

Moray Citizens' Panel

Environmental Services - Direct Services Survey

Summary Findings

Craigforth

April 2013

1. INTRODUCTION

Survey responses

- 1.1. The survey fieldwork ran during February and March 2013, and a total of 438 responses had been received by consultation close at the end of March – representing a response rate of 45%. This is a strong level of response to a survey of this kind - particularly as the survey followed another recent Panel consultation – and is sufficient to produce robust results.
- 1.2. Moreover, consultation results have been weighted to minimise any “bias” in the profile of responses e.g. resulting from a lower level of response from some demographic groups. Weighting has been conducted on the basis of location and age, to ensure that findings are as representative as possible of all parts of the community in Moray. Percentages presented in the tables show the percentage satisfaction rate of those who have used the particular service in the past year.
- 1.3. This report provides a summary of consultation findings across the key survey topics, including:
 - Waste management
 - Lands and parks
 - Building, cleaning and catering
 - Roads maintenance
 - Transportation and consultancy
 - Service staff
 - Consultation

2. SUMMARY FINDINGS

Waste management

2.1. Key findings in relation to waste management services were:

- Views were most positive in relation to refuse and recycling collection, with more than 90% satisfied.
- Views were significantly less positive in relation to the cleanliness of verges and embankments – only 44% indicated that they were satisfied with this.

Figure 1: Rating of waste management services over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Refuse collection (residual)	97%	404	52%	40%	2%	5%	0%
Recycling collection	98%	415	54%	38%	3%	5%	0%
Recycling facilities	98%	410	44%	44%	6%	5%	1%
Cleanliness of verges and embankments	99%	413	10%	34%	25%	25%	7%

Lands and parks

2.2. Key findings in relation to lands and parks services were:

- In relation to specific services, views were most positive in relation to public parks (82% satisfied) and open spaces (78% satisfied). Views were least positive in relation to the countryside ranger service (42% of those using the service were satisfied).
- In relation to the general condition of council parks and gardens, views were most positive on grass cutting (83% satisfied), flowerbeds/floral displays (83%) and trees (84%). Views were least positive on play equipment (67% of those using services) and infrastructure (63%).
- Views were generally positive in relation to the general condition of council cemeteries, particularly in relation to trees/leaves (84%), grass cutting (83%) and headstone areas (83%).
- Views were generally positive in relation to the condition of council footpaths, verges and open spaces. This was most notable in relation to flowerbeds (81% satisfied).
- Most indicated that they do not have concerns for their safety in parks, gardens, cemeteries, footpaths, verges or open spaces.

Figure 2: Rating of lands and parks services over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Public parks	82%	344	22%	60%	7%	10%	1%
Open spaces	87%	364	20%	58%	14%	7%	1%
Countryside ranger service	39%	162	15%	27%	55%	3%	1%
Burial service	36%	151	21%	46%	31%	2%	0%
Cemeteries	53%	221	20%	53%	20%	5%	2%

Figure 3: Rating of general condition of council parks and gardens

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Grass cutting in parks/gardens	89%	374	27%	56%	8%	9%	1%
Flowerbeds/floral displays in parks and gardens	91%	384	29%	54%	9%	7%	0%
Shrub beds in parks and gardens	91%	386	26%	54%	15%	5%	0%
Footpaths in parks and gardens	89%	375	22%	55%	18%	5%	1%
Park furniture e.g. seating	85%	355	15%	56%	19%	9%	1%
Trees	91%	376	25%	58%	15%	1%	0%
Play equipment	67%	276	17%	50%	18%	11%	4%
Infrastructure	79%	315	15%	48%	34%	2%	1%

Figure 4: Rating of general condition of council cemeteries

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Grass cutting	89%	374	27%	56%	8%	9%	1%
Headstone areas	91%	384	29%	54%	9%	7%	0%
Footpaths/car parks in cemeteries	91%	386	26%	54%	15%	5%	0%
Access	89%	375	22%	55%	18%	5%	1%
Floral tributes	85%	355	15%	56%	19%	9%	1%
Trees/leaves	91%	376	25%	58%	15%	1%	0%
Water supply	67%	276	17%	50%	18%	11%	4%
Infrastructure	79%	315	15%	48%	34%	2%	1%

Figure 5: Rating of general condition of council footpaths/verges/open spaces

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Grass cutting	95%	405	20%	56%	11%	12%	2%
Flowerbeds	94%	398	25%	56%	13%	6%	1%
Trees/leaves	94%	398	20%	54%	15%	10%	1%

Figure 6: Whether concerns for safety or experienced antisocial behaviour in the following areas

Parks and gardens	19%
Cemeteries	3%
Footpaths/verges/open spaces	16%
None of these	71%

Building, cleaning and catering

2.3. Key findings in relation to building, cleaning and catering services were:

- Views were particularly positive in school meals, with 72% of those using the service satisfied.
- Views were less positive on public toilets – 55% of those using the service were satisfied.

Figure 7: Rating of building, cleaning and catering services over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Street cleaning	94%	393	15%	50%	17%	15%	3%
Public toilets	65%	271	11%	43%	18%	20%	7%
School meals	34%	138	30%	41%	22%	6%	1%

Roads maintenance

2.4. Key findings in relation to roads maintenance services were:

- In relation to specific services, views were most positive in relation to gritting of main council roads (82% satisfied). Views were least positive in relation to snow clearing of footpaths, cycleways and council car parks (fewer than half of those using these services were satisfied).
- In relation to the general condition of council roads assets, views were most positive in relation to road signs (76% satisfied). Views were least positive in relation to rural roads (40% satisfied), road drainage (46%) and residential roads (48%).
- In relation to maintenance of council road assets, views were most positive in relation to speed of repairs to street lights and traffic signals (76% and 79% respectively), and least positive in relation to speed and quality of pothole repairs (31% and 36% respectively).
- Residents generally see pothole repairs and resurfacing of main roads as the most important services (selected by 94% and 80% respectively).
- Around three quarters of residents feel that the illumination of street lighting in their area is adequate.

Figure 8: Rating of roads maintenance services over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Gritting of main council roads	99%	414	25%	57%	8%	9%	1%
Gritting of residential roads	96%	401	9%	40%	16%	27%	8%
Gritting of rural roads	87%	363	11%	37%	25%	21%	6%
Gritting of footways/paths/cycleways	94%	390	9%	39%	20%	25%	7%
Snow clearing of all council roads	96%	401	14%	50%	19%	14%	4%
Snow clearing of footways/paths	93%	386	9%	38%	23%	23%	7%
Snow clearing of cycleways/paths	76%	314	6%	30%	36%	23%	6%
Snow clearing of council car parks	76%	315	6%	38%	31%	17%	7%

Figure 9: Rating of general condition of council roads assets over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Main roads	99%	411	8%	53%	12%	21%	6%
Residential roads	99%	403	5%	43%	20%	26%	6%
Rural roads	96%	401	4%	36%	17%	35%	8%
Footways and paths	95%	389	8%	55%	27%	8%	2%
Cycle routes	58%	236	8%	49%	32%	11%	1%
Road drainage	97%	402	3%	42%	19%	32%	4%
Road signs	97%	403	14%	62%	18%	5%	0%
Road markings	97%	400	10%	56%	23%	10%	1%
Road safety barrier	92%	380	12%	56%	29%	3%	0%
Pedestrian barriers	89%	370	13%	56%	29%	1%	1%

Figure 10: Rating of maintenance of council roads assets over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Speed at which road potholes repaired	100%	417	11%	20%	38%	24%	7%
Quality of road pothole repairs	99%	414	14%	23%	32%	24%	8%
Cleanliness of roads & verges	98%	405	32%	31%	21%	10%	5%
Frequency of gully emptying	95%	387	18%	43%	24%	10%	5%
Keeping drainage clear and working	98%	408	27%	29%	27%	13%	4%
Cleanliness and visibility of road signs	95%	395	36%	38%	22%	4%	1%
Visibility of road markings	96%	402	31%	40%	21%	6%	1%
Speed of repair to bridges	96%	395	22%	52%	25%	2%	0%
Speed of repair to street lights	95%	391	31%	45%	20%	3%	1%
Speed of repair to traffic signals	95%	396	32%	47%	18%	3%	0%

Figure 11: Importance of roads maintenance services

	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice	5th Choice
Resurfacing of main roads	35%	17%	12%	9%	7%
Resurfacing of residential roads	2%	17%	12%	9%	10%
Resurfacing of footways & paths	2%	5%	6%	8%	7%
Repairing road potholes and other surface defects promptly	43%	21%	15%	12%	3%
Re-lining and marking roads	1%	6%	7%	8%	6%
Renewing worn road signs	-	1%	1%	4%	7%
Replacing dark street lights	3%	5%	11%	8%	6%
Replacing lighting columns in poor condition	0%	1%	2%	4%	2%
Repairing bridges	1%	3%	3%	4%	8%
Replacing bridges in poor condition	0%	1%	1%	5%	8%
Replacement of safety fencing/barriers	1%	1%	4%	4%	7%
Preparing for adverse weather	10%	12%	11%	12%	17%
Clearing blocked drains quickly	4%	11%	14%	14%	12%

Figure 12: Views on illumination of street lighting in local area

Too high	13%
Adequate	73%
Too low	9%
Don't know/No opinion	5%

Transportation and consultancy

2.5. Key findings in relation to transportation and consultancy services were:

- In relation to specific services, views were most positive in relation to provision of school crossing patrollers (85% of those using the service) and car parks (79%). Views were least positive in relation to provision of permits for skips/scaffolding (33%) and community transport (40%).
- New routes, improving existing surfaces and additional cycling crossing points are seen as the top three priorities for improving local cycling facilities.
- Around two thirds of residents feel that there is adequate provision of lowered kerbs at crossings in their area.
- In relation to utility works, most feel that guarding and signage, and information on signs is adequate (72% and 68% respectively). Views were somewhat more divided on the standard and speed of reinstatement of roads and footways, and waiting times.

Figure 13: Rating of transportation and consultancy services over the last year

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Provision permits for skips/scaffolding	14%	55	7%	25%	62%	7%	2%
Disabled parking	31%	128	13%	44%	24%	14%	5%
Car parks	90%	368	20%	59%	10%	8%	2%
Provision of school transport	23%	93	15%	38%	45%	2%	2%
Provision of school crossing patroller	44%	179	35%	50%	12%	2%	1%
Community transport (Dial-a-bus)	20%	81	11%	28%	51%	6%	2%
Harbours	31%	126	10%	40%	40%	7%	2%
Dealing with flooding	43%	174	6%	42%	37%	12%	3%

Figure 14: Priorities for improving cycling facilities

New routes	38%
Additional cycle crossing points	25%
Improved signing	22%
Improved lighting	19%
Improving existing surfaces	29%
Additional cycle parking facilities	18%
Improved road markings	15%
Don't know/No opinion	35%

Figure 15: Views on provision of lowered kerbs at crossing in local area

Adequate	63%
Inadequate	20%
Don't know/No opinion	17%

Figure 16: Views on utility works

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither / Nor	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The guarding and signage of works was adequate	13%	60%	13%	4%	3%	7%
The information provided on signs was adequate and clear	10%	58%	16%	6%	3%	7%
The reinstatements of the road/footway was to a good standard	8%	40%	22%	16%	6%	8%
The reinstatement was undertaken promptly	6%	45%	25%	12%	4%	8%
The waiting time was an acceptable level	6%	45%	26%	11%	5%	8%

Service staff

- 2.6. Views were generally positive on service staff, and particularly in relation to staff friendliness and co-operation (80%).

Figure 17: Rating of service staff

	Used service in last year		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither/ Nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Friendliness/co-operation of staff	62%	256	29%	51%	14%	5%	0%
Presentability of staff	60%	246	20%	54%	24%	2%	0%
Ease of obtaining information/help	61%	253	21%	45%	25%	7%	2%
Ease on reporting faults/making complaints	58%	243	21%	46%	25%	7%	2%

Consultation

- 2.7. Key findings in relation to consultation were:

- A large majority of residents are happy to receive Panel surveys at least every 4 months (70%).
- Residents are generally less likely to be willing to receive regular invites to take part in other consultations – although there remains around a third who would be willing to receive these at least every 3 months.

Figure 18: How often would like to receive surveys/consultations

	Every month	Every 2-3 months	Every 3-4 months	Every 5-6 months	No more than once a year	Don't know/ No opinion
Panel surveys	21%	30%	19%	8%	17%	6%
Invites to take part in other consultations	14%	23%	19%	9%	23%	13%

* _ * _