

Life in Lancashire 2003

Rossendale District

Research study for Lancashire County Council
Conducted by MORI

Fieldwork September to December 2003

For more information contact

Mike Walker, Research Manager

Lancashire County Council, PO Box 78, County Hall, Preston, PR1 8XJ

Telephone: 01772 533445

Email: mike.walker@css.lancscc.gov.uk



Contents

Introduction	4
Summary of Findings	7
Quality of Life	7
Improving Quality of Life.....	7
Community Cohesion	8
Quality of Life	9
Satisfaction in Lancashire	9
Satisfaction in Rossendale	10
Positive Aspects of Life in Lancashire	11
Negative Aspects of Life in Lancashire	12
Improving Quality of Life	13
Quality of Life: Broad Themes in Lancashire.....	13
Key Quality of Life Themes: Crime and Disorder in Lancashire	14
Key Quality of Life Themes: Activities for Young People in Lancashire	15
Key Quality of Life Themes: Traffic and Transport in Lancashire	16
Key Quality of Life Themes: Illegal Drug-Taking in Lancashire	17
Community Cohesion.....	18
People Get on Well Together in Lancashire	18
People Get on Well Together in Rossendale	18
Looking Out for One Another in Lancashire	19
Looking Out For One Another in Rossendale	19
Knowing and Trusting Each Other in Lancashire	20
Knowing and Trusting Each Other in Rossendale	20
County Council Services.....	21
Importance of services in Lancashire	21
Satisfaction with Services	22
Universal services in Lancashire	22
Other services in Lancashire	23
Comparisons with MORI Normative Data	25
Trends	26
Service Improvement Priorities	27
Service Usage	28
Social Services	29
Education Services	30
Introduction	30
Overview for Lancashire.....	30
Leisure & Cultural Services.....	31
Overview for Lancashire.....	31
Environmental Services	32
Overview for Lancashire.....	32
Overview for Rossendale	32
Environmental Services in Lancashire	33
Local Transport.....	34
Overview for Lancashire.....	34
Other County Council Services	35
Economic Development and Job Creation (all residents).....	35
Support for Local Businesses (all residents)	35

Trading Standards (all residents)	35
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages (all users)	35
Planning Services (all users).....	36
Welfare Rights (all users)	36
County Information Centres	36
Participating in Local Government	37
Getting Involved	37
Role of County Councillors	39
Appendices	40

Introduction

Background and Objectives

This report presents the findings of a survey carried out by the MORI Local Government Research Unit for Lancashire County Council. The document reports on the latest views of Lancashire residents about Lancashire County Council, the services it provides and quality of life in the county. It also examines how views have changed since 2000, when the baseline Lancashire County Council residents' survey was conducted by MORI.

More specifically, this representative survey of Lancashire residents is intended to provide robust information on residents' attitudes towards living in Lancashire which can be used for comparisons with the 2000 baseline survey, as well as on-going monitoring. Topics covered include:

- satisfaction with the local area as a place to live;
- quality of life;
- social cohesion;
- usage of, and satisfaction with, local services;
- local transport; and
- corporate priorities.

Methodology

MORI carried out 2,447 interviews with Lancashire residents (aged 18+) in 192 randomly selected enumeration districts (EDs) across the County. Within each ED, quotas were set using 2001 Census data to reflect the population profile of that neighbourhood.

The data are weighted by sex, age, working status, ethnicity and area.

All interviews were carried out face-to-face in respondents' homes between 15 September and 9 December 2003.

Presentation and Interpretation of Data

It should be remembered at all times that a sample and not the entire population of Lancashire residents has been interviewed. In consequence, all results are subject to sampling tolerances, which means that not all differences are statistically significant.

Where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of "don't know" categories, or multiple answers. Throughout the volume an asterisk (*) denotes any value of less than half a per cent.

In the computer tables, 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. In the case of a "net satisfaction" figure, this represents the percentage satisfied on a particular issue or service, less the percentage dissatisfied. For example, if a service records 40% satisfied and 25% dissatisfied, the "net satisfaction" figure is +15 points.

For some questions the district level data only has a small base size so any differences may not be statistically significant. This means that the service questions, which require users, have not been compared by district since the base would be too small. Statistics for the district are presented with those of Lancashire overall where possible.

For further information contact:

Steven Knuckey, Data Analyst

Lancashire County Council, PO Box 78, County Hall, Preston, PR1 8XJ

Telephone: 01772 531811

Email: steven.knuckey@css.lancscc.gov.uk

Understanding the Profile of Lancashire

This report makes reference to how people's views differ across the various areas of the County. When making these comparisons it is important to bear in mind the profile of the population being considered. Some significant demographic differences between districts are highlighted in the table below.

	Age				Social Class			
	18-24 %	25-44 %	45-64 %	65+ %	AB %	C1 %	C2 %	DE %
Lancashire	14	36	29	21	21	29	16	34
Burnley	18	34	35	13	9	24	17	49
Chorley	10	41	31	18	28	33	13	26
Fylde	6	32	35	27	35	35	11	18
Hyndburn	13	31	25	32	11	22	18	47
Lancaster	14	36	28	22	17	33	19	31
Pendle	18	40	23	20	17	28	13	40
Preston	16	41	29	14	22	27	14	37
Ribble Valley	11	38	30	22	16	39	14	31
Rossendale	13	36	25	27	8	19	13	60
South Ribble	19	39	25	18	21	30	23	26
West Lancs.	13	39	31	17	34	21	16	29
Wyre	11	27	32	30	23	35	16	27

Comparison with Baseline Survey

The report also makes frequent comparisons between the results of the 2003 study and the baseline study conducted in 2000 to point out what has changed or what has stayed the same.

Publication of the Data

As with all our studies, findings from this survey are subject to our standard Terms and Conditions of Contract. Any press release or publication of the findings of this survey requires the advance approval of MORI. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misrepresentation.

Summary of Findings

Quality of Life

- Satisfaction with Lancashire as a place to live
 - The majority of residents are happy to be living in Lancashire (88% satisfied overall with Lancashire as a place to live).
 - Rossendale residents are slightly more satisfied with Lancashire as a place to live than the county average (91%).
- Positive aspects of life in Lancashire
 - Few respondents in Lancashire (3%) say there are 'no good things' about the area.
 - Rossendale's most positive aspects are openness/countryside (57%), peace and quiet (50%) and friendly people (33%)
- Negative aspects of life in Lancashire
 - No single aspect stands out across the county, 24% say there are 'no bad things' about living in the area.
 - The three most mentioned negative aspects for Rossendale are poor facilities for young people (14%) and poor street lighting (13%).

Improving Quality of Life

- Broad themes
 - Across Lancashire curbing antisocial behaviour and crime, and reducing traffic and transport problems are seen as the things that would improve quality of life most.
 - The top priorities for improving quality of life in Rossendale are reducing crime and disorder and improving opportunities for young people.
- Crime and disorder
 - Across Lancashire the most commonly cited ways of reducing crime and disorder are providing a more visible police presence (71%), providing more things for youngsters to do (42%) and tackling the drugs problem (35%).
- Activities for young people
 - The most commonly cited actions for the County Council in providing activities for young people are to provide more youth centres for meeting people their own age (66%) and more leisure centres (60%).

- Traffic and transport priorities for Lancashire County Council
 - improving existing roads, street lighting and bridges (37%)
 - public transport to be prioritised for improvement (33%)
 - improvements to pedestrian facilities (25%)
 - improving road safety and providing safe routes to schools (23%)
 - least likely to favour building new roads (12%)
- The most frequently mentioned methods of curbing illegal drug taking are:
 - stricter punishments for illegal drug dealers (62%)
 - stricter punishment for users (42%)
 - drug awareness education in schools (34%)
 - better facilities for young people generally (29%)

Community Cohesion


- People get on well together
 - 60% of Lancashire residents agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together, only 15% say they disagree.
- Looking out for one another
 - 88% in Rossendale agree that their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours look out for each other. The proportion agreeing strongly is half the Lancashire average however.
- Knowing and trusting each other
 - The majority of Lancashire residents claim to know (95%) or trust (93%) people in their neighbourhood. However residents are more likely to say that they trust (58%) than know (42%) *many* of their neighbours.

Quality of Life

Satisfaction in Lancashire

The majority of residents report that they are happy to be living in Lancashire. Overall, almost nine in ten (88%) are satisfied with Lancashire as a place to live, including two in five who are very satisfied (41%).


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



Base: All respondents (2,447)
Source: MORI

Satisfaction with the local area

Q Thinking about this area, on the whole, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it as a place to live?




Base: All respondents (2,447)

Source: MORI

Satisfaction in Rossendale

A slightly higher proportion than average of residents report that they are happy to be living in Lancashire. Overall, more than nine in ten (91%) are satisfied with Lancashire as a place to live, including almost two in five who are *very* satisfied (37%). People from Rossendale are less likely to say they are very satisfied with the area where they live though (23%).


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



Base: All Rossendale residents (139) Source: MORI

Satisfaction with the local area

Q Thinking about this area, on the whole, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it as a place to live?




Base: All Rossendale residents (139) Source: MORI

Positive Aspects of Life in Lancashire

Lancashire residents give a variety of reasons why they are happy to be living in the area. Very few (3%) say that there are 'no good things' about the area.

Residents across the County are most likely to emphasise **peace and quiet**, **friendly people**, **openness/greenery and convenience for shops** as positive aspects of their area. Important changes since 2000 are that those mentioning convenience for shops as a positive aspect of the area has decreased by 11% and those citing adequate transport had decreased by 3%. On the positive side, those reporting that access to countryside has increased by 4% and percentages of those citing friendly people, openness and countryside and good education have all stayed the same since 2000.



Base: All respondents; Lancashire (2,447), Rossendale (139)


Source: MORI

Residents in Rossendale are more likely to mention **openness/countryside** (57%) and **peace and quiet** (36%) than Lancashire residents overall.

Negative Aspects of Life in Lancashire

No single aspect stands out across the county as the one particularly negative factor. Indeed, almost one in four (24%) of residents say that there are 'no bad things' about living in the area and in 2003, Lancashire residents cite fewer negative aspects of life in Lancashire than in 2000.

The most frequently mentioned negative aspects overall are **poor facilities for young people** (10%), **volume of traffic** (9%), **poor public transport** (8%), **unclean streets** and **high crime rate**. This is largely similar to the 2000 baseline survey, however poor facilities for young people and high crime rates were not key negative aspects in the 2000 survey.



Base: All respondents; Lancashire (2,447), Rossendale (139)

Source: MORI

In Rossendale, **poor facilities for young people** (14%) is the most mentioned bad thing about the area. Residents are also nearly twice as likely to give **poor street lighting** (13%) as the county overall.


Improving Quality of Life

Quality of Life: Broad Themes in Lancashire

When residents are asked what factors would improve quality of life, there is heavy emphasis on curbing **anti-social behaviour** and **crime**. **Reducing traffic and transport problems** is also cited by one in four (25%) residents. These findings broadly reflect perceived 'bad things' about areas.

Although quality of life data is not directly comparable with the baseline survey, due to a change in question wording, findings indicate some changes since 2000. As this time, although improving youth services and reducing crime were also high priorities, better road and pavement maintenance and safer roads were deemed to be more important than reducing traffic and drug abuse problems.

Q Thinking now 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 (2,447), Rossendale (139)


Source: MORI

As across Lancashire, **reducing crime** and **providing activities for young people** are the key priorities for Rossendale residents.

Key Quality of Life Themes: Crime and Disorder in Lancashire

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** (71%). Other key perceived important aspects are **providing more things for youngsters to do** (42%) and **tackling the drugs problem** (35%). This suggests that Lancashire residents associate youngsters having insufficient leisure activities with illegal drug-taking and crime and disorder problems in their area.

Q 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 respondents giving “reduce crime and disorder” as a key priority; Lancashire (985), Rossendale (50*)
 Source: MORI
 *Note small base

A more visible police presence is seen as important by Rossendale residents.

Key Quality of Life Themes: Activities for Young People in Lancashire

When 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** (66%) and **more leisure centres** (60%).

Q 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 respondents giving “provide activities for young people” as a key priority; Lancashire (771), Rossendale (49*)
 Source: MORI
 * Note small base

More youth centres, leisure facilities and space for games are seen as the ways to provide activities for young people in Rossendale.

Key Quality of Life Themes: Traffic and Transport in Lancashire

In terms of transport priorities, residents are most likely to want the County Council to prioritise **improving existing roads, street lighting and bridges** (37%) and least likely to favour **building new roads** (12%). A third (33%) of residents would like **public transport** to be prioritised for improvement, and a quarter (25%) would like to see improvements to **pedestrian facilities**. Road safety is also a salient issue, with around one in four (23%) residents mentioning improving **road safety** and providing **safe routes to schools**.

Q In your opinion, which two or three local transport issues do you think should be the main priorities for Lancashire County Council?




Base: All respondents; Lancashire (2,447), Rossendale (139)
Source: MORI

In Rossendale, residents are significantly more likely to give **improving existing roads, street lighting and bridges** (54%) than the county overall, and this is the most important transport priority.

Key Quality of Life Themes: Illegal Drug-Taking in Lancashire

The most frequently mentioned course of action for curbing illegal drug-taking is the introduction of **stricter punishments for illegal drug dealers** (62%). Other important actions are seen to be **stricter punishment for users** (42%), **drug awareness education in schools** (34%) and **the better facilities for young people generally** (29%).

Q In your opinion, which two or three, if any, of the following should Lancashire County Council do in order to reduce illegal drug-taking?



Base: All respondents giving "reduce illegal drug taking" as a key priority Lancashire (555), Rossendale (49*)

Source: MORI

* Note small base


Rossendale residents give **stricter punishments for illegal drug dealers** (46%) as the most important way to reduce illegal drug-taking.

Community Cohesion

People Get on Well Together in Lancashire

Six in ten (60%) of Lancashire residents agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together only 15% disagree.¹

Q "This is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together"




Base: All respondents (2,447)

Source: MORI

People Get on Well Together in Rossendale

Rossendale residents are much less likely to say they *definitely agree* (4%).

Q "This is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together"



Base: All Rossendale residents (139)


Source: MORI

¹ This broadly reflects the rest of the UK according to the Citizenship Survey 2003, conducted on behalf of the Home Office.

Looking Out for One Another in Lancashire

Over four in five residents (85%) agree that their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours look out for each other.²

Q Would you say this neighbourhood is a place where people look out for each other?




Base: All respondents (2,447)
Source: MORI

Looking Out For One Another in Rossendale

Again agreement in Rossendale is less strong, with residents three times as likely to say *yes, to some extent*, as *yes, definitely*.

Q Would you say this neighbourhood is a place where people look out for each other?




Base: All Rossendale residents (139) Source: MORI

² This broadly reflects the rest of the UK according to the Citizenship Survey 2003, conducted on behalf of the Home Office.

Knowing and Trusting Each Other in Lancashire

The majority of residents claim to know (95%) or trust (93%) people in their neighbourhood. However residents are more likely to say that they trust (58%) than know (42%) *many* of their neighbours³.

Q Would you say that you know / trust?




Base: All respondents (2,447)

Source: MORI

Knowing and Trusting Each Other in Rossendale

Q Would you say that you know / trust?



Base: All Rossendale residents (139)

Source: MORI

In Rossendale, residents are less likely to say they trust many of the people in their neighbourhood (34%).


³ Comparison with findings from the Citizenship Survey 2003 indicates that Lancashire residents are more likely to know and trust “many” of the people in their area, and less likely to know and trust “a few” or “none” in their area than residents in the UK overall.

County Council Services

Importance of services in Lancashire

Residents consider the most important County Council services to be **services for older people** (37%), **facilities for young people** (28%) and **road/pavement maintenance** (28%). This is entirely consistent with services considered most important in 2000. The only significant change in importance attributed to services since 2000 is for **secondary schools** and **primary schools**, with residents now more likely to say that they are among the most important services.

Q Which three or four of the services on the list do you think are most important for people in this area?



Base: All respondents; Lancashire (2,447), Rossendale (139)

Source: MORI

Rossendale residents are more likely to mention **road maintenance** and **road safety** compared to the county overall.

Satisfaction with Services

Universal services in Lancashire

Satisfaction with most universal services – and all services related to roads and traffic – has improved since 2000.

Residents remain most satisfied with **street lighting**, with more than three-quarters (77%) of residents saying that they are at least ‘fairly satisfied’.

In contrast, there is greatest dissatisfaction with **road maintenance** (41% dissatisfied) **pavement maintenance** (39%) and **traffic calming measures** (38%). This is not unusual in our experience. However, residents are now *less dissatisfied* with all of these services than in 2000.

Other improvements in net satisfaction since 2000 are for **road safety**, the **local road system** and traffic management.

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

	Satisfied %	Dissatisfied %	Net satisfied ±	Change Since 2000
Street lighting	77	17	+60	+1
Traffic management	56	22	+34	+7
Local road system	56	23	+33	+11
Road safety	50	28	+22	+13
Trading standards	20	3	+17	-6
Pavement maintenance	47	39	+8	+13
Road maintenance and repairs	45	41	+5	+7
Traffic calming measures	39	38	*	+9
Economic development and job creation	15	14	+1	-1

Base: All residents (2,447)

Source: MORI

Other services in Lancashire

Among service users, there is highest overall satisfaction with **libraries** (94%), and **registration of births, deaths and marriages** (89%). Most impressively, the County's **primary schools** and **pre-school facilities** are particularly well regarded, with nine out of ten users (90%) at least 'fairly satisfied' with each. This shows a significant increase in satisfaction with pre-school facilities since 2000. **Adult education** (86%) and **museums** (87%) and **tourism services** (86%) are also rated highly by those who use them.

Other services recording high satisfaction levels include **household waste disposal sites** (86%) and **recycling facilities** (88%). Indeed, satisfaction with recycling facilities has improved since 2000, as has usage of this service.

Although **facilities for young people** remain among the lowest rated services in Lancashire, a significant improvement in users' satisfaction with this service (+13 points) deserves recognition.

Other services that are rated somewhat higher than in 2000 are **planning services** (+19 points), **cycle facilities** (+11 points) and **bus services** (+6 points). However, there has been a significant decrease in net satisfaction with **welfare rights** (-15 points) and **services for older people** (-13 points).

Thinking about *all* the services provided by Lancashire County Council, the majority of residents (50%) think that these services have stayed about the same over the past two years. However, more residents think that the services have *got better* than think that they have got worse (25% vs 11%).

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

	Satisfied %	Dissatisfied %	Net satisfied ±	Change since 2000
Libraries	94	4	+90	+4
Registration of births, deaths and marriages	89	3	+86	+6
Primary schools	90	5	+85	+1
Pre-school facilities	90	6	+84	+10
Museums	87	6	+82	-6
Tourism services	86	4	+82	+2
Adult education	86	7	+79	+1
Recycling facilities	88	8	+79	+7
Household waste disposal sites	86	9	+78	-5
County Information Centres	79	4	+74	-5
Local taxis	83	9	+74	-3
Countryside recreation	81	9	+72	-2
Secondary schools	81	11	+70	-6
Footpaths, bridleways and rights of way	80	13	+67	+1
Support for the arts	76	12	+63	+8
Welfare rights	76	17	+59	-15
Youth service**	70	14	+55	+29
Services for disabled people	68	18	+51	+12
Local bus services	72	22	+50	+6
Services for people with learning difficulties	69	21	+47	+7
Services for older people	68	24	+44	-13
Local train services	67	23	+44	-5
Support for children with special needs	67	25	+42	-7
Cycle facilities (e.g. cycle paths)	61	26	+35	+11
Planning services*	61	26	+35	+19
Support for local businesses*	54	27	+28	-2
Services for people with mental health problems*	58	30	+28	+4
Facilities for young people	57	32	+25	+13
Services for vulnerable children and families**	49	27	+22	+6
Services for young offenders**	30	35	-5	-41
Base: All users				
Source: MORI				
*: n<100; **: n<50				

Comparisons with MORI Normative Data

The table below shows where Lancashire has **high, about average and below average satisfaction scores** in the context of MORI's comparative data.

Lancashire County Council compared with MORI Normative Data	
High or Above Average Satisfaction	About Average Satisfaction
Nursery schools	Secondary schools
Primary schools	Services for older people
Recycling	Street lighting
Libraries	Road and pavement maintenance
Services and facilities for the disabled	
Bus services	
Adult education	
Facilities for young people	

Source: MORI

Lancashire is not significantly **below average** compared with similar authorities surveyed by MORI for any services.

Trends

The table below shows which services were **rated better**, **rated about the same** and **rated worse** in terms of satisfaction scores in 2003 in comparison to the 2000 baseline survey.

Satisfaction with Lancashire County Council Services in 2003 Vs. 2000		
Rated better	Rated about the same	Rated worse
Road and pavement maintenance	Primary schools	Welfare rights
Cycle facilities	Adult education	Services for older people
Road safety	Tourism services	Secondary schools
Local Road System	Countryside recreation	Services for people with special needs
Traffic management and calming	Footpaths, bridleways and rights of way	Museums
Bus services	Local taxi services	Household waste disposal sites
Recycling facilities		Local train services
Nursery schools		County information centres
Services for people with learning difficulties		
Services and facilities for disabled people		
Support for the arts		
Registration of births, deaths and marriages		
Libraries		
Facilities for young people		


Source: MORI

Service Improvement Priorities

The chart below plots satisfaction with services against the importance given to that service area 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 poorly rated.

The services that are priorities for improvement are: **services for older people**, **maintenance of roads and pavements** and **facilities for young people**. These are of high importance but are given low satisfaction ratings.

Importance vs Service Satisfaction



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

Service Usage

The most significant shift in County Council service usage since 2000 is for **recycling facilities**, which are now used by nearly two-thirds of Lancashire residents (64%). Despite this increase, **household waste disposal sites** remain widely used (62%). There has been a slight fall in the number of residents using **library services** since 2000, however libraries are still used by three in five (61%) residents.

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

	% Using the service	Change since 2000 (+/-%)
Recycling facilities	64	+13
Household waste disposal sites	62	+2
Libraries	61	-4
Local bus services	57	-1
Local taxis	50	-5
Footpaths, bridleways and rights of way	45	-1
Countryside recreation	43	+1
Local train services	30	-4
Primary schools	25	+1
Cycle facilities	21	-1
Secondary schools	21	+2
Museums	20	+1
Adult education	17	0
Registration of births, deaths and marriages	15	+1
Pre-school facilities or nursery schools	12	-2
Tourism services	11	-2
Services for older people	9	+1
Facilities for young people	8	-3
County Information Centres	8	-1
Support for the arts	7	-2
Welfare rights	7	-1
Services and facilities for disabled people	7	+2
Support for children with special needs	4	0
Trading standards	4	0
Planning services	4	0
Services for people with mental health	4	+1
Services for people with learning difficulties	4	+1
Economic development and job creation	3	0
Support for local businesses	3	0
Youth service	2	0
Services for vulnerable families and children	2	+1
Services for young offenders	1	0

Base: All residents (2,447)

Source: MORI

Social Services


Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with Social Services in Lancashire. Satisfaction figures are based on *user perceptions* of each of the service areas, unless otherwise stated. Services for people with mental health problems, for people with learning difficulties, for vulnerable children and families and for young offenders all have a small number of users. To this extent satisfaction scores must be interpreted with caution.

Overview for Lancashire

Satisfaction with Lancashire's **services for disabled people** (68%) is high, as is satisfaction with services for people with **learning difficulties** (69%) and services for **older people** (68%). Of all social services, satisfaction with services for **young offenders** is lowest, having dropped somewhat (-31%) since the 2000 baseline survey.

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



Base: All users (21-219)
Source: MORI

Overall, users are more likely to say that social services have improved (26%) than got worse (19%) over the past few years. This shows a marked improvement since 2000, when only 15% residents said that social services had improved overall.

Education Services


Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with education services in Lancashire. Satisfaction figures are based on *user perceptions* of each of the service areas, unless otherwise stated. Youth services have a small number of users, so satisfaction scores must be interpreted with caution.

Overview for Lancashire

Although there has been a slight fall in satisfaction with secondary schools since 2000, primary education (90%), nursery education (90%), adult education (86%) and secondary schools (81%) are particularly well regarded among users in Lancashire, and receive higher satisfaction ratings than those in many other similar authorities. As is often found across the country, users of secondary education are slightly less satisfied than those using primary education. Very few people use the youth service, however findings indicate that satisfaction with the youth service has improved somewhat since 2000 (an increase of 20 percentage points).

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



Base: All users (37-611)
Source: MORI

Education services are generally perceived to have improved or stayed the same. Almost one in four (38%) users think that education services have *got better* over the last two years or so, 39% think that they have stayed the same and only 10% think that they have got worse.

Leisure & Cultural Services


Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with leisure and cultural services in Lancashire. Satisfaction figures are based on *user perceptions* of each of the service areas.

Overview for Lancashire

Lancashire's **libraries** (93% satisfied) and **museums** (87% satisfied) are highly rated. As is the case elsewhere in Britain, facilities for young people are rated low in relation to other leisure services. However, satisfaction with these has significantly increased (plus nine percentage points) since 2000.

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



Base: All users (162-1,493)
Source: MORI

Overall, almost one in four (38%) users of leisure and cultural services think that the services that they use have *got better* over the last two years or so and less than one in seventeen (6%) say they have got worse. Just under a half (46%) of users say that leisure and cultural services have 'stayed the same'.

Environmental Services


Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with environmental services in Lancashire. Satisfaction figures are based on *user perceptions* of each of the service areas. If base sizes allow, comparisons are made between the perceptions of different areas. In addition, this section covers a number of universal services which are rated by all residents. Where satisfaction scores for like authorities are available, these are used to contextualise Lancashire's results.

Overview for Lancashire

Among all residents, satisfaction with **street lighting** (77%) is particularly high. Satisfaction with **traffic management** (56% satisfied), **road safety** (50% satisfied) and **pavement maintenance** (47% satisfied) is somewhat lower, although all are rated slightly higher than in 2000.

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




Base: All respondents (2,447)

Source: MORI

Overview for Rossendale

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



Base: All Rossendale residents (139)


Source: MORI

In Rossendale, satisfaction with street lighting (57%) and road safety (37%) are lower than Lancashire values, while other services are close to county averages.

Environmental Services in Lancashire

Satisfaction with **recycling facilities** (88%) among users is particularly high, and has increased since 2000. Although satisfaction with cycle facilities (60%) is somewhat lower than satisfaction with other non-universal environmental services, this has also improved slightly since 2000.

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



Base: All users (505-1,569)
Source: MORI

Overall, just under half (45%) of environmental service users think that services have *got better* over the last two years or so. A third (35%) think that they have stayed the same and only one in ten (9%) say that they have got worse. This shows a more positive picture than in 2000, when the majority (54%) of residents said that environmental services had stayed the same and only a quarter (25%) saw an improvement.

Local Transport


Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with local transport services in Lancashire. Satisfaction figures are based on either users or all residents.

Overview for Lancashire

Local taxis remain the most satisfactory local transport service in Lancashire, with four out of five (83%) users satisfied. Whereas bus services are seen to have improved slightly (plus three percentage points to 72%), train service ratings have declined (minus three percentage points to 67%). Significant improvements can be seen in satisfaction with the local road system; less than half of road users (48%) were satisfied in 2000, and this has increased to nearly three in five (58%).

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



Base: All users (737-2,207)
Source: MORI

Users of local transport services are rather divided as to whether services have improved or deteriorated over the past few years. Half (49%) say that services have 'remained the same', one in four (25%) say they have got better and one in five (19%) say they have got worse over the past few years. This is a slight improvement since 2000, when one in four (23%) said that services had got worse and one in five (19%) said that services had got better.

Other County Council Services

Introduction

This section looks at satisfaction with services in Lancashire not covered in preceding sections.

Economic Development and Job Creation (all residents)

As in 2000, overall opinion on economic development and job creation in Lancashire is divided. One in seven (15%) residents say they are satisfied, and the same proportion (14%) say they are dissatisfied with this element of Lancashire County Council's work. Reflecting very low usage of this service, the majority (55%) of residents are unable to rate their satisfaction with economic development and job creation.

There are differences in satisfaction by area. In Burnley, where residents are most likely to give high importance to economic development and job creation, satisfaction is low with 18% residents dissatisfied and only 10% satisfied.

Support for Local Businesses (all residents)

The majority of residents (60%) are unable to rate their satisfaction with support for local businesses, reflecting low usage of this service. Among those who are able to rate support for local businesses, opinion tends to be more positive (14% satisfied) than negative (10% dissatisfied).

Trading Standards (all residents)

Very few people in Lancashire are *d*issatisfied with trading standards (3%) and one in five residents (20%) are satisfied.

Since 2000, satisfaction has increased slightly among users of trading standards, with four in five (80%) satisfied and only 7% dissatisfied (compared with 75% satisfied and 10% dissatisfied).

Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages (all users)

Nearly all (89%) of people who have used registration of births, deaths and marriages are satisfied with this service, and only 3% are dissatisfied. As in 2000, satisfaction with service is consistent across the county.

Planning Services (all users)

Three in five (61%) users are satisfied one in four (26%) are dissatisfied with planning services, giving a net satisfaction score of +35 points. This shows a marked improvement since 2000, when net satisfaction was only +17 points.

Welfare Rights (all users)

The majority (76%) of users of welfare rights are satisfied with the service and nearly one in six (17%) is dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction score of +59 points. This shows a decline in satisfaction since 2000, when the net score was +73 points.

County Information Centres


As in 2000, the vast majority of users of County Information Centres are happy with the service – the net satisfaction score of +74 points remains very high.

Participating in Local Government

Getting Involved

The majority of Lancashire residents (56%) want to know what the County Council is doing but are happy to let them get on with their job. One in five (19%) would like to have more say in what the County Council does. This level of interest in involvement with the County Council remains largely unchanged from the 2000 baseline survey. Rossendale residents have similar opinions to Lancashire as a whole.

Q Which of these statements comes closest to your own attitude towards Lancashire County Council?



Base: All respondents (2,447), Rossendale (139)
Source: MORI

Level of Interest In Getting Involved: Sub-Group Analysis

Interest in getting involved varies by sub-group:


- Those who are dissatisfied with the County Council are more likely than average to want to get involved (39%), whereas those who are most satisfied tend to want to know what the County Council is doing without getting involved (64%);
- Reflecting the above, older residents (61% of those aged 65 or over) and those living in Chorley (72%) are more likely than average to say that they like to know what the County Council is doing but are happy to let it get on with its job;

- Residents aged 25-44 (23%) and from higher, AB, social classes (25%) are most likely to say that they would like to have more say in what the County Council does;
- Younger residents (5% of under 25s) are more likely than average to be uninterested in what the County Council does;
- People belonging to social class DE (27%) are more likely than average to say they are not interested in what the County Council does as long as it does its job.

Role of County Councillors

The most important functions of County Councillors are seen to relate to interacting and communicating with residents. Three in four residents (76%) say that one of the most important functions of a County Councillor is to **listen to the views of local people**, and half (50%) think it is important for County Councillors to **deal with complaints and problems**. Other important functions are thought to be **working with local communities** (40%) and **keeping residents informed** about County Council activities (32%). Rossendale residents are more likely to say that Councillors should **deal with complaints and problems** (67%).

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



Base: All respondents (2,447), Rossendale (139)
Source: MORI

Appendices
