

# **Life in Lancashire 2007 Ribble Valley District**

**Report compiled by** Lancashire County Council  
**Data supplied by** Ipsos MORI

**Fieldwork** September to December 2007

**For more information contact**

Mike Walker, Corporate Research and Intelligence Manager  
Lancashire County Council, PO Box 78, County Hall, Preston, PR1 8XJ  
Telephone: 01772 533445  
Email: [mike.walker@css.lancscc.gov.uk](mailto:mike.walker@css.lancscc.gov.uk)





---

# Contents

---

Introduction .....	1
Summary of Findings .....	3
Quality of Life .....	6
Improving Quality of Life .....	10
Community Cohesion .....	14
County Council Services.....	17
Satisfaction with Services .....	18
Service Improvement Priorities .....	21
Service Usage .....	22
Services for Adults.....	23
Services for Children and Young People .....	24
Services for Young People .....	25
Community Services.....	27
Environmental Services .....	29
Local Transport.....	31
Participating in Local Government.....	32

## Appendices

Guide to Statistical Reliability

Sample Profile

Marked-up Questionnaire



# Introduction

---

## Background and objectives

This report has been produced by Lancashire County Council and is based on data supplied by the Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute. The document reports on the latest views of Lancashire residents about the county council, the services it provides and the quality of life in Lancashire. It also examines how views have changed since 2003. The research project constituted a face-to-face survey of residents, conducted in the Lancashire County Council area.

Specifically, the research covered:

- quality of life;
- community cohesion;
- satisfaction with the county council generally;
- levels of use and satisfaction with specific county council services;
- county council communications; and
- local democracy, including the role of councillors.

## Methodology

Ipsos MORI interviewed a representative sample of 2,451 residents (aged 16+) across the Lancashire County Council area. Interviews were carried out face-to-face between 15 September and 16 December 2007 using a randomly selected sample of 468 output areas (the smallest unit by which census data can be recorded).

In each output area, quotas were set by gender, age, working status and council district. The data were subsequently weighted by these factors, plus ethnicity, to match the mid-2006 estimates Census profile of the area. The survey averaged 30 minutes in length.

All responses have been analysed by a range of demographic, geographical and attitudinal variables.

## **Presentation and interpretation of data**

It should be noted that in this study a sample and not the entire population of the Lancashire County Council area has been interviewed. All results are therefore subject to sampling tolerances, meaning not all differences are statistically significant. A guide to statistical reliability is appended to this report.

Where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of “don’t know” categories, or multiple answers. An asterisk (\*) denotes any value less than half a per cent but greater than zero.

The report also includes “combination” scores. These are combined responses to two or more response categories on the same side of a scale, for example, “very/fairly satisfied” and “very/fairly dissatisfied”. Please note that the aggregate percentage may vary slightly from the sum of the two smaller percentages due to computer rounding.

Where reference is made to “net” figures this represents the balance of opinion on attitudinal questions, and provides a particularly useful means of comparing the results for a number of variables. For example, if a statement records 40% agree and 25% disagree, the ‘net agree’ figure is +15 points.

It is also worth emphasising that the survey deals with residents’ *perceptions* of the local area and the county council at the time the survey was conducted rather than *facts* about these.

## **Publication of the data**

The publication of the data in this report is subject to the advance approval of Ipsos MORI and Lancashire County Council. This would only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misinterpretation of the findings.

# Summary of Findings

---

## Quality of life

- Satisfaction with Lancashire and local area as a place to live
  - Across Lancashire, nine in ten (90%) residents of the county are satisfied overall with Lancashire as a place to live, with two in five who are **very satisfied** (41%). Five in six Lancashire residents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live (83%).
  - Residents in the Ribble Valley are more likely to be satisfied with Lancashire and their local area as a place to live compared to the county overall (net satisfaction 94% for both in Ribble Valley). This is the highest net satisfaction for the local area of all the Lancashire districts. Satisfaction levels haven't changed in since 2003.
- Positive aspects of life
  - Remaining consistent with 2003, Lancashire residents cite **friendly people, peace and quiet, countryside and convenience for shops** as the most positive aspects of their area.
  - In Ribble Valley **friendly people, openness/countryside, and peace and quiet** are most often seen as the good things about the area (the same top priorities as in 2003). The proportion of people saying friendly people, openness/countryside, and safe area/low crime rate are good things about the area is greater in Ribble Valley than in Lancashire. Whereas fewer people in Ribble Valley are likely to say the area is convenient for the shops, has adequate public transport, or has access to other places compared to Lancashire.
- Negative aspects of life
  - The most frequently given bad aspects across the county are **too much traffic** (14%), **speed of traffic** (10%), and **poor facilities for young people** (9%). One in five people says there are **no bad things** about the local area.
  - In Ribble Valley, **expensive housing** is the most quoted bad thing about living in the area (11%). However more respondents state that there is **nothing** wrong with living in their area (39%), the highest of any district.

- Improving quality of life in Lancashire
  - **Reducing crime and disorder** (37%) and **providing activities for young people** (34%) are seen as the factors that would most improve quality of life. **Reducing traffic and congestion** is also cited by over one in four residents (29% compared to 25% in 2003).
  - The top priorities in Ribble Valley are similar to those for Lancashire, with the exception of **proving more affordable housing** (31% versus 18% in Lancashire).

## Community Cohesion

- In Lancashire, over half of residents (53%) agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together.
- In Ribble Valley, residents are more likely to agree that people get along where they live than in the county overall (60% agreeing against 53%). There has been no significant change in Ribble Valley of the proportion of people agreeing since the 2003 survey (based on the respondents who gave an opinion to the question).

## Service satisfaction and priorities

- The highest named priority services across the county are:
  - services for older people (31%);
  - services for young people (27%); and
  - road maintenance and repairs (25%).
- In Ribble Valley, the highest priorities are:
  - services for older people (37%);
  - services for young people (33%); and
  - road maintenance and repairs (23%).
- Service satisfaction
  - The greatest increases in net service satisfaction across the county are for local train services (+24%) and local bus services (+14%).
  - There has also been a significant improvement in satisfaction with the museum service (+10%), which now has the highest satisfaction of any Lancashire County Council service (+92% net satisfied).



## Participation

- As in 2003, there has been no significant change in the proportion of residents who say they would like to participate in local government across Lancashire. In 2007, only 17% of residents say they would like to have more of a say in what the county council does.
- The majority (58%) of residents say they like to know what the county council is doing, but they are happy to let it get on with the job, while 18% say they are not interested in what the county council does as long as it does its job.
- Listening to people and/or dealing with their complaints/problems are considered by residents the most important things for a local councillor to do (75% and 50% respectively).
- The priorities for Ribble Valley were similar to those across Lancashire, but dealing with complaints and problems is seen as less important in Ribble Valley than in Lancashire (39% versus 50%).


# Quality of Life

---

## Satisfaction with Lancashire

The majority of residents across the county report that they are happy to be living in Lancashire. Nine in ten (90%) are satisfied overall with Lancashire as a place to live, with two in five who are *very* satisfied (41%). These findings remain in line with 2003, where 88% were satisfied.

**Chart 1 - Thinking about Lancashire, on the whole, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it as a place to live?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI


## Satisfaction with Lancashire – Ribble Valley district

Residents in the Ribble Valley are more likely to be satisfied with Lancashire as a place to live compared to the county overall (net satisfaction 94% versus 86%). Also residents in Ribble Valley are significantly more likely to be very satisfied than Lancashire residents (52% versus 41%). Satisfaction levels haven't changed in Ribble Valley since 2003.

## Satisfaction with the area

Residents were also asked to rate their satisfaction with *their area* as a place to live. Overall, Lancashire residents are less satisfied with their own area (83%) than they are with Lancashire as a whole (90%). However, satisfaction with area remains consistent with 2003, when 81% residents said they were satisfied.

**Chart 2 - And thinking about this area, on the whole, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it as a place to live?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

## Satisfaction with the local area – Ribble Valley district


Residents in the Ribble Valley are more likely to be satisfied with their local area as a place to live compared to the county overall (net satisfaction 94% versus 74%). This is the highest net satisfaction of all the Lancashire districts. Also residents in Ribble Valley are significantly more likely to be very satisfied than Lancashire residents (57% versus 43%). Satisfaction levels haven't changed in Ribble Valley since 2003.

## Positive aspects of life in Lancashire

Lancashire residents were asked to provide reasons why they are happy to be living in the area. In line with 2003, very few (3%) say that there are 'no good things' about the area.

Remaining consistent with 2003, residents cite **friendly neighbours/people; peace and quiet, openness/greenery /countryside and convenience for shops** as the most positive aspects of the area. Positively, none of the aspects shown on the chart below have seen a decrease since 2003, with the majority having seen an increase over the past four years. The proportion citing **friendly neighbours/people** and **adequate public transport** as good things about living in the area has increased by five percent. Percentages of those mentioning **convenience of shops, access to the countryside** and **good schools/education** have also risen by three percent since 2003.

**Chart 3 - Which three or four things, if any, would you say are good things about living in this area? (Top 8 answers)**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)

Source: Ipsos MORI

## Positive aspects of life in Ribble Valley


In Ribble Valley **friendly people, openness/countryside, and peace and quiet** are most often seen as the good things about the area (the same top priorities as in 2003). The proportion of people saying friendly people, openness/countryside, and safe area/low crime rate are good things about the area is greater in Ribble Valley than in Lancashire. Whereas fewer people in Ribble Valley are likely to say the area is convenient for the shops, has adequate public transport, or has access to other places compared to Lancashire.

## Negative aspects of life in Lancashire

Just over one in five (22%) of residents say there are 'no bad things' about living in the area.

At the aggregate level, the most commonly cited negative aspects are **too much traffic** (14%), **speed of traffic** (10%), **poor facilities for young people** (9%), **poor public transport** (8%) and **unclean streets** (8%). This is largely similar to both the 2000 and 2003 surveys. However, reflecting the growing concern about anti-social behaviour for which young people can be frequently blamed, poor facilities for young people was not mentioned as a key negative aspect in the 2000 survey.

**Chart 4 - Which three or four things, if any, would you say are bad things about living in this area? (Top 8 answers)**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)

Source: Ipsos MORI

## Negative aspects of life in Ribble Valley


In Ribble Valley, **expensive housing** is the most quoted bad thing about living in the area (11%). However more respondents state that there is **nothing** wrong with living in their area (39%), the highest of any district.

# Improving Quality of Life

## Priorities for improving local quality of life in Lancashire

In line with the 2003 survey, over a third of residents cite **reducing crime and disorder** (37%) and **providing activities for young people** (34%) as factors that would most improve quality of life. **Reducing traffic and congestion** is also cited by over one in four (29% compared to 25% in 2003) residents, with one in five (20%) mentioning **protecting the environment**.

**Chart 5 - Thinking about your quality of life, which two or three of the following things, if any, are the most important to improve your own quality of life?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI


## Priorities in Ribble Valley

The top priorities in Ribble Valley are similar to those for Lancashire, with the exception of **providing more affordable housing** (31% versus 18% in Lancashire).

## Key Priority: Reducing crime and disorder

As in 2003, when presented with a list of possible ways in which to reduce crime and disorder, the most commonly cited action is to **provide a more visible police presence** (70%). Other key actions cited include **tackling anti-social behaviour** (60%) and **tackling drugs and alcohol misuse** (34%).

**Chart 6 - In your opinion, which two or three, if any, of the following should Lancashire County Council do in order to reduce crime and disorder?**



Base: All giving crime and disorder as a priority (Lancashire 898, Ribble Valley 40)  
 Source: Ipsos MORI


### Key priorities in Ribble Valley

As across the county, a **more visible police presence** (69%) and **tackling anti-social behaviour** (64%) are the top suggestions for reducing crime and disorder in the district of Ribble Valley. Residents of Ribble Valley are more likely to want the council to **improve access to support for victims** than Lancashire as a whole (20% versus 9%).

## Key priority: Providing activities for young people

Residents were asked what the county council should do to provide activities for young people. The most commonly cited actions are to **provide more youth centres for meeting people of their own age** (59%) and **more leisure facilities that are affordable for young people** (58%). Over a third (34%) of Lancashire residents also cite **providing more spaces for playing** as a key priority. These findings remain consistent with the 2003 survey.

**Chart 7 - In your opinion, which two or three, if any of the following should Lancashire County Council do in order to provide activities for young people?**



Base: All giving activities for young people as a priority (Lancashire 811, Ribble Valley 37)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

## Key priorities in Ribble Valley


Priorities in the district are similar to the county overall, although **more affordable leisure facilities** is more important (71% versus 58%) and **more spaces for playing** is less important (21% versus 34%) in the Ribble Valley.



## Key priority: Improving traffic and transport

All respondents were asked their key priorities for transport. Residents are most likely to prioritise **reducing delays to traffic** (35%) and **improving existing roads, street lighting and bridges** (34%). As in 2003, a third (33%) would like to see an improvement in travelling by **public transport** and a quarter (25%) would like improvements to **road safety** to be prioritised. Remaining consistent with the 2003 findings, residents are least likely to favour building new roads.

**Chart 8 - Which of the following two or three local transport issues do you think should be the main priorities for Lancashire?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

## Key priorities in Ribble Valley

As was the case in 2003, residents in Ribble Valley are most likely to prioritise **improving travelling by public transport** (39%), followed by **improving pedestrian facilities** (29%) and **improving road safety** (28%). These results are both similar to the responses in 2003. Reducing delays to traffic is significantly less important in Ribble Valley than in Lancashire (24% versus 35%).


# Community Cohesion

---

## Participation in formal volunteering

Only 16% of Lancashire residents have undertaken some kind of formal volunteering in the last 12 months – the overwhelming majority (83%) have not.

**Chart 9 - Formal volunteering is unpaid help given as part of groups, clubs or organisations to benefit others or the environment. Have you done any formal volunteering in the last 12 months?**




Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

Residents living in Ribble Valley are similarly likely to have taken part in formal volunteering as the county overall (15% compared to 16% overall).

## Interaction with people of a different ethnic origin

The most popular situations in which residents from different ethnic backgrounds mix together are at the local shops and at work (35% and 34% respectively), whilst over a quarter (28%) of residents say they do not meet anyone from a different ethnic origin.

**Chart 10 - Here is a list of a number of everyday situations. In which of these situations, if any, would you say you regularly meet and talk with people of a different ethnic origin to you?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI


## Interaction with people from a different ethnic origin in Ribble Valley

Responses in Ribble Valley are similar to those across the county overall, although in Ribble Valley residents are less likely to meet people of a different ethnic origin in their neighbourhood (11% versus 20%).

## People from different backgrounds

Over half of residents (53%) agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together. This is a decrease of seven percentage points from the figure recorded in the 2003 survey. However, this decrease is most likely accounted for by the increase in the proportion of people who say there are too few people in the area to make a judgement (up 13 points to 16% since 2003). Importantly, there has been no overall increase in the proportion of people who *disagree* that people in the local area get on well together.

**Chart 11 - To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)

Source: Ipsos MORI

### People from different backgrounds in Ribble Valley


In Ribble Valley, residents are more likely to agree that people get along where they live than in the county overall (60% agreeing against 53%). There has been no significant change in Ribble Valley of the proportion of people agreeing since the 2003 survey (based on the respondents who gave an opinion to the question).

# County Council Services

## Importance of services

Caring services dominate when we consider the importance of council services. **Services for older people** (31%) continue to be considered by residents in Lancashire as the most important county council services, followed by **services for younger people** (27%) and **road maintenance and repairs** (25%). This is consistent with services considered important in 2000 and 2003. Significant changes include **road safety** (19%) overtaking **secondary schools** (17%) and **primary schools** (15%), whilst the introduction of **doorstep recycling collections** (23%) in this survey has seen it placed fourth.

**Chart 12 - Thinking now about all the services provided by Lancashire County Council, which three or four of the services on this list, do you think are most important for people in this area? (Top 10 answers)**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

## Service priorities in Ribble Valley

Priorities in Ribble Valley are similar to those of Lancashire as a whole, although there is greater priority given to services for young people (33% versus 27%).

# Satisfaction with Services

---

## Universal services

Net satisfaction with most universal services – particularly street lighting and road maintenance and repairs – has improved since 2003 and those that have not have only declined by a percentage point.

Residents remain most satisfied with street lighting, with four-fifths (79%) of residents saying they are at least 'fairly satisfied'.


The level of dissatisfaction is greatest with road maintenance (38%), pavement maintenance (36%) and traffic calming measures (35%). This is consistent with the previous Life in Lancashire surveys, and indeed MORI's experience with surveys conducted for other county councils. As with 2003 though, residents are once again *less dissatisfied* with these services than the previous survey.

## Universal services in Ribble Valley

In Ribble Valley, the proportion satisfied with most services is similar to that for Lancashire as a whole; though the proportion satisfied with pavement traffic management is significantly higher (62% versus 55%).


**Chart 13 - How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your local area?**

### Lancashire



Base: All respondents (2501)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

### Ribble Valley



Base: All Ribble Valley respondents (202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

### Other services

Among service users, there is highest overall satisfaction with libraries (94%) and museums (94%). Satisfaction with museums was particularly impressive as net satisfaction has risen ten points since 2003.

Other services recording high satisfaction levels include **registrations of births, deaths and marriages** (91%), **primary schools** (91%) and **nursery schools** (90%). This is consistent with the 2003 results.

**Q How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way each of the following are provided in your local area?**

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Net Satisfied	Change since 2003
Base: All users	%	%	+/-	+/-
Museums	94	2	92	+10
Libraries	94	3	91	+1
Registration of births, deaths and marriages	91	3	88	+2
Primary schools	91	4	87	+2
Services for families & younger children	89	2	87	N/A
Nursery schools	90	5	85	+1
Local tips/household waste disposal sites	89	6	83	+5
Special schools*	86	4	83	N/A
Countryside recreation	87	5	82	+10
County Information Centres	85	4	82	+8
Welfare rights	87	7	80	+21
Adult education	87	7	79	0
Local taxis	82	5	77	+3
Secondary schools	84	9	75	+5
Footpaths, bridle paths & rights of way	79	9	70	+3
Local train services	79	11	68	+24
Trading standards	72	6	67	-6
Local bus services	78	14	64	+14
Doorstep recycling	79	16	63	N/A
Support for the arts	77	16	60	-3
Services for older people	70	15	55	+11
Services for people with a disability	72	18	54	+3
Support for local businesses	60	14	46	18
Cycle facilities	66	21	45	+10
Services for carers	62	21	40	N/A
Local road system	58	20	38	+4
Services for people with learning disabilities*	56	20	37	-10
Services for people with mental health problems	60	28	32	+4
Services for vulnerable children and families*	52	32	20	-2
Planning services	45	26	19	-16
Services for young offenders*	37	41	-4	+1

\*Base size <100

Source: Ipsos MORI




# Service Improvement Priorities

The chart below plots satisfaction with services against the importance given to that service by residents. The further to the right a service is, the more important it is to residents, and the further up, the higher the net level of satisfaction with the service. Services to focus on are in the bottom right hand quadrant; they are seen as important, but are currently poorly rated.

The services that are priorities for improvement are: **road maintenance** and **road safety**.

**Chart 14 - Importance of services vs service satisfaction**



Base: All respondents (importance), all service users (satisfaction)

# Service Usage

**Doorstep recycling collections** (83%) are by far the most widely used Lancashire County Council service, followed by **household waste disposal sites** (67%). Once again there has been a slight fall in the proportion of residents using **libraries**, although they are still used by nearly three-fifths of residents (58%).

**Q Which of these services have you or your family benefited from in the last 12 months?**

	<b>% Using the service</b>	<b>Change since 2003 (+/-%)</b>
Doorstep recycling collections	83	N/A
Local tips or household waste disposal	67	+5
Local bus services	60	+3
Libraries	58	-3
Local taxis	53	+3
Footpaths, bridleways and rights of way	47	+2
Countryside recreation	45	+2
Local train services	41	+11
Other recycling facilities	32	N/A
Primary schools	27	+2
Secondary schools	23	+2
Cycle facilities	22	+1
Museums	19	-1
Adult education	17	0
Registration of births, deaths and	17	+2
Services for older people	14	+5
County Information Centres	14	+6
Nursery schools	14	+2
Services for young people	13	N/A
Services for people with a disability	12	N/A
Welfare rights	9	+2
Planning services	7	+3
Support for the arts	6	-1
Services for adults with mental health	6	+2
Services for carer	6	N/A
Services for families and younger children	5	N/A
Trading standards	5	+1
Services for children with additional	5	N/A
Support for local businesses	5	+2
Special schools	2	N/A
Services for people with learning	2	-2
Services for vulnerable children and	2	0
Services for young offenders	1	0

Base: All residents (2,451)

Source: Ipsos MORI

# Services for Adults

---


## Introduction

This section looks at user satisfaction with services for adults in Lancashire. Services for adults with learning disabilities have a small number of users, so satisfaction scores must be interpreted with caution.

## Overview for Lancashire

Services for people with a disability (72%) post the highest level of satisfaction among users, followed closely by services for older people (70%). Satisfaction among users of services for adults with learning disabilities (56%) has dropped by 13 percentage points since 2003, although the small base size means that this finding is not statistically significant.

**Chart 15 - And how satisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your area?**



Base: All who have used or benefited from the service (52-359)

One-quarter (26%) of those residents who have used at least one adult service believe that the service/s they have used have got better over the last two years, while 45% think that they have stayed the same. Twelve percent think that they have got worse.

Among services for adults those for people with a disability have the highest level of satisfaction among users in Lancashire, and also compare very favourably with those in other county councils. Net satisfaction has risen by three percentage points since 2003.

Services for older people also have a high level of satisfaction among users with net satisfaction up two percentage points since 2003.

# Services for Children and Young People

---


## Introduction

This section looks at user satisfaction with services for children and young people in Lancashire. Services for vulnerable children and families and services for young offenders have a very small number of users (41 and 22 respectively), so satisfaction scores must be interpreted with caution.

## Overview for Lancashire

Three-quarters (77%) of those who have used services for young people (such as youth clubs, youth projects, Connexions service) are satisfied with the way they are provided in their local area. The majority (72%) of users of services for children with additional needs are also satisfied. Services for young offenders are the only ones for which users are more likely to be dissatisfied than satisfied (although this is based on a very small base size).

**Chart 16 - And how satisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your area? (Young people)**



Base: All who have used or benefited from the service (41-283)

One-third (33%) of those residents who have used or benefited from a service for children and young people in the last 12 months think that they have got better over the last two years or so. Two fifths (40%) think that they have stayed the same, while nine percent think that they have got worse.

# Services for Young People

---

## Overview for Lancashire

Residents in Lancashire are most satisfied with the primary and nursery schools in the local area (91% and 90% respectively), a finding broadly in line with 2003. Although users of secondary schools (84%) are slightly less satisfied than users of other education services in the area, satisfaction levels have increased since 2003 (with net satisfaction increasing from +70 points to +75 points in 2007). Positively, satisfaction levels for all services are high and are particularly well regarded among users in Lancashire in comparison to those in many other similar authorities.

**Chart 17 - And how satisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your area? (Young people)**



Base: All who have used or benefited from the service (46-662)

Of those who have used or benefited from at least one young people's service, over two in five (43%) think that education services have *got better* over the last two years or so, up five percentage points since 2003. With over a third (36%) thinking it has *stayed the same* and only eight percent suggesting that it has *got worse* over the years.

## Nursery schools

As in 2003, the majority of users of nursery schools are satisfied with the service provided in their local area (90%). Only five percent express dissatisfaction, giving a net satisfaction score of +85 points. This score remains in line with 2003 (also +85 points) and is a significant increase on the 2000 net satisfaction score, when net satisfaction was +74 points.

Positively, in comparison to other authorities Lancashire's nursery school facilities are well regarded.

## **Primary schools**

Nine out of ten (91%) primary schools users are satisfied with the service. Only 4% express dissatisfaction, giving a net satisfaction score of +87 points. Net satisfaction scores for this service have gradually increased from 2000, when the net satisfaction score was +84 points and satisfaction with Lancashire's primary school facilities remains high in comparison to other authorities.

## **Secondary schools**

Those who have used or benefited from secondary schools services are the least satisfied users overall. However, it is still a very positive picture, with 84% satisfied (up from 81% in 2003) and nine percent dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction score of +75 points. Encouragingly, this is an increase from 2003, when the net satisfaction score was +70 points.

## **Support for children with special needs**

Of the 46 users of support for children with special needs, over four out of five respondents (86%) are satisfied overall with the service provided. Only four percent of those who have used or benefited from the service are dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction score of +83 points.

# Community Services


---

## Overview for Lancashire

Satisfaction among users of community services is generally higher than for other services provided by Lancashire County Council. Indeed libraries (94%) and museums (94% - up seven points since 2003) have the highest levels of satisfaction of any service mentioned in the survey.

The most significant changes since 2003 are that satisfaction with support for the arts has risen 20 percentage points to 77%, while there has been 11 point rise in the level of satisfaction with welfare rights.

**Chart 18 - And how satisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your area? (Community)**



Base: All who have used or benefited from the service (150-1,426)

Nearly one-third (31%) of those who have used at least one community service in the last two years or so think that the service has got better in the last two years or so. Half (49%) think that it has stayed the same, while only five percent think it has got worse.

## Museums

Satisfaction with museums (94%) has risen seven percentage points since 2003 and is three points higher than the baseline survey in 2000. Net satisfaction is 92% (only two percent are dissatisfied), the highest score of any service provided by Lancashire County Council. As with library services, satisfaction with museums compares very favourably with other county councils.

## **Libraries**

As in 2003, libraries have one of the highest net satisfaction scores (91%) of any of the Lancashire County Council services mentioned in the survey. Lancashire continues to have higher levels of satisfaction for its libraries than any of the other county councils for which Ipsos MORI has completed similar surveys.

## **Registrations of births, deaths and marriages**

The net satisfaction score among residents who have used registrations of birth, deaths and marriages service is 88%, with 91% of users satisfied with the service and only three percent dissatisfied.

## **Adult education**

The majority (87%) of those residents who have used the adult education provided in Lancashire are satisfied with the service they received, while seven percent are dissatisfied. The net satisfaction score is 79%.

## **Welfare rights**

The net satisfaction score among users of welfare rights has risen by 21 percentage points since 2003 to 80%, with 87% of users satisfied with the service and seven percent dissatisfied.

## **County Information Centres**

The majority (85%) of users are satisfied with County Information Centres, and the net satisfaction score is 82% as only four percent are dissatisfied.

## **Support for the arts**

Just over three-quarters (77%) of users are satisfied with support for the arts in Lancashire and 16% are dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction of 60%. This is not a significant increase on 2003.




# Environmental Services

## Overview for Lancashire

Among users, satisfaction with local tips or household waste recycling centres (89%) and countryside recreation (87%) is particularly high. As in 2003, satisfaction with cycle facilities (66%) is lower than for other environmental services, but there has been an improvement.

**Chart 19 - And how satisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your area? (Environmental)**



Base: All who have used or benefited from the service (115-1,654)

## Local tips or household waste recycling centres

The great majority (89%) of those who have used or benefited from local tips or household waste recycling centres are satisfied, while only six percent are dissatisfied, giving a net score of +83 points. This compares well with the small number of other county councils in which Ipsos MORI have asked this question.

## Countryside recreation

Countryside recreation (such as country parks, picnic sites etc) is another service with a very high level of satisfaction (87% satisfied versus only five percent dissatisfied) among users, and a net score of +82 points

Satisfaction with countryside recreation is greatest among residents in Lancaster (95%), while dissatisfaction is highest among those in Rossendale (14%).

## **Footpaths, bridleways and rights of way**

Four-fifths (79%) of users are satisfied with footpaths, bridleways and rights of way, with nine percent dissatisfied, giving a net score of +70 points.

As with countryside recreation, satisfaction is greatest in Lancaster (86%), plus Chorley (86%), while dissatisfaction is highest among users in Rossendale (17%).

## **Doorstep recycling collections**

Four in five (79%) users are satisfied with doorstep recycling collections, while 16% are dissatisfied. Net satisfaction is therefore +63 points.

Satisfaction is greatest among users in Hyndburn (87%) and Pendle (86%), and older users (eg 86% of those aged 65+). In contrast, dissatisfaction is (once again) greatest in Rossendale (32%), and also significantly higher among those aged 25-44 (22%).

## **Cycle facilities**

Two-thirds (66%) of users are satisfied, while one-fifth (21%) are dissatisfied, giving a net score of +45 points. Although largely positive, satisfaction levels among users are below those for other environmental services and in line with the 2003 results for this service.

Users aged 16-24 (83%) and those living in Chorley (83%) have the highest level of satisfaction, whilst dissatisfaction is greatest in West Lancashire (38%).

# Local Transport

---

## Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with local transport services in Lancashire. Satisfaction figures are based on all who have used or benefited from each of the service areas.

## Overview for Lancashire

Satisfaction among users of local taxi services remains higher than for other local transport services, with four out of five users satisfied (82% compared to 83% in 2003). Positively satisfaction levels have generally increased or remained steady since the 2003 survey, with train service ratings showing the greatest improvement (plus 12 percentage points to 79%). Significant improvements can also be seen in satisfaction with local bus services (plus six percentage points to 78%). Satisfaction with the local road system has remained steady, with nearly three in five Lancashire residents satisfied with this service (58%).

**Chart 20 - And how satisfied are you with the way each of these services is provided in your area? (Local Transport)**



Base: All who have used or benefited from the service (933-2,320)

As in 2003, users of local transport services remain divided as to whether local transport services have improved or deteriorated over the last two years or so. Half (49%) say they have 'stayed the same', just over one in four (28%) say they have got better and just under one in five (16%) say they have got worse over the past few years. This reflects a slight improvement since 2003, when one in four (25%) reported that transport services had got better and one in five (19%) said that services had got worse.

## Local transport in Ribble Valley


In Ribble Valley, residents are the most likely to be satisfied with local train services (82%) and least likely to be satisfied with the local road system (68%).

# Participating in Local Government

## Getting involved

When asked which of the following statements relating to participation best related to them, well over half of residents (58%) said *'I like to know what the county council is doing, but I'm happy to let it get on with the job'*. Only two percent were not interested in the council or what it does. Almost one in five (17%) said they would like to have more of a say on what the council does. The figures are broadly similar to the 2000 and 2003 surveys.

**Chart 21 - Which of these statements comes closest to your attitude about Lancashire County Council?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)

Source: Ipsos MORI

## Level of interest in getting involved: sub-group analysis

- Residents aged 25-44 are most likely to want to have more of a say (20% compared to 17% for all respondents), and those in social class AB (22%).
- Around a quarter of residents living in Rossendale (25%), Burnley (24%) and Wyre (23%) would like to have more of a say (compared to 17% overall). However, only 15% of residents living in West Lancashire would like to have more of a say.
- Residents who are more likely to be high level service users are more likely to want more of a say (21% compared to 17%).
- Residents who are dissatisfied with the council, and who do not feel very well informed about the council are much more likely to want more of a say in what the county council does, than those who are satisfied and feel more informed.


## Role of county councillors

Residents were asked which two or three things they thought were the most important for their local county councillors to do.

The figures are broadly similar to those in the 2003 survey, with three-quarters of residents saying that *'listening to views of local people'* was the most important role for a councillor, and half saying *'dealing with complaints/problems'*. Less than one in ten thought taking decisions about council services, maintaining ethical standards and scrutinising decisions were important.

Respondents were asked for the first time whether they thought it was important that their local councillor reflected the background of their community: 12% agreed it was.

**Chart 22 - Which two or three of the following do you think it is most important for your local county councillors to do?**



Base: All respondents (Lancashire 2,451, Ribble Valley 202)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

The priorities for Ribble Valley were similar to those across Lancashire, but dealing with complaints and problems is seen as less important in Ribble Valley than in Lancashire (39% versus 50%).

---

# Appendices

---

# Guide to Statistical Reliability

---

The survey may be based on quota samples where normal distribution-based confidence intervals do not strictly apply, however it is common practice in research to present confidence intervals for quota samples to be as if they were simple random samples (as in the tables below).

The sample tolerances that apply to the percentage results in this report are given in the table below. This table shows the possible variation that might be anticipated because a sample, rather than the entire population, was interviewed. As indicated, sampling tolerances vary with the size of the sample and the size of the percentage results.

<b>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable To percentages at or near these levels</b>			
	<b>10% or 90%</b>	<b>30% or 70%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	<b>±</b>	<b>±</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>Size of sample on which Survey result is based</b>			
100 interviews	6	9	10
200 interviews	4	6	7
300 interviews	3	5	6
400 interviews	3	5	5
500 interviews	3	4	4
1,000 interviews	2	3	3*
<b>2,000 interviews</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2,451 interviews</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

*Source: Ipsos MORI*

\*For example, with a sample of 1,000 where 50% give a particular answer, the chances are 19 in 20 that the “true” value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 3 percentage points ( $\pm 3$ ) from the sample result.

## Comparing percentages between sub-groups and the overall total

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be “real”, or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. if it is “statistically significant”, we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume the “95% confidence interval”, the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below:

<b>Differences required for significance at or near these percentages</b>			
	<b>10% or 90%</b>	<b>30% or 70%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	±	±	±
<b>Size of sample on which survey result is based</b>			
100 and 100	8	13	14
100 and 200	7	11	12
100 and 300	7	10	11
100 and 400	7	10	11
100 and 500	7	10	11
200 and 200	7	10	11
200 and 300	5	8	9
200 and 400	5	8	9
200 and 500	5	8	8
300 and 300	5	7	8
300 and 400	5	7	8
300 and 500	4	7	7
400 and 400	4	6	7
400 and 500	4	6	7
500 and 500	4	6	6
1,000 and 500	3	5	5
1,000 and 1,000	3	4	4
2,451 and 200	4	7	7
2,451 and 500	3	4	5
2,451 and 1,000	2	3	4

*Source: Ipsos MORI*



# Sample Profile

	<i>Number of people Unweighted</i>	<i>Unweighte d %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
	2,451		
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	1,174	48	48
Female	1,275	52	52
<b>Age</b>			
16-24	282	12	15
25-34	327	13	14
35-44	446	18	18
45-64	778	32	30
65+	618	25	23
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
White British	2,320	95	94
BME/Other	112	5	5
<b>Work Status</b>			
Working	1,179	48	49
Retired	745	30	27
Not working	1,020	42	39
<b>District</b>			
Burnley	205	8	7
Chorley	215	9	9
Fylde	203	8	7
Hyndburn	199	8	7
Lancaster	213	9	13
Pendle	201	8	8
Preston	200	8	11
Ribble Valley	202	8	5
Rosendale	200	8	6
South Ribble	206	8	9
West Lancashire	202	8	9
Wyre	203	8	10

Source: Ipsos MORI