

BRIGHTON AND HOVE PLACE SURVEY 2008: FINDINGS AND COMPARATOR RESULTS

1. Summary

This report presents findings from the 2008 Place Survey and compares them to the performance of other Local Authorities. Further reports are available from the Analysis and Research Team on initial headline findings, and a comparison of satisfaction levels amongst different demographic groups and areas of the city.

1. Summary
2. Key messages
3. Comparative results
4. What are we doing about...?
5. What information do we now have from the Place Survey
6. Issues to note
7. The Place Survey background information
8. Appendix 1: People, place and satisfaction: the national context

Rankings are based on results for 352 Local Authorities and 55 Unitary Authorities.

Typically unitary authorities cover towns or cities which are large enough to function independently of county or other regional administration. For this reason they tend to be more urban than the comparators for all Local Authorities taken together where significant rural areas will be included. This partly explains the shift in comparative performance for some indicators when compared against all LAs or against Unitaries only.

2. Key messages

2.1. Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live is high at 86%. This figure ranks us as 9th amongst other Unitaries and in the second quartile for all local authorities. This indicator has improved in comparison to 2006 when it stood at 72%.

2.2. Overall satisfaction with the way the Local Authority runs things stands at 45.2% ranking us 18th amongst other Unitaries. The average for Unitaries is 42% and England is 45.4% (ranking 182).

What does this mean?

Our figure is higher than the average for Unitaries and close to the English average. Nationally since 2000 satisfaction levels have been falling with the average then standing at 65% (55% in 2003). Brighton and Hove has not followed this trend with our score staying relatively

steady (49% in 2000). This means that we have gradually improved in relation to other Local Authorities.

2.3. Approximately one-third of people (32%) feel that the council offers value for money which is a better performance than the average for other Unitary Authorities (30% satisfaction). This performance is in line with the figure for England (33%) and the South-East (34%). B&HCC ranks 23rd amongst other Unitaries and 213rd in comparison to all other Local Authorities

2.4. In some areas (notably anti-social behaviour), Brighton and Hove has improved its performance and satisfaction levels although our comparative performance has not shown such a positive improvement. People feeling that those being drunk or rowdy in public places is a problem has fallen from 49% in 2006 to 34% and people who think dealing or using drugs is a problem in their local area has fallen from 56% in 2006 to 30%.

Similarly, there has been improvement in some areas of refuse and recycling satisfaction levels whilst our comparative performance has not fully reflected this. Satisfaction with refuse collection has risen from 68% in 2006 to 70% and satisfaction with keeping land free of litter has risen to 55% from 53% in 2006.

2.5. Best performance when compared to all LAs is in relation to transport information (2nd), parks and open spaces (14th) and cultural services (6th in satisfaction with theatres and concert halls).

In comparison to Unitary Authorities only we rank first for people agreeing that their local area is one where people from different backgrounds get on well together; people wishing to be more involved in local decision making; and satisfaction with local theatres and concert halls.

2.6. We have a high ranking (4th amongst all Local Authorities and 1st amongst Unitaries) for residents who would like to be more involved in decisions which affect the local area and this has risen from 34% in 2006 to 38%.

2.7. Areas where we do less well comparatively: police and public services seeking views about anti-social behaviour and crime; feeling informed about what to do in the event of a large scale emergency; belonging to the immediate neighbourhood. In terms of looking at a service area for which we have detailed data, refuse and recycling performs least well, despite improving satisfaction levels within the city in recent years. We have not been provided with comparative data on

some service areas and partners outside of the Local Authority and it seems unlikely that this will be made available.

3. Comparative Results

The table below lists results for all National Indicators and our comparison to all other Local Authorities. They are ranked in terms of our comparative performance to all Local Authorities. Those listed first are those where we compare most positively. The rankings take into account the fact that questions differ as to whether a higher or lower score is more positive.

Table 1: Comparison to all Local Authorities

INDICATOR	South East	England	B&HCC	Rank out of 352 Authorities in England
	%	%	%	
% satisfied with local transport information	44.3	48	69.5	2
Generally speaking would you like to be more involved in the decisions that affect your local area	26.7	26.6	37.7	4
% satisfied with theatres/concert/halls	46.7	43.2	72.8	6
% satisfied with museums/galleries	40.8	41.5	62.9	10
% satisfied with local bus services	48.9	55.2	76.1	11
% satisfied with parks and open spaces	72.6	68.5	82.1	14
% who agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together (NI 1)	78.9	76.4	86.1	14
% satisfied with libraries	70.2	69	73.3	67
% who agree that in their local area parents take enough responsibility for the behaviour of their children (NI 22)	30.9	29.6	36.0	67
% who say their health is good or very good (NI 119)	79.3	75.8	79.8	89

% who are satisfied with their local area as a place to live (NI 5)	82.8	79.7	85.9	102
% who think there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area (NI 23)	28.1	31.2	24.8	111
% who have given unpaid help at least once per month over the last 12 months (NI 6)	24.8	23.2	24.3	151
% who have been involved in decisions that affect the local area in the past 12 months (NI 3)	14.2	14	14.5	153
% who agree that the police and other local public services are successfully dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime in their local area (NI 21)	26.2	26.3	26.5	174
% people aged 65 and over who are satisfied with both home and neighbourhood (NI 138)	85.5	83.9	85.7	177

INDICATOR	South East %	England %	B&HCC %	Rank out of 352 Authorities in England
very or fairly satisfied with how council runs things	47	45.4	45.2	182
% who agree that they can influence decisions in their local area (NI 4)	28.2	28.9	27.6	204
Strongly or tend to agree local council provides value for money?	34.4	33.2	31.9	213
% who would say that they have been treated with respect and consideration by their local public services in the last year (NI 140)	75.8	72.4	73.4	213
sport/leisure facilities	49.4	46.2	44.3	214
% who think that drug use or drug dealing is a problem in their local area (NI 42)	24.4	30.5	29.8	220
% who think that anti-social behaviour is a problem in their local area (NI 17)	16.2	20	19.4	221
% satisfied with doorstep recycling	68.2	69.8	67.8	225
% satisfied with keeping public land clear of litter and refuse	59.8	56.9	54.6	243
% satisfied with local tips/hold waste recycling centres	72.6	71.2	67.8	266
% satisfied with refuse collection	76.8	77.6	70.2	286

% who think that drunk and rowdy behaviour is a problem in their local area (NI 41)	26.6	29	33.9	286
% who think that older people in their local area get the help and support they need to continue to live at home for as long as they want to (NI 139)	28.4	30	25.8	289
% who feel they belong to their immediate neighbourhood (NI 2)	58.3	58.7	53.9	290
% who feel informed about what to do in the event of a large-scale emergency (NI 37)	15.5	15.3	11.9	324.0
% who agree that the police and other local public services seek people's views about anti-social behaviour and crime in their local area (NI 27)	23.7	24.8	19.5	344

The table below lists results for all National Indicators and our comparison to Unitary Authorities only. They are ranked in terms of our comparative performance to Unitary Authorities. Those listed first are where we compare most positively. The rankings take into account the fact that questions differ as to whether a higher or lower score is more positive.

Table 2: Comparison to Unitary Authorities

INDICATOR	All Unitary Authorities	B&HCC	Rank out of 55 Unitary Authorities in England
	%	%	
% who agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together (NI 1)	75.8	86.1	1
Generally speaking would you like to be more involved in the decisions that affect your local area	26.2	37.7	1
% satisfied with theatres/concert/halls	45.7	72.8	1
% satisfied with local transport information	45.9	69.5	2
% satisfied with local bus services	51.6	76.1	2
% satisfied with parks and open spaces	68.5	82.1	2
% satisfied with museums/galleries	42.5	62.9	3

% who agree that in their local area parents take enough responsibility for the behaviour of their children (NI 22)	28.6	36.0	5
% satisfied with libraries	69.3	73.3	8
% who are satisfied with their local area as a place to live (NI 5)	79.2	85.9	9
% who think there is a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area (NI 23)	31.5	24.8	9
% who say their health is good or very good (NI 119)	75.7	79.8	12
% who have given unpaid help at least once per month over the last 12 months (NI 6)	22.7	24.3	15
% who have been involved in decisions that affect the local area in the past 12 months (NI 3)	13.6	14.5	16
very or fairly satisfied with how council runs things	42.3	45.2	18
INDICATOR	All Unitary Authorities %	B&HCC %	Rank out of 55 Unitary Authorities in England
% people aged 65 and over who are satisfied with both home and neighbourhood (NI 138)	83.6	85.7	19
% who agree that the police and other local public services are successfully dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime in their local area (NI 21)	25.7	26.5	20
Strongly or tend to agree local council provides value for money?	29.8	31.9	23
% who think that anti-social behaviour is a problem in their local area (NI 17)	20.1	19.4	26
% who would say that they have been treated with respect and consideration by their local public services in the last year (NI 140)	72.6	73.4	27
% who think that drug use or drug dealing is a problem in their local area (NI 42)	30.5	29.8	27

% satisfied with keeping public land clear of litter and refuse	56.5	54.6	29
% who agree that they can influence decisions in their local area (NI 4)	27.9	27.6	32
sport/leisure facilities	46.4	44.3	35
% who think that drunk and rowdy behaviour is a problem in their local area (NI 41)	29.8	33.9	39
% satisfied with doorstep recycling	71.4	67.8	39
% who feel they belong to their immediate neighbourhood (NI 2)	57.2	53.9	41
% who think that older people in their local area get the help and support they need to continue to live at home for as long as they want to (NI 139)	30.7	25.8	44
% satisfied with local tips/hold waste recycling centres	72.4	67.8	44
% satisfied with refuse collection	78.3	70.2	46
% who feel informed about what to do in the event of a large-scale emergency (NI 37)	15.9	11.9	53
% who agree that the police and other local public services seek people's views about anti-social behaviour and crime in their local area (NI 27)	24.4	19.5	55

4. What are we doing about?:

4.1 People feeling that in their local area people from different backgrounds get on well together (NI1)

This indicator is included in our Local Area Agreement with a target of 86%. We have exceeded the target and this is an area where we perform comparatively well. The Stronger Communities Programme Partnership leads on this indicator and activities which have contributed to meeting our target include: community development commissioning to support community development in 13 neighbourhoods and other areas across the city; work around a common framework for commissioning and procurement; revised discretionary grants programme; and a strengthening of the festivals network resulting in stronger and more varied festival delivery.

4.2 People who feel they can influence decisions in their local area (NI4)

As a perceptual indicator this is difficult to measure and interpret. A range of factors may impact upon whether a person feels they are able to influence local decision making. This indicator is included in our Local Area Agreement with a target of 29.4% and a score from the Place Survey of 27.6%. Key activities here include: the communication and implementation of the Community Engagement Framework including a CEF e-learning programme; significant growth in Community and Voluntary Sector Forum representation so increasing the influence of the third sector on citywide decision making; extensive networking and support events held across the city; active neighbourhood fora with action plans; attendance by service providers at Neighbourhood Action Groups; support for 20 community newsletters; developing the role of B&HCC as a community empowerment champion; developing and strengthening the work of the city's Equalities Coalition. The Citizens' Panel also provides opportunities for residents to regularly have an input into consultation carried out by partner organisations across the city.

4.3 Participation in regular volunteering (NI6)

This is a new indicator where we have no previous figures to compare. Our performance is mid ranking in comparison to other Local Authorities, but much better (ranking 5th) when compared to Unitaries only. A City Volunteering Strategy has been developed which will be implemented by a steering group. £190,000 of funding has been secured from DCLG for the Take Part Programme to develop local learning opportunities. Community development support has been provided to initiate community groups in neighbourhoods and informal learning and training is being offered to develop the skills of volunteers.

4.4 Involvement in decisions which affect the local area (NI3)

Activities relating to NI4 and NI6 will impact upon this area. B&HCC is organising a 'Get Involved' campaign to promote citizens' involvement in local democracy. The implementation of actions contained in the Community Engagement Framework is also contributing to potential improvement in all Community Engagement indicators.

4.5 Antisocial behaviour

Measures of perceptions of anti-social behaviour and satisfaction with how changes have been made in the area have shown significant improvement in recent years.

The city has an anti social behaviour team which includes caseworkers, police staff and a solicitor, the team analyse data on anti social behaviour from across the city and then target their resources at individuals who are causing anti social behaviour and areas where anti social behaviour is a particular problem. The team works with individuals using a variety of methods starting with early intervention measures such as visits, warning letters, behaviour contracts and

referring people in to support services such as treatment for substance misuse and parenting classes. In most circumstances this early intervention is successful, however it fails to achieve an improvement in behaviour then the team can utilise the legal tools it has available such as anti social behaviour orders, injunctions and property closure orders.

The anti social behaviour team work closely with other agencies to tackle anti social behaviour, this includes a joint operation with Sussex Police, RUOK (the young peoples substance misuse service) and the youth service to tackle youth disorder and underage drinking this takes place across the city on a Friday and Saturday night. They also work closely with the Business Crime Reduction Partnership taking referrals about individuals who cause anti social behaviour in local shops, pubs and clubs.

Consultation with residents is undertaken by Sussex Police and the Council via local action teams which are resident lead groups which exist across the city to identify problems and bring services together to tackle them. The Citizens' Panel is also used for consultation with local residents on ASB issues.

4.6 Refuse and recycling

Satisfaction with refuse and recycling has increased in Brighton and Hove since 2006. The service has recently undergone a complete reorganisation resulting in a 17% reduction in costs (a saving of almost £1 million) and voluntary redundancies from the service. As part of the reorganisation, 120,000 household collections were re-routed. This was being undertaken at the time of the field work for the Place Survey in Autumn 2008. However, from a comparison of questionnaires returned before and after round changes were introduced, it does not appear that this in itself had a negative impact on satisfaction levels.

The waste strategy is out for consultation during 2009 and contains within it a raft of proposals for improving waste and recycling services. This includes a communications programme. 500 communal bins have been introduced over the past 6 months which will have a large positive impact in the city centre.

5. What information do we now have from the Place Survey?

We now have a full set of data for the Brighton and Hove Place Survey findings. The second set of data which was made available to us on 23rd June 2009 includes comparator data for all Local Authorities for National Indicators and some additional questions only. The Place Survey included NIs and other additional questions some of which we do not have comparator data for and we have been given no indication that this will be made available.

6. Issues to note

The results on many of the indicators are very closely bunched together. This can mean that a comparatively small difference in the % figure can lead to a large difference in ranking and the corresponding quartile we are placed in.

Given that confidence intervals can also be up to + or - 2% these in themselves could potentially shift rankings.

Weightings on the data were changed between the first and second release to us. This means that initial headline figures reported may have shifted slightly in later reports. The trajectories remain the same and no rankings or comparisons will be affected.

Data is weighted at a city wide level. At Ward, or area level the data remain un-weighted in order to avoid skewing the impact of different demographic groups. For this reason comparisons between Ward or area level data and that at city level is made between two different data sets.

7. The Place Survey background information

The Place Survey replaced the Best Value User Satisfaction Survey (BVPIs) and provides data for 19 of the new national indicators, all focused on citizen perspectives. It also provides evidence for some of our LAA targets.

The focus of the Place Survey shifted from satisfaction with services delivered by the Local Authority, to satisfaction with the local area as a place to live. This incorporates services delivered by partners outside of BHCC. For this reason the Place Survey was branded under the LSP and carried the LSP logo in addition to that of the Local Authority.

The fieldwork for the survey was carried out between September and December 2008. The sampling is overseen by the audit commission and we exceeded the minimum response rate to make the survey sample robust. We received a total of 2,255 responses from 6,000 (a rate of 38%). The audit commission also weight the data in order to make sure that it represents the different groups resident in the city.

APPENDIX 1

Place survey and satisfaction: the national context (Ipsos MORI local: People, perception and place, July 2009)

In general, residents are increasingly happy with where they live. Brighton and Hove residents are happier than the average for Metropolitan Authorities and Unitaries. ASB is declining, particularly people using and dealing drugs. However, Local Authorities are not receiving credit for these improvements. Satisfaction with councils is down from scores in the 50s in 2003 to satisfaction levels in the 40s in 2008. Inner London does not follow this trend. Brighton and Hove has also maintained a comparatively steady score over this time.

Satisfaction can be correlated with the public feeling that they are not informed about local public services (37% feel informed in Mets and Unitaries)

Satisfaction with local police forces is similar to that of councils - again despite improvements in ASB.

Two key points

1. Understand what is driving these perceptions (both what is under local control and what is not)
2. Look more carefully at local neighbourhoods within authorities

Issues with perceptual indicators

Perceptions are heavily influenced by factors beyond local control (see the list below).

There is a strong relationship between perception and key indicators. There is a time-lag between changes to service delivery and perception of improvement/change as well as a lag between satisfaction with individual services but dissatisfaction with the council or service deliverer

Looking across all measures, what are the background factors that are largely beyond the control of local services that are most related to perceptions?

82% of all variation in satisfaction with local areas can be explained by knowing five characteristics of the local population

- Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)
- Young people (proportion of the population aged under 21)
- Physical living conditions (levels of occupancy)
- Percentage of the population with degrees
- Region

According to these factors the most challenged Unitary and Met is: Manchester and the least is Rutland

What background characteristics are consistently associated with making 'satisfaction' hard to achieve?

- IMD
- Ethnic diversity (the level of ethnic fractionalisation – or how diverse an area is)
- Young people – the more people under 19 in an area, the more difficult it is to achieve high levels of satisfaction
- Population churn
- Physical living conditions (particularly over-occupancy)
- Urbanity – the more urban an area, the harder it is to achieve positive perceptions
- Region – the North-East is associated with higher satisfaction and London is (generally) associated with lower satisfaction scores

But there are things which Local Authorities and partners can do:

- Local public services really matter to a sense of place and satisfaction with the local area. ASB is key here.
- Understanding and targeting local priorities
- Informing and listening. No councils that communicated well are poorly rated overall in the Place Survey. In terms of shifting perception the biggest impact would be to communicate activities to a wide group, rather than active involvement of smaller numbers of residents. However, communication does not simply involve information provision and the most effective activities relate to seeking out views, acting upon them and communicating back how they have been acted upon.
- Crime measures are heavily related to respect and parenting
- Targeting individual neighbourhoods

What does this mean for Brighton and Hove?

A communications programme aimed at most influential perceptual indicators is key

Combining research, consultation and analysis effectively to fully understand local issues is vital

Area analysis is required, for example using tools such as the Brighton and Hove Local Information Service (BHLIS). In terms of satisfaction levels for B&HCC, areas of the city are becoming as influential as membership of particular demographic groups (a report on demographic and area analysis of Place Survey results is available from the Analysis and Research Team)

27/08/2009: Analysis and Research Team, B&HCC