



BRINKLOW

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SURVEY RESULTS

January 2018

Mike King

People and Places Insight Limited

Director

mike.king@people-places.co.uk

01908 776940/ 07788 286337

CONTENTS PAGE

Executive Summary	Page 3
Key Findings	Page 9
Section 1: About your Household	Page 10
Section 2: Our Village and Parish	Page 12
Section 3: Housing	Page 15
Section 4: Business	Page 22
Section 5: Tourism	Page 25
Section 6: Community Facilities	Page 27
Section 7: Conservation and Heritage	Page 30
Section 8: Green Spaces and Environment	Page 31
Section 9: Infrastructure and Connectivity	Page 34
Section 10: Transport	Page 40

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Environment

Importance and Protection of Environment

- ❖ In terms of aspects of the Parish which respondents felt were important to them 98% rated 'General upkeep of the village' as 'Very Important' (78%) or 'Important' (20%) and 97% of respondents rated 'Protected open space and trees' as either 'Very Important' (68%) or 'Important' (29%). Over 90% also rated 'Easy access to the countryside' (94%), 'Rural atmosphere' (94%), 'Open countryside reaching close to the centre' (93%) and 'Quiet environment' (91%) as either 'Very Important/ Important'.
- ❖ Over 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed or Agreed' that in terms of development protection was needed for 'open green spaces and countryside' (97%), 'Brinklow Parish's character e.g. varied historic buildings, rural feel' (97%) and 'environment (trees, wildlife etc)' (96%)
- ❖ From those respondents who would not like to see more 'Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish' 87% either 'Strongly Agreed' (60%) or 'Agreed' (27%) that they were concerned about 'Crowding in the village' and 85% 'Strongly Agreed' (58%) or 'Agreed' (27%) in terms of 'Impact on countryside and wildlife'.

Importance of Conservation and Heritage

- ❖ Conservation and Heritage was important to respondents with over 90% either 'Strongly Agreeing' or 'Agreeing' to the following statements; 'The Parish should actively protect unique local historic features, footpaths and countryside' (99%), 'Conservation Area status is important to preserve both the building and the mature trees for current and future generations' (98%), 'Historic buildings in the Parish need to be maintained (where appropriate) renovated sympathetically' (98%) and 'The character and architecture of the older buildings in the village is an important feature of the Parish' (97%).

Improvement and Promotion of Green Spaces

- ❖ In terms of 'Green Spaces' and 'Environment' that respondents would like to see improved 90% or over 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with the following; 'Wildlife sites e.g. Old Canal, the Tump' (93%), 'Existing green spaces within the village' (92%) and 'Trees and hedgerows to provide wildlife habitats and enhance the rural nature of the Parish' (90%)

- ❖ In regard to ‘Green Space and Environment’ schemes that respondents would like to see promoted, 92% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (52%) or ‘Agreed’ (40%) with ‘Planting more trees’ and 91% ‘Wildlife meadows’. (46% Strongly Agreed/ 45% Agreed).

Housing

Future Developments

- ❖ Having decided that Main Rural Settlements like Brinklow must have around 100 new houses each, Rugby Borough Council (RBC) issued a ‘call’ for potential development sites each able to deliver around 100 houses; those submitted for Brinklow were all on previously undeveloped ‘Greenfield’ sites on Green Belt Land. One site identified as suitable for up to 100 houses by RBC is north of Brinklow, to the east of Lutterworth Road and following consultation from November 2016 to January 2017, Rugby Borough Council included this site in their new draft Local Plan. Review hearings with the Planning Inspectorate are scheduled for 17 April 2018. All the remaining sites were rejected by Rugby Borough Council as being unsuitable for housing development. Over half of respondents (54%) agreed with RBC’s decision to reject all potential development sites except the 100 new homes already proposed.
- ❖ 58% of those responding to the online survey question ‘Do you think the Parish needs more housing’ stated ‘No’. 46% of paper-based survey respondents stated that ‘No more housing required’.
- ❖ When asked in the paper-based survey ‘How many more houses do you think the Parish needs in the next 15-20 years’ 30% stated ‘No more housing’.

Type of Future Developments

- ❖ Over three quarters (81%) of those online respondents who felt the Parish needs more housing stated this should be ‘For young people who would like to live in Brinklow Parish in the future’. Whilst in the paper-based survey, 47% respondents indicated that the Parish needs more housing ‘For young people who would like to live in Brinklow Parish in the future’.
- ❖ In terms of the size of any further housing developments in the Parish over the next 15-20 years, 43% of online respondents indicated that they felt ‘21-50 houses’ were needed, whilst the same response in the paper-based survey was 26%.
- ❖ Respondents were clear that ‘Large developments (more than 50 houses)’ were not wanted with 88% either stating ‘Strongly Disagree’ (69%) or ‘Disagree’ (19%).
- ❖ From those who did not agree with RBC’s decision to reject all other sites the key theme to emerge from the qualitative analysis was that ‘more, smaller sites’ would be better for Brinklow.
- ❖ 79% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (30%) or ‘Agreed’ (49%) that any further housing development should be ‘Infill, small plots of one or two houses’ whilst 70%

either 'Strongly Agreed' (23%) or 'Agreed' (47%) that these should be 'Conversion or change of use of existing buildings or previously developed (brownfield) sites'.

- ❖ 86% of respondents did not think any more 'Large/ luxury' houses were required in the Parish and the same number stating 'Short/ medium term rental properties: Buy to let and investment properties' were not required.

Design of Future Developments

- ❖ 96% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (67%) or 'Agreed' (29%) that if new properties were to be built they would support 'Dwellings of appropriate size and character for the neighbouring area'.
- ❖ 96% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (34%) with 'Pavements for pedestrians' as a design feature of any new housing development in the Parish.
- ❖ 94% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' (61%) or 'Agreed' (33%) with 'Off road parking' as a design feature they would support and 87% 'Strongly Agreed' (48%) or 'Agreed' (39%) with 'Low Energy considerations'.
- ❖ In terms of environmental features on new housing developments in the Parish over 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 'Tree planting' (92%), 'Green spaces' (92%), 'Green areas for wildlife' (91%) and 'Shrubs and hedges' (91%).

Village Identity

- ❖ 95% of respondents rated 'Village identity/ feeling part of a community' as an important aspect of the Parish whilst 89% 'Strongly Agreed' (69%) or 'Agreed' (20%) with the need to 'Control development to maintain Brinklow Parish's fundamental size and shape'.

Traffic and Transport

Traffic Issues Impacting Development

- ❖ In regard to specific actions concerning development, 93% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (74%) or 'Agreed' (19%) with the assertion to 'Address traffic issues, e.g. speeding vehicles'.
- ❖ Transport issues were classed as a current barrier to Business Development within the Parish with 79% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreeing' (56%) or 'Agreeing' (23%) with 'Parking' and 74% 'Traffic flow (congestion)' ('Strongly Agree' (49%)/ 'Agree' (25%).
- ❖ From those respondents who do not want to see more 'Tourists and Visitors being attracted to the Parish', 96% either 'Strongly Agreed' (78%) or 'Agreed' (18%) that this was due to 'Car parking issues' whilst continuing on the transport theme 95% either 'Strongly Agreed' (76%) or 'Agreed' (19%) that this was due to 'Traffic issues'.

Speeding Vehicles

- ❖ 93% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (73%) or 'Agreed' (20%) that 'Speeding vehicles' were problematic in the Parish. 38% of these indicated that the issue was prevalent on 'Broad Street' whilst 22% stated 'Lutterworth Road'. In terms of time of day, 'Rush Hour/ Peak times' was the most common response.

Volume of Traffic

- ❖ 87% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (25%) that the 'Volume of traffic was too high' in the Parish. 54% of those who provided a rating of either 'Strongly agree' or 'Agree', indicated that there was a problem with the volume of traffic being too high on 'Coventry Road' with 43% stating 'Broad Street'. When questioned on the time of day the traffic volume was problematic 26% referred to 'Rush Hour', 21% 'Morning' and 12% 'Peak'.
- ❖ 86% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (68%) or 'Agreed' (18%) that 'HGV traffic' is a problem in the Parish with 45% of comments referring to 'Coventry Road' and 37% 'Broad Street'. When asked the time that HGV traffic was a problem a number of comments cited 'All the time'.

Car Parking

- ❖ 65% of respondents felt that more public car parking space should be made available and from this cohort 80% either 'Strongly Agreed' (37%) or 'Agreed' (43%) with 'Near the shops and food outlets on Broad Street' and 78% 'Near the playing fields' (32% 'Strongly Agree'/ 46% 'Agree').
- ❖ 65% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (46%) or 'Agreed' (19%) that 'Car parking on the pavements' was a problem in the Parish, when asked the location of this issue 30% reported 'Coventry Road' and 25% 'Broad Street'. 10% indicated that the problem of cars parking on the pavements was 'Evenings' and 9% 'Anytime.'
- ❖ 77% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' (55%) or 'Agreed' (22%) that 'Parking close to junctions' was problematic in the Parish. 36% commented that this problem was prevalent on 'Coventry Road', 35% 'Heath Lane' and 34% 'Broad Street'. 'School times' was cited when questioned on when 'Parking close to junctions' was an issue.

Traffic Management Solutions

- ❖ 82% of respondents either 'Strongly agreed' (55%) or 'Agreed' (27%) that '20 mph zones near the school' are needed and 72% that '20 mph zones near the shops' are needed. ('Strongly Agree' 46% or 'Agree' 26%). 70% or 'Strongly agreed' (49%) or 'Agreed' (21%) that '20 mph zones along Ell Lane' are needed.

Public Transport

- ❖ Over half (60%) of respondents did not use public transport from and to the Parish.
- ❖ 87% of respondents would not like to see an additional bus stop.

Community Facilities

Frequency of Use

- ❖ In terms of community facilities which are used, 77% indicated that they used the 'Shop' at least once a week with 67% using the 'Post Office' the same frequency.

Importance of Retaining Facilities

- ❖ 97% of respondents rated 'Local services/ facilities (shops, healthcare, pubs etc)' as 'Very Important' (65%) or 'Important' (32%) aspects of the Parish.
- ❖ In terms of retaining facilities in the Parish, the key theme to emerge from the quantitative feedback was that it was important. For example, over 90% felt that it was either 'Very Important' or 'Important' to retain the 'Surgery' (99%), 'Shop' (99%), 'Post Office' (98%), 'Pharmacy' (98%), 'Playing field and facilities' (95%), 'Churches' (91%), 'Community Hall' (90%), 'Food outlets' (90%) and 'Pubs' (90%).
- ❖ In terms of aspirations for community facilities, 69% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (27%) or 'Agreed' (42%) with 'Churches improved and used more creatively, e.g. concerts, plays' and 67% 'More facilities for older children' ('Strongly Agree' 20% / 'Agreed' 47%). 58% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (24%) or 'Agreed' (34%) with the Parish aspiring to provide a '24-hour cash point'.

Infrastructure and Connectivity

Broadband

- ❖ 94% of respondents had Broadband access at their home.
- ❖ 58% of respondents were happy with the speed of their Broadband service.

Mobile Phones

- ❖ Nearly two thirds (63%) of respondents were happy with their mobile phone signal.
- ❖ Over half of respondents (56%) would not support the installation of a mobile phone mast.

Waste Disposal

- ❖ 60% of respondents would like to see more litter bins in the Parish.
- ❖ 60% of respondents indicated that more bins for dog waste are needed in the Parish.

Tourism

Indecision over Tourist Development

- ❖ There was an even split between whether or not respondents wanted to see more 'Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish'.
- ❖ From those who would like to see more 'Tourists and Visitors attracted' 97% either 'Strongly Agreed' (44%) or 'Agreed' (53%) with 'Promotion of local countryside, footpaths and historic features'. 92% either 'Strongly Agreed' (46%) and 'Agreed' (46%) with 'Enhancement of the rural aspects of the village' and 82% either 'Strongly Agreed' (32%) or 'Agreed' (57%) with 'More events/ entertainment'. Respondents (89%) also indicated that they would like to see Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish with 'Interpretation Boards to guide visitors regarding the history and countryside on offer'. ('Strongly Agree' (39%) and 'Agree' (50)').

Business Development

- ❖ In terms of the type of Business Development which should be encouraged in the Parish 81% either 'Strongly Agreed' (33%) or 'Agreed' (48%) with 'Home working', 73% 'Pubs/cafes/ restaurants', 69% 'Agricultural/ Food Production', 69% 'Service trades e.g. plumbers, electricians' and 64% 'Nursery'.

BACKGROUND

Notes

In total, **229** surveys were submitted via both the online system and hard copies. In some surveys, not all the individual questions or components to the question were completed as respondents skipped through certain elements, so the total number of respondents to each question or each element to the question is designated by an **N** figure. The percentage figures for each question refer to those respondents who answered that question or rated that particular option within the questions.

The Key Findings follow the structure of the survey. All qualitative comments, copied verbatim thus including grammatical errors, have been broken down per question and will be included in the Appendix which will be added when the final report is signed off.

KEY FINDINGS

Section 1: About your Household

1.1 How would describe the current make up of your household? (Please tick one option only)

	%
Male living alone	5
Female living alone	11
Couple (with no children)	18
Family with young children (pre-school or primary age)	20
Family with older children	8
Family with grown up children living entirely at home	6
Couple with grown up children living away	31
Prefer not to say	2
N=	219

31% of respondents were described the make-up of their household as 'Couple with grown up children living away'.

1.2 How old are you? (Please tick one option only)

	%
Less than 18 years	0
18-35 years	8
36-50 years	28
51-65 years	36
66-70 years	13
71-75 years	6
76-80 years	4
More than 80 years	5
Prefer not to say	1
N=	224

36% of respondents were aged '51-56 years' whilst 28% were aged '36-50 years'.

1.3 What is your current employment situation? (Please tick one option only)

	%
Full Time worker	49
Part Time worker	12
Temporary employment	0
Seasonal employment	0
Unemployed	0
Unable to work	2
Retired	34
Looking after home/ Carer	1
Student	0
Prefer not to say	2
N=	220

Just under half of the respondents stated that they were a 'Full Time worker' (49%), whilst 34% were 'Retired'.

1.4 How long have you lived in the Parish? (Please tick one option only)

	%
Less than 1 year	1
1 to 5 years	22
6 to 10 years	11
11 to 25 years	30
More than 25 years	35
Prefer not to say	0
N=	223

35% of respondents had lived in the Parish for 'More than 25 years' with 30% '11-25 years'.

Section 2: Our Village and Parish

2.1 Which of the following aspects of the Parish are important to you? (Please tick one option per row)

	Very important %	Important %	No opinion %	Not important %	Not at all important %	N=
Views from or approaching the village	47	41	4	7	1	221
Listed buildings	44	41	10	4	1	219
Open countryside reaching close to the centre	65	28	4	4	0	221
Working farms surrounding the village	50	38	6	4	1	221
Churches, cemeteries and the quality of their upkeep	49	42	5	3	1	222
Protected open space and trees	68	29	1	1	0	218
Access to major road networks, railways and airports	22	49	8	20	1	221
Local services/ facilities (shops, healthcare, pubs etc)	65	32	2	0	0	222
Locally available employment	17	39	21	18	5	221
Attractive mix of houses (thatched, timber framed, Georgian, Victorian, modern etc	42	47	8	3	0	221
Village identity/ feeling part of a community	60	35	4	1	0	220
Village activities/ community groups	46	40	10	4	0	219
Quiet environment	58	33	5	3	1	222
Easy access to the countryside	65	29	4	2	0	220
Rural atmosphere	63	31	3	3	0	221
General upkeep of the village	78	20	1	0	0	216
Family or friends nearby	26	40	16	13	5	216
Other	50	12	32	3	3	34

In terms of aspects of the Parish which respondents felt were important to them, 98% rated 'General upkeep of the village' as 'Very Important' (78%) or 'Important' (20%). 97% rated 'Protected open space and trees' as either 'Very Important' (68%) or 'Important' (29%) and the same figure rated 'Local services/ facilities (shops, healthcare, pubs etc)' as 'Very Important' (65%) or 'Important' (32%). Over 90% also rated 'Village identity/ feeling part of a community' (95%), 'Easy access to the countryside' (94%), 'Rural atmosphere' (94%), 'Open countryside reaching close to the centre' (93%), 'Churches, cemeteries and the quality of their upkeep' (91%) and 'Quiet environment' (91%) as either 'Very Important/ Important'.

2.2 Please tell us which of the following actions concerning economic development in the Parish you agree/ disagree with? (Please tick one option per row)

	Very important %	Important %	No opinion %	Not important %	Not at all important %	N=
Control development to maintain Brinklow Parish's fundamental size	69	20	4	5	0	216
Protect Brinklow Parish's 'character' e.g. varied historic buildings, 'rural' feel	76	21	1	2	0	217
Improve community facilities (e.g. shops, schools, leisure, health etc.)	32	48	11	7	2	216
Development to encourage a wider range of facilities	15	38	11	26	9	214
Promote local businesses	28	51	16	2	2	215
Increase tourism	8	35	29	23	6	213
Protect open 'green' spaces and countryside	72	24	2	0	0	217
Protect environment (trees, wildlife etc)	77	19	2	0	1	218
Provide more parking in the Parish	22	32	24	16	4	214
Address traffic issues, e.g. speeding vehicles	74	19	5	1	1	216
Other	61	12	24	3	0	33

Over 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed or Agreed' that in terms of development protection was needed for 'open green spaces and countryside' (97%), 'Brinklow Parish's character e.g. varied historic buildings, rural feel' (97%) and 'environment (trees, wildlife etc)' (96%)

In regard to specific actions concerning development, 93% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (74%) or 'Agreed' (19%) with the assertion to 'Address traffic issues, e.g. speeding vehicles) whilst 89% 'Strongly Agreed' (69%) or 'Agreed' (20%) with the need to 'Control development to maintain Brinklow Parish's fundamental size and shape'.

Section 3: Housing

3.1 Do you agree with RBC's decision to reject all the other sites as they have done?

	%
Yes	54
No	26
Don't Know	20
N=	197

Over half of respondents (54%) agreed with RBC's decision to reject all potential development sites except the 100 new homes already proposed.

Why don't you agree with RBC's decision to reject all the other sites as they have done?

From those who did not agree with RBC's decision to reject all other sites the key theme to emerge was that 'more, smaller sites' would be better for Brinklow. Comments included;

❖ <i>They have rejected smaller, less obtrusive sites</i>
❖ <i>One large development would have an adverse visual impact and change the character of the village, smaller development would minimize these effects</i>
❖ <i>Small developments of say 20 homes fit the village better than a large development.....do not look out of place</i>
❖ <i>We should keep the village as it is with small individual developments instead of new estates</i>
❖ <i>numerous small developments would be preferable to one large site</i>
❖ <i>I feel it would be beneficial to have many small developments in preference to one large one</i>
❖ <i>We believe smaller pockets of houses being built ie: 5 – 10 on small plots of land is better than a full scale larger housing estate that becomes a massive add on to the village. It's less intrusive and maybe more acceptable by the villagers.</i>
❖ <i>Several smaller sites would be more appropriate to the size and rural character of the existing village.</i>
❖ <i>I believe multiple small developments rather than one big development would have been in keeping with how the village has developed over the years</i>

3.2 Do you think the Parish needs more housing? (Online version)

(Please Note that this YES/ NO question format was only asked in the online version of the survey)

	%
Yes	42
No	58
N=	88

58% of respondents from the online survey analysis did not think the Parish needs more housing.

If yes, please tick all that apply (Online version)

	%
For young people who would like to live in Brinklow Parish in the future	81
I have children who hope to live in Brinklow Parish in the future	16
I live in Brinklow Parish and would like to 'downsize' in Brinklow Parish in the future	24
I live in Brinklow Parish and would like to 'upsized' in Brinklow Parish in the future	11
I believe the Parish needs a larger population to encourage good facilities	46
I want to see more rental properties in the Parish	24
N=	37

Over three quarters (81%) of those online respondents who felt the Parish needs more housing stated this should be 'For young people who would like to live in Brinklow Parish in the future'.

Do you think the Parish needs more housing? Please tick all that apply (Paper Based Version)

	%
No more housing required	46
For young people who would like to live in Brinklow Parish in the future	47
I have children who hope to live in Brinklow Parish in the future	12
I live in Brinklow Parish and would like to 'downsize' in Brinklow Parish in the future	14
I live in Brinklow Parish and would like to 'upsized' in Brinklow Parish in the future	5
I believe the Parish needs a larger population to encourage good facilities	14
I want to see more rental properties in the Parish	7
N=	111

47% of paper-based survey respondents indicated that the Parish needs more housing 'For young people who would like to live in Brinklow Parish in the future', whilst 46% stated 'No more housing required'.

3.3 How many more houses do you think the Parish needs in the next 15-20 years? Online Version

	%
1-10 houses	0
11-20 houses	3
21-50 houses	43
51-100 houses	24
101-150 houses	14
More than 150 houses	16
N=	37

43% of respondents in the online survey indicated that they felt '21-50 houses' were needed for the Parish over the next 15-20 years.

How many more houses do you think the Parish needs in the next 15-20 years? (Paper-Based Version)

	%
No more houses	30
0-10 houses	11
11-20 houses	17
21-50 houses	26
51-100 houses	12
101-150 houses	3
More than 150 houses	2
N=	106

30% of paper-based survey respondents stated in terms of how many more houses they think the Parish needs in the next 15-20 years, there should be ‘No more houses’.

3.4 What are your views on the size of any further housing developments in the Parish over the next 15-20 years? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Garden infill development	16	33	20	15	16	176
Infill, small plots of one or two houses	30	49	7	8	7	181
Small developments (10-15 house plots)	21	37	6	21	16	175
Medium developments (16-50 houses)	7	17	6	29	41	174
Large developments (more than 50 houses)	6	5	1	19	69	168
Conversion or change of use of existing buildings or previously developed (brownfield) sites	23	47	15	9	6	175

In terms of the size of any further housing developments in the Parish over the next 15-20 years, respondents were clear that ‘Large developments (more than 50 houses)’ were not wanted with 88% either stating ‘Strongly Disagree’ (69%) or ‘Disagree’ (19%).

79% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (30%) or ‘Agreed’ (49%) that any further housing development should be ‘Infill, small plots of one or two houses’ whilst 70% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (23%) or ‘Agreed’ (47%) that these should be ‘Conversion or change of use of existing buildings or previously developed (brownfield) sites’.

3.5 Are any more of the following housing types required? (Please tick one option per row)

	Yes %	No %	N=
Flats/ apartments	26	74	178
Bungalows	59	41	174
Detached houses	39	61	174
Semi-detached houses	60	39	174
Terraced housing	43	57	173
Large/ luxury houses	14	86	173
Agricultural conversions	55	45	169
Affordable starter homes for 100% purchase	64	36	178
Affordable homes for part rent/ part buy	48	52	178
Social housing through housing association	28	72	174
Sheltered housing for the elderly (a group with a warden)	66	34	179
Short/ medium term rental properties: Buy to let and investment properties	14	86	174

86% of respondents did not think any more ‘Large/ luxury’ houses were required in the Parish and the same number stating ‘Short/ medium term rental properties: Buy to let and investment properties’ were not required.

‘Sheltered housing through housing association’ (66%), ‘Affordable starter homes for 100% purchase’ (46%), ‘Semi-detached houses’ (60%) and ‘Bungalows’ (59%) were classed as the housing types required.

**3.6 If new properties are to be built in the Parish, what design features would you support?
(Please tick one option per row)**

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Dwellings of appropriate size and character for neighbouring area	67	29	3	1	1	181
Low Energy considerations	48	39	11	2	1	176
Unobtrusive solar panels	33	37	21	6	3	176
Brick/ stone fascias and decorative chimneys	28	33	33	2	2	178
Wooden beams	20	23	49	6	2	178
Coloured finish e.g. painted rendering	12	16	47	17	8	177
'Modern' design	7	18	35	22	18	176
Off road parking	61	33	4	1	1	184
Garage	27	33	36	3	2	177
Other	25	12	58	0	4	24

96% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (67%) or 'Agreed' (29%) that if new properties were to be built they would support 'Dwellings of appropriate size and character for the neighbouring area'. 94% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' (61%) or 'Agreed' (33%) with 'Off road parking' as a design feature they would support and 87% 'Strongly Agreed' (48%) or 'Agreed' (39%) with 'Low Energy considerations'.

**3.7 What features below do you support for new housing developments in the Parish?
(Please tick one option per row)**

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Mixed property types and size	37	39	10	8	6	180
Green spaces	59	33	6	2	1	177
Green areas for wildlife	62	29	7	2	1	179
Tree planting	65	27	6	2	1	177
Shrubs and hedges	63	28	7	2	1	179
Dedicated cycle paths	31	30	29	7	3	173
Pavements for pedestrians	62	34	2	1	1	180
Developments are connected by pathways to enable walking through, rather than just cul-de-sacs	35	35	21	6	3	178
Other	35	6	59	0	0	17

96% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (62%) or ‘Agreed’ (34%) with ‘Pavements for pedestrians’ as a design feature of any new housing development in the Parish.

In terms of environmental features on new housing developments in the Parish over 90% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ or ‘Agreed’ with ‘Tree planting’ (92%), ‘Green spaces’ (92%), ‘Green areas for wildlife’ (91%) and ‘Shrubs and hedges’ (91%).

Section 4: Business

4.1 Do you currently own your own Business(es)

	%
Yes	18
No	82
N=	206

82% of respondents were not Business Owners.

4.2 From where do you operate your Business(es)

	%
Home	76
Other premises in the Parish	5
Other premises outside the Parish	26
Other (please specify)	5
N=	38

Over three quarters (76%) of respondents who owned a Businesses operated from 'Home.'

4.3 What sort of Business Development do you think should be encouraged within the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Home working	33	48	16	2	0	194
Tourism and leisure	11	35	25	22	8	196
Office based business	7	24	34	23	11	193
Retail	12	36	20	24	9	195
Small scale industry	4	24	21	32	19	188
Agricultural/ Food production	24	45	13	10	7	193
Service trades e.g. plumbers, electricians	18	51	21	8	4	193
Pubs/ cafes/ restaurants	27	46	12	10	5	196
Bank/ Financial services	9	23	29	27	11	195
Education e.g. Private tutors	8	36	41	10	5	192
Nursery	17	47	22	9	5	195
Online/ Web Based	18	38	37	5	2	194
Creative industries	16	36	35	9	4	192
Veterinary services	10	34	41	11	4	193
Additional health (Dentist, Optician etc.)	18	36	28	13	5	196
Other	35	13	39	4	9	23

In terms of the type of Business Development which should be encouraged in the Parish 81% either 'Strongly Agreed' (33%) or 'Agreed' (48%) with 'Home working', 73% 'Pubs/cafes/ restaurants', 69% 'Agricultural/ Food Production', 69% 'Service trades e.g. plumbers, electricians' and 64% 'Nursery'.

4.4 What are the current barriers to Business Development within the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Traffic flow (congestion)	49	25	14	9	3	197
Parking	56	23	15	5	1	193
Transport links	17	27	28	25	4	187
Suitable business premises	20	40	31	9	0	187
Access to adequate broadband	36	23	19	17	5	191
Access to adequate mobile network	28	23	27	19	3	189
Other	42	8	50	0	0	24

Transport issues were classed as a current barrier to Business Development within the Parish with 79% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreeing’ (56%) or ‘Agreeing’ (23%) with ‘Parking’ and 74% ‘Traffic flow (congestion)’ (‘Strongly Agree’ (49%)/ ‘Agree’ (25%).

Section 5: Tourism

5.1 Would you like to see more Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish?

	%
Yes	50
No	50
N=	195

There was an even split between whether or not respondents wanted to see more 'Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish'.

5.2 How would you like to see more Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
More events/ entertainment	32	57	6	4	1	101
More holiday lets	5	26	33	33	4	98
More B and B accommodation	14	47	25	13	2	102
More Hotel or Inn accommodation	5	31	37	23	4	96
Better marketing of the Parish	28	52	18	1	1	99
Promotion of local countryside, footpaths and historic features	44	53	4	0	0	101
Enhancement of the rural aspects of the village	46	46	7	2	0	101
Interpretation Boards to guide visitors regarding the history and countryside on offer	39	50	10	1	0	99
Tourist information kiosk or visitor centre	18	29	27	26	1	101
Larger village car park	32	39	10	16	3	98
Campsite	12	14	21	36	16	99
Mini Marina	15	23	25	27	9	99
Other	24	12	59	0	6	17

When asked how they would ‘like to see more Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish’, 97% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (44%) or ‘Agreed’ (53%) with ‘Promotion of local countryside, footpaths and historic features’. 92% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (46%) and ‘Agreed’ (46%) with ‘Enhancement of the rural aspects of the village’ and 82% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (32%) or ‘Agreed’ (57%) with ‘More events/ entertainment’. Respondents (89%) also indicated that they would like to see Tourists and Visitors attracted to the Parish with ‘Interpretation Boards to guide visitors regarding the history and countryside on offer’. (‘Strongly Agree’ (39%) and ‘Agree’ (50%)’.

5.3 If you would not like to see more Tourists and Visitors being attracted to the Parish please tell us why? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Traffic issues	76	19	1	2	2	95
Car parking issues	78	18	0	2	2	95
Crowding in the village	60	27	7	4	1	95
Impact on countryside and wildlife	58	27	10	4	1	95
Need to extend opening hours of local facilities (such as the shop)	19	13	48	19	1	94
Other	40	0	47	7	7	15

From those respondents who do not want to see more ‘Tourists and Visitors being attracted to the Parish’, 96% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (78%) or ‘Agreed’ (18%) that this was due to ‘Car parking issues’ whilst continuing on the transport theme 95% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (76%) or ‘Agreed’ (19%) that this was due to ‘Traffic issues’. 87% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (60%) or ‘Agreed’ (27%) that they were concerned about ‘Crowding in the village’ and 85% ‘Strongly Agreed’ (58%) or ‘Agreed’ (27%) in terms of ‘Impact on countryside and wildlife’.

Section 6: Community Facilities

6.1 How often do you use the following key facilities in the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Daily %	More than once a week %	Weekly %	Monthly %	Less than once a month %	Never %	N=
Shop	13	41	23	16	5	2	204
Churches	0	4	7	10	48	31	198
Post Office	2	34	31	22	9	1	201
Hairdressers	0	2	3	33	18	44	198
Surgery	1	3	7	39	45	5	202
Pharmacy	0	4	9	43	38	5	203
Food outlets	1	11	21	32	27	8	201
Community Hall	0	0	9	16	52	22	201
Scout HQ	0	3	3	3	15	77	199
Playing field and facilities	18	12	18	12	19	21	200
Pubs	2	17	16	27	25	14	203
Allotments	2	3	0	1	3	90	203
Primary schools	16	1	0	0	1	82	201
Nursery	5	2	1	0	1	92	199
Other	25	8	25	0	0	42	12

In terms of community facilities which are used, 77% indicated that they used the 'Shop' at least once a week with 67% using the 'Post Office' the same frequency.

**6.2 How would you rate the importance of retaining the following facilities in the Parish?
(Please tick one option per row)**

	Very important %	Important %	No opinion %	Not important %	Not at all important %	N=
Shop	90	9	1	0	0	202
Churches	58	23	13	4	4	199
Post Office	91	7	1	0	1	201
Hairdressers	49	31	16	2	3	200
Surgery	93	6	1	1	0	201
Pharmacy	92	6	2	1	0	201
Food outlets	66	24	5	2	2	202
Community Hall	60	30	7	1	1	201
Scout HQ	45	30	20	1	4	200
Playing field and facilities	77	18	3	1	1	202
Pubs	64	26	5	3	1	201
Allotments	33	37	23	3	4	200
Primary schools	62	27	8	1	1	201
Nurseries	55	33	9	1	1	201
Other	70	0	30	0	0	10

In terms of retaining facilities in the Parish, the key theme to emerge from the quantitative feedback was that it was important. For example, over 90% felt that it was either ‘Very Important’ or ‘Important’ to retain the ‘Surgery’ (99%), ‘Shop’ (99%), ‘Post Office’ (98%), ‘Pharmacy’ (98%), ‘Playing field and facilities’ (95%), ‘Churches’ (91%), ‘Community Hall’ (90%), ‘Food outlets’ (90%) and ‘Pubs’ (90%).

6.3 Which of the following community facilities do you think the Parish should aspire to provide? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Dedicated gym/ leisure centre	8	22	21	32	17	197
Larger village hall	7	16	33	34	10	193
24-hour cash point	24	34	21	15	6	196
Mini supermarket	11	27	15	31	16	195
Temporary cinema	4	21	21	29	24	192
More facilities for older children	20	47	23	4	6	198
Theatre for live entertainment	8	18	32	25	18	194
Temporary stage facilities for travelling players	6	25	37	18	14	195
Soft play facilities	5	23	44	15	13	192
Churches improved and used more creatively, e.g. concerts, plays	27	42	19	8	5	198

In terms of aspirations for community facilities, 69% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (27%) or ‘Agreed’ (42%) with ‘Churches improved and used more creatively, e.g. concerts, plays’ and 67% ‘More facilities for older children’ (‘Strongly Agree’ 20% / ‘Agree’ 47%). 58% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (24%) or ‘Agreed’ (34%) with the Parish aspiring to provide a ‘24-hour cash point’.

6.4 Are there any other community facilities that you would like to see built in Parish?

Three respondents cited the need for a Library to be built within the Parish.

Section 7: Conservation and Heritage

7.1 Which of the following statements concerning conservation and heritage do you agree/disagree with? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Conservation Area status is important to preserve both the building and the mature trees for current and future generations	77	21	1	1	1	199
The Conservation Area should be extended to provide greater protection to the Parish	56	23	12	7	2	197
Mature trees outside the Conservation Area should be protected	58	31	7	4	1	198
The Parish should actively protect unique local historic features, footpaths and countryside	76	23	1	0	1	199
Ridge and furrow fields should be preserved	62	22	13	1	1	197
The character and architecture of the older buildings in the village is an important feature of the Parish	73	24	2	0	1	199
Historic buildings in the Parish need to be maintained and (where appropriate) renovated sympathetically	73	25	1	0	1	199

Conservation and Heritage was important to respondents with over 90% either ‘Strongly Agreeing’ or ‘Agreeing’ to the following statements; ‘The Parish should actively protect unique local historic features, footpaths and countryside’ (99%), ‘Conservation Area status is important to preserve both the building and the mature trees for current and future generations’ (98%), ‘Historic buildings in the Parish need to be maintained (where appropriate) renovated sympathetically’ (98%) and ‘The character and architecture of the older buildings in the village is an important feature of the Parish’ (97%).

Section 8: Green Spaces and Environment

8.1 Which of the following would you like to see improved? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Trees and hedgerows to provide wildlife habitats and enhance the rural nature of the Parish	59	31	8	1	1	197
Allotments	14	39	41	2	4	197
Air quality (as a result of vehicle traffic) in the Parish	51	34	12	3	1	197
Traffic noise	60	24	12	2	1	197
Traffic vibration	60	24	14	2	1	197
Wildlife sites e.g. Old Canal, the Tump	60	33	6	0	1	198
Existing green spaces within the village	58	34	5	2	1	196
Existing ponds for the benefit of frogs, toads and newts	51	35	12	1	1	198
Open natural landscape green belt	57	32	6	3	1	196
Existing off-road rights of way, footpaths	55	34	8	2	2	196

In terms of 'Green Spaces' and 'Environment' that respondents would like to see improved 90% or over 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with the following; 'Wildlife sites e.g. Old Canal, the Tump' (93%), 'Existing green spaces within the village' (92%) and 'Trees and hedgerows to provide wildlife habitats and enhance the rural nature of the Parish' (90%)

8.2 Which of the following would you like to see promoted in the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Wind energy schemes	10	19	17	27	27	192
Solar energy schemes	23	30	19	16	11	192
Reprocessing of garden waste, potentially via new facilities in the Parish	21	34	16	16	13	196
Extend existing off-road rights of way to horse riders and cyclists	22	37	19	10	11	196
Wildlife meadows	46	45	8	1	1	197
Planting more trees	52	40	7	1	2	196

In regard to ‘Green Space and Environment’ schemes that respondents would like to see promoted 92% either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (52%) or ‘Agreed’ (40%) with ‘Planting more trees’ and 91% ‘Wildlife meadows’. (46% Strongly Agreed/ 45% Agreed).

8.3 Please state any concerns or suggestions you have about the existing environment

Issues with the ‘Quarry’ especially air pollution were cited by a number of respondents, comments included;

- ❖ *I am very concerned about the volume of traffic on the roads through the village from the bio-digester. I believe it breaches planning restrictions. I am also concerned about the smell that comes from the quarry area.*
- ❖ *Too much traffic for digester, the landscape is awful by the quarry and it smells bad*
- ❖ *What is the noise I hear at night? Constant rumbling- suspect quarry / digester plant*
- ❖ *The smell of waste being ripped at the quarry can be repugnant*
- ❖ *Too much traffic for digester, the landscape is awful by the quarry and it smells bad*
- ❖ *Brinklow quarry - too many vehicles going in and out. The smell is horrendous and the fly problem is getting worse. Planning conditions set for the quarry should be adhered to - the smell needs investigation*
- ❖ *Last year we have had lots of flies, our summer was spoilt. This year it has been bad with extra tractors and horrible smell from recycling at the quarry. Makes you feel sick sometimes.*

Issues with ‘Traffic’ were also cited;

❖ Traffic is horrendous through the village particularly Lutterworth Road it is constant and too many speed through, we need traffic calming and weight limits.
❖ I am very concerned about the volume of traffic on the roads through the village from the bio-digester. I believe it breaches planning restrictions. I am also concerned about the smell that comes from the quarry area.
❖ Concern over traffic through village. Size of lorries and amount of vibration damage to building. Damage caused to erosion of roads and pavements and impact on drainage.
❖ Traffic impact on village with 100 houses. Loss of green belt land unfair distribution of the 100 houses other Revel villages could have some
❖ Just the traffic really, in particular the industrial traffic which is constantly through the village, although these are often tractors and trailers they are not agricultural really as are not for farming food, they are feeding an industrial plant. The tractors are far too big and there are far, far too many. A limit needs to be suggested per day and if found in breach prosecutions should be made. (Esp. As diesel fumes have been proven carcinogenic!)

Section 9: Infrastructure and Connectivity

9.1 Does your home have Broadband access to the Internet?

	%
Yes	94
No	6
N=	198

94% of respondents had Broadband access at their home.

9.2 Do you need your home to have Broadband access to the Internet?

	%
Yes	17
No	83
N=	12

87% of those who did not have Broadband access at their home indicated that they did not need this service.

9.3 Are you happy with the speed of your home's Broadband?

	%
Yes	58
No	42
N=	206

58% of respondents were happy with the speed of their Broadband service.

9.4 If No, how much would you like to see your home's Broadband improved?

The key theme to emerge from the qualitative comments was the need to improve the 'Speed' of Broadband;

- ❖ *Having had 10 years of extremely slow speed we have now had an increase to 26-31Mb/s which is about the same as we could get in Warwick a decade ago. Whilst the current speeds are OK for now it is not sufficient for the future and technologies that are becoming available. Unless there is a plan to increase speeds the area becomes less desirable for businesses or those that wish to work from home. We are currently far from future proof with the current speeds and unless there are plans to improve connectivity the area becomes less attractive to those that wish to embrace the future and its possibilities*

❖ Would like to receive the BT OpenReach advertised maximum speed . Currently variable speeds achieved which are well below this, potentially due to copper connection from cabinet.
❖ Ours is so slow so quadruple the speed as a minimum
❖ It is extremely slow at the moment would like it improved to a speed that would be say as good as in the towns
❖ Would like to see faster and more efficient broadband
❖ 100% Faster

9.5 Do you have a mobile phone?

	%
Yes	97
No	3
N=	219

97% of respondents own a mobile phone.

9.6 What is the name of your Network Provider

21% of respondents stated that 'Vodafone' were their mobile phone network provider.

9.7 Are you happy with your mobile phone signal throughout the Parish?

	%
Yes	63
No	37
N=	188

Nearly two thirds (63%) of respondents were happy with their mobile phone signal.

9.8 If No, how would you like to see your mobile phone signal improved throughout the Parish?

The key theme to emerge was the need to make the mobile phone signal ‘stronger’.

❖ <i>Better signal and reception</i>
❖ <i>Stronger signal</i>
❖ <i>More consistent signal</i>
❖ <i>So that I can use my phone in my house</i>

9.9 Would you support the installation of a mobile phone mast?

	%
Yes	44
No	56
N=	192

Over half of respondents (56%) would not support the installation of a mobile phone mast.

9.10 Do you think more litter bins are needed in the Parish?

	%
Yes	60
No	40
N=	196

60% of respondents would like to see more litter bins in the Parish.

9.11 Where would you like to see any new litter bins located?

In terms of where respondents would like to see new litter bins located, 19% of the qualitative comments referred to ‘Coventry Road, 11% ‘Broad Street’ and 8% ‘Playing Fields.’

9.12 Do you think more bins for dog waste are needed in the Parish?

	%
Yes	60
No	40
N=	190

60% of respondents indicated that more bins for dog waste are needed in the Parish.

9.13 Where would you like to see any new dog waste bins located?

16% of comments cited 'Footpaths', including;

❖ <i>Adjacent to litter bins in Green Lane and adjacent to footpath that crosses Lutterworth Road</i>
❖ <i>At the footpaths which lead on to/off the canal</i>
❖ <i>At the entry and exit points to footpaths but not near houses as the stench from the bins in the summer is not pleasant for residents.</i>
❖ <i>Where the footpaths intersect the Lutterworth Road, and by Peddlar's Bridge/Smeaton Lane exit</i>
❖ <i>Where footpaths meet main roads</i>
❖ <i>playing field and footpaths</i>
❖ <i>On all footpaths</i>
❖ <i>Access and excess points of public footpaths</i>
❖ <i>Along footpath areas</i>
❖ <i>On every footpath and off road rights of way</i>

17% of those who wanted to see new dog waste bins in the Parish referred to 'Coventry Road'.

9.14 Do you think street lighting in the Parish needs improving?

	%
Yes	36
No	64
N=	160

Nearly two thirds (64%) of respondent did not think that the street lighting in the Parish need improving.

9.15 Where would you like to see street lighting improved?

Of those respondents who would like to see more street lighting in the Parish 26% stated ‘Green Lane’ and 20% ‘Heath Lane’.

9.16 Do you think there is a crime and vandalism problem in the Parish?

	%
Yes	42
No	58
N=	181

58% of respondents did not think that there was a crime and vandalism problem in the Parish.

9.17 If yes, what action(s) would you like to see reduce crime and vandalism in the Parish?

A number of comments cited ‘Police presence’;

❖ <i>Police presence, CCTV, street lights on when dark on all roads.</i>
❖ <i>use of CCTV and facilities to encourage a police presence in the village, NPR cameras on all roads in and out of the village. And the public use of the stock</i>
❖ <i>Stronger police presence</i>
❖ <i>More visible police presence</i>
❖ <i>More police presence. We have so tried to maintain a neighbourhood watch over the years. Never lasts. The pressing problem seems that people don't always report suspicious activity . The webpages are excellent for this as shown several times last year. Do all older and vulnerable people have access to computers or training in their use for this?</i>
❖ <i>Crime and vandalism happens occasionally. It isn't much different, it has always happened in the village. More police presence needed</i>
❖ <i>Greater police presence</i>

'CCTV' was the other key theme to emerge;

❖ CCTV
❖ CCTV around village and car recognition registration on main access roads
❖ Police presence, CCTV, street lights on when dark on all roads.
❖ Ban older children from the child's play area and protect it with CCTV
❖ use of CCTV and facilities to encourage a police presence in the village, NPR cameras on all roads in and out of the village

9.18 Please use this space to comment on any other infrastructure and connectivity problems you have within the Parish.

A number of comments referred to issues with the 'Traffic'.

❖ The speed of traffic through the village is terrible. When the speed camera is there everyone flashes each other as a warning, therefore not giving a true picture of the problem.
❖ Need to reduce traffic speeds through village and Ell Lane, Eeasenhall Road then walking from canal at the Eeasenhall Bridge would be better
❖ traffic! Too fast too much heavy traffic coming through the village at speed
❖ Heavy traffic through the village
❖ Better speed control through the village

9.19 Please use this space to outline suggestions for any other infrastructure and connectivity future needs you have within the Parish.

A number of respondents referred to the need for 'more footpaths'.

❖ Footpath on Ell Lane Footpath on Green Lane
❖ I support the possible footpath from the canal to the top of Ell Lane. A new footpath entrance to the Tump, lower down Ell Lane, would take some pedestrians off part of the road, and provide an appealing route through the natural valley between the mounds.
❖ Foot path from the canal to the top of Ell Lane.
❖ Footpath from the canal to the top of Ell Lane. Footpath from the canal along the old arm into the village

Section 10: Transport

10.1 What is your main means of transport for each of the activities below?

	Car %	Motorcycle %	Taxi %	Bus %	Bicycle %	Walking %	None of these %	N=
Work	73	0	0	3	1	3	20	158
Leisure	77	1	0	6	2	15	0	175
Accessing Local Services	39	0	0	2	1	58	1	179

In terms of travelling to 'Work', 73% of respondents used the 'Car', whilst 77% used the same mode of transport for 'Leisure' activities.

When 'Accessing Local Services' 58% did so by 'Walking'.

10.2 How many vehicles does your household have?

	%
0	4
1	28
2	46
3	16
More than 3	6
N=	192

46% of respondents reported that their household had 'two' vehicles.

10.3 Are you able to park all your vehicles on your property?

	%
Yes	80
No	20
N=	183

80% of respondents stated that they were able to park all their vehicles on their property.

10.4 Is there sufficient public space near your property to safely park your vehicle?

	%
Yes	64
No	36
N=	39

From those respondents who could not park their vehicles at their property, 64% stated that there was sufficient public space near to their property where this was possible.

10.5 Do you think more public car parking space should be made available?

	%
Yes	65
No	35
N=	184

65% of respondents felt that more public car parking space should be made available.

10.6 Where would you like to see more car parking spaces? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Near the playing fields	32	46	15	6	2	116
Near St John the Baptist Church	17	39	29	11	5	111
Near the shops and food outlets on Broad Street	37	43	10	9	2	116
Near the allotments	7	24	53	14	1	107
Near the school	31	31	27	8	2	116
Near the cemetery	20	36	37	7	1	112
Other	27	0	64	0	10	11

From those respondents who would like to see more car parking spaces in the Parish, 80% either 'Strongly Agreed' (37%) or 'Agreed' (43%) with 'Near the shops and food outlets on Broad Street' and 78% 'Near the playing fields' (32% 'Strongly Agree'/ 46% 'Agree').

10.7 Do you drive to the community facilities/ shops in the Parish?

	%
Yes	26
No	74
N=	191

Nearly three quarters (74%) of respondents did not drive to the community facilities/ shops in the Parish.

10.8 How often do you drive to the community facilities/ shops in the Parish? (Please tick one option only)

	%
Daily	6
More than once a week	27
Weekly	37
Monthly	16
Less than once a month	10
Never	4
N=	51

From those respondents who drive to community facility/ shops in the Parish, 70% do so at least once a week.

10.5 Do you use public transport from and to the Parish?

	%
Yes	40
No	60
N=	191

Over half (60%) of respondents did not use public transport from and to the Parish.

10.10 How often do you use public transport? (Please tick one option per row)

	Daily %	More than once a week %	Weekly %	Monthly %	Less than once a month %	Never %	N=
For Work	5	2	2	6	6	80	64
For Leisure	0	7	10	25	48	11	73
For Access to Services	0	9	4	21	34	31	67
For Shopping	0	13	9	16	27	36	70
Other	0	8	8	23	46	15	13

From those respondents who used public transport, 22% did so at least once a week 'For Shopping'. 80% reported that they 'Never' used public transport for 'Work'.

10.11 Whether or not you use the services, how would you rate public transport in the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Very good %	Good %	No opinion %	Poor %	Very poor %	N=
Frequency of service	18	41	20	18	2	191
Number of stopping points	17	52	26	5	0	191
Bus shelter	8	32	29	27	5	191
Routes/ destinations available	9	47	29	13	2	186

69% of respondents rated the 'Number of stopping points' in the Parish as either 'Very Good' (17%) or 'Good' (52%), whilst 61% felt the 'Frequency of Service' was either 'Very Good' (19%) or 'Good' (42%). 57% of respondents rated 'Routes/ destinations available' as either 'Very Good' (11%) or 'Good' (46%).

10.12 Would you like an additional bus stop?

	%
Yes	13
No	87
N=	199

87% of respondents would not like to see an additional bus stop.

10.13 Where would you like an additional bus stop?

24% of those respondents who would like to see an additional bus stop stated 'Coventry Road' as the location.

10.14 Do you believe that there are problems with the roads in the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Volume of traffic too high	62	25	7	5	2	190
Speeding vehicles	73	20	2	4	1	192
Parking close to junctions	55	22	13	10	1	186
Car parking on the pavements	46	19	19	14	2	190
Low visibility	31	23	29	16	1	186
Narrowness of roads	20	17	27	32	3	182
HGV traffic	68	18	9	3	1	186

93% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (73%) or 'Agreed' (20%) that 'Speeding vehicles' were problematic in the Parish. 38% of these indicated that the issue was prevalent on 'Broad Street' whilst 22% stated 'Lutterworth Road'. In terms of time of day, 'Rush Hour/ Peak times' was the most common response.

87% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (25%) that the 'Volume of traffic was too high' in the Parish. 54% of those who provided a rating of either 'Strongly agree' or 'Agree', indicated that there was a problem with the volume of traffic being too high on 'Coventry Road' with 43% stating 'Broad Street'. When questioned on the time of day the traffic volume was problematic 26% referred to 'Rush Hour', 21% 'Morning' and 12% 'Peak'.

86% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (68%) or 'Agreed' (18%) that 'HGV traffic' is a problem in the Parish with 45% of comments referring to 'Coventry Road' and 37% 'Broad Street'. When asked the time that HGV traffic was a problem a number of comments cited 'All the time'.

77% of respondents ‘Strongly Agreed’ (55%) or ‘Agreed’ (22%) that ‘Parking close to junctions’ was problematic in the Parish. 36% commented that this problem was prevalent on ‘Coventry Road’, 35% ‘Heath Lane’ and 34% ‘Broad Street’. When questioned on when ‘Parking close to junctions’ was an issue, a number of comments referred to the ‘School Times’.

❖ <i>Can be any time and any day. Though school run does add to this problem</i>
❖ <i>school drop off and collection times</i>
❖ <i>School run times</i>
❖ <i>School run</i>
❖ <i>School Bus pick up and drop offs</i>
❖ <i>school times</i>

65% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (46%) or ‘Agreed’ (19%) that ‘Car parking on the pavements’ was a problem in the Parish, when asked the location of this issue 30% reported ‘Coventry Road’ and 25% ‘Broad Street. 10% indicated that the problem of cars parking on the pavements was ‘Evenings’ and 9% ‘Anytime.’

54% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (31%) or ‘Agreed’ (23%) that ‘Low visibility’ was a problem in the Parish. 52% of this cohort referred to ‘Broad Street’ as the location for the problem;

❖ <i>I have to pull out of a courtyard onto the main road in Broad Street and I find it difficult to see past the parked cars. I also find it difficult when you are pulling out of broad street onto Coventry road</i>
❖ <i>Turning out of Broad Street it can be difficult to see Right.</i>
❖ <i>Junction of Broad Street with Coventry Road</i>
❖ <i>Junction of broad Street Coventry rd and heath lane</i>
❖ <i>Barr Lane into Broad Street</i>
❖ <i>Broad Street double parking</i>
❖ <i>At the bottom of Broad Street</i>
❖ <i>Turning out of Broad Street and onto Coventry Road</i>

In terms of the time when ‘Low visibility’ is a problem, the key theme to emerge was ‘All the time’.

10.16 Do you have any other comments in term of the usage of the roads in the Parish?

Available in Appendix Document

**10.17 Would you support any of the following measures to control traffic in the Parish?
(Please tick one option per row)**

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Traffic lights	26	28	15	24	7	177
Roundabout(s)	22	20	20	27	11	171
Speed bumps	23	23	6	31	18	171
Pinch points (chicanes) as in Pailton	34	30	7	15	14	178
20mph zones near the school	55	27	8	8	2	180
20mph zones near the shops	46	26	10	13	5	177
20mph zones along Ell Lane	49	21	13	12	4	178

82% of respondents either ‘Strongly agreed’ (55%) or ‘Agreed’ (27%) that ‘20 mph zones near the school’ are needed and 72% that ‘20 mph zones near the shops’ are needed. (‘Strongly Agree’ 46% or ‘Agree’ 26%). 70% or ‘Strongly agreed’ (49%) or ‘Agreed’ (21%) that ‘20 mph zones along Ell Lane’ are needed.

10.18 Are there any other traffic related measures you would suggest?

A number of comments referred to ‘Speed Cameras’;

❖ We basically need some speed cameras installing, then if speed limit is lowered to 20 miles per hour this would solve a lot of our problems with noise and vibrations particularly with the 100's of huge industrial tractors passing through daily. It would be even better if proceeds from any fines could then be used for village needs, e.g. Church restoration/ helping those in need etc.
❖ Speed cameras at all 3 entry points- activated to give speeding tickets
❖ Automatic cameras e.g. Coventry Road to record speeding motorists, estimated average speed between 60-70mph leaving the village.
❖ Average speed cameras
❖ Speed cameras as 20mph won't be heeded as 30 isn't.
❖ Permanent proper speed cameras on Lutterworth Road, The Crescent, Broad Street

10.19 Do you believe there are problems with pavements in the Parish? (Please tick one option per row)

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	No opinion %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	N=
Lack of pavement	11	22	32	31	3	179
Poor state of repair	17	18	31	32	3	177
Narrowness	13	21	30	33	3	175
Not suitable for wheelchairs/ pushchairs/ wheeled walking aids	19	20	37	21	3	173

39% of respondents felt that pavements in the Parish were ‘Not suitable for wheelchairs/ pushchairs/ wheeled walking aids’. (19% ‘Strongly Agree’ or 20% ‘Agree’).

35% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (17%) or ‘Agreed’ (18%) that there was a ‘Poor state of repair’ in the Parish.

34% of respondents either ‘Strongly Agreed’ (11%) or ‘Agreed’ (23%) that there was a ‘Lack of pavement’ in the Parish. 28% of this cohort stated that there was a problem in ‘Green Lane.’

36% of respondents either ‘Disagreed’ (33%) or ‘Strongly Disagreed’ (3%) that there was a problem with ‘Narrowness’ or pavements in the Parish.

10.21 Do you have any other comments concerning pavements in the Parish?

A number of comments cited the issue of 'cars parking on the pavements' impacting on access for disabled people;

<i>❖ stop cars parking on pavement wheelchairs/prams unable to pass safely</i>
<i>❖ Stop parking of cars half on pavements</i>
<i>❖ Stop cars parking on pavement - more fines issued. Enforcement of parking laws.</i>
<i>❖ I don't think the pavements (or at least the ones I use) are too narrow however they are often compromised by they way people park. With parked vehicles blocking or partially blocking payments there are issues for those using pushchairs and wheelchairs.</i>
<i>❖ The pavements are fine if inconsiderate, obnoxious drivers do not park on them!</i>
<i>❖ Stop people parking on them!!!</i>
<i>❖ Too many people park across them.</i>

10.22 Do you have any comments on how disabled access could be improved in the Parish?

A number of comments cited the issue of 'cars parking on the pavements' impacting on access for disabled people;

<i>❖ Too many cars parked on pavements</i>
<i>❖ Reduce parking on pavements</i>
<i>❖ Not able to walk on right side of road going out of village on Lutterworth Road, cant walk down to Walkers Terrace</i>
<i>❖ Hedges encroaching due to lack of maintenance. Hedges migrating from their original boundaries, making footpath use very dangerous</i>
<i>❖ Along Coventry rd, because of cars parked across the pavement. If pushing a wheelchair you have to go on the road which is dangerous, also hardly and dips in the kerbs to cross the roads. Until you actually have to try to negotiate a wheelchair it is unlikely that anyone would notice how frustrating and difficult this is.</i>
<i>❖ Stop parking on the pavement Widen paths where needed Put paths down where needed</i>

10.23 Do you have any other comments on anything at all, related to the Neighbourhood Plan or the Parish?

A number of comments referred to the 'issue of HGV traffic' in the Parish;

<i>❖ Traffic impact from Magna Park is becoming a serious issue, both due to traffic volume and early start / late finishing</i>
<i>❖ I feel that a bus shelter set back from the road along Coventry rd would be of benefit as when standing waiting for the rugby bus the traffic is really close to the people waiting. It would also help if traffic , especially the large trucks went with the speed limit from Aston's farm</i>
<i>❖ HGV traffic should be diverted away from the village. The roads are not suitable for these huge 6 axle plus vehicles. Magna park traffic should not use the Fosse</i>
<i>❖ increased tractor and lorry traffic.</i>
<i>❖ No more business development at highwood farm/quarry. Already far too much HGV traffic</i>

'Issues with new housing developments' were referred to;

<p>❖ Very concerned about the proposed huge increase in houses which would overwhelm the village in so many ways.</p>
<p>❖ The Lutterworth Road site is not good for new houses, being so far from the main village facilities. I expect the Parish Council to fight strongly to minimise the number built, and their adverse visual impact. I would have liked the PC to have shown more Leadership during the site selection process - the public will inevitably go quiet once development is not close to them, and any shock has passed. This does not make the development right. Both the immediate planning process and the new NDP need to help minimise development of this site. If not, there is surely an incentive to pursue legal challenge - hopefully the integrity of those involved will make this unnecessary!</p>
<p>❖ The new houses in last few years are too big for area and too expensive for most people who already live in the village</p>
<p>❖ I don't think where the housing is proposed is a suitable site. Ell Lane and Smeaton Lane will be under lots of pressure with extra traffic because that will be used as cut through and Broad Street is already heavily used.....</p>
<p>❖ Brinklow born and bred. We acknowledge that a community needs to grow and that we are compelled to have 100 more houses. In such a lovely busy community it I hard to see the increase in population will safely integrate without some prejudice. Current residents will feel troubled by the upheaval. Throughout the process those affected must feel valued and part of the process making it easier for all. We would like to see some properly managed sheltered accomm. That the new builds do not become further speculative properties for developers. Thought for younger first-time buyers. Maybe some properties with a covenant ensuring that the properties are not over extended or sold on to profit but remain affordable for younger people or even older residents.</p>