




m.e.l  
research

**2019 Residents' Survey**

**Charnwood Borough Council**

**Final Report**

**October 2019**



Project details and acknowledgements .....	3
Executive Summary .....	4
Background .....	4
Method .....	4
Introduction .....	6
Background .....	6
Method .....	6
Response and statistical reliability .....	6
Notes on reporting.....	6
Results .....	8
1. Local Area .....	8
2. Local Council .....	16
3. Influencing decisions.....	22
4. Loughborough residents only.....	25
5. Conclusions .....	26
Appendix A: Respondent Profile .....	28
Appendix B: Questionnaire .....	30

## Project details and acknowledgements

<b>Title</b>	2019 Residents' Survey: Face-to-face interviews
<b>Client</b>	Charnwood Borough Council
<b>Project number</b>	19082
<b>Client reference</b>	Mike Roberts
<b>Author</b>	Diana Danaila, Research Executive
<b>Reviewer</b>	Clare Rapkins, Associate Director

We would like to thank the residents of Charnwood Borough who took part in the survey and shared their views.

### M·E·L Research

2nd Floor, 1 Ashted Lock, Birmingham Science Park Aston, Birmingham. B7 4AZ

Email: [info@melresearch.co.uk](mailto:info@melresearch.co.uk)

Web: [www.melresearch.co.uk](http://www.melresearch.co.uk)

Tel: 0121 604 4664



# Executive Summary

## Background

- On a biennial basis, Charnwood Borough Council carries out a Residents' Survey to understand and track changes in residents' views on the local area and the Council's services.
- M·E·L Research were commissioned to carry out Charnwood Borough Council's biennial Residents' Survey in 2017 and 2019.
- This year's survey was conducted using a face to face methodology only.

## Method

- A quota sampling approach was used to ensure that the sample represented the population of Charnwood Borough.
- Independent quotas were set by ward, gender, age and ethnicity (White and BME) based on the 2011 census data.
- Postcodes were provided to trained interviewers to be used as starting points.
- They subsequently knocked on residents' doors and invited them to participate ensuring the quotas were met.
- The results have been compared to the 2017 survey and the LGA Resident Satisfaction Polling Survey (June 2019) where possible.

## Results

### Local Area

- Nearly all respondents (94%) reported that they were happy (either very happy or happy) living in their area.
- The top three important things for residents were:
  - Feeling safe in their home and the local area (67%)
  - Cleanliness and tidiness of their local area (41%)
  - Their rubbish collected on a regular and reliable basis (33%)
- The availability of affordable housing to rent was the lowest priority amongst residents (7%)

- Respondents were most satisfied with rubbish collected on regular and reliable basis (96%), feeling safe in their home and local area (89%) and being able to go to well-maintained parks and green spaces (86%)
- The variety of shops and markets available is an area where the Council may wish to improve in the future (as it has high importance but low satisfaction).
- 93% felt that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.

## Local Council

- When reporting a problem, the most popular contact method was telephone (80%).
- 86% were satisfied with their experience of contacting the council.
- Residents would prefer to hear about the Council's services either by letter (56%), email alerts (50%) or leaflet (48%).
- If the Council provided more online services, 71% would use them.
- 80% were satisfied with how the Council kept them informed about their services.
- 67% were satisfied with how Charnwood Borough Council spent its proportion of Council Tax.
- 63% felt the Council provides value for money.
- 83% trust Charnwood Borough Council.
- 68% of Loughborough residents felt the Council supports their town centre.

## Getting Involved

- 29% felt that it was easy to influence decisions that might affect them in Charnwood. Although, nearly six in ten thought it was hard (42%) The remaining 29% did not know which suggests residents were unsure how to engage with the Council.
- 36% were satisfied with how they can get involved in local decision making.

# Introduction

## Background

On a biennial basis, Charnwood Borough Council carries out a Residents' Survey to understand and track changes in residents' views on the local area and the Council's services. M·E·L Research were commissioned to conduct the survey on the Council's behalf in 2017 and 2019.

## Method

A quota sampling approach was used. Independent quotas set by ward, gender, age and ethnicity (White vs. BME) based on the 2011 census data. The aim was to ensure the sample was broadly representative of the Charnwood population. As the final sample was almost identical to the Charnwood population, no weighting was required this year.

The survey was conducted face-to-face using Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) machines. The Royal Mail's Postal Address File (PAF) was used to generate a random sample of postcodes stratified by ward. These postcodes were then used as starting points by our trained interviewers. They subsequently knocked on residents' doors and invited them to participate ensuring the quotas were met.

## Response and statistical reliability

An overall target of 550 responses was set in order to achieve a margin of error of  $\pm 4\%$  at the 95% confidence level (based on a population of 166,100). This would mean that we can be 95% certain that had every resident been surveyed, the overall results would be 4% above or below the figures that were reported (e.g. a 50% satisfaction rate could in reality lie within the range of 46% to 54%). Overall 551 interviews were conducted (See Appendix B for full respondent breakdown).

## Notes on reporting

Where deemed relevant, and where base sizes were sufficiently large (50 and above), data has been analysed using z-tests. A z-test is a type of statistical test used to compare two groups in order to determine whether differences between the two groups are due to chance, or due to a "real" or statistically significant difference (at 95% confidence level). Where there is a statistically significant difference between groups, this has been noted in the report and is referred to as a "significant difference". However, a significant difference may not always mean that the difference is 'important'. It will also need to be considered in practical terms i.e. does the difference matter? For example, whilst there may be a significant difference, it may not matter due to its low importance or because the response is still very positive for both groups.

Results have been broken down by ward and demographics and displayed in tables within the report. However due to the small base sizes, they should be treated as indicative only.

The results have been compared to the 2017 survey where questions are identical. We have also compared some questions (satisfaction with refuse collection, cleanliness and sports facilities, being kept informed, value for money and level of trust) to the June 2019 LGA polling results (<https://www.local.gov.uk/polling-resident-satisfaction-councils-june-2019>). Due to the slight difference in the wording of the questions, between this survey and the LGA polling and the difference in methodologies (telephone for the LGA polling vs. face-to-face for your survey) caution should be used when interpreting the results.

Owing to the rounding of numbers, percentages displayed visually on graphs in the report may not always add up to 100% and may differ slightly when compared with the text. The figures provided in the text should always be used as the authoritative results. For some questions, respondents could give more than one response (multiple choice). For these questions, the percentage for each response is calculated as a percentage of the total number of respondents and therefore percentages do not add up to 100%.

For open-ended questions, quotes have been included for the key themes where appropriate.

# Results


## 1. Local Area

### Living in the area

Respondents were asked how happy they are living in the area. Over nine out of ten (94%) reported that they were either happy or very happy, with the majority (66%) being 'happy'.

**Figure 1.1 Living in the area**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Year	Happiness (%)
2019	94%
2017	97%

Comparison by survey period showed that this year result was significantly lower than that of 2017, meaning that residents of Charnwood were less happy about living in the area, than they were two years ago.

Table 1.1. breaks the result down by ward. As seen in the table below, 12 out of 28 wards were happy (gave a score of 100%) living in their local area. However, this level is lower in other areas such as East Goscote (78%) and Loughborough Hastings and Loughborough Storer (both 80%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward are very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 1.1 Living in the area- Ward breakdown**

Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)	Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)
Anstey	22	100%	Loughborough Southfields	22	100%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	100%	Loughborough Storer	20	80%
Birstall Wanlip	21	95%	Mountsorrel	23	100%
Birstall Watermead	21	100%	Queniborough	10	80%
East Goscote	9	78%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	100%
Forest Bradgate	11	91%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	80%
Loughborough Ashby	21	95%	Shepshed East	22	100%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	100%	Shepshed West	21	95%
Loughborough Garendon	19	100%	Sileby	24	92%
Loughborough Hastings	20	80%	Syston East	20	90%
Loughborough Lemington	22	91%	Syston West	25	96%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	100%	Thurmaston	32	94%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	100%	Wreake Villages	10	90%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	100%	The Wolds	10	90%

A significant difference was found between age groups, with respondents aged 18 to 24 significantly happier (99%) compared to those aged 35 to 44 (90%) and 55 to 64 (92%).

## Area priorities

Respondents were provided with a list of priorities and asked to choose the three that were most important to them. Figure 1.2 shows that the top priorities are:


1. Feeling safe in own home and the local area (67%)
2. Cleanliness and tidiness of my local area (41%)
3. My rubbish collected on regular and reliable basis (33%)

The least important areas were:

1. The availability of housing that you can afford to rent (7%)
2. Climate change and looking after the environment (9%)
3. The availability of housing that you can afford to buy (9%)
4. Encouraging and investing in business and jobs (9%)

**Figure 1.2 Area priorities**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



## Satisfaction with area

Respondents were also asked how satisfied they were with each of the topics that been asked to prioritise above. Results show that satisfaction was generally high across the board. The areas with the highest satisfaction were:

- Rubbish collected on regular and reliable basis (96%)
- Feeling safe in home and local area (89%)
- Being able to go to well-maintained parks and green spaces (86%)

Satisfaction was lowest for encouraging and investing in business and jobs (56%). Although this could be due to the relatively high proportion (16%) of residents that said don't know to this question.

**Figure 1.3 Satisfaction with services/aspects of living in an area**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551




Table 1.2 below compares the satisfaction levels for three service areas (cleanliness, waste collection and sports and leisure) against the latest LGA results. It shows that Charnwood Borough Council has performed significantly better than the national average in all three. However, these results should be treated as indicative as the questions are not identical to the LGA survey.

**Table 1.2 Comparison between LGA and Charnwood BC Survey results**

Satisfaction %	Cleanliness	Waste collection	Sports and leisure
Charnwood Borough Council (n=551)	86%	96%	66%
LGA (n=1,004)	70%	74%	56%



A range of significant differences were identified between age groups.

- *Being able to go to sports and leisure facilities:* Residents under 35 (57%) are less likely to be satisfied than those aged 35-44 (73%) or those aged 55-74 (74%).
- *Encouraging and investing in business and jobs:* Residents aged between 35-44 (67%) were more likely to be satisfied than residents in the 18-24 (46%) or 65-74 age group (51%).
- *Feeling safe in my home and the local area:* 83% of 35-44 year olds report satisfaction compared to 94% of 65-74 year olds.
- *Climate change and looking after the environment:* 70% of 45-54 year olds report satisfaction compared to 84%-85% of 18-44 year olds and 90% of those aged 65-74.
- *My rubbish collected on a regular and reliable basis:* 93% of 35-44 year olds report satisfaction compared to 100% of 18-24 year olds.
- *Availability of affordable housing to buy:* Residents aged 18-24 (52%) are less likely to be satisfied compared to older residents (64%-84%).
- *Cleanliness and tidiness of my local area:* 91% of 18-34 year olds report satisfaction compared to 79% of 45-54 year olds.



Significantly fewer white residents (71%) were satisfied with the variety of shops and markets available, compared to non-white residents (83%).



A range of significant differences were found between respondents with and without a disability:

- *Being able to go to sports and leisure facilities:* 65% of those without a disability report satisfaction compared to 81% of those with a disability (limited a lot).
- *Availability of affordable housing to rent:* 35% of those with a disability (limited a little) report satisfaction compared to 63% of those without a disability and 68% of those with a disability (limited a lot).
- *My rubbish collected on a regular and reliable basis:* 89% of those with a disability (limited a lot) report satisfaction compared to 96% of those without a disability.

## Importance vs. Satisfaction

Figure 1.4 overleaf plots importance against satisfaction with Council services or aspects of living in an area. The vertical pink line marks the mean importance score (24%), and the horizontal pink line marks the mean satisfaction score (81%). In summary, the chart highlights the following:

### High importance and low satisfaction

Items in box A are those that were considered important (above 24%) but have lower satisfaction levels (below 81%). Items within this box are the ones that the Council should prioritise for future improvement. The diagram indicates that the 'variety of shops and markets' is the only aspect that falls within this category.

### High importance and high satisfaction

Items that fall in box B were also considered to be important services, but satisfaction is higher. The Council should therefore ensure that the quality of these services (such as my rubbish is collected on a regular and reliable basis) is maintained.

### Low importance and high satisfaction

Items in box C are aspects which have a low importance but high satisfaction. These include: Climate change and looking after the environment and good access to transport and parking. Less priority should be placed on these as they are less important to residents and the Council is already doing well in these areas.


### Low importance and low satisfaction

Items in box D are those that have both a relatively low importance and low satisfaction rating. These include: a variety of entertainment and cultural facilities and encouraging and investing in business and jobs. Therefore, the Council should not direct limited resources in improving on these areas as they are considered less important to residents.

**Figure 1.4 Importance vs. satisfaction**

Percentage of respondents

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. My rubbish collected on a regular and reliable basis       | 7. The availability of housing that you can afford to rent |
| 2. Feeling safe in my home and the local area                 | 8. The availability of housing that you can afford to buy  |
| 3. Climate change and looking after the environment           | 9. A variety of shops and markets                          |
| 4. Being able to go to well-maintained parks and green spaces | 10. Being able to go to sports and leisure facilities      |
| 5. The cleanliness and tidiness of my local area              | 11. A variety of entertainment and cultural facilities     |
| 6. Good access to transport and parking                       | 12. Encouraging and investing in business and jobs         |



## Areas of concern

Respondents were subsequently asked if there were any areas that they were concerned about. This was an open-ended question. All 551 respondents provided an answer. Table 1.3 shows the number of mentions for each of the key themes.

Results show that the vast majority (460 respondents) did not have any areas of concern.

**Table 1.3** Areas of concern- Themes

Theme	Frequency
No areas of concern	460
Safety/ASB	15
Cleanliness/maintenance	12
Speeding	11
Roads	8
Street lighting	8
My area is left out	7
Parks	6
Services/facilities/infrastructure/investment needed	6
Noise	6
Other	5
Housing	5
Parking	3
Health services	3
Transport	2
Traffic	2
Activities for children	1

Of those residents that mentioned an area of concern, the most common theme was safety/ASB (15 mentions) closely followed by cleanliness and maintenance (12 mentions). Below are some example quotes for the top theme.

### Safety/ASB (15 people)

Respondents highlighted concerns around crime in their local area, drug users and ASB. A few respondents mentioned that there was a need for greater police presence.

Security issues - not enough police  
(*Birstall, Leicester*)

Drugs is an issue here (*Loughborough*)

Need more police patrol  
(*Barrow upon Soar*)


Local police unresponsive (*Thurmaston*)

## Community cohesion

Respondents were asked whether they felt that their local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together. Over nine out of ten (93%) felt that it was.

**Figure 1.5 People from different backgrounds getting on**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



■ Yes ■ No ■ Don't know

Year	Getting on well (%)
2019	93%
2017	93%

Comparison by survey period showed that this year result was in line with that of 2017.

Table 1.4 breaks results down by ward. As seen in the table below, 9 out of 28 wards felt that their local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together (gave a score of 100%). However, this level is lower in other wards such as: Rothley and Thurcaston (70%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward are very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 1.4 People from different backgrounds getting on - Ward breakdown**

Ward	No.	Getting on well (%)	Ward	No.	Getting on well (%)
Anstey	22	91%	Loughborough Southfields	22	95%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	100%	Loughborough Storer	20	95%
Birstall Wanlip	21	100%	Mountsorrel	23	100%
Birstall Watermead	21	95%	Queniborough	10	90%
East Goscote	9	89%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	91%
Forest Bradgate	11	82%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	70%
Loughborough Ashby	21	90%	Shepshed East	22	86%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	100%	Shepshed West	21	95%
Loughborough Garendon	19	100%	Sileby	24	92%
Loughborough Hastings	20	95%	Syston East	20	85%
Loughborough Lemyngton	22	100%	Syston West	25	80%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	100%	Thurmaston	32	88%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	89%	Wreake Villages	10	90%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	100%	The Wolds	10	100%


## 2. Local Council

### Contacting the Council

Respondents were asked, if they had to contact the Council for any reason, how they would they do it. Eight out of ten (80%) contacted the Council by telephone, a half (50%) by email and almost a third (31%) through the website.

**Figure 2.1 Methods of contacting the Council**


Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Respondents were asked, if they had contacted the Council for any reason, how they would rate their experience. Nearly nine out of ten (86%) reported satisfaction ('very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined), with the majority stated 'satisfied' (68%).

**Figure 2.2 Experience of contacting Council**

Percentage of respondents- base size 434



Year	Satisfaction (%)
2019	86%
2017	85%

Comparison by survey period showed that this year result was in line with that of 2017.

Table 2.1 breaks results down by ward. As seen in the table, Loughborough Outwoods are 100% satisfied, but this percentage is much lower in Loughborough Hastings where only 72% are satisfied. Please note that

the response numbers for each individual ward are very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 2.1 Experience of contacting Council - Ward breakdown**


Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)	Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)
Anstey	10	80%	Loughborough Southfields	16	94%
Barrow and Sileby West	18	78%	Loughborough Storer	14	93%
Birstall Wanlip	19	84%	Mountsorrel	21	95%
Birstall Watermead	13	77%	Queniborough	9	78%
East Goscote	8	75%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	21	95%
Forest Bradgate	9	89%	Rothley and Thurgaston	18	78%
Loughborough Ashby	17	76%	Shepshed East	16	75%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	18	94%	Shepshed West	18	89%
Loughborough Garendon	17	94%	Sileby	20	85%
Loughborough Hastings	18	72%	Syston East	16	81%
Loughborough Lemyngton	18	94%	Syston West	22	86%
Loughborough Nanpantan	16	94%	Thurmaston	13	77%
Loughborough Outwoods	14	100%	Wreake Villages	8	75%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	18	89%	The Wolds	9	89%

## Preferred method of receiving news and information about services

Respondents were asked how they would like to hear about Council services. Results show that the most popular methods were letter (56%), email alerts (50%), and leaflet (48%). The least popular methods were via the Your Homes Matter tenants' magazine (2%) and village publication (5%).

**Figure 2.3 Preferred contact methods**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551




## Use of online services

All respondents were asked if the Council provided more services (such as bookings, payments and reporting problems online) would they use them. Around seven in ten (71%) said yes, while only a quarter (25%) said they would not use these online services. The remaining 4% did not know.

**Figure 2.4 Use of other online services**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551




## Being kept informed

Respondents were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with how the Council keeps them informed about their services. Results show that around eight out of ten (80%) were satisfied ('very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined) with the vast majority being 'satisfied' (76%). Only 17% said they were dissatisfied.

**Figure 2.5 Being kept informed**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Year	Satisfied (%)
2019	80%
2017	81%

Comparison by survey period showed that this year result was in line with that of 2017.

Comparison with the LGA polling results from June 2019 shows that Charnwood Borough Council residents are significantly more satisfied with the way the Council keeps them informed (80%), compared to the national score (59%). Still, caution is advised when interpreting this result, because the questions differ slightly.

Table 2.2 breaks results down by ward. As the table below shows, satisfaction was highest in Syston West (96%) and lowest in Loughborough Hastings (50%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward are very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 2.2 Being kept informed- Ward breakdown- DK excluded**


Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)	Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)
Anstey	22	77%	Loughborough Southfields	22	77%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	82%	Loughborough Storer	20	70%
Birstall Wanlip	21	76%	Mountsorrel	23	83%
Birstall Watermead	21	71%	Queniborough	10	80%
East Goscote	9	78%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	95%
Forest Bradgate	11	73%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	70%
Loughborough Ashby	21	90%	Shepshed East	22	95%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	95%	Shepshed West	21	90%
Loughborough Garendon	19	74%	Sileby	24	79%
Loughborough Hastings	20	50%	Syston East	20	85%
Loughborough Lemyngton	22	77%	Syston West	25	96%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	78%	Thurmaston	32	59%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	84%	Wreake Villages	10	80%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	88%	The Wolds	10	90%

A significant difference was found between age groups, with respondents aged 65-74 (87%) significantly more satisfied compared to those aged 35-44 (73%).

## Council tax

Respondents were provided with some information around the proportion of Council Tax that Charnwood Borough Council receives and subsequently asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with how this is spent. Results shows that nearly seven out of ten (67%) were satisfied ('very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined), with the majority being 'satisfied' (63%). Almost three out of ten (27%) report dissatisfaction in this area.

**Figure 2.6 Council tax spending**  
Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Year	Satisfied (%)
2019	67%
2017	83%

Comparison by survey period shows that this year result is significantly lower than that of 2017, meaning that residents of Charnwood are less satisfied about how the council is spending the council tax, than they were two years ago.

Table 2.3 breaks results down by ward. As the table shows, satisfaction was highest in Birstall Wanlip (86%) and lowest in Shepshed East (36%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward is very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 2.3 Council tax spending-Ward breakdown**


Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)	Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)
Anstey	22	64%	Loughborough Southfields	22	68%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	82%	Loughborough Storer	20	55%
Birstall Wanlip	21	86%	Mountsorrel	23	70%
Birstall Watermead	21	43%	Queniborough	10	70%
East Goscote	9	78%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	55%
Forest Bradgate	11	82%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	60%
Loughborough Ashby	21	52%	Shepshed East	22	36%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	80%	Shepshed West	21	48%
Loughborough Garendon	19	74%	Sileby	24	79%
Loughborough Hastings	20	75%	Syston East	20	85%
Loughborough Lemyngton	22	64%	Syston West	25	60%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	83%	Thurmaston	32	50%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	84%	Wreake Villages	10	80%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	84%	The Wolds	10	70%

## Value for money

Respondents were also asked whether or not they consider that the Council offers value for money. Results show that over six out of ten (63%) consider they do, while about a third (31%) felt they do not.

**Figure 2.7 Value for money**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Comparison with the LGA polling results from June 2019 shows that Charnwood Borough Council residents were significantly more satisfied with the value for money offered by the Council (63%), compared to the national score (48%). Still, caution is advised when interpreting this result, because the question wording differs.

Table 2.4 breaks results down by ward. As the table shows, agreement that Charnwood Borough Council offers value for money was highest in Forest Bradgate (82%) and lowest in Shepshed East (36%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward is very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 2.4 Value for money -Ward breakdown**


Ward	No.	Offers VfM (%)	Ward	No.	Offers VfM (%)
Anstey	22	64%	Loughborough Southfields	22	59%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	73%	Loughborough Storer	20	50%
Birstall Wanlip	21	76%	Mountsorrel	23	74%
Birstall Watermead	21	43%	Queniborough	10	70%
East Goscote	9	78%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	64%
Forest Bradgate	11	82%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	60%
Loughborough Ashby	21	52%	Shepshed East	22	36%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	75%	Shepshed West	21	43%
Loughborough Garendon	19	68%	Sileby	24	79%
Loughborough Hastings	20	65%	Syston East	20	65%
Loughborough Lemyngton	22	59%	Syston West	25	44%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	78%	Thurmaston	32	47%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	74%	Wreake Villages	10	80%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	76%	The Wolds	10	70%

## Trusting the Council

All respondents were asked how much they trust Charnwood Borough Council. Results show that overall, around eight out of ten (83%) trust it ('a great deal' and 'a fair amount' combined). Only 15% report not trusting the Council.

**Figure 2.8 Trusting the Council**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Comparison with the LGA polling results from June 2019 shows that significantly more Charnwood residents trusted the Council (83%). This compares to 58% nationally.

Table 2.5 breaks results down by ward. As seen below, residents of Birstall Wanlip and Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle trust Charnwood Borough Council 100%, but this percentage is much lower in Birstall Watermead where only 62% trust the Council. Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward is very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 2.5 Trusting the Council -Ward breakdown**

Ward	No.	Trust (%)	Ward	No.	Trust (%)
Anstey	22	82%	Loughborough Southfields	22	91%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	91%	Loughborough Storer	20	65%
Birstall Wanlip	21	100%	Mountsorrel	23	96%
Birstall Watermead	21	62%	Queniborough	10	80%
East Goscote	9	78%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	100%
Forest Bradgate	11	91%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	65%
Loughborough Ashby	21	76%	Shepshed East	22	77%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	80%	Shepshed West	21	86%
Loughborough Garendon	19	89%	Sileby	24	83%
Loughborough Hastings	20	90%	Syston East	20	65%
Loughborough Lemyngton	22	77%	Syston West	25	80%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	100%	Thurmaston	32	75%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	89%	Wreake Villages	10	80%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	84%	The Wolds	10	80%


A significant difference was found between age groups, with respondents aged 18-24 trusting Charnwood Borough Council significantly more (95%) compared to those aged 25-84 (76%-83%).

### 3. Influencing decisions

Respondents were asked how easy they felt it was to influence decisions that might affect them. Results show that three out of ten (29%) felt that it was easy and four out of ten (42%) felt that it was hard. 29% said they did not know which suggests they have not taken part in consultations or did not know how to.

**Figure 3.1 Influencing decisions**

*Percentage of respondents- base size 551*



Year	Influence decisions - easy (%)
2019	29%
2017	43%

Compared to 2017, significantly fewer residents felt it was easy to influence decisions that might affect them. (29% felt it was easy this year compared to 43% in 2017).

Table 3.1 breaks results down by ward. As seen below, the highest percentage of residents that consider it easy to influence decisions can be found in Loughborough Outwoods (58%) while the lowest percentage is in Anstey (5%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward is very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 3.1 Influencing decisions- Ward breakdown**

Ward	No.	Easy (%)	Ward	No.	Easy (%)
Anstey	22	5%	Loughborough Southfields	22	9%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	32%	Loughborough Storer	20	15%
Birstall Wanlip	21	38%	Mountsorrel	23	30%
Birstall Watermead	21	14%	Queniborough	10	50%
East Goscote	9	56%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	36%
Forest Bradgate	11	55%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	20%
Loughborough Ashby	21	38%	Shepshed East	22	36%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	55%	Shepshed West	21	5%
Loughborough Garendon	19	47%	Sileby	24	38%
Loughborough Hastings	20	40%	Syston East	20	20%
Loughborough Lemington	22	14%	Syston West	25	12%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	50%	Thurmaston	32	13%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	58%	Wreake Villages	10	30%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	40%	The Wolds	10	20%

All respondents were subsequently asked to provide reasons for their response to this question (ability to be able to influence decisions). This was an open-ended question. Comments were separated into whether they had rated it as easy or hard.

Table 3.2 shows the themes that emerged from those who rated it as **easy** (162 respondents). The most common reason was that it was just their own personal opinion rather than being based on anything concrete (55 people). This was followed by 19 respondents commenting that it was easy to influence decisions as they could attend meetings or groups. 18 respondents said that they could do so by contacting their councillor. Only 3 respondents explicitly reported that their rating was based on past experience.

**Table 3.2 Influencing decisions (Easy) - Themes**

Theme	Frequency
No reason/own perception	55
Meetings/groups	19
Councillors/representatives	18
By contacting Council (e.g. by email)	15
Votes	10
Easy to approach them	8
Opportunities available	8
Speak with residents	7
Know how to do it	5
Hope that they can influence	5
Council listens	4
Responsive	4
Past experience	3
Have contacts	2
Local paper/Online	2
Other	3

Table 3.3 shows the themes that emerged from those who rated it as **hard** (229 respondents). The most common reason was that the Council ignores or does not listen to them (55 comments). The second most common reason was that it was just their own personal opinion (33 mentions). This was followed by 20

comments stating that they lacked information or knowledge about how they could go about influencing decision making.

**Table 3.3 Influencing decisions (Hard) - Themes**


Theme	Frequency
Don't listen/ignore us	55
No reason/own perception	33
Don't know how	20
No means/mechanism	19
Lack of consultation/communication	17
Have no voice as individual/can't influence	17
Lack of information/knowledge on process	9
Not accessible/helpful	7
Can't attend meetings	7
Long process/difficult	6
Keep to myself	6
Not interested	5
Haven't tried/don't know how	4
More focus on Loughborough	4
Other	20

## Involvement in local decision-making

Respondents were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with how they can get involved in local decision-making. Results show that around a third (35%) were satisfied ('very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined) with the vast majority being 'satisfied' (34%). Four in ten (42%) stated that they were dissatisfied with how they can get involved in local decision making.

**Figure 3.2 Involvement in decision making**

Percentage of respondents- base size 551



Year	Getting involved (%)
2019	35%
2017	55%

Comparison by survey period shows that this year result is significantly lower than that of 2017, meaning that significantly fewer residents are satisfied with how they can get involved in local decision-making, compared to two years ago.

Table 3.4 breaks results down by ward. As seen below, the highest percentage of residents that are satisfied with how they can get involved in local decision-making can be found in Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle

(77%) while the lowest percentage is in Anstey (9%). Please note that the response numbers for each individual ward is very small and so results in the table should be treated as indicative only.

**Table 3.54 Involvement in decision making - Ward breakdown - DK excluded**

Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)	Ward	No.	Satisfied (%)
Anstey	22	9%	Loughborough Southfields	22	9%
Barrow and Sileby West	22	27%	Loughborough Storer	20	20%
Birstall Wanlip	21	33%	Mountsorrel	23	30%
Birstall Watermead	21	24%	Queniborough	10	50%
East Goscote	9	56%	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22	77%
Forest Bradgate	11	55%	Rothley and Thurcaston	20	55%
Loughborough Ashby	21	52%	Shepshed East	22	41%
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20	55%	Shepshed West	21	33%
Loughborough Garendon	19	37%	Sileby	24	46%
Loughborough Hastings	20	30%	Syston East	20	30%
Loughborough Lemyngton	22	18%	Syston West	25	44%
Loughborough Nanpantan	18	39%	Thurmaston	32	16%
Loughborough Outwoods	19	42%	Wreake Villages	10	30%
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25	44%	The Wolds	10	30%


A difference was found between age groups, with respondents aged 18-24 (23%) being significantly less satisfied compared to those aged 25-34 (38%) and 45-74 (38%-48%).

## 4. Loughborough residents only

Loughborough residents were asked whether they believe that the Council adequately supports the town centre. Results show that almost seven out of ten (68%) believe they do, while the remaining three out of ten (32%) believe they don't.

**Figure 4.1 Supporting Loughborough's town centre- DK excluded**

Percentage of respondents- base size 211



All those who said that the Council does not adequately support the town centre were asked to provide ideas to help the Council achieve this in the future.

68 people responded to this question. The most frequent complaint was that residents felt the business rates and rents were too high (27 mentions). This could be linked to the high number of closed shops and businesses and the perceived lack of variety (18 people). Other themes can be found in Table 4.1 below.

**Table 4.1 Supporting Loughborough’s town centre - Themes**

Theme	Frequency
Business rates/rent too high	27
Shops/businesses closing/too many empty shops/a larger variety of shops needed	18
Lack of development/investment/funding	7
Fly tipping/cleanliness/recycling needs improving	6
Offer more incentives to businesses	5
Not good for pedestrians	2
Need more family activities	2
Empty shops	1
No encouragement for small businesses	1
Look after green space	1
More support needed for businesses	1
Greater promotion	1
Parking	1
Other	4

## 5. Conclusions

Overall Charnwood Borough Council has performed well. Over nine out of ten (94%) were happy about living in their area and felt that their local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together (93%). Around eight out of ten (83%) trusted the council and 86% were satisfied with their experience of contacting it. Almost all service areas that residents consider important are also provided at a satisfactory level, with the exception of “the variety of shops and markets available”. This is an area where the Council may wish to improve in the future (as it has high importance but low satisfaction).

An area where satisfaction has decreased significantly compared to 2017 is the satisfaction with how money is spent (16 percentage points decrease) which translates into a low proportion of residents that consider that the Council offers value for money (63%). Although, this is significantly higher than the national average (48%).

One way to improve the low satisfaction levels with how money was spent and the value for money offered by the Council might be to find better ways of getting residents involved in local decision-making and making it easy for them to influence decisions. Both these areas currently have low satisfaction rates (35% and 42% respectively).

Charnwood Borough Council has performed significantly better than the national average in all compared area. However, these results should be treated as indicative as the questions are not identical to the LGA survey.

# Appendices

**Appendix A: Respondent Profile**

**Appendix B: Questionnaire**

## Appendix A: Respondent Profile

Ward	Frequency
Anstey	22
Barrow and Sileby West	22
Birstall Wanlip	21
Birstall Watermead	21
East Goscote	9
Forest Bradgate	11
Loughborough Ashby	21
Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	20
Loughborough Garendon	19
Loughborough Hastings	20
Loughborough Lemyngton	22
Loughborough Nanpantan	18
Loughborough Outwoods	19
Loughborough Shelthorpe	25
Loughborough Southfields	22
Loughborough Storer	20
Mountsorrel	23
Queniborough	10
Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	22
Rothley and Thurcaston	20
Shepshed East	22
Shepshed West	21
Sileby	24
Syston East	20
Syston West	25
Thurmaston	32
Wreake Villages	10
The Wolds	10

Gender	Frequency
Male	274
Female	271
Prefer not to say	6

Age	Frequency
18 - 24	79
25 - 34	81
35 - 44	100
45 - 54	87
55 - 64	76
65-74	69
75-84	32
85+	21

Ethnicity	Frequency
White	475
Non-White	71

Disability	Frequency
Yes – limited a lot	37
Yes – limited a little	37
No	471

Religion	Frequency
No religion	241
Christian (all denominations)	252
Buddhist	1
Hindu	26
Jewish	0
Muslim	15
Sikh	4
Any other religion	0

Sexual Orientation	Frequency
Heterosexual/straight	535
Gay man	4
Gay woman	0
Bisexual	1
Other	2

## Appendix B: Questionnaire

### Charnwood Residents' Survey 2019

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is xxxx and I am from M·E·L Research, an independent Social Research Company. We are working on behalf of Charnwood Borough Council to conduct their residents survey to find out how satisfied residents are with our services and life in the borough.

The survey should take no more than 10 minutes to complete and will be carried out in accordance with the Market Research Society's Code of Conduct and Data Protection Act 2018 (incorporating GDPR). All information you provide will be treated in the strictest of confidence and you will not be personally identifiable in the research report. Details of how M·E·L Research process personal data can be found at <https://melresearch.co.uk/page/privacypolicy>. This includes your right to withdraw consent at any time.

#### More information about the research

If you have any questions or queries regarding this survey, you can contact Mike Roberts, the Council's Communications Manager on 01509 634705 or Clare Rapkins from M·E·L Research on Freephone number 0800 0730 348 or email [info@melresearch.co.uk](mailto:info@melresearch.co.uk) for more information.

Q1 How happy or unhappy are you with living in the area?

- Very happy
- Happy
- Unhappy
- Very unhappy
- Don't know

**Q2** What are the **three** most important things to you from this list:  
**(CAN TICK A MAXIMUM OF 3 PRIORITIES OVERALL) (SHOWCARD 1)**

A variety of entertainment and cultural facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	01	Good access to transport and parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	07
A variety of shops and markets	<input type="checkbox"/>	02	Climate change and looking after the environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	08
Being able to go to sports and leisure facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	03	My rubbish collected on a regular and reliable basis	<input type="checkbox"/>	09
Being able to go to well-maintained parks and green spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	04	The availability of housing that you can afford to buy	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Encouraging and investing in business and jobs	<input type="checkbox"/>	05	The availability of housing that you can afford to rent	<input type="checkbox"/>	11
Feeling safe in my home and the local area	<input type="checkbox"/>	06	The cleanliness and tidiness of my local area	<input type="checkbox"/>	12
			Other, please specify below:	<input type="checkbox"/>	13

Other, please specify below:

**Q3** And how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following:  
**(PLEASE TICK ONE BOX FOR EACH ROW) (SHOWCARD 1)**

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
A variety of entertainment and cultural facilities	<input type="radio"/>				
A variety of shops and markets	<input type="radio"/>				
Being able to go to sports and leisure facilities	<input type="radio"/>				
Being able to go to well-maintained parks and green spaces	<input type="radio"/>				
Encouraging and investing in business and jobs	<input type="radio"/>				

And how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following:  
**(PLEASE TICK ONE BOX FOR EACH ROW) (SHOWCARD 1)**

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Feeling safe in my home and the local area	<input type="radio"/>				
Good access to transport and parking	<input type="radio"/>				

Climate change and looking after the environment	<input type="radio"/>				
My rubbish collected on a regular and reliable basis	<input type="radio"/>				
The availability of housing that you can afford to buy	<input type="radio"/>				
The availability of housing that you can afford to rent	<input type="radio"/>				
The cleanliness and tidiness of my local area	<input type="radio"/>				

**Q4** Are there any areas you feel concerned about?

**Q5** Do you feel that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

Yes

No

Don't know

**Q6** How would you contact the Council if you needed to? **(PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY) (SHOWCARD 2)**

Email	<input type="checkbox"/>	01	Through the website	<input type="checkbox"/>	06
Telephone	<input type="checkbox"/>	02	Via Twitter	<input type="checkbox"/>	07
Going into the office	<input type="checkbox"/>	03	Via Facebook	<input type="checkbox"/>	08
Councillor	<input type="checkbox"/>	04	Other, please specify below	<input type="checkbox"/>	09
Through staff (i.e. housing officer)	<input type="checkbox"/>	05	None of the above	<input type="checkbox"/>	10

Other, please specify below:

**Q7** If the Council provided more services online (such as bookings, payments and reporting problems online), would you use them?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**Q8** If you have contacted the Council for any reason, how would you rate your experience?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know
- Not Applicable – I have never contacted the Council

**Q9** How would you like to receive news and information about our services? **(PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY)**  
**(SHOWCARD 3)**

- |   |                          |    |                                     |                          |    |
|---|--------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| Email alerts                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 01 | Leaflet                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 08 |
| Facebook  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 02 | Website                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 09 |
| Twitter   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 03 | Local media                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 |
| Council residents' newsletter<br>(Charnwood News) | <input type="checkbox"/> | 04 | Your Homes Matter tenants' magazine | <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 |
| Posters   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 05 | Village publication                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 |
| Texts (SMS)                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | 06 | Other, please specify below         | <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 |
| Letter  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 07 | None of the above                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 |

Other, please specify below:

Q10 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how the Council keeps you informed about their services?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

Q11 An average Band D property pays £122.09\* to the borough council on an annual basis. This covers services such as waste collection and recycling, leisure centres, food hygiene and safety, council housing, markets and fairs, CCTV.

*\*this figure does not include the Loughborough Special levy for residents living in Loughborough or Parish or Town Council precepts*

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how Charnwood spends their proportion of your Council Tax?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

Q12 Do you think the Council provides value for money?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Q13 Do you feel it is easy to influence decisions that might affect you in Charnwood?

- Very easy
- Quite easy
- Quite hard
- Very hard
- Don't know

Q14 Please can you include reasons?

Q15 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how you can get involved in local decision making?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

Q16 How much do you trust Charnwood Borough Council?

- A great deal
- A fair amount
- Not very much
- Not at all
- Don't know

**Q17 For Loughborough residents only.** Do you think the Council adequately supports the town centre?

Yes

No

I am not a Loughborough resident.

**Q18** How do you think the Council can better support the town centre?

**Q19** Have you seen a copy of the Council's residents magazine 'Charnwood News' in the past 12 months? INTERVIEWER SHOW RESIDENT COPY OF MAGAZINE.

Yes

No

Can't remember

And finally a few questions from yourself to help analyse the data. Please note that you do not have to provide answers to any of the questions, however even a partial response is useful. This information will be kept confidential and you will not be personally identifiable from the results or the report.

**Q20** What is your gender?

Male

Female

Prefer not to say

**Q21 How old are you? (SHOWCARD 4)**

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> 18 - 24 | <input type="radio"/> 65-74             |
| <input type="radio"/> 25 - 34 | <input type="radio"/> 75-84             |
| <input type="radio"/> 35 - 44 | <input type="radio"/> 85+               |
| <input type="radio"/> 45 - 54 | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to say |
| <input type="radio"/> 55 - 64 |   |

**Q22 What is your ethnic group? (SHOWCARD 5)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British <input type="radio"/> 01 | Any other mixed / multiple ethnic background <input type="radio"/> 11 |
| Irish <input type="radio"/> 02   | Indian <input type="radio"/> 12                                       |
| Gypsy or Irish Traveller <input type="radio"/> 03                              | Pakistani <input type="radio"/> 13                                    |
| Any other White background <input type="radio"/> 04                            | Bangladeshi <input type="radio"/> 14                                  |
| African <input type="radio"/> 05   | Chinese <input type="radio"/> 15                                      |
| Caribbean <input type="radio"/> 06   | Any other Asian background <input type="radio"/> 16                   |
| Any other Black / African / Caribbean background <input type="radio"/> 07      | Arab <input type="radio"/> 17   |
| White and Black Caribbean <input type="radio"/> 08                             | Any other ethnic group <input type="radio"/> 18                       |
| White and Black African <input type="radio"/> 09                               | Prefer not to say <input type="radio"/> 19                            |
| White and Asian <input type="radio"/> 10                                       |   |

**Q23 Are your day to day activities limited because of a health problem which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?**

- Yes – limited a lot
- Yes – limited a little
- No
- Prefer not to say

**Q24 What is your religion? (SHOWCARD 6)**

No religion  1

Christian (all denominations)  2

Buddhist  3

Hindu  4

Jewish  5

Muslim  6

Sikh  7

Any other religion  8

Prefer not to say  9

**Q25 How would you describe your sexual orientation? (SHOWCARD 7)**

Heterosexual/straight  1

Gay man  2

Gay woman  3

Bisexual  4

Other  5

Prefer not to say  6

**Q26 What is your first language?**

English  1

Other (please specify below)  2

Prefer not to say  3

Other, please specify below:

**Q27 What is your post code? *This will be used so that we can see if there are any differences in views by different areas/wards.***

**Q28** As part of our quality checking process, some of the people who answered the survey will be selected at random to answer a few quick questions. Could I please take either your email address - you will be sent a quick online form or telephone number - where someone will call you if necessary? This will not be passed to anyone else.

Yes - email

Yes - telephone

No

**Q29** Finally, would you like to be kept up-to-date on borough council news via the Council's e-mail alert Charnwood Now? This would require your name and email address.

Yes

No

**Q30** If YES, please provide your details below:

First Name	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>
Phone	<input type="text"/>
Email	<input type="text"/>

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey**



m·e·l  
research

