is raised.

Table 2

1. Litter & fly-tipping: 18
2. Condition of Laverock Bridge: 15
3. Dog fouling and barking: 10
4. Use of pesticides and herbicides: 4
5. Agricultural spraying: 4
6. Roadside verges overgrown: 3
7. Noise from Mealbank trading estate: 3
8. Huge HGVs going to Mealbank trading estate: 2
9. Dangerous retaining wall at Mealbank Trading estate: 2
10. Inappropriate planning permissions: 2
11. Sewerage: 2
12. Hedge protection: 2
13. Tree planting: 2
14. Community Hall events & booking on PC website: 2
15. Anti-dog fouling signs: 2
16. Hedge-cutting in Mealbank: 2
17. Street lights in Mealbank: 2
18. Drainage in Mealbank: 2
19. Encourage wildlife: 1
20. Better communication from PC: 1
21. Contribution of facilities by developers: 1
22. Bicycle rack at Community Hall: 1
23. SSI for Sprint: 1
24. Trailer parking in layby: 1
25. PC more proactive with organizing and promoting events: 1
26. PC more proactive for local democracy against local government: 1
27. Footpath clearing events: 1
28. Mature trees felled: 1
29. Lack of footpaths: 1
30. Light pollution: 1
31. Too many street lights: 1
32. Lack of wildlife habitat: 1
33. Safety railings on bridge at Mealbank trading estate: 1