

## **Facilities, Business and Services Sub Group- Draft Report on findings**

(Based on Findings extracted from RCC Report of Questionnaire Responses (December 2016))

### **Q 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 – Community Facilities**

In excess of 78% of the responders considered that all of the listed facilities (except for the Sibson library) were important to the Parish, with 65.6% of the responders considering that the Sibson library was important.

*[Sibson library response may be impacted by the smaller size of the category impacted].*

However, all of the facilities were used “sometimes” or never used by in excess of 87% of the responders.

*[Acknowledge that the responses in relation to Sibson Church and library and the school may be impacted by the smaller size of the category impacted].*

### **Q 2.1.3- Other community facilities used and beneficial to the Parish**

See attached excel spreadsheet for free text field responses

A number of the responses do not relate to **community** facilities. However, for completeness, we have listed all of them due to their potential relevance to other questions. In terms of themes, the following facilities are most used/considered the most beneficial in the Parish:

- Pubs and restaurants (69 responses with additional responses being provided in relation to individual establishments)
- Public paths (37 responses, again additional responses being provided in relation to particular areas/paths)
- Sheepy Park (32 responses)
- Sheepy Playing Fields (56 responses, again additional responses being provided in relation to particular areas eg play area had 19) and
- Shop (27 responses)

### **Q 2.1.4- Improvement and protection of community facilities**

See attached excel spreadsheet for free text field responses

The main comments were made in relation to the need for or protection of social and sports facilities and parking, against the threat of urbanisation and the need for a shop/post office.

There was, in addition, a range of other responses in insignificant numbers and also comments that could not be categorised.

### **Q 2.1.5- Improvements to community facilities**

See attached excel spreadsheet for free text field responses.

The largest number of responses were in relation to the provision of a shop in the parish.

### **Q 2.1.6- Improvements to sports facilities**

Except for Facilities for Senior Citizens and for Youths, there was no one facility that we listed that had a “yes” response of in excess of 38.1%. As regards Facilities for Senior Citizens and for Youths, the “yes” responses were 51.6% and 54.4% respectively. The “no” responses were low (12.7% and 13% respectively). This raised questions as to the size of the category impacted. Drilling down further, we have ascertained that approximately 59% of the “yes” responders in relation to facilities for senior citizens were within the age group 55+. In relation to facilities for youths, approx. 87% of the “yes” responders were within the 45+ age group. The young Persons questionnaire responses may provide additional relevant responses.

See attached excel spreadsheet for the free text field responses to this question. The responses are wide-ranging and no real conclusion can be drawn from the free text field responses to this question. However, the comments may be useful to identify the types of improvements being considered if we in fact recognise a need for improvement in relation to the first part of the question. The responses may also be relevant for other questions/ to establish a theme.

### **Q 2.2.1- Need for facilities and services**

89.3% of the responders indicated a need for a convenience shop in the parish.

Whilst the responses in favour of a need for additional childcare/nursery facilities and out of hours school care are low (21.8% and 24.6% respectively), the “no” responses were low (16.2% and 14.3% respectively) and the no opinions relatively high (62% and 61.1% respectively). We have therefore drilled down to see which age group has responded in any particular way. Whilst a crude analysis, it has not identified a particular need.

### **Q 2.2.2- Other facilities beneficial to the Parish**

See attached excel spreadsheet for free text field responses

The responses appear to support the need identified in the responses to q 2.2.1.

### **Q 2.2.3- Support for businesses**

89.9% of the responders support protecting the pubs against closure and there was support for work for the young, including apprenticeships and work experience and micro/small and start up businesses (72.6% and 65.8% respectively). There was little support for the development of heavy and light industry (5.3% and 25.3% respectively).

See attached excel spreadsheet for the free text field responses to this question. Whilst not huge numbers, the largest number of responses were in relation to the protection/improvement of the pubs, with some suggestions as to how this might be achieved.

#### **Q 2.3.1- 2.3.2- Defibrillators**

Resounding support for the need ie 85.9%. We understand that the Parish council has just given the go ahead to this project and that suitable locations have already been identified. Free text field responses have indicated central/community locations.

#### **Q2.3.4- Improvement to services**

There was support for an improvement to broadband (superfast), broadband (standard) and mobile phone networks with responses of 73.2%,68.7% and 82.9% respectively.

#### **Q 2.3.5- How to improve services**

See attached excel spreadsheet for the free text field responses to this question as the responses are self-explanatory.

#### **Q 2.3.6- Support for a community-based solution**

The responses to the first part of the question (ie in the absence of services being enhanced by major suppliers, would you be prepared to pay for a community-based solution) were inconclusive.

See attached excel spreadsheet for the free text field responses to this question. Whilst the response numbers are small, there appears to be some support from 28 responders to participate in a community-based solution depending on outcome and costs.

#### **Q 2.4.1 and 2.4.2- Use and importance of community groups**

The responses indicated that these groups were not often used with 85% to 98.7% of the responders "never" using the groups. However, the responses also acknowledged the importance of the groups, with the "yes" responses ranging from approx. 70% to approx. 85% .

#### **Q 2.4.3- Other community services and groups considered to be important**

See attached excel spreadsheet for the free text field responses to this question. There are a wide-range of responses here that do not appear to indicate a need for any one particular new community group/service.

21 Feb 2017