



**SCRUTINY COMMISSION - 29 October 2015**

**WINTER 2014/15 SATISFACTION SURVEY**  
**REPORT OF CHIEF OFFICER FOR CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND HOUSING REPAIRS**

**WARDS AFFECTED: ALL WARDS**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform the Scrutiny Commission of the findings of the satisfaction survey conducted in December 2014 to February 2015 and to identify key messages from the survey that can inform the future direction of council policy and service delivery

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Scrutiny Commission review the results and recommend that:

- appropriate elements are considered by relevant services
- any changes are incorporated into service improvement plans in order to improve service delivery and satisfaction levels

3. BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

The resident Satisfaction Survey is undertaken on an annual basis. It is intended to measure the satisfaction of residents and service users with the quality of services delivered by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council. Resident satisfaction surveys are an integral part of the local government performance framework. They play a vital role in understanding what people think about local services – what’s working and what’s not. They also provide valuable data about how views of local services change over time, including people’s preferences and expectations. Crucially, satisfaction surveys provide information which can help Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council shape, deliver, and improve local services around the needs and wishes of local people

Each year the survey includes questions which allow monitoring of trends over time, as well as a range of questions which are included at the request of service areas.

To better understand how local residents’ views have changed over time, additional satisfaction questions have been introduced this year which can be directly compared to questions asked in the General User Satisfaction Survey which was undertaken in 2006/07 by central government

This year the questionnaire included the following topics:

Streets and public land	How satisfied residents are with the cleanliness of streets and whether keeping public land clear of litter and refuse has got better or stayed the same in the last three years
Household waste	How satisfied residents are and whether they think the service has got better or stayed the same over the last three years
Garden waste	
Doorstep recycling	
Sports and leisure facilities	
Parks and open spaces	
Other services	How satisfied residents/users are with other services such as Advice and Benefits and Planning and Building Control
The way the council runs things	How satisfied residents are and whether they think things have got better or stayed the same over the last three years
Communication and resident engagement	How well informed residents feel about services
	Main source of finding out about the council
Working to improve things	Whether residents think that the council is working positively

	to make things better such as providing value for money
Community Safety	Satisfaction with how the police and other public services are dealing with community safety issues in the local area
	How safe residents feel in their local area
	What community safety issues residents think need addressing in their local area

The Community Safety Partnership questions stated above have been included at the request of the Community Safety Partnership and the responses from this survey have been forwarded to the partnership for inclusion into their own independent survey which will be analysed and reported to the Community Safety Partnership board. Therefore this report does not include any summary or analysis on the section of the questionnaire titled “Community Safety”

#### 4. SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

	Citizens Panel (direct mail/email invite)	Randomly selected households (direct mail to households in all wards proportionally aligned with overall borough demographics)	HBBC staff
No of residents invited to participate	555	1500	370
No of responses	162	343	51
Response rate	29%	23%	14%
Response rate compared to last year's survey	<b>(-16%)</b>	<b>(-5%)</b>	<b>(+6%)</b>

The survey was also available on the council's website and promoted on social media for all residents to participate should they wish to do so and this attracted a further thirteen responses

All three community houses in the borough were sent questionnaires which attracted a further 12 responses.

While the responses received were proportionally in line with the demographics of the borough, the overall response rate itself was down on previous years. Some reasons why response rates might be lower are:

- Survey was mailed out during the Christmas week rather than after the Christmas break as in past surveys.
- Due to the large number of forms mailed out in the first mailing, reminders were only sent to residents living in the lowest responding areas and research shows that reminders can have a positive impact on response rates

## 5. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE SURVEY

This report summarises the results at ward level which can be compared to those recorded in 2006/07 by the “General User Satisfaction” survey

Some questions asked in 2006/07 have been regularly featured year on year so in these cases the charts include the results from last year’s survey as well as the results from the General User Satisfaction survey

Questions that have been introduced since 2006/07 will compare last year’s results against this year’s results also at a ward level.

Detailed analysis is provided at appendix 1 which shows charts with narrative highlighting the main observation for each question.

All charts display ward level summaries as well as overall response summaries.

Chart legend & responses by ward:

Ward/overall	No of responses	Response rate
Ambien	14	21%
Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston	27	45%
Barwell	84	40%
Burbage (All Burbage wards combined)	94	19%
Cadeby, Carlton and Market Bosworth with Shackerstone	21	27%
Earl Shilton	48	24%
Groby	28	24%
Hinckley (All Hinckley wards combined)	161	22%
Markfield, Stanton and Fieldhead	29	28%
Newbold Verdon with Desford and Peckleton	31	20%
Ratby, Bagworth and Thornton	25	21%
Twycross and Witherley with Sheepy	19	32%
General User Satisfaction survey 2006/07 - overall results	2,716	45%
Overall results from last year’s (2013/14) survey	466	29%
Overall results from this year’s (2014/15) survey	581	24%

While response rates were generally in line with the demographics of the borough, future surveys will need to take into account the low response rates from some areas as denoted in the table above if participation is to be improved.

5.1 Results – detailed charts are provided at appendix 1 but some key observations are:

5.1.1 Cleanliness of streets – overall, satisfaction remains high at over 85%, dropping to 79% in Burbage wards and 77% in the ward of Twycross & Witherley with Sheepy.

5.1.2 Keeping public land clear of litter and refuse – respondents were asked how they thought the service had fared over the last three years and while the overall result was slightly down on the 2006/07 survey it is still over 85% satisfied. However, respondents from Ambien ward (64%) and Burbage ward (76%) were less satisfied with the service. It should be noted that both of these areas are parished areas which are cleansed by parish councils and not the borough council.

5.1.3 Household waste – generally satisfaction levels have remained high with all aspects of the waste collection service right across the borough. However in three wards (Burbage, Earl

Shilton and Twycross & Witherley with Sheepy), residents' satisfaction with the cleanliness of streets following a collection has reduced compared with 2006/07.

- 5.1.4 Doorstep recycling – up to and including last year's survey (2013/14), this service has seen a steady improvement. However, this year there has been a drop in satisfaction levels across all wards from 92% to 80%. In Earl Shilton the percentage of respondents who think the service has improved over the last three years has dropped from 95% to 66%. On a positive note: the results from Groby ward have continued to improve year on year. It is worth noting that the overall drop in satisfaction this year could be due to project 'Recycle Right' which aims to improve the quality of dry recycling collected
- 5.1.5 Garden waste – this question was introduced this year and results show that this service is generally well received; respondents from all wards are 85% satisfied
- 5.1.6 Sports and leisure facilities – Good improvement over the last few years across most wards (80% overall now satisfied). One negative observation: only 42% of respondents from the ward of "Groby" were satisfied.
- 5.1.7 Parks and open spaces – good improvement this year in all areas apart from respondents from the ward of Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston where the satisfaction levels have dropped from 92% satisfied to 80% satisfied. It is worth noting that the parks in the areas where satisfaction has dropped are maintained by the parish council
- 5.1.8 Other services -: this year (new question) we asked how satisfied users were of the following services:
- Advice and Benefits
  - Environmental Protection
  - Planning and Building Control
  - Community Safety
  - Licences, Permits and Permissions

Response rates varied due to the low number of users across the services so it's difficult to ascertain any significant observations. Detailed charts at ward level are included at appendix 1.

- 5.1.9 The way the council runs things – satisfaction continues to improve year on year in all wards and is currently around 85% overall. On the question of whether residents think that this has improved over the last three years, the results were rather more varied. In particular some areas were significantly less favourable:
- Ambien
  - Burbage
  - Cadeby, Carlton and M. Bosworth
  - Groby
  - Twycross and Witherley with Sheepy
- 5.1.10 how well informed residents feel about:
- How to pay bills to the council
  - How and where to register to vote
  - How to get involved in local decision making
  - How to complain to the council
  - What the council spends its money on
  - What standard of service to expect from the council
  - Whether the council is delivering on its promises
  - What the council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour in the local area
  - How well the council is performing
  - How well the council keeps residents informed about the services it provides

Since 2006/07 when this was last asked, all the above areas of communication have improved. However, one area where although it has improved quite a low percent (43%) feel well informed about what the council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour in the local area.

5.1.11 Main source of finding out about the council – the borough bulletin is still the main source with respondents in almost all wards. The exception was Barwell which showed an equal split between the Borough Bulletin and local media such as newspapers, television and radio

5.1.12 whether residents agree that the council is working positively in the following:

- In making the local area a better place to live
- In making the area safer
- In making the area cleaner and greener
- Is efficient and well run
- Provides good value for money
- That the council is trustworthy
- That the council promotes the interests of local residents
- That the council acts on the concerns of local residents
- That the council treats all types of people fairly

All the above apart from cleaner and greener have all improved since we last asked residents in 2006/07. The results vary from ward to ward in each category and observations are best considered by reviewing the detailed charts at appendix 1.

Some respondents added further general comments on the completed forms and these can be viewed in detail at appendix 2.

Most of the comments are around waste, litter and recycling.

## 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [DW]

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report

## 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS [MR]

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report

## 8. CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS

This report supports the following elements of the “Corporate Plan 2013-2016”

- Creating a vibrant place to work and live
- Empowering communities
- Supporting individuals
- Providing value for money and pro-active services

## 9 CONSULTATION

Residents of Hinckley and Bosworth invited to take part in the survey:

- 347 members of the Citizens Panel by direct mail
- 214 members of the Citizens Panel by electronic mail
- 637 residents selected from the councils Mosaic Public sector profile data base (proportionally selected by number of residents per wards in relation to number of residents in the borough)

- HBBC staff by way of electronic invite
- Survey was also made available to all residents from the “Have your say” page on the councils website

## 10. RISK IMPLICATIONS

It is the Council’s policy to proactively identify and manage significant risks which may prevent delivery of business objectives.

It is not possible to eliminate or manage all risks all of the time and risks will remain which have not been identified. However, it is the officer’s opinion based on the information available, that the significant risks associated with this decision / project have been identified, assessed and that controls are in place to manage them effectively.

The following significant risks associated with this report were identified from this assessment:

Management of significant (Net Red) Risks			
Risk	Risk failure leads to:	Mitigating actions	Owner
CPS.33 - Resident engagement	Ill informed decisions and failure to comply with Public Sector Equality Duty	Communication and Consultation strategy in place. Resident satisfaction survey conducted annually	Jacqueline Puffet

## 11. KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY – EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS

The consultation was undertaken with respondents from across the whole borough. Demographically the Citizens’ Panel and residents selected from the councils Mosaic database are proportionally in line with the demographics of the borough.

## 12. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

Community Safety implications – included in the report

- Environmental implications – included in the report
- ICT implications – none relating to this report
- Asset Management implications – none relating to this report
- Human Resources implications – none relating to this report
- Planning Implications – none relating to this report
- Voluntary Sector - none relating to this report

---

Background papers: none  
 Contact Officer: Cal Bellavia ext 5795  
 Executive Member: Councillor KWP Lynch