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**A. Background and Introduction**

A.1 The purpose of the survey was to review resident opinion on issues relating to priorities, sense of place, perceptions and use of facilities, information and communications and preferences for improvements. The questionnaire contained the following sections:

**Section 1:** Living in the Borough

**Section 2:** About the Council

**Section 3:** Darlington Town Centre

**Section 4:** About Your Services

**Section 5:** Residents’ Priorities or Concerns

**Section 6:** Contact with the Council and Information

**Section 7:** Helping Out (Volunteering)

**Section 8:** Community Safety

**Section 9:** About Yourself (Demographic Profile of the Sample)

A.2 This report relates to RED HALL AND LINGFIELD Ward from which there were 216 responses giving a confidence interval of +/-6.7% (worst case). Comparisons are made within the report to the overall survey which had responses of 4714 completed surveys. Differences of +/-6.8% would need to be observed for there to be a statistical difference between the ward and the overall sample. Note: numbers of responses for the ward are shown in the figures. ‘Don’t know’ responses have been omitted and in some instances respondents failed to give a response so not all questions have responses from all 216 respondents.

**1. SECTION 1: LIVING IN THE BOROUGH**

1.1 Respondents living in the Red Hall and Lingfield ward are slightly less satisfied with their area as a place to live than the overall sample (21.9% were ‘very satisfied’ and 48.6% ‘fairly satisfied’ - overall satisfaction rate of 70.5% compared with the Borough – 75.6%).

1.2 60.9% of all respondents in Red Hall and Lingfield agreed that the local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together and treat each other with respect compared to 64.9% overall. 17.2% disagreed with this statement (compared with 13.4% in the Borough overall).

1.3 There was no statistically observable difference between Red Hall and Lingfield and the Borough overall in respect of strength of belonging to the area (Red Hall and Lingfield – very strongly – 26.7%, fairly strongly – 46.8% - overall strong sense of belonging 73.5% compared with the Borough – 74.8%).







**2. SECTION 2: ABOUT THE COUNCIL**

2.1 When asked which of the statements given came closest to how they felt about Darlington Borough Council, a quarter of respondents in Red Hall and Lingfield said that they would speak positively about the Council (4.1% ‘without being asked’ and 21.2% ‘if asked about it’ – 25.3% speaking positively). Conversely, 40.8% would speak negatively (27.2% ‘if asked’ and 13.6% ‘without being asked’). There are no statistically significant differences between Red Hall and Lingfield and the overall sample.

2.2 Residents in this Ward were as likely to agree that they can influence decisions made by Darlington Borough Council (11.7% agreeing in Red Hall and Lingfield compared to 12.9% of the Borough overall). There were however significantly more respondents disagreeing (69.1% compared with 60% in the Borough overall) illustrating that over half of all respondents in the ward feel unable to influence decisions.

2.3 Agreement of Residents in Red Hall and Lingfield in respect of the statement Darlington Borough Council is well run and good value for money is in line with the rest of the Borough with just 24.6% agreeing with this statement (DBC 28.9%). A quarter of respondents agreed (24.4% cf. 29.1% for Borough overall) that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents, while 34.9% agreed (cf. 39.9% for the Borough overall) that Darlington Borough Council treats all people fairly.







**3. SECTION 3: THE TOWN CENTRE**

3.1 The primary reason for visits to the town centre by respondents from the Red Hall and Lingfield ward was for shopping purposes mirroring closely the response from the overall sample (74.4% cf. overall sample 77.4%). Residents here were similarly as likely to visit the town centre for leisure (33.1% cf. overall 37.2%) or for work (9.2% cf. with 11.8%).

3.2 17.7% of residents in Red Hall and Lingfield visit town centre events as a ‘dedicated trip’ – slightly lower than the overall sample (23.6%).





**4. SECTION 4: ABOUT YOUR SERVICES**

Environmental Services

4.1 Whilst respondents in Red Hall and Lingfield tended to be as satisfied with cleanliness in the town centre as the overall sample (Red Hall and Lingfield – 62.0% cf. overall sample – 64.4%), satisfaction with the cleanliness of the local area showed a lower satisfaction rate (42.0% satisfied cf. 48.6% for the overall sample).

4.2 Residents in this ward were both as satisfied (45.5% cf. overall 43.2%) and dissatisfied (39.0% cf. overall 35.2%) with grass cutting in comparison to the overall sample. Satisfaction was similar in respect of household waste collection, (refuse and recycling) with a satisfaction rate of 72.3% (25.3% ‘very satisfied’ and 47.0% ‘fairly satisfied) against and overall sample response of 76.4% satisfied.

4.3 Satisfaction with the upkeep of public parks, recreation ground and open spaces is lower than the overall sample with 42.9% satisfaction (6.0% ‘very satisfied’ and 36.9% ‘fairly satisfied’) and a dissatisfaction of 43.1%. Overall sample satisfaction was 56.1%.

4.4 Just a third of all respondents (35.9%) were satisfied with the cleanliness of public parks (6.2% ‘very’ and 29.7% ‘fairly satisfied’). This is a significantly lower level of satisfaction than the overall sample (35.9% cf. 50.8%).





Facilities

4.5 The most used facility by residents of Red Hall and Lingfield provided by Darlington Borough Council was the Dolphin Centre with 62.9% of all respondents using this. 22.9% of respondents used it at least once a month (at least once a week – 9.7%, at least monthly – 13.2%). The next most used facility is South Park with 60.8% using this – 19.4% of respondents using this at least monthly. Least used was Cockerton Library (4.7% used this in the last 12 months).

4.6 As can be seen from the tables that follow satisfaction with facilities was generally very high – exceeding 75% for most facilities. The exceptions was in relation to other Darlington Borough Council parks (57.0%).

4.7 Reasons for not using the facilities largely related to lack of interest in the facility with being unable to access by my usual form of transport only appearing in one in twenty respondents or more in respect of the Household Recycling Centre (10.4%) and South Park (6.7%).

4.8 When asked how often they intended to use Darlington Hippodrome in the future, responses from residents living in Red Hall and Lingfield were largely similar to those of the overall sample. Around one-in-five (20.5%) were likely to use the theatre at least three to four times a year with a further 34.2% using it once or twice a year. (Overall sample usage at least once or twice a year – 54.7% cf. 59.2% overall). Reasons for never intending to use Darlington Hippodrome for this groups were largely related to cost (37.2%) or to the type of shows (12.6%). Responses to the open question category ‘other’ are shown in the appendices.











**5. SECTION 5: RESIDENTS’ PRIORITIES OR CONCERNS**

5.1 Respondents were informed that the Council is interested in their priorities for the Borough and that the Council has set out 8 priority area (themes) for the next four years. Respondents were asked which four of the eight themes were most important to them. The themes were as follows with only the emboldened text being used in the figures that follow:

* **More people healthy and independent** –improving the health and wellbeing of residents (examples… tackling air and noise pollution, addressing poor housing conditions, and encouraging healthy behaviours).
* **Children with the best start in life** – enabling children and young people to maximise and achieve their potential (examples… schools and education, career and employment prospects for young people, child poverty, mental health and wellbeing of children and young people).
* **A safe and caring community** – creating a safer and more socially cohesive community (examples…tackling speeding cars, anti-social behaviour).
* **More people active and involved** -increasing participation of residents in physical activity and civic life (examples… access to recreational activities, unnecessary use of cars, volunteering).
* **More businesses, more jobs** – enabling strong and inclusive economic growth in Darlington (examples… creating jobs, job security, wage levels, cost of living, levels of poverty and debt).
* **More people caring for our environment** – continuing to protect and enhance the local environment (examples… volunteering, tackling fly tipping and litter).
* **Enough support for people when needed –** ensuring residents get the right level and kind of support when they need it to enable them to live independently (examples… supporting older people, the local voluntary and community sector offer, homelessness).
* **A place designed to thrive** – ensuring we have the necessary physical infrastructure for residents and businesses to prosper (examples… vitality of the town centre, availability of affordable housing to buy or rent, accessible public transport).

5.2 In addition respondents were informed that as part of the medium term financial plan (2018-2022) the Council is considering making improvements to the Borough across five themes and respondents were asked to rank these on a one to five basis. These themes were:

* **Community Safety** – for example: - Tackling anti-social behaviour in the town centre or neighbourhoods.- Working with the Police, communities and landlords to improve neighbourhoods.
* **Maintaining an Attractive Street Scene Environment** – for example: return grass cutting to 12-15 day cycles, return to weekly back lane cleanse, a general increase in cleansing across the borough. One off investments for priority areas for deep cleans and physical improvements in some areas.
* **Maintaining a Vibrant Town Centre** – for example: - Flowers and cleanliness in the town centre, events and markets, attracting new business, Improving the environment.
* **Developing an Attractive Visitor Economy** – for example: Celebrating our Rail Heritage and attracting more visitors. Having a Tourist Information Centre. Improving the Head of Steam. Match funding grants to enhance cultural activities such as theatre or dance. Preparing for the bi-centenary of the world’s first passenger railway.
* **Neighbourhood Renewal** – for example: Supporting families and neighbourhoods facing disadvantage and poverty. Schemes to improve health and education in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Tackling some of the impacts of welfare changes.

5.3 Two of the PRIORITY themes listed were clearly the most important priority areas of residents of Red Hall and Lingfield each being identified by more than 60% of all respondents. These were ‘a safe and caring community’ (63.4%) and ‘children with the best start in life’ (62.5%). Least important was ‘more people active and involved’ (17.2%).

5.4 Because the importance of improvements was a ‘ranked response’ question the responses have been analysed as mean scores. The lower the mean score the higher the priority. For respondents living in the Red Hall and Lingfield ward the highest priority by far was that of improving community safety with a mean score of 1.62. This was followed by maintaining an attractive street scene environment (2.76). Least important here was developing an attractive visitor economy with a mean score of 4.10.





**6. SECTION 6: CONTACT WITH THE COUNCIL AND INFORMATION**

6.1 When participants were asked how well informed they felt they were the large majority of respondents (74.4%) felt that they were either very or fairly well informed about what can be recycled as part of the waste collection service. Only in respect of events and activities in the Borough did over half of all respondents in Red Hall and Lingfield (56.8%), say that they were very or fairly well informed.

6.2 Conversely over half of all respondents felt that they were not very well or not well informed at all about what the Council does (54.4% not well informed), the reasons the Council has to make savings (62.0%) and opportunities available to volunteer locally (60.6%).

6.3 As can be seen from the figure on the following pages sources of information used by respondents in Red Hall and Lingfield are largely similar to the overall sample. The ‘One Darlington’ magazine is the most used source (63.1%) followed by ‘word of mouth’ (49.1%). (Note – this was a multiple choice question and answers will add to more than 100%. Only responses in excess of 10% have been shown in the charts – full details are available in the tables).

6.4 When asked about the main method of contact when contacting the Council, over half of those in Red Hall and Lingfield (60.6%) said that they had made contact in the last 12 months. This is similar to the overall sample where 57.8% had made contact. The primary source of contact was by phone (39.2%) and this is higher than the overall sample where 28.1% had made contact by telephone.

6.5 Respondents who had made contact with the Council were asked for the main reason for their last contact. It was clear from the responses that the reasons given in the questionnaire did not resonate with respondents and resulted in over half of all of those who had made contact giving ‘other’ responses. These are shown in the appendices. The largest of the main responses was ‘to book or apply for something such as Council Tax discount, housing repair or bulky waste collection’ (24.0%).

6.6 Satisfaction with aspects of their last contact was high with 74.3% being satisfied with the ease of using their chosen method of contact and 57.9% with the information provided. 56.6% were satisfied with how the issue was resolved and over a quarter (30.7%) were dissatisfied with this. Also to note is that 31.5% of those who had made contact were dissatisfied with the information that had been provided.

6.7 When asked if they would be willing to contact Darlington Borough Council electronically 50.8% said that they would or already did so – a lower percentage than the overall sample (60.9%). 11.6% said that either hadn’t got regular internet or any internet access and 15.1% had concerns about or were not confident about using the internet to contact Darlington Borough Council.













**7. SECTION 7: HELPING OUT**

7.1 23.9% of respondents living in the Red Hall and Lingfield ward had given unpaid help to groups, clubs or organisations as an individual or through their employer (76.1% not given unpaid help). This is similar to the overall sample where 74.7% had not given unpaid help. Giving unpaid help through an employer was also in Red Hall and Lingfield was 3.5% (7.7% for the overall sample).

7.2 The main barriers to volunteering were that respondents here ‘don’t have time’, (22.5%) or were ‘not interested’ (35.7%).





**8. SECTION 8: COMMUNITY SAFETY**

8.1 Respondents were asked how safe or unsafe they felt when out in the dark and during the day in their local area. As can be seen from the figure below respondents living in Red Hall and Lingfield feel less safe when outside in the dark than the overall sample (51.4% feel safe compared to 61.1% of the overall sample). Similarly, 32.5% feel unsafe when outside in the dark compared with 25.4% of the overall sample. Whilst the differences are less marked in respect of feeling safe when outside during the day the overall sample (91.1% safe) feel safer than do residents living in Red Hall and Lingfield (84.6%). When outside after dark in the town centre 45.3% (48.3% overall), felt very or fairly safe and 33.8% (32.6% overall), fairly or very unsafe. This is similar to the overall sample. Also similar were the responses relating to town centre during the day time with 84.3% feeling safe, (overall 87.3%); and 6.1% feeling unsafe (4.6% overall).





**9. SECTION 9: ABOUT YOURSELF**

