

Results: Services First - Have we got it right?

This report presents results regarding Services First - Have we got it right? from Survey 9 of the People's Panel West Lancashire, carried out in Winter 2005/06.

The survey involved 1,123 members of the People's Panel West Lancashire: a response rate of 82.6% on the current membership of 1,360.

The results are based on the 1,123 questionnaires returned, and exclude the members who failed to respond to the survey. The label "no-response" used in some tables indicates the % of respondents to the survey who failed to answer an individual question or part question. As a result of rounding and weighting, some results might not precisely tally between tables.

The People's Panel is generally representative of the total population of West Lancashire in terms of ward populations, ethnicity and gender. However, there is some under-representation of specific age groups. Therefore, to ensure that the distribution of responses is representative of the West Lancashire electoral population as a whole, the survey results have been weighted, based on age within gender population.

The People's Panel West Lancashire was recruited in Summer 2003 using probability (random) sampling, stratified by ward, which means that it has a good standard of statistical validity. The Panel was "refreshed" in summer 2005 when around a third of members were retired, and other residents were recruited to replace them. The reliability of the survey is enhanced by the high number of respondents.

The survey results are estimates of the figure in the whole population which would have given a particular response if everyone had been asked. There is, therefore, always a 'margin of error' which depends, for each question, on the size of the percentage and the number of people who answered the question. The greater the number of respondents, the smaller is the margin of error.

In order to assist with the interpretation of the results, a table is given overleaf which enables the margin of error for each individual result to be calculated.

Margin of error

The table below is an approximate guide to the margin of error appropriate to a specific result percentage and size of base (weighted number of members that question applies to) and based on a 95% confidence level (this is the same high level demanded by Government for Performance indicator surveys, and means that we can be 95% certain that we did not arrive at the result by chance.) The formula used to calculate the margin of error is a widely used one but generally assumes that the sample which was drawn was a simple random one. However, this formula is often used as a rule of thumb for all types of sample. As can be seen, the margin of error for any particular percentage given in the survey analyses depends both on the size of the percentage and the weighted base.

How to use the table

In the left hand column, select the figure closest to the 'size of base' (i.e. the number of people who answered the question: these figures are given at the bottom of each of the results tables.) On the top row, select the column with the percentage closest to your % result. The margin of error is the figure where the row and column intersect.

For example: results show that 94.4% of Panel members rated "protecting and improving street scene and the environment" as very/fairly important. The weighted base was 1166. Therefore the margin of error is 1.2%. This means that the true % is 94.4% +/- 1.2% i.e. it lies between 93.2% and 95.6%.

Size of base*	Percentage with the characteristic :									
	95 or 5	90 or 10	85 or 15	80 or 20	75 or 25	70 or 30	65 or 35	60 or 40	55 or 45	50
	+/- %									
50	6.0	8.3	9.9	11.1	12.0	12.7	13.2	13.6	13.8	13.9
100	4.3	5.9	7.0	7.8	8.5	9.0	9.3	9.6	9.8	9.8
150	3.5	4.8	5.7	6.4	6.9	7.3	7.6	7.8	8.0	8.0
200	3.0	4.2	4.9	5.5	6.0	6.4	6.6	6.8	6.9	6.9
250	2.7	3.7	4.4	5.0	5.4	5.7	5.9	6.1	6.2	6.2
300	2.5	3.4	4.0	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.4	5.5	5.6	5.6
350	2.3	3.1	3.7	4.2	4.5	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.2
400	2.1	2.9	3.5	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.9
450	2.0	2.8	3.3	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6
500	1.9	2.6	3.1	3.5	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
600	1.7	2.4	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0
700	1.6	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7
800	1.5	2.1	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5
900	1.4	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.3
1000	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1
1100	1.3	1.8	2.1	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.0
1200	1.2	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8

* weighted number of members answering the question

1. Importance of Council's six priorities

Panel members were informed about "Services First" and the Council's long-term vision to put customer services first and to build a community second to none. The aim is that within the next three years West Lancashire District Council will be a flagship District Council - not only satisfying its customers but delighting them. Members were told that to achieve this vision the Council is focusing on six priority areas.

Members were given a list of the priorities and were asked "How important or unimportant do you think these priorities are?"

Table 1 shows that overall the majority of members completing Survey 9 in Winter 2005/06 gave high importance ratings to all the six priorities; more than 79% of members saw each priority as very or fairly important.

However, there were significant variations in the proportions who gave "very important" ratings. 83.4% saw the priority "combating crime and the fear of crime" as very important compared with only 31.5% who gave the same rating to "providing opportunities for leisure and culture".

A brief summary of the importance ratings for each priority area is given below. A very similar question was put to members of the previous Panel during Winter 2004/05, and questions about importance ratings were also asked in both Winter 2003/04 (on the Council's then priorities) and Winter 2002/03 (on the Council's key objectives). Tables 2a-2f compare the importance ratings for Survey 9 in Winter 2005/06 with those from the survey the previous year whilst any comparable results from the two earlier surveys are indicated below.

"Protecting and improving street scene and the environment"

Table 2a shows that 94.4% of current members rated this priority as very/fairly important, a similar proportion to that during Winter 2004/05 (94.9%). During Winter 2003/04, 95.1% of members rated the then priority "protecting and improving the environment" as very/fairly important whilst 96.3% gave the same rating to a similar worded Council key objective during Winter 2002/03.

"Combating crime and the fear of crime"

Although the proportion of members rating "combating crime and the fear of crime" as very or fairly important has been falling steadily over the four years, this Council priority continues to be the one given such a rating by the highest proportion of members. The proportion in 2005/06 was 95.8% compared to 97.5% in the previous year whilst during 2003/04 and 2002/03, 98.0% and 98.7% respectively gave it the same rating.

"Working to create good quality jobs for local people"

This priority was seen as very/fairly important by 89.1% of members during 2005/06, a small decrease since the previous year (90.7%) and continuing the trend since 2003/04 (92.1%) and 2002/03 (96.2%).

"Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people"

There has also been a steady fall over the past four years in the proportions of members indicating this priority to be very or fairly important. During 2005/06 the proportion was 86.4% compared with 89.9% in 2004/05, 90.0% during 2003/04 and, for the key objective in 2002/03, 93.2%.

“Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all”

Table 2e reveals that this priority was considered to be very/fairly important by 88.4% of members during 2005/06. The priority “delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer” was put to members in 2004/05 and the proportion giving it the same rating was 88.1%.

“Providing opportunities for leisure and culture”

This has been a priority area identified in the last three surveys since 2003/04. During 2005/06 79.9% of members rated it as very or fairly important compared with 82.7% in 2004/05 and 84.3% the previous year. The steady fall in this rating has been accompanied by an increase in the proportions of members having no strong opinion (12.6%, 11.9% and 9.7% respectively).

Table 1: Importance of Council's six priorities (2005/06)

	% of members indicating :							Total
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	
Protecting and improving street scene and the environment	63.3%	31.1%	2.1%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	2.6%	100.0%
Combating crime and the fear of crime	83.4%	12.4%	1.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	2.0%	100.0%
Working to create good quality jobs for local people	51.8%	37.3%	5.3%	1.7%	0.7%	0.2%	2.9%	100.0%
Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people	52.4%	34.0%	7.7%	2.2%	0.4%	0.9%	2.4%	100.0%
Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all	54.8%	33.6%	6.1%	1.4%	0.4%	1.2%	2.4%	100.0%
Providing opportunities for leisure and culture	31.5%	48.4%	12.6%	2.8%	1.0%	0.7%	3.0%	100.0%

(Weighted base- completing survey = 1166)

Table 2a: “Protecting and improving street scene and the environment”- Comparisons 2004/05 and 2005/06

	“Protecting and improving street scene and the environment”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Winter 2004/05	59.7%	35.2%	2.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	2.1%	100.0%
Winter 2005/06	63.3%	31.1%	2.1%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	2.6%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = Winter 2004/05 = 881, Winter 2005/06 = 1166)

Table 2b : “Combating crime and the fear of crime”- Comparisons 2004/05 and 2005/06

	“Combating crime and the fear of crime”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Winter 2004/05	87.8%	9.7%	0.8%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Winter 2005/06	83.4%	12.4%	1.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	2.0%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = Winter 2004/05 = 881, Winter 2005/06 = 1166)

Table 2c : “Working to create good quality jobs for local people”- Comparisons 2004/05 and 2005/06

	“Working to create good quality jobs for local people”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Winter 2004/05	53.2%	37.5%	5.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.3%	2.5%	100.0%
Winter 2005/06	51.8%	37.3%	5.3%	1.7%	0.7%	0.2%	2.9%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = Winter 2004/05 = 881, Winter 2005/06 = 1166)

Table 2d : “Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people”- Comparisons 2004/05 and 2005/06

	“Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Winter 2004/05	54.3%	35.6%	5.2%	2.3%	0.4%	0.4%	1.9%	100.0%
Winter 2005/06	52.4%	34.0%	7.7%	2.2%	0.4%	0.9%	2.4%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = Winter 2004/05 = 881, Winter 2005/06 = 1166)

Table 2e: “Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all”*- Comparisons 2004/05 and 2005/06

	“Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all”*							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Winter 2004/05	52.6%	35.5%	7.3%	1.4%	0.3%	0.5%	2.3%	100.0%
Winter 2005/06	54.8%	33.6%	6.1%	1.4%	0.4%	1.2%	2.4%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = Winter 2004/05 = 881, Winter 2005/06 = 1166)

* In 2004/05 the wording was slightly different ie “Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer”

Table 2f: “Providing opportunities for leisure and culture”- Comparisons 2004/05 and 2005/06

	“Providing opportunities for leisure and culture”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Winter 2004/05	30.7%	52.0%	11.9%	2.5%	0.9%	0.4%	1.7%	100.0%
Winter 2005/06	31.5%	48.4%	12.6%	2.8%	1.0%	0.7%	3.0%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = Winter 2004/05 = 881, Winter 2005/06 = 1166)

Tables 3a-3f on the following pages show Panel members' importance ratings in 2005/06 for each of the Council's current priority areas broken down by age, gender, disability and area of residence. It should be noted that these breakdowns involve smaller numbers of people and therefore the margin of error may be greater.

“Protecting and improving street scene and the environment”

Table 3a shows that there is some variation by age in the importance ratings given by current members to this priority area. 96.1% of members aged 16-24 saw this priority as very/ fairly important compared with 89.5% of those aged 65+.

“Combating crime and the fear of crime”

Table 3b reveals a higher proportion of members aged 45-64 rating “combating crime and the fear of crime” as very or fairly important (97.2%) compared with those aged 65+ (92.7%). There was hardly any variation by gender, disability or area.

“Working to create good quality jobs for local people”

Age also appears to play a part in the importance ratings given to this particular priority as shown by Table 3c. Whereas 90.6% of members aged 45-64 rated this as very/ fairly important, the comparable proportion for those aged 65+ was 84.4%. Women were also more likely to give this priority this rating (91.4%) than men (86.6%).

“Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people”

In respect of this priority, Table 3d indicates that members from Skelmersdale/Up Holland were more likely to give this a rating of very/fairly important than those from Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes (89.8% and 84.1% respectively). A higher proportion of younger members aged 16-24 (88.3%) than older ones over 64 (83.6%) gave the same rating.

“Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all”

Table 3e shows that with regard to this priority area a higher proportion of members aged 45-64 rated it as very or fairly important (93.0%) compared with their younger counterparts aged 16-24 (80.6%). Similarly, members living in Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes were more likely to give it the same rating (89.8%) than those living in Skelmersdale/ Up Holland (85.5%).

“Providing opportunities for leisure and culture”

Table 3f reveals some variation particularly by gender and area of residence in the importance ratings given to “providing opportunities for leisure and culture”. A higher proportion of female members than male rated this priority as very/fairly important (84.9% and 74.0% respectively). Members living in Skelmersdale/ Up Holland were more likely to give this rating to this priority than those living elsewhere.

Table 3a : “Protecting and improving street scene and the environment”- Importance ratings by age, gender, disability and area of residence (2005/06)

	“Protecting and improving street scene and the environment”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Broad age group								
16-24	50.4%	45.7%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25-44	56.0%	38.4%	3.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	1.4%	100.0%
45-64	66.2%	29.4%	1.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	2.6%	100.0%
65+	74.0%	15.5%	1.8%	1.8%	0.5%	0.0%	6.4%	100.0%
No response	73.2%	25.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Gender								
Male	59.8%	33.7%	3.5%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	2.4%	100.0%
Female	66.3%	28.9%	0.8%	1.1%	0.0%	0.2%	2.7%	100.0%
Disability								
With a limiting disability	74.8%	19.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%	100.0%
With a non limiting disability or no disability	61.5%	32.9%	2.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	2.1%	100.0%
No response	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Area of residence								
Skelmersdale/Up Holland	66.9%	28.3%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	0.0%	2.7%	100.0%
Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes	57.9%	35.7%	2.2%	1.0%	0.2%	0.2%	2.7%	100.0%
Northern Parishes	65.2%	29.2%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	100.0%
TOTAL	63.3%	31.1%	2.1%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	2.6%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = 1166. Age : 16-24 = 129, 25-44 = 351, 45-64 = 385, 65+ = 219, no response = 82. Gender : male = 539, female = 627. Disability : with a limiting disability = 162, with a non-limiting disability or no disability = 998, no response = 6. Area of residence : Skelmersdale/Up Holland = 374, Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes = 402, Northern Parishes = 390)

Table 3b : “Combating crime and the fear of crime”- Importance ratings by age, gender, disability and area of residence (2005/06)

	“Combating crime and the fear of crime”							Total
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	
Broad age group								
16-24	84.5%	11.6%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25-44	76.1%	19.7%	1.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	1.4%	100.0%
45-64	84.5%	12.7%	1.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	1.0%	100.0%
65+	88.6%	4.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	5.9%	100.0%
No response	93.9%	3.7%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Gender								
Male	80.3%	15.4%	1.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	1.7%	100.0%
Female	86.1%	9.9%	1.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	2.2%	100.0%
Disability								
With a limiting disability	87.7%	6.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	100.0%
With a non limiting disability or no disability	82.7%	13.4%	1.7%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	1.5%	100.0%
No response	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Area of residence								
Skelmersdale/Up Holland	83.7%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.0%	2.4%	100.0%
Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes	81.3%	14.7%	1.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	2.0%	100.0%
Northern Parishes	85.4%	11.8%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	100.0%
TOTAL	83.4%	12.4%	1.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	2.0%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = 1166. Age : 16-24 = 129, 25-44 = 351, 45-64 = 385, 65+ = 219, no response = 82. Gender : male = 539, female = 627. Disability : with a limiting disability = 162, with a non-limiting disability or no disability = 998, no response = 6. Area of residence : Skelmersdale/Up Holland = 374, Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes = 402, Northern Parishes = 390)

Table 3c : “Working to create good quality jobs for local people”- Importance ratings by age, gender, disability and area of residence (2005/06)

	“Working to create good quality jobs for local people”							Total
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	
Broad age group								
16-24	42.6%	45.7%	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25-44	45.6%	44.2%	6.3%	2.0%	0.3%	0.0%	1.7%	100.0%
45-64	56.1%	34.5%	5.7%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	2.1%	100.0%
65+	57.5%	26.9%	5.0%	1.4%	0.5%	0.5%	8.2%	100.0%
No response	58.5%	35.4%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Gender								
Male	47.2%	39.4%	7.2%	2.6%	0.4%	0.2%	3.0%	100.0%
Female	55.9%	35.5%	3.7%	1.0%	1.1%	0.2%	2.7%	100.0%
Disability								
With a limiting disability	59.3%	28.4%	4.3%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	5.6%	100.0%
With a non limiting disability or no disability	50.5%	38.9%	5.5%	1.8%	0.8%	0.1%	2.4%	100.0%
No response	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Area of residence								
Skelmersdale/Up Holland	56.6%	33.5%	4.6%	0.8%	1.3%	0.3%	2.9%	100.0%
Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes	50.7%	38.4%	6.2%	1.7%	0.5%	0.2%	2.2%	100.0%
Northern Parishes	48.1%	39.6%	5.4%	2.6%	0.5%	0.3%	3.6%	100.0%
TOTAL	51.8%	37.3%	5.3%	1.7%	0.7%	0.2%	2.9%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = 1166. Age : 16-24 = 129, 25-44 = 351, 45-64 = 385, 65+ = 219, no response = 82. Gender : male = 539, female = 627. Disability : with a limiting disability = 162, with a non-limiting disability or no disability = 998, no response = 6. Area of residence : Skelmersdale/Up Holland = 374, Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes = 402, Northern Parishes = 390)

Table 3d : “Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people”- Importance ratings by age, gender, disability and area of residence (2005/06)

	“Improving housing and ensuring that there is affordable housing available for local people”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Broad age group								
16-24	45.7%	42.6%	7.8%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25-44	44.7%	40.5%	10.3%	2.0%	0.3%	0.9%	1.4%	100.0%
45-64	56.5%	30.1%	7.0%	1.8%	0.8%	1.3%	2.6%	100.0%
65+	57.1%	26.5%	6.8%	2.7%	0.0%	0.9%	5.9%	100.0%
No response	63.4%	30.5%	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	100.0%
Gender								
Male	45.7%	38.7%	9.8%	2.2%	0.6%	0.6%	2.4%	100.0%
Female	58.2%	30.0%	5.7%	2.2%	0.2%	1.1%	2.6%	100.0%
Disability								
With a limiting disability	61.7%	24.1%	4.3%	1.9%	0.0%	2.5%	5.6%	100.0%
With a non limiting disability or no disability	50.9%	35.6%	8.2%	2.4%	0.4%	0.6%	1.9%	100.0%
No response	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Area of residence								
Skelmersdale/Up Holland	57.9%	31.9%	3.5%	2.4%	0.5%	1.1%	2.7%	100.0%
Ormskir/Aughton & Western Parishes	50.4%	33.7%	10.7%	2.2%	0.2%	0.7%	2.0%	100.0%
Northern Parishes	49.2%	36.0%	8.7%	2.0%	0.5%	1.0%	2.6%	100.0%
TOTAL	52.4%	34.0%	7.7%	2.2%	0.4%	0.9%	2.4%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = 1166. Age : 16-24 = 129, 25-44 = 351, 45-64 = 385, 65+ = 219, no response = 82. Gender : male = 539, female = 627. Disability : with a limiting disability = 162, with a non-limiting disability or no disability = 998, no response = 6. Area of residence : Skelmersdale/Up Holland = 374, Ormskir/Aughton & Western Parishes = 402, Northern Parishes = 390)

Table 3e : “Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all”- Importance ratings by age, gender, disability and area of residence (2005/06)

	“Delivering cost-effective services that will delight the customer and are accessible to all”							
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	Total
Broad age group								
16-24	34.9%	45.7%	11.6%	3.9%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	100.0%
25-44	43.1%	42.9%	9.7%	2.6%	0.0%	0.3%	1.4%	100.0%
45-64	65.2%	27.8%	3.4%	0.3%	0.3%	1.0%	2.1%	100.0%
65+	61.8%	25.0%	4.1%	0.9%	1.4%	0.9%	5.9%	100.0%
No response	68.3%	24.4%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	2.4%	2.4%	100.0%
Gender								
Male	55.0%	32.2%	7.0%	2.6%	0.4%	0.6%	2.2%	100.0%
Female	54.5%	34.8%	5.4%	0.5%	0.5%	1.8%	2.6%	100.0%
Disability								
With a limiting disability	68.5%	19.8%	3.1%	0.6%	0.6%	1.2%	6.2%	100.0%
With a non limiting disability or no disability	52.5%	35.8%	6.7%	1.6%	0.4%	1.2%	1.8%	100.0%
No response	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Area of residence								
Skelmersdale/Up Holland	54.8%	30.7%	6.7%	1.9%	0.8%	2.1%	2.9%	100.0%
Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes	56.8%	33.0%	6.7%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	2.0%	100.0%
Northern Parishes	52.4%	36.8%	5.1%	2.0%	0.3%	1.0%	2.3%	100.0%
TOTAL	54.8%	33.6%	6.1%	1.4%	0.4%	1.2%	2.4%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = 1166. Age : 16-24 = 129, 25-44 = 351, 45-64 = 385, 65+ = 219, no response = 82. Gender : male = 539, female = 627. Disability : with a limiting disability = 162, with a non-limiting disability or no disability = 998, no response = 6. Area of residence : Skelmersdale/Up Holland = 374, Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes = 402, Northern Parishes = 390)

Table 3f : “Providing opportunities for leisure and culture”- Importance ratings by age, gender, disability and area of residence (2005/06)

	“Providing opportunities for leisure and culture”							Total
	Very important	Fairly important	Neither important nor unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Very unimportant	Don't know	No response	
Broad age group								
16-24	23.1%	53.8%	19.2%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25-44	29.8%	50.6%	13.9%	3.1%	1.1%	0.0%	1.4%	100.0%
45-64	32.5%	49.1%	11.2%	3.9%	0.3%	0.5%	2.6%	100.0%
65+	33.8%	43.4%	9.6%	2.7%	0.9%	1.8%	7.8%	100.0%
No response	41.5%	41.5%	11.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	3.7%	100.0%
Gender								
Male	27.8%	46.2%	17.4%	3.7%	1.7%	0.6%	2.6%	100.0%
Female	34.7%	50.2%	8.4%	2.1%	0.5%	0.8%	3.3%	100.0%
Disability								
With a limiting disability	37.7%	40.1%	9.9%	2.5%	0.6%	1.2%	8.0%	100.0%
With a non limiting disability or no disability	30.3%	49.8%	13.0%	2.9%	1.1%	0.6%	2.2%	100.0%
No response	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Area of residence								
Skelmersdale/Up Holland	37.3%	46.9%	8.6%	0.8%	1.6%	0.8%	4.0%	100.0%
Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes	31.3%	48.9%	13.2%	3.5%	0.7%	0.5%	2.0%	100.0%
Northern Parishes	26.3%	49.6%	15.9%	4.1%	0.5%	0.8%	2.8%	100.0%
TOTAL	31.5%	48.4%	12.6%	2.8%	1.0%	0.7%	3.0%	100.0%

(Weighted base - completing survey = 1166. Age : 16-24 = 129, 25-44 = 351, 45-64 = 385, 65+ = 219, no response = 82. Gender : male = 539, female = 627. Disability : with a limiting disability = 162, with a non-limiting disability or no disability = 998, no response = 6. Area of residence : Skelmersdale/Up Holland = 374, Ormskirk/Aughton & Western Parishes = 402, Northern Parishes = 390)

2. Suggestions for Services First priorities

Panel members were then asked if they thought anything had been missed out from the Services First priorities. Suggestions were made from over 21% of members completing Survey 9. These are set out in Table 1 below.

Many of the suggestions specifically related to providing leisure facilities for young people as well as the need for more street cleaning and dealing with litter.

List 1 : Suggestions for Services First priorities

A more comprehensive transport concession system for the elderly.
A most important priority should be the provision of a foot bridge at the railway bridge in Derby Street.
A place for kids to play football instead of on the roads.
A question relating to why people do not use the sport centres! Answer- over priced charges.
Activities for teenagers to prevent need for groups to harm streets, vandalising property.
Affordable housing.
Affordable transport which doesn't leave us waiting for 2 hours. Reduced fares don't apply if there are no buses.
An extra market day in Ormskirk.
Areas for dog walking.
Bad signs, speed limits especially rural areas. Road repair direct line. Rodent nuisance rural areas. Traffic calming, visibility rural areas.
Better control of illegal campers, imposing fines for litter left by the campers and ensuring that boundaries are protected against illegal entrance.
Better transport facilities for aged and infirm residents in rural areas.
Care for the old
Care of the environment/green issues.
Centres for young people only to attend in their free time.
Change the accessibility of dog walkers in play areas for children.
Clamp down on under age drinking
Clean around Concourse between library and baths. I walked from ASDA to Concourse and there were rats running in front of me
Clearing footpaths of leaves and branches.
Combating anti-social behaviour. More action needs to be taken against adult anti-social behaviour.
Communicate and listen to local people.
Conditions of roads & extra gullies required due to heavy rain flooding pavements. Money seems to be spent on Ormskirk/Skelmersdale and no other areas.
Continue to develop the recycling scheme. I would like lots of smaller wheelie bins for each thing.
Continuing to improve re-cycling services.
Correct information on heating grants.
Could do with more Community Patrol officers for each estate. One officer patrolling around 5 estates is not acceptable.
Creating opportunities for young people in the evenings.
Cut council tax to half what a couple pay. Single person discount is unfair. Shouldn't be a discount, should be half.
Deal with the travellers/caravans, they just make one big mess. You must have the power to stop the whole issue. If you can't give them a skip to use.
Demolish housing in areas where there is a perceived antisocial problem.
Difference in standards, what's allowed in Roby Mill would not be tolerated in Ormskirk.
Disposal & recycle bin are important.
Do not agree with the last 3 ratings.
Do you believe it is important to disclose all of the facts related to a proposed change in a proposal ?

People's Panel West Lancashire: Survey 9 Winter 05/06

Dog dirt on the streets which is not as important as your six priorities but is still an issue in some parts of West Lancs.
Dog waste bins. Converting both green and tip waste. Employment needed soon.
Education which includes life skills and parenting.
Encourage more variety of shops especially in Ormskirk.
Encouraging market traders on Thurs + Sat by curbing rent increase.
Encouraging more people to recycle waste.
Encouraging visitors to the area to increase revenue.
Ensuring our heritage is kept alive. Should have a small museum showing artefacts that have been discovered from stone age to modern day.
Ensuring that farm land is not giving over to housing.
Ensuring that Ormskirk and Southport hospitals are not merged with any other trusts.
Ensuring that private householders are refrained from selling goods from houses to the detriment of legitimate businesses.
Environmental work/protection. Facilities for teenagers.
Fly tipping is an ongoing problem & the Council should do more to identify offenders and show no compassion.
Fouling of dogs! Would like to see cleaner streets!
Free parking near shopping areas to boost local businesses. Stop harassing people who want to spend money.
General cleanliness of area i.e. road signs coming into Rufford, they haven't been cleaned in years & gives a poor "welcoming" feeling when going down
General cleanliness of Blaguegate sports area, its a disgrace. Dog fouling and parking on the green.
Give the people of West Lancashire local hospital facilities or at the very least maintain Ormskirk hospital and not merge with other trusts.
Good lighting at railway station and bus station. Prevent vandalism at bus station. Clean/patrol toilet facilities.
Good transport works.
Good, regular reliable transport services.
Gritting back streets in winter or leaving grit bins in Old Skelmersdale.
Hesketh Bank needs an injection of help from you.
HGV park needed for Stanley slip road- parking of HGV's overnight is on the increase.
Hospital services need to be reinstated at Ormskirk, not having to go all the way to Southport.
How are you going to create jobs without putting the cost on the tax paper?
I am concerned about the environment - recycling.
I am strongly opposed to the decision of the Council to introduce a 2 week collection of general household disposal.
I consider jobs, housing and culture to be outside any local council businesses.
I don't feel we are listened to regarding new housing. The area is saturated with new homes and the traffic on Hesketh Lane is horrendous.
I feel there are many more important projects which would enhance the appearance of Ormskirk.
I have complained about the tennis court not being open everyday. Members have a key, but what about those who cannot afford to join.
I think its appalling that a payment has to be made even on income support.- the poor cant afford it and that's why it is becoming such a problem.
I think Lancs County Council should work hard to ensure more consideration is given, especially since we are poorly connected to these centres.
I think more leisure opportunities should be offered to older people with consideration given to methods of transport to leisure/cultural activities.
I think we should abandon the present Council Tax and change to system as in Ireland where they pay private firms for any services they need.
I would like to see WLDC do more on fly tipping around Burscough. Some areas are a disgrace.
If council houses were not sold off cheaply, then maybe the housing problem would ease off. Farmers dropping mud on public roads.
If there is too much waste in our bins we should be able to put bins bags beside the bins to be lifted.
Improve Skelmersdale not Ormskirk town centre.

People's Panel West Lancashire: Survey 9 Winter 05/06

Improve street cleaning in rural areas. Leaves drop and block grids in September. There are still some areas which have not received any attention.
Improve street scene. I am disgusted at the way Gravel Lane has been neglected.
Improve the Councils relationship with the public. Providing sufficient services. There many issues needing sorted out.
Improve transport links between hospitals. Sort out A570 from Arm lights (??) to Tesco roundabout.
Improve transport links, especially for outlying/rural areas.
Improve transport.
Improved recycling of waste
Improving adult education.
Improving local transport.
Improving recycling and expanding doorstep collection of recyclable items. Developing/improving public transport and off-road cycle paths.
Improving the environment for wildlife.
In order to build a community you need to monitor the impact of increasing student population on both community & its services (education etc).
Increased level of ***** of council services.
Informing people about planning permission
Informing residents of activities planned which could be sent out by leaflet.
Is it possible to have low cost housing developments in WL with restrictions making it very difficult for non residents to buy?- to help young people?
Jobs and training
Keep gardens and streets clean.
Keep the streets clean.
Keep West Lancashire free from litter.
Keeping area clean whilst protecting the environment.
Keeping hooligans off the street. Patrol when hooligans are out in force.
Keeping local residents informed of all key/important council activities and policies & enabling residents to have a meaningful input.
Keeping streets clean.
Keeping teenagers & young kids off the streets. A curfew would be good. Make parents responsible for their children.
Keeping the Council Tax reasonable to help the old people.
Kids have nothing to do around here. Such a big town with hardly any major big shops.
Lack of consultation i.e. recycling - no choice given - must use bins, take up space, then refuse not collected.
Large notices in town centre regarding litter dropping.
Listen and take action if possible to all problems presented to the Council from local residents.
Listen to the people more, where there are petitions instead of being rail-roped into accepting the big companies view.
Listen to the people who actually live in the area. Consult them and let them know what is going on.
Litter - There are many litter bins, but I still see canals, rivers, hedgerows, side streets full of litter. I see many local people tidying up.
Litter – Up Holland is a pigsty, created by the same louts time after time. The only time I saw a policeman was Remembrance Day.
Littering has become a big problem in my area. Need litter bins in this area.
Liverpool City Council are introducing leisure passes free to young people whose presence give people impression of a job culture.
Local council & Police should work closer together to prosecute tenants who think they can get away with vandalising Council property.
Local gamekeepers rather than rangers. Motorbikes on the path on weekends still needs to be addressed.
Lonely elderly people not able to get out the house. Scared because of the gangs hanging about.
Maintaining Ormskirk's heritage - not modernising its appearance. Leisure/culture - info about exercise outdoors, giving every household a recycle bin.
Maintenance of public footpaths.
Maintenance/improvement of school buildings & play areas.
Make a motorbike scramble park. It will reduce the wreckage done to our football fields.

People's Panel West Lancashire: Survey 9 Winter 05/06

Make sure there are adequate local facilities to occupy young people.-to keep them off the streets so they don't cause trouble for themselves and others
Making shops tidy up their backyards- often full of litter.
Market 3 times a week. It brings visitors into Ormskirk, they enjoy it and spend money. There should be more toilets to cater for visitors.
Miss out hyperbole and PR jargon in your literature.
More emphasis on cleaning up litter to tidy our region.
More facilities should be available near us. We have to travel to most centres which for the older people is not good.
More family friendly shops/transport - pram accessible, baby feeding/changing facilities.
More focus on activities for youth, it is vital to have more well kept skateboard parks etc.
More help is needed in reducing taxes for pensioners. Council rates are not fair on the elderly.
More information to the elderly and people in care homes of entertainment and facilities suitable for them.
More leisure at low cost for 11-18 yrs olds activities. Better public transport/rail link to town/after dark transport.
More local clubs for the over 65s. We don't want bingo. Speakers - cup of tea, a chat etc. There's a lot of lonely pensioners in Old Skelmersdale.
More parking spaces around Scott Estate, a lot of waste ground could be used.
More police presence. More library time.
More street cleaning.
Need for youth clubs.
Need something for the older children to do. There is a sport centre, they should use that for something for them there.
Need to look at ways of redirecting heavy transporters through our village. Surely Gorse Lane is too narrow to allow this to go on much longer.
Need to sort out bins, not often enough. Dog fouling is utterly disgusting and needs police intervention with dog owners.
Need to sort out the speed of vehicles in the area. Need speed humps and more speed cameras that work.
New pavements especially in Banks that are smooth because wheelchairs tip over and they have to go on the road where motorists are speeding.
No green grass bins in sandy area.
Not allowing green land to be built on until all the brown land is redeveloped.
Not granting too many planning permissions regarding housing developments especially in Skelmersdale. Already over developed.
Ormskirk town is an important townscape, as a specific objective within this category
People are still leaving dog dirt on footpaths. Should be instant fines.
People listening to the public and trying to do something about what problems they are told about.
Preserving the night sky by employing sky friendly lights that do not contribute to the pall of sky glow.
Prevent expansion
Preventing/controlling young nuisance /ASB in the area.
Promoting healthy living like through smoke free policies.
Proper checks on condition of pavements.
Protecting Medical Services.
Protecting the green belt from development around the Ormskirk area
Protecting the green belt.
Provide a good sports hall.
Provide activities for teenagers to stop them hanging around.
Provide services that are given in towns to rural areas as well.
Provide transport for the people living on the outskirts.
Provide young people with youth clubs, to break the drinking culture and anti-social behaviour.
Providing activities relevant to today's youngsters to encourage them to stay of the streets.
Providing financial help to all new business start-ups.
Providing local leisure facilities for teenagers in a protected environment.
Providing more facilities for young people e.g. youth clubs.

People's Panel West Lancashire: Survey 9 Winter 05/06

Providing more opportunities for the elderly to meet- also youth clubs to get teenagers of the street.
Providing parking for residents in tow centre close to their homes.
Providing parks for young people and providing outdoor activities for teenagers.
Providing playable sports facilities for the youth of our area.
Providing public toilets in the town of a high standard with an attendant if possible and a charge to use them if needed.
Providing worthwhile public transport. Get rid of the Heathfield service to Burscough inter-change. There is nobody on it.
Provision of specific leisure opportunities for young people.
Public need to be included more before the Council make decisions.
Public transport & parking.
Putting Coronation Park back to rights - it is depressing, ugly & ruined.
Q26 Jobs - as long as they are private sector & not none public sector jobs.
Question 26 ask (WHAT) is required. Maybe a box on this (HOW) should be included.
Recycling facilities from house for cardboard. Wheelie bins for rubbish in Appley Bridge.
Reduce litter.
Reduce traffic with by-pass Burscough/ Ormskirk
Reducing traffic congestion.
Refuse collection
Refuse collection service is appalling, its a small avenue of 2 houses and is often missed.
Refuse collection should remain weekly. Cardboard recycling would also be useful.
Refuse collection: with the throw away packaging of today its of vital importance that a weekly collection is maintained. Fly tipping still a problem
Regarding leisure pursuits, over 55s need more social activities e.g. coach trips, days out. Social events in local clubs to be advertised in advance
Repaving pavements in side roads.
Road cleaning & protecting countryside.
Road safety.
Road sweeping.
Sidewalks are blocked by overgrown shrubbery, fallen leaves. Pathways not clear. Grass has been cut but not maintained satisfactorily.
Skelmersdale is used as a dumping ground.
Some of the roads need repairing.
Speeding cars
Street cleaning
Street cleaning is abysmal.
Street cleaning never seems to be done in the area. Lighting repairs are not done quickly enough.
Street cleaning regularly. Concentrating around and in vicinity of station entrance to remove litter.
Support to older members of the local area who live alone.
Support transport in rural areas so people can take advantage of services located centrally e.g. Ormskirk.
Swimming pools' lack of hygiene stop me from visiting. Local newly built fishing lakes & parks left to rundown as no one patrols these.
Swimming pools ok, but hygiene needs improving. Huge costly vandalism problem with play area & parks.
Tacking the growing litter problem/fly tipping.
Taking the time out to visit schools and colleges and educate people on a one to one basis.
The bus services are slowly disappearing. More frequent buses.
The car parking in Ormskirk should be improved and should become free to encourage more trade in town centre.
The Council and the police choose to ignore the problems with the drugs being sold in our area. Also the streets need to be cleaned better.
The grey bins to take over the existing bins maybe a problem, when it comes into force. 1 bin is not enough as bin men won't take loose bins.
The oldest estate should be modernised 1st instead of the new town houses. It needs improving!
The parks in the area are a disgrace, needs sorting out especially the dog bins and litter bins.
The streets could do with a good brush.
There are no footpaths near my home.
There should be a place for pensioners to go and meet other people.

People's Panel West Lancashire: Survey 9 Winter 05/06

There should be better facilities, for people without children in the area.
There should be more accessibility to home grants.
To keep local parks clean and stop youths hanging around by giving them something to do. Spend money wisely, no stupid sculptures like other towns.
To try improve community spirit in the town - organising events.
Too much curtailing of adult education classes.
Traffic calming
Traffic management - Ormskirk by-pass. Development of bridgeways to keep horse & riders safe. Major proposed changes in Health services.
Transport
Transport in rural and semi rural areas at sensible times.
Trees that are growing to great heights in the neighbourhood.
Try to educate litter louts!
Very dissatisfied with the collection service for the green bin + blue box.
We live in Hesketh Bank, what leisure facilities?
We need more leisure facilities, a new shopping centre, a rail link, footpaths that get you from a to b instead of taking you around houses as it were
We need things for young teens, the centre here is too expensive. That why so many people don't use it.
Wheelie bins are essential. Larger recycling boxes required.
Why don't we have rubbish bins like other areas ?
Why is one area given priority? Fairer distribution is needed. Apart from "The Voice" never asked about our views or needs.
Wonder what the Council is doing to reduce waste/cost?
Work towards making people work accountable for their actions especially in the areas of vandalism and fly tipping.
Working to build an inclusive society.
Working with the schools to help them provide the young to be more patriotic and aware of keeping their environment at all time in good shape.
Would like all of these to include every road and house in the area, not stop at main roads.
Would like to see development of organisations to bring together different age groups in the district.
You should address cleaning up the estates & jobs making peoples lives unbearable.
Young people
Younger people i.e. teenagers need somewhere to go to keep them occupied and off the streets.
Youth opportunities/leisure. Supporting local policing.
Youth outreach & engagement