



Analysis of data from questionnaire sent to all Godalming & Farncombe households

Report to a meeting of the Planning & Environment Committee of Godalming Town
Council meeting on 26 November 2015

1. Introduction

- 1.1. On 17 September 2015 Godalming Town Council posted a questionnaire to all households in the Town Council's administrative area (all households with a GU7 postcode who have their refuse collected by Waverley Borough Council). That's some 9,300 paper questionnaires. A simultaneous publicity campaign also drew attention to the fact that the questionnaire was available online. The online survey was not restricted to the town's residents. A copy of the questionnaire is reproduced as Annexe 1 to this report.
- 1.2. This report outlines the response to the questionnaire.
- 1.3. This report presumes a certain level of understanding of the Neighbourhood Planning process and the stage that the process has reached in Godalming & Farncombe because it is assumed that the main audience for this report is town councillors and the volunteers who have been working on the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Godalming & Farncombe (GOFARNP) since its launch in January 2014. However, the author will answer any questions about the process.

2. Who responded to the Questionnaire?

- 2.1. 2,084 questionnaire responses were received by the cut-off date (this was publicised as being 16 October 2015 – but all responses received by 6 November were processed). Of these 1,909 were paper copies and 175 online. This equates to a response rate of approximately 20% allowing for the fact that (as we hoped) some households returned more than one response. It means that we achieved our target response rate.
- 2.2. 61.3% (1260) of respondents who told us their gender were female. And, it follows, 38.7% (760) were male.
- 2.3. 2060 respondents chose to indicate their age range which was as follows:

Age Range	No.	%	Total Adult Population
Under 18	6	0.3%	
19 - 29	61	3.0%	14%
30 - 39	331	16.0%	21%
40 - 49	380	18.5%	19%
50 - 59	357	17.3%	16%
60 - 69	427	20.7%	14%
70 or over	498	24.2%	16%

- 2.4. The final column in the table above shows the percentage of each age group in the total adult population for Godalming. A comparison with the percentage of respondents indicates that 19 to 29 year olds are significantly under represented in our respondents and those over 60 years old are over represented. Under 18's are under represented too – but only those over 14 years were eligible to complete the questionnaire so the comparative statistics for this are not given.

3. Housing Questions

- 3.1. The first questions in relation to housing were posed by the Housing working group and respondents were asked the following: "If new homes are to be built in the local area which of the following do you think should be prioritised?"
- 3.2. 103 respondents chose not to give any answer to this question – meaning that 95% of all respondents did give an answer and those responses are summarised in the table below.

There was no limit to the number of boxes that a respondent could check in relation to this question.

	1-Bed	2-Bed	3-Bed	4-Bed or larger
A Social Rented Flat	669	780	202	49
A Social Rented House	225	756	817	158
A Private Owned Flat	378	589	197	52
A Private Owned House	143	569	855	378
A Private Rented Flat	232	362	104	17
A Private Rented House	70	233	301	87
A property with some form of care facility	449	473	150	163
Shared Ownership property	399	732	499	147

3.3. The table would tend to indicate that respondents felt that small (3 or fewer bedrooms) should be prioritised. There is also significant support for the prioritisation of social rented properties.

3.4. Next, respondents were asked to identify **sites suitable and unsuitable for new housing**. These were narrative responses and have not yet been fully analysed. These responses have been listed and using text search (which is a crude tool) the following initial findings have been identified. It would not be appropriate to come to any conclusions on the basis of this data until all responses have been analysed.

Text (Site)	No. of Respondents	
	Suitable for Housing	Unsuitable for Housing
Brownfield (or similar)	141	-
Green Belt (or similar)	4	295
Flood Plain (or similar)	4	376
Aarons Hill	27	3
Binscombe	67	157
Busbridge	54	48
Catteshall Lane/Road	88	86
Dunsfold	61	-
Furze Lane	84	25
Lammas Lands	1	189

3.5. 974 (47%) respondents chose to skip the question “Are there any locations that you think are suitable for new housing?” and 730 (35%) chose to skip the question “Are there any locations that you think are unsuitable for new housing?”

3.6. The Heritage & Design working group asked the next question in relation to the design aspects of housing. “How important do you think following aspects of design in new housing are?” Respondents were invited to rank a series of design issues by their importance and the results are summarised in the table on the next page:

3.7. 23 or 1.1% of respondents chose to skip this question. 380 (18.4%) chose to add an additional comment but those comments have not yet been analysed.

Design Aspect	Not important		Quite important		Very important	
Sufficient off-street parking (eg two car spaces for properties with more than one bedroom)	85	4.1%	511	24.8%	1430	69.4%
Off-street waste and recycling storage	142	6.9%	734	35.6%	1104	53.6%
Highly energy efficient and sustainable	78	3.8%	682	33.1%	1195	58.0%
Predominantly 'traditional' design, in-keeping with existing character	294	14.3%	718	34.8%	934	45.3%
Predominantly 'modern' design	1292	62.7%	362	17.6%	89	4.3%
Varied design within each development	518	25.1%	922	44.7%	453	22.0%
Where appropriate, planting of small trees / shrubs to enhance the street scene and environment	108	5.2%	545	26.4%	1354	65.7%

4. Environment Question

4.1. The Environment working group posed the next question which asked respondents to identify their **top three priorities for environmental improvements**. The answers are summarised in the table below.

Priority	No.	%
More parks/outside recreation areas	925	45.3%
More outside sports areas	415	20.3%
Better info & access to countryside in green belt	513	25.1%
High quality walking /cycling routes	1335	65.4%
Planting more trees and habitats to help wildlife	1165	57.1%
Further land for community use, for example allotments, community orchards	833	40.8%
Protecting particular views across the open countryside	816	40.0%

4.2. 42 or 2% of respondents chose to skip this question. 425 (20.8%) chose to add an additional comment but again those comments have not yet been analysed

5. Economy Questions

5.1. Respondents were asked to identify which mode of transport that they used to undertake their **main grocery shopping** and the results are shown in the table on the next page.

5.2. 19 respondents (0.9%) chose to skip this question.

Means of transport	No.	%
Car	1474	71.2%
On foot	254	12.3%
Bike	38	1.8%
Public Transport	61	3.0%
Online	243	11.7%

5.3. Respondents were then asked “**Should we have more days/times when Godalming High St excludes cars?**” and responded as below.

Yes	1432	78.21%
No	399	21.79%

5.4. 253 (12.1%) respondents chose to skip the question about excluding cars from Godalming High Street.

5.5. Respondents struggled with the next question – “**If there are other roads locally that would be better as "Destinations" rather than through routes, please detail them here**”. 1683 (80.8%) chose to skip the question and a number of the narrative answers given indicated that the respondent did not understand the question.

5.6. The two most commonly identified roads as destinations were Church Street (119 respondents) and Farncombe Street (66 respondents). However, more analysis of the narrative responses needs to be undertaken.

5.7. The next question in this section was posed by the Heritage & Design working group and was “**How could the design of new Retail/Commerical properties improve the Godalming/Farncombe area?**” Respondents were invited to rank a series of commercial design issues by their importance and the results are summarised in the table below.

Design Aspect	Not important		Quite important		Very important	
Shop and other business frontages which fit in with or enhance surroundings particularly in conservation areas	115	6.3%	658	35.9%	1174	64.0%
Off-street waste and recycling storage for businesses	81	4.4%	754	41.1%	1074	58.6%
No plastic and neon signage in conservation areas	248	13.5%	663	36.2%	1010	55.1%
Where possible, greater use of pavements for street cafes, etc	453	24.7%	785	42.8%	710	38.7%

5.8. 59 or 2.8% of respondents chose to skip this question. 250 (13.6%) chose to add an additional comment but again those comments have not yet been analysed

6. Community Facilities Questions

6.1. The first question in this section was posed by the Heritage & Design working group and it would be fair to say that the placing of the question in this section caused the working group some disquiet. The question was “**We have an opportunity to identify local**

buildings and areas of land that we feel are of particular importance and that we would like to safeguard for the future (please list any here that you would like us to explore through the Neighbourhood Plan and why you feel they are important)”. The question was designed to obtain information about heritage assets that might not already be listed without being too leading. The nature of responses to the question indicates that the working group’s misgivings were well founded.

6.2. 1378 or 66.1% of respondents chose to skip the question. The narrative answers that were given have not yet been fully analysed but using text search on the list of answers the following list (not an exhaustive one) has been produced.

Important community asset	No. of respondents
Borough Hall	10
Broadwater Park (or related facility)	74
Farncombe Boathouse	16
Godalming Bandstand	23
Lammas Lands	196
Old Fire Station	18
Phillips Memorial/Park	20
Pepperpot	79
The Square	18
River Wey (or related facility)	53

6.3. The following table details the answers given to the question “**Do you think there are sufficient schools locally?**” 72 or 3.45% of respondents chose not to answer this question.

	Yes		No		Don't know	
Nursery	636	31.61%	361	17.94%	968	48.11%
Primary	522	25.94%	671	33.35%	787	39.12%
Secondary	554	27.53%	586	29.13%	837	41.60%
Further Education	593	29.47%	410	20.38%	922	45.83%

6.4. The following table details the answers given to the question “**Do you find it easy to access the following local health needs locally?**” 45 or 2.2% of respondents chose not to answer this question. The narrative answers to this question have yet to be analysed but concerned the difficulty in getting timely appointments with doctors; insufficient parking at doctors’ surgeries and the lack of NHS dentists in the town.

	Yes		No	
Doctor	1576	77.29%	442	21.68%
Dentist	1378	67.58%	530	25.99%
Pharmacy	1944	95.34%	51	2.50%

6.5. The following table details the answers given to the question “**How do you rate the community facilities for the following in Godalming/Farncombe?**” 46 or 2.2% of respondents chose not to answer this question.

	Poor		Adequate		Good		Don't know	
Young children	139	6.8%	499	24.5%	688	33.8%	655	32.1%
Teenagers	784	38.5%	286	14.0%	83	4.1%	835	41.0%
Young couples	260	12.8%	580	28.5%	407	20.0%	714	35.0%
Families	147	7.2%	567	27.8%	788	38.7%	468	23.0%
Those with disabilities	359	17.6%	314	15.4%	127	6.2%	1191	58.4%
Older people	281	13.8%	550	27.0%	485	23.8%	692	33.9%

6.6. 1422 (68.2%) of respondents chose not to answer the question “Are there any community facilities that you feel are lacking in the area?” and the narrative answers that resulted have not yet been analysed. But a number of respondents identified a lack of facilities for young people - text searches reveal the word “teenager” used 87 times, “young” 57 times and “youth” 68 times.

7. Transport Questions

7.1. The following table details the answers given to the question “**How often do you use a bus locally?**” 19 or 0.9% of respondents skipped the question.

More than once a week	202	9.78%
Once a week	145	7.02%
Once or twice a month	260	12.59%
Rarely	614	29.73%
Never	845	40.92%

7.2. 330 or 15.8% skipped the follow-up question “**What might persuade you to use buses more often?**” and the following table details the answers given to that question.

More frequent services	902	51.43%
New routes	435	24.80%
Cheaper fares	615	35.06%
Nothing	319	18.19%

7.3. There are a number of narrative answers to that question yet to be analysed but indicating that better publicised timetables, a more reliable service, a cheaper service, a more direct service (i.e. straight to Guildford for example) and realtime information might each persuade more people to use buses.

7.4. The following table details the answers given to the question “**What would encourage you to walk or cycle more in the local area?**” The narrative answers have yet to be analysed but refer often to the need for dedicated cycle paths and for better maintained paths and pavements. 79 or 3.8% of respondents chose to skip this question

More paths	971	48.43%
Better maintained	987	49.23%
More cycling facilities	734	36.61%
Reduced speed limits	541	26.98%
Nothing	261	13.02%

7.5. The answers to the question “Some people believe that the roads in the area have generally become more dangerous for cyclists, walkers and unsupervised children. Do you agree with this?” split as indicated below. 164 or 7.9% of respondents skipped this question.

Yes	1593	82.9%
No	328	17.1%

7.6. The narrative answers to this question (all 43 pages) have yet to be analysed.

7.7. The final question was about individuals top transport priority and this required narrative answers. Regrettably these have yet to analysed.

8. Other Comments

8.1. Respondents were encouraged to make other comments and these are reproduced unanalysed as Annex 2 to this report