

# West Wiltshire PG17 Assessment Appendices

<b>Contents</b>	A: People's Voice Results	3
	B: Survey of Town and Parish Councils	11
	C: Audit Forms	53
	D: Audit Results	71
	E: Application of Quantity Standards	103
	F: Quality Standards	107

Kit Campbell Associates  
Open Space, Sport and Recreation Consultants  
Chuckie Pend  
24A Morrison Street  
Edinburgh EH3 8BJ  
Telephone 0131-229 1006

May 2007



# Appendix A

## People's Voice Questionnaire

### Introduction

In October 2004, a large part of the People's Voice questionnaire related to open space, sport and recreation provision in the District. We are very grateful to the Council for arranging this, the 490 Panel members who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire and the County Council for doing the data entry and producing the tables.

We set out the full set of tables in an appendix to this report and summarise the main results below.

### Questionnaire Results

#### The Quality of Provision

	Very good or good	Not very good or poor	Net "good or very good" rating	Don't know
Access	65%	24%	41%	11%
Appearance and design	61%	32%	29%	7%
Outdoor events	51%	27%	24%	22%
Security and safety	49%	37%	12%	14%
Nature conservation	47%	26%	21%	27%
Maintenance	45%	49%	-4%	7%
Countryside activities	39%	23%	-16%	38%
Formal sports facilities	37%	30%	7%	33%
Informal activity provision	26%	35%	-9%	39%
Management	25%	32%	-7%	43%
Motorised sports	8%	31%	-23%	61%

Note: totals may not sum to 100% because of rounding

**Comment:** the "Net good or very good" column above is the proportion of respondents giving a good or very good rating minus the proportion giving a poor or very poor one. This helps to highlight those facilities whose quality was rated highest by respondents. Clearly the quality of access, defined in the questionnaire as parking, ease of access, well located paths and entrances, well-surfaced hard areas, ramps for buggies and wheelchairs and directional signs, was the aspect most highly rated. The only characteristic to be classed as poor or very poor by anything approaching a majority of respondents was maintenance, defined as litter control, graffiti control, maintenance of grass and shrubs, dog toilets, repairs to vandalism and damage. Management also received a negative net score. Overall, the responses to this question suggested a

reasonable level of satisfaction with six of the characteristics or features in the table above but a net dissatisfaction with five of them. It is also noticeable that the proportion of “don’t knows” is highest in relation to those features or characteristics rated worst by other respondents.

### The Quantity of Provision

	More or better needed	No more needed	Net proportion in favour of more/better	Don't know
Maintenance	72%	19%	53%	9%
Security and safety	59%	25%	24%	17%
Access	48%	36%	12%	16%
Appearance and design	48%	41%	7%	12%
Nature conservation	46%	31%	15%	24%
Management	40%	17%	23%	43%
Formal sports facilities	37%	28%	9%	36%
Informal activity provision	35%	24%	11%	41%
Outdoor events	30%	48%	-18%	22%
Countryside activities	29%	35%	-6%	36%
Motorised sports	22%	27%	-5%	51%

Note: totals may not sum to 100% because of rounding

**Comment:** an absolute majority of respondents perceived a need for more maintenance and better security and safety while almost half saw a need for more or better access, design and nature conservation. Overall, more respondents wanted more or better management, formal sports provision and informal activity provision than did not. There seems to be little need for more outdoor events.

The table below gives similar information for the five community areas of the District in the form of the net percentage of respondents rating the various characteristics as good or very good. We have calculated this by deducting the percentage classing each characteristic or quality as poor or very poor from the percentage classing it as good or very good, and ignored “don’t knows”. For example, if 60% class see no need for better provision and 40% do, the net percentage is 20%. We have colour-coded the figures as follows: green = a net 20% or more of respondents see no need for better provision; yellow = a net 0-20% of respondents see no need for better provision; red = a net percentage of respondents see a need for better provision.

## The Quality of Provision by Community Area

	Bradford-on-Avon	Melksham	Trowbridge	Westbury	Warminster
Access	43%	36%	57%	27%	37%
Design	35%	13%	42%	25%	25%
Security and safety	13%	-12%	22%	5%	33%
Maintenance	15%	-21%	2%	-8%	-12%
Management	13%	-18%	-16%	-9%	-6%
Nature conservation	21%	7%	22%	9%	47%
Formal sports facilities	19%	0%	-7%	20%	16%
Informal activity provision	-8%	-11%	-20%	-14%	17%
Outdoor events	43%	18%	32%	11%	5%
Motorised sports	-11%	-28%	-30%	-21%	-23%
Countryside activities	38%	-1%	2%	11%	33%

**Comment:** this table identifies that concerns for the quality of provision is fairly widespread across the District but least acute in Bradford and most acute in Melksham, where a majority of local residents regard the quality of no less than seven forms of provision as poor and only a relatively small majority regard the quality of another three as good. Across the District as a whole, the key areas for the District and Town or Parish Councils to focus on are improving management and maintenance, informal activity provision and motorised sports.

## Provision in the District as a Whole

	No need for more or better	Better needed	Net "better needed" rating	Don't know
Access	36%	48%	12%	16%
Appearance and design	41%	48%	7%	12%
Security and safety	25%	59%	24%	17%
Maintenance	19%	72%	53%	9%
Management	17%	39%	22%	43%
Nature conservation	31%	46%	15%	24%
Formal sports facilities	28%	37%	9%	36%
Informal activity provision	24%	35%	11%	41%
Outdoor events	48%	30%	-18%	22%
Motorised sports	27%	22%	-5%	51%
Countryside activities	35%	39%	4%	36%

**Comments:** respondents clearly identified a need for more maintenance, enhanced safety and security (although the District is officially the safest in the country), better management, improved nature conservation, better access to the countryside and better informal provision.

## The Need for More Neighbourhood Provision

		More needed	No more needed
Countryside Facilities	Country parks and commons	18%	82%
	Rural footpaths	30%	70%
	Bridleways/off-road cycleways	26%	74%
	Nature conservation areas	31%	69%
	Woodland areas	25%	75%
	Tranquil water areas	25%	75%
Public Spaces	Village greens	23%	77%
	Local recreation grounds	24%	76%
	Parks and public gardens	23%	77%
	Town squares/pedestrian spaces	28%	72%
	Churchyards and cemeteries	8%	92%
	Landscaped areas	26%	74%
	Street trees/planted verges	39%	61%
Activity spaces	Children's Play (< 8 years)	24%	76%
	Children's Play (8-12 years)	26%	74%
	Supervised adventure play areas	34%	76%
	Teenage facilities	48%	52%
	Grass sports pitches	18%	82%
	Tennis courts	16%	84%
	Bowling greens	10%	90%
	Water sports areas	14%	86%
	Allotments	21%	79%
Indoor facilities	Fitness centres	17%	83%
	Racquet facilities	14%	86%
	Leisure centres	14%	86%
	Village halls/community centres	20%	80%
	Youth centres	26%	74%
	Swimming Pools	15%	85%
	Pubs and cafes	10%	90%
	Cinemas	45%	55%
Theatre or concert venues	27%	73%	

Note: totals may not sum to 100% because of rounding

**Comment:** an absolute majority of respondents did not see any need for additional provision of any of the above types within their own neighbourhood, although this majority was wafer thin in relation to teenage facilities.

The table below gives similar information for the five community areas of the District in the form of the net percentage of respondents believing there is no need for any more provision in their area. We have calculated this by deducting the percentage wanting more provision from those who see no need for more. For example, if 60% see no need for more provision and 40% do, the net percentage is 20%. We have colour-coded the figures as follows: green = a net 20% or more of respondents see no need for any more provision; yellow = a net 0-20% of respondents see no need for any more provision; red = a net percentage of respondents see a need for additional provision.

	Bradford	Melksham	Trowbridge	Westbury	Warminster
Country parks and commons	68%	56%	66%	56%	76%
Rural footpaths	44%	34%	42%	22%	44%
Bridleways/off-road cycleways	55%	36%	56%	36%	52%
Nature conservation areas	28%	30%	50%	28%	50%
Woodland areas	54%	48%	46%	50%	52%
Tranquil water areas	60%	42%	52%	42%	54%
Village greens	68%	46%	52%	45%	62%
Local recreation grounds	78%	46%	44%	34%	56%
Parks and public gardens	64%	46%	56%	50%	44%
Town squares/pedestrian spaces	30%	20%	70%	56%	35%
Churchyards and cemeteries	88%	80%	88%	80%	84%
Landscaped areas	57%	40%	46%	50%	44%
Street trees/planted verges	32%	10%	10%	30%	30%
Children's Play (< 8 years)	68%	48%	36%	54%	56%
Children's Play (8-12 years)	68%	40%	38%	48%	44%
Supervised adventure play areas	66%	48%	44%	40%	59%
Teenage facilities	14%	-2%	8%	8%	-16%
Grass sports pitches	76%	60%	56%	66%	64%
Tennis courts	70%	62%	64%	68%	74%
Bowling greens	92%	86%	74%	62%	78%
Water sports areas	84%	62%	76%	74%	66%
Allotments	48%	68%	54%	56%	62%
Fitness centres	50%	75%	60%	74%	78%
Racquet facilities	60%	88%	70%	82%	71%
Leisure centres	64%	80%	68%	74%	78%
Village halls/community centres	60%	58%	72%	56%	44%
Youth centres	66%	42%	42%	54%	30%
Swimming Pools	78%	80%	48%	76%	76%
Pubs and cafes	88%	92%	68%	80%	71%
Cinemas	38%	-4%	-8%	22%	8%
Theatre or concert venues	52%	38%	48%	54%	35%

**Comment:** this table confirms that a majority of residents in all parts of the District see no need for most forms of additional provision, indicating that the present level of provision is more than adequate in their eye. However, there are a few exceptions:

- Teenage facilities in Melksham and Warminster
- Cinemas in Melksham and Trowbridge

In addition, only a slim majority of 20% or fewer respondents saw no need for any of the following forms of provision:

- Teenage facilities in Trowbridge and Westbury
- Town squares/pedestrian spaces in Melksham
- Street trees or planted verges in Melksham and Trowbridge

### The Need for More Provision in the District

		More needed	No more needed
Countryside Facilities	Country parks and commons	40%	60%
	Rural footpaths	39%	61%
	Bridleways/off-road cycleways	41%	59%
	Nature conservation areas	48%	52%
	Woodland areas	46%	54%
	Tranquil water areas	47%	53%
Public Spaces	Village greens	26%	74%
	Local recreation grounds	25%	75%
	Parks and public gardens	29%	71%
	Town squares/pedestrian spaces	32%	68%
	Churchyards and cemeteries	14%	86%
	Landscaped areas	30%	70%
	Street trees/planted verges	40%	60%
Activity spaces	Children's Play (< 8 years)	23%	77%
	Children's Play (8-12 years)	25%	75%
	Supervised adventure play areas	29%	71%
	Teenage facilities	47%	53%
	Grass sports pitches	24%	76%
	Tennis courts	21%	79%
	Bowling greens	17%	83%
	Water sports areas	30%	70%
	Allotments	27%	73%
Indoor facilities	Fitness centres	17%	83%
	Racquet facilities	20%	80%
	Leisure centres	19%	81%
	Village halls/community centres	19%	81%
	Youth centres	25%	75%
	Swimming Pools	20%	80%
	Pubs and cafes	14%	86%
	Cinemas	49%	51%
	Theatre or concert venues	39%	61%

Note: totals may not sum to 100% because of rounding

**Comment:** the same conclusions apply as for neighbourhood provision – a majority see no need for any further provision of any of the above kinds, but once again the majority in favour of no

more teenage provision is very small. However, there are some interesting differences from the responses in relation to neighbourhood provision. Firstly, a higher proportion of respondents identified a need for more provision within the District than in their own neighbourhood for all forms of provision other than teenage facilities, fitness centres, village halls/community centres and youth centres, for which the proportions were almost identical. Accordingly it is possible to sum up the message from anything up to about a quarter of respondents as “more please, but not in my neighbourhood”. In relation to all forms of provision, however, a majority of respondents – albeit a slim one in some cases - indicated that they saw no need for any further provision within the District.

The table below presents the same information, but analysed by the five community areas of the District. As above, the table gives the net proportion of respondents thinking there is no need for any additional provision. Accordingly a minus figure indicates the opposite, ie a need for more. We have colour-coded the figures as follows: green = a net 20% or more of respondents see no need for any more provision; yellow = a net 0-20% of respondents see no need for any more provision; red = a net percentage of respondents see a need for additional provision.

	Bradford	Melksham	Trowbridge	Westbury	Warminster
Country parks and commons	42%	23%	-2%	18%	20%
Rural footpaths	30%	14%	18%	8%	26%
Bridleways/off-road cycleways	26%	14%	8%	16%	26%
Nature conservation areas	24%	0%	-8%	-10%	18%
Woodland areas	16%	4%	-4%	4%	20%
Tranquil water areas	10%	-6%	-4%	8%	18%
Village greens	56%	48%	46%	34%	59%
Local recreation grounds	50%	60%	48%	56%	47%
Parks and public gardens	54%	38%	32%	34%	50%
Town squares/pedestrian spaces	42%	27%	28%	42%	40%
Churchyards and cemeteries	78%	73%	60%	76%	73%
Landscaped areas	44%	46%	31%	42%	32%
Street trees/planted verges	22%	18%	12%	22%	30%
Children's Play (< 8 years)	60%	58%	40%	56%	64%
Children's Play (8-12 years)	52%	60%	40%	48%	52%
Supervised adventure play areas	57%	50%	21%	40%	56%
Teenage facilities	6%	16%	8%	13%	-8%
Grass sports pitches	63%	56%	48%	48%	54%
Tennis courts	72%	48%	58%	56%	56%
Bowling greens	82%	60%	66%	54%	68%
Water sports areas	58%	35%	20%	36%	47%
Allotments	40%	56%	32%	45%	56%
Fitness centres	74%	77%	56%	66%	64%

Racquet facilities	70%	80%	46%	56%	52%
Leisure centres	66%	68%	50%	68%	64%
Village halls/community centres	64%	75%	40%	71%	71%
Youth centres	60%	62%	38%	48%	42%
Swimming Pools	62%	75%	34%	62%	76%
Pubs and cafes	74%	86%	56%	71%	78%
Cinemas	-4%	2%	-18%	10%	32%
Theatre or concert venues	29%	16%	8%	13%	38%

**Comment:** this analysis has identified some interesting differences between the five community areas:

- A majority of **Bradford** area residents want only cinema provision, although a sizeable minority would like more woodland, tranquil water and teenage facilities
- **Melksham** area residents also identify a need for tranquil water areas, while a sizeable minority see a need for more access to the countryside, nature conservation, street trees, teenage facilities, cinemas and theatre or concert venues
- **Trowbridge** area residents would like additional country parks or commons (in spite of the fact that Southwick is on their doorstep), nature conservation, woodland areas, tranquil water and cinemas, while a sizeable minority would like to see better countryside access, street trees, teenage facilities and theatre or concert venues
- **Westbury** area residents would like more nature conservation areas, while sizeable minorities would like more countryside access, woodland, tranquil water areas, teenage facilities, cinemas and theatre or concert venues
- **Warminster** area residents identified only a need for more teenage facilities, although sizeable minorities would like more nature conservation and tranquil water areas

## Conclusions

Overall, the results of the survey indicate clearly that most residents see little or no need for more of most forms of open space, sport and recreation provision in the District. Conversely, what they want most of all is better management and maintenance of existing provision. However, it is also clear that some sizeable minorities would like to see more or better countryside facilities, nature conservation, teenage and children's facilities and some indoor and outdoor sports facilities.

**Appendix B**  
**Survey of Town and Parish Councils**

**Appendix C  
Audit Forms**

**Appendix D**  
**Summary of Audit Results**

## **Appendix E Application of Quantity Standards**

## **Appendix F Draft Quality Standards**