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1 Introduction

1.1 Background and objectives

In 2013, Ipsos MORI were commissioned by Oxford City Council to conduct its 2014/15 Residents’ Survey, assessing residents’ perceptions of their local area, Council services, community safety, the local economy and health and well-being issues. The findings of this survey will be used to further develop Council services in future.

Oxford City Council is responsible for a wide range of services in Oxford, including planning, housing, Council Tax collection, housing benefits, business rates, environmental health, licensing, refuse and recycling collection, leisure services and parks, tourism, and cemeteries. However, other public services are the responsibility of Oxfordshire County Council – schools, safeguarding children, social care for the elderly, the fire service, roads, libraries and the museums service, trading standards, land use, transport planning and waste management.

This is the first time that the Council have commissioned a survey to be conducted in line with the guidelines of Local Government Association’s (LGA) LG Inform benchmarking service. Complying with the LGA’s guidelines enabled the Council to upload its results to the LG Inform website and, as a result, gain access to the results of other Councils, both in the same 2014/15 cohort and from previous years. By comparing Oxford City Council’s results with similar Councils from previous years, this allowed the findings to be placed into a wider context; these comparisons were considered more of a meaningful benchmark than the Council’s previous survey conducted in 2008 due to the significant changes in the local government landscape over this period.

The Residents’ Survey focuses mostly on issues relating to Oxford City Council, although it also includes questions relating to services provided or supported by Oxfordshire County Council (e.g. libraries, museums and the local transport network). We know from our work with other two-tier local authorities that residents rarely make the distinction between the two service providers and it is important in any such resident survey to address issues which have greatest impact (of which the road network is one such issue).

1.2 The approach

The research took place through a postal survey of residents across the local authority area. Ipsos MORI drew a random sample of 4,000 addresses from the Royal Mail postal address file (PAF). The mailout size was determined by the need to achieve 1,000 completed responses – this was calculated using the results from the previous Residents’ Survey, adjusted to take into account the slight fall in participation rates in postal surveys over recent years.

An 8-page questionnaire and covering letter (see Appendices) were sent out to each address in the sample on 15 October 2014. Subsequently, one reminder mailing was sent out to households who had not responded to the initial mailout. Fieldwork closed on the 5 January 2015.

There were 983 valid responses from the original sample of 4,000 addresses. However, there were 18 invalid responses (this includes incorrect or non-existent addresses), meaning that the adjusted response rate was 24.7%, a response which enables us to undertake robust analysis at sub-group level.

Data were weighted back to the known population profile of the area to counteract non-response bias. Data are weighted by age within gender bands, and ethnicity. The weighting profile was based on a combination of 2011
Census information and the latest available mid-year estimates. Further information on the sampling approach can be found in the technical report.

1.3 Benchmarking

This report summarises the key findings of the research, however a full set of data tables are held by the Council under separate cover. Two sources of benchmarking are used throughout the report, referenced as Council A and Council B. Council A is an anonymised local authority with a similar statistical profile to Oxford based on CIPFA’s ‘Nearest Neighbours’ model1. Data was sourced from the Local Government Association’s LG Inform benchmarking website2 – fieldwork for this survey was also conducted during 2014. Council B is an anonymised local authority from Ipsos MORI’s own postal norms database – fieldwork was conducted during 2012.

Additional contextual benchmarking from the LG Inform website is included for reference as an appendix to this report. This includes Oxford City Council’s results for the key LG Inform questions shown alongside any other Councils who submitted their postal survey results within the 2013-14 cohort. Only one of these Councils are amongst those considered to be statistically similar to Oxford under the CIPFA ‘Nearest Neighbours’ model (Stevenage Borough Council) – therefore, these are (on the whole) less likely to be meaningful comparisons than Council A (comparisons with which are included in the main body of the report). The 2013-14 results are included purely to show where Oxford’s results can be placed in terms of national Councils more generally, regardless of whether they have any statistical similarities.

Further benchmarking of Oxford City Council’s results was limited by the small number of Councils to upload their postal survey results to the LG Inform website for the 2014/15 cohort. The reasons for this could be quite wide-ranging: lack of funding; not needing to complete a survey during this period; not being a statutory requirement to complete surveys; completing surveys but wanting to keep results private/internal; using different methodologies; conducting non-LG Inform compliant surveys; using citizens’ panels, other methods of consultation with the public etc.

1.4 Statistical reliability and margins of error

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total “population”, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been surveyed. But we can predict the variation between the sample results and the “true” values from knowing the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given.

It is important to note that margins of error relate only to samples that have been selected using strict random probability sampling methods. However, in practice it is reasonable to assume that these calculations provide a good indication of the confidence intervals relating to this survey and the sampling approach used.

Unless otherwise stated, all comparisons made in the report commentary between Oxford City Council’s data and the Ipsos MORI contextual data, or between sub-groups in Oxford, are based on statistically significant differences. Please see the technical report for more details.

Data points which appear as asterisks denote a figure of less than 0.5% but greater than zero.

---

1 CIPFA ‘Nearest Neighbours Model’ - http://www.cipfastats.net/resources/nearestneighbours/
2 LG Inform benchmarking http://lginform.local.gov.uk/
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2 Summary of key findings

Overall, the findings of the 2014/15 Oxford Residents’ Survey are extremely positive. Residents’ views on the LGA’s core performance indicators of local area satisfaction, Council satisfaction and perceived value for money are all significantly higher than both of the benchmarking sources used in this report – Council A and Council B. Levels of self-reported health and mental well-being are more positive than Council B, as are perceptions of the local economy and residents’ economic optimism over the next twelve months.

At a local area level, those in the South East area of Oxford tend to be less positive than average on a range of measures, in particular with regard to views on community life and the prevalence of anti-social behaviour issues.

2.1.1 Living in Oxford

Most residents are satisfied with their local area (81%) and levels of satisfaction are higher than in either Council A or Council B (both 72%). The most significant driver of satisfaction with the local area is overall satisfaction with the Council, although feelings of safety in the local area are also important.

The level of crime, health services and affordable decent housing are seen as the most important aspects in making somewhere a good place to live, while the level of traffic congestion is seen as the one thing most in need of improvement in Oxford. However, taking into account the perceived importance attributed to the different aspects, affordable decent housing is also seen as a significant priority for improvement in Oxford.

Over seven in ten are satisfied with the way the Council keeps the residential streets, city centre or formal parks clear of litter. A general lack of rubbish bins, streets being full of leaves, and bins on narrow footpaths are the most cited reasons for dissatisfaction.

2.1.2 Community cohesion

Seven in ten (72%) agree their local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together, a significantly higher proportion than in Council B (51%). Eight in ten (81%) think that people failing to treat each other with respect and consideration is not a big problem in their local area. Three in ten (30%) give unpaid help to groups, clubs or organisations at least once a month; 18% do so at least once a week.

2.1.3 Feeling safe

The vast majority of Oxford residents feel safe during the day both in their local area (94%) and in the city centre (92%). At night, however, this falls to seven in ten (69%) who feel safe in their local area and just short of six in ten (56%) who feel safe in the city centre.

Overall the two biggest anti-social behaviour problems are seen to be car-related – speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving, and cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally. Other common problems relate to the appearance of the local area – rubbish or litter lying around, and pavement staining or dropped chewing gum. The anti-social behaviour issues considered to have shown highest net improvement in the last

---

3 Council A is an anonymised local authority with a similar statistical profile to Oxford. Data was sourced from the Local Government Association’s LG Inform benchmarking website – fieldwork for this survey was also conducted in 2014. Council B is an anonymised local authority included in Ipsos MORI’s postal norms database – fieldwork was conducted during 2012.

4 For a number of questions, benchmarking data is only available for Council B – particularly the questions relating to health, well-being and the economy. Results are only available for Council A with regard to the core performance indicators.
twelve months are noisy neighbours or loud parties, and abandoned or burned out vehicles. The most negative scores over this period relate to car parking issues and speeding vehicles.

In total, 14% think there is a big problem with alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre during the day, but this rises to 52% when thinking about the city centre after dark. At night, 15% think this type of anti-social behaviour has increased over the last year compared with just 3% who think it has got better.

14% know how to contact their Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs), while a further 51% think they could find out if they wanted to. Overall, around half (54%) agree that the Police are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their area – this falls to a third (35%) when considering the record of the Council.

### 2.1.4 Health and well-being

Residents’ self-reported health is significantly better in Oxford than in Council B (77% vs. 64% who think it is very good or good). Older respondents, social renters, those who live alone and those with a disability are less likely to be in good health. As with self-assessed health, the mental well-being of Oxford residents is comparatively better than those in Council B. The average well-being index score in Oxford is 25.3 out of a maximum of 35 (see Section 6.2 of the report for a full explanation), and the majority of respondents score between 20 and 29 on this scale (73%).

One in five respondents report a long-term health condition or disability that limits their day-to-day activities (19%). Just under one in five residents (19%) provide unpaid help or care to someone else.

### 2.1.5 The economy

Oxford residents are much more optimistic about the economy of their local area than those in Council B – their positive views mirror the national outlook on the state of the economy (Ipsos MORI’s own Economic Optimism Index shows that ‘net optimism’ – that is the proportion thinking the national economy will get better, less those thinking it will get worse – stands at +21 ppts in March 2015). Compared to Council B, fewer Oxford residents have been affected by the current economic climate, although 60% have still been affected in some way. Respondents are most likely to be affected by not being able to afford to go on holiday. One in five believes their financial circumstances will improve in the next year, significantly higher than Council B.

### 2.1.6 Council performance

Seven in ten (71%) are satisfied with the way Oxford City Council runs things, compared to 12% that are dissatisfied. Levels of satisfaction are significantly higher than both Council A (52%) and Council B (47%). Key drivers of satisfaction include agreeing the Council provides value for money, being satisfied with the local area as a place to live and being satisfied with a range of environmental services that the Council provides (see Section 3.2 for a full explanation of this analysis).

Two in five (43%) agree the Council provides value for money, again significantly higher than both Council A (35%) and Council B (33%); 17% of residents think it does not provide value for money. Key drivers of value for money include overall satisfaction with the way the Council runs things and feeling informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding.

Almost three in five (57%) feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides, in line with Councils A and B. Two in five (41%) feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding; but half do not (50%). Two thirds (68%) think they have been treated with respect and consideration by public services all or most of the time in the last year.
Satisfaction with Council services is highest for parks and open spaces (88%), recycling and refuse collection (82%) and museums and galleries (74%). However, levels of dissatisfaction are highest with regard to sport and leisure facilities (18%), the local transport network (17%) and local bus services (14%).
Living in Oxford
3 Living in Oxford

This section of the report examines overall attitudes towards the local area and residents' priorities for their area.

Summary

- Most residents are satisfied with their local area (81%). Levels of satisfaction are higher in Oxford than in either Council's A or Council B (both 72%).
- Satisfaction with the local area is closely linked to perceptions of the Council, but demographically, opinions are fairly consistent. Feelings of safety in the local area are identified as a key driver to overall satisfaction with the local area.
- The level of crime, health services, and affordable decent housing are the most important aspects in making somewhere a good place to live.
- Infrastructure issues are perceived to be most in need of improvement including traffic congestion, road and pavement repairs and affordable housing.
- Results are pretty consistent at a small area level, with the exception of those from the South East who are more likely to identify a higher number of issues that need improving in their local area.
- Similar proportions of residents (over seven in ten) are satisfied with the way the Council keeps the residential streets, city centre or formal parks clear of litter. Dissatisfaction with the cleanliness of residential streets is greater than with the city centre or formal parks. A general lack of rubbish bins, streets full of leaves, or bins on narrow pavements are amongst the most cited reasons for residents' dissatisfaction.

3.1 General satisfaction with the area

Satisfaction with the local area is high: over eight in ten (81%) respondents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live compared to just under one in ten (9%) who are dissatisfied.

Looking at the benchmarking data available, Oxford City Council compares significantly better than both Council A and Council B where seven in ten residents (both 72%) are satisfied with their local area.

Satisfaction with the local area is consistent at a small area level.
Q1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

![Satisfaction with local area chart]

Base: All valid responses (969)

Figure 3.1 – Satisfaction with the local area

A common finding of residents’ surveys is that generally satisfaction with the local area is closely linked to perceptions of the Council. The vast majority of people who are satisfied with the Council are satisfied with the local area (92% vs. 39% who are not satisfied with the Council). A similar relationship appears across a number of measures of the Council’s performance, such as value for money, how well informed people feel about the Council, or how satisfied respondents are about the Council dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime, and this is a common theme across many attributes in the survey.

Attitudes also vary by people’s economic outlook on the state of the local economy. Nine in ten (89%) of those who think the local economy is improving are satisfied with their local area compared with just under seven in ten (69%) who believe it is getting worse.

Demographically, there are very few significant differences in opinion. Those aged 65+ years are more likely to be satisfied with their local area than others (85% vs. 81% overall) but tenure, household composition and disability do not appear to play a part.
3.2 Key drivers of satisfaction

The local area satisfaction question was subjected to regression analysis, also known as key drivers analysis, to establish which elements have the most influence on the way residents answered this key satisfaction question.

It is important to note that with these models we are only able to ‘predict’ a small percentage of residents’ behaviour because of the nature of the outcomes we are looking to predict. As the following figure demonstrates, through the regression analysis we have been able to predict 37% of the change and variation in people’s levels of satisfaction with the local area. The regression analysis arrived at this figure by establishing how often the variables included in the analysis correctly predicted the degree of variation.

There are a range of different factors driving satisfaction with the local area upwards as well as downwards. Out of the 37% that we can predict, residents’ satisfaction with the Council is the most dominant factor – i.e. the thing most likely to influence perceptions within the model. Anti-social behaviour issues also play a key part with feeling safe being a key driver. Agreement that the Council provides value for money, feelings of community cohesion and satisfaction with local tips/ household waste recycling centres are also key to satisfaction with the local area – albeit at lower levels.

Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live

Positive drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive driver</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the way Oxford City Council runs things</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel safe in your local area during the day</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Oxford City Council provides value for money</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that your local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with local tips/Household waste recycling centres</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state of the economy in your local area is thriving</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the day alcohol-related antisocial behaviour in Oxford city centre is not a problem</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative driver</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around is a problem</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour - Pavement staining or dropped chewing gum has got worse</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties is a problem</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health in general is bad</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37% of the variance explained by the model

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 3.2 – Key Driver Analysis: Satisfaction with local area
3.3 Which issues are most important?

Residents were given a list of factors which make somewhere a good place to live and asked which they consider to be most important. The most mentions relate to:

- The level of crime (54%);
- Health services (45%); and
- Affordable decent housing (44%).

Least important are:

- Facilities for young children (14%);
- Activities for teenagers (14%); and
- Community activities and events (13%).

Residents in Council B have also been given a similar list to that of Oxford City Council, and asked to select the most important factors in making somewhere a good place to live. The table below compares residents’ priorities.

---

³ There are a number of differences between the two lists, so please treat comparisons as indicative only:
- Some option codes were not included in the list for Council B (e.g. “access to nature”, “people of different backgrounds gets on well together” and “the level of pollution”).
- Some option codes were worded differently for Council B (“facilities and activities for teenagers” compared to “activities for teenagers”; “high profile events and tourist attractions” compared to “community activities and events”).
Table 3.1 – Important aspects in making somewhere a good place to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford City Council</th>
<th>Council B 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable decent housing</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean streets</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education provision</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to nature</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural facilities (e.g. libraries, museums, theatres)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of traffic congestion</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage levels and the cost of living</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job prospects</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and pavement repairs</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of different backgrounds get on well together</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of pollution</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and leisure facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for young children</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activities and events</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ipsos MORI North
Base: All valid responses (any number selected) (961/1053)

It can be seen from the table that Oxford residents place greater priority compared to those in Council B on the following aspects:

- The level of crime (54% Oxford vs. 42% Council B);
- Public transport (38% vs. 18%);
- Parks and open spaces (34% vs. 16%);
- Cultural facilities (30% vs. 2%);
- The level of traffic congestion (27% vs. 7%); and
- Wage levels and the cost of living (24% vs. 12%).

Conversely, fewer Oxford residents say that job prospects (22% vs. 34%) is the most important aspect in making somewhere a good place to live.

The following bar chart contrasts the percentage of Oxford respondents who say a particular factor is important, against the percentage who say it needs improving.

### 3.4 Issues in need of improvement

Q7. **Thinking generally, which of the things below would you say are most important in making somewhere a good place to live?**

Q8. **And thinking about your local area, which of the things below, if any, do you think most need improving?**

![Figure 3.3 - Important vs improvement](image)

**Figure 3.3 – Important vs improvement**
It is positive to note that those issues deemed as most important have generally fewer respondents stating that they need improved, however, this is not the case for affordable housing (46% needs improving vs. 44% important) and other infrastructure issues including traffic congestion (62% needs improving vs. 27% important) and road and pavement repairs (51% needs improving vs. 20% important).

Other issues which are seen as most in need of improvement are:

- Wage levels and the cost of living (35% say this needs improving);
- Clean streets (22%); and
- Activities for teenagers (20%).

Residents' views on what needs improving differ to those in Council B.

For instance, a greater proportion of Oxford residents compared to those in Council B believe that the following aspects need improving in their local area:

- The level of traffic congestion (62% Oxford vs. 15% Council B);
- Affordable decent housing (46% vs. 19%); and
- Wage levels and the cost of living (35% vs. 15%).

Conversely, fewer Oxford residents perceive the following to be in need of improvement:

- Clean streets (22% Oxford vs. 29% Council B);
- Activities for teenagers (20% vs. 29%);
- Job prospects (14% vs. 41%);
- Shopping facilities (13% vs. 25%); and
- Facilities for young children (8% vs. 19%).
Table 3.2 – Aspects in need of improving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford City Council</th>
<th>Council B 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of traffic congestion</td>
<td>The level of traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and pavement repairs</td>
<td>Road and pavement repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable decent housing</td>
<td>Affordable decent housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage levels and the cost of living</td>
<td>Wage levels and local cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean streets</td>
<td>Clean streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers</td>
<td>Facilities and activities for teenagers (e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skateboarding facilities, youth clubs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>The level of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of pollution</td>
<td>The level of pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and leisure facilities</td>
<td>Sports and leisure facilities (includes swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>pools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>Health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job prospects</td>
<td>Job prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities</td>
<td>Shopping facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activities and events</td>
<td>High profile events and tourist attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education provision</td>
<td>Education/schools provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of difference background get on well together</td>
<td>People of difference background get on well together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces</td>
<td>Parks and green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to nature</td>
<td>Access to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for young children</td>
<td>Facilities and activities for young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under 13 years (e.g. playgrounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural facilities (e.g. libraries, museums, theatres)</td>
<td>Cultural facilities (e.g. museums, art venues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ipsos MORI North
Base: All valid responses (any number selected) (914/1041)
The following quadrant analysis helps illustrate local priorities more clearly. Issues closest to the top right hand corner of the figure are priority areas to address because they are identified as both ‘most important’ and ‘in need of improvement’ by sizeable proportions of residents. It is positive to see that there are no issues at the very far right of the quadrant. Affordable decent housing is the biggest priority for local residents of Oxford.

Figure 3.4 – Residents’ priorities: importance vs. improvement

Issues nearer to the bottom left hand corner are both less important to the quality of the local area (relative to other things) and less in need of improvement. For Oxford, numerous issues (including job prospects, community cohesion, and facilities for teenagers or young children) can be found in this part of the figure.

Although the main priorities identified above are consistently seen as important across the borough, we also note that some issues are more important for residents living in particular areas as illustrated below. It is worth noting that compared to Oxford residents overall, those from the South East are more likely to identify a higher number of issues that need improving in their local area.
Q8. And thinking about your local area, which, if any, do you think need improving?

North
- Wage levels/cost of living (43% vs. 32% overall)

North East
- The level of traffic congestion (70% vs. 62% overall)
- Road and pavement repairs (65% vs. 51%)

East
- Clean streets (35% vs. 22% overall)

South East
- The level of crime (32% vs. 17% overall)
- Job prospects (24% vs. 14%)
- Shopping facilities (24% vs. 13%)
- Health services (22% vs. 14%)
- People from different backgrounds get on well together (17% vs. 9%)

Cowley
- Community activities and events (20% vs. 12% overall)

Base: All valid responses (any number selected) (914)

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 3.5 – Issues which are significantly more likely to need improving compared to Oxford overall
3.5 Satisfaction with the cleanliness of the area

Residents were asked how satisfied, or dissatisfied, they were with the cleanliness of the residential streets, city centre and formal parks respectively.

Around seven in ten residents are satisfied with the way the Council keeps the residential streets (71%), city centre (72%) or formal parks (74%) clear of litter. A small minority (6%) are dissatisfied with the cleanliness of the formal parks but this increases to 12% and 18% for the city centre and residential streets, respectively.

Figure 3.6 – Cleanliness of the area

Results are fairly consistent at a small area level, with two exceptions:

- Those in the East are significantly less likely to be satisfied with the cleanliness of the residential streets (59% vs. 71% overall); and
- Those in the Central, South and West are significantly less likely to be satisfied with the cleanliness of the formal parks (62% vs. 74% overall).

Looking at differences by the key demographic groups, it is older respondents aged 65+, those who live alone, or those in poor health or with a disability who are generally less satisfied with the cleanliness of the streets, city centre or formal parks.
As with overall satisfaction with the local area, those who are generally satisfied with aspects of the Council also tend to be more positive about the cleanliness of these.

Residents were also given the opportunity to provide an explanation for their dissatisfaction with Council services. These comments have been reviewed below. Please note, however, that these perceptions are by no means a representation of all residents’ views in Oxford. The comments have not been quantified and some of the perceived issues represent only a very small number of survey respondents.

Please see below some of the reasons for which residents can be dissatisfied with the cleanliness of the residential streets, city centre or formal parks:

- The leaves in parks are not swept regularly;
- There are not enough rubbish or dog waste bins;
- General dissatisfaction with refuse collection which should be done on a weekly, rather than fortnightly basis;
- Cans and bottles are not collected from streets at weekends;
- Bins can be found on narrow footpaths, which make these impassable. A couple of residents mentioned this is the case for the East Oxford area. In addition to this, narrow footpaths (e.g. between Littlemore and Cowley) are not generally cleared of rubbish as often as they should be;
- High levels of fly tipping and dog fouling in residential areas.
Community Life
4 Community Life

This section examines different aspects of community life in Oxford, such as the extent to which people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together, whether people are seen to treat each other with respect and consideration, and how engaged residents are with their local communities in terms of giving unpaid help or support to groups, clubs or organisations on a regular basis.

Summary

- Seven in ten (72%) agree their local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together, a significantly higher proportion than Council B.
- Eight in ten (81%) think that people not treating each other with respect and consideration is either not a very big problem or not a problem at all in their local area.
- Three in ten (30%) give unpaid help to groups, clubs or organisations at least once a month, including 18% that do so at least once a week.
- Those in the South East of Oxford are less likely to be positive about, or engaged in, the different aspects of community life covered in this chapter. They are more likely to see problems with a lack of respect and consideration in their local area, less likely to think people from different ethnicities get on well together, and are less likely to give unpaid help or support on a regular basis.

4.1 Community cohesion

Seven in ten Oxford residents (72%) agree that their local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together. Around one in eight (12%) neither agree nor disagree, and less than one in ten (8%) disagree.

The proportion agreeing with the statement is significantly higher than Council B (72% vs. 51%), while the level of disagreement is significantly lower (8% vs. 18%)\(^6\).

\(^6\) However, please note that Council B asked about ‘different backgrounds’ rather than ‘different ethnic backgrounds’, and defined getting on well together as ‘living alongside each other with respect’ rather than ‘treating each other with respect’.
Q16. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together? By getting on well together, we mean treating each other with respect.

Figure 4.1 – Community cohesion

At a local area level, those in the South East of Oxford are significantly less likely to agree with the statement (59% vs. 72% overall), as well as being more likely to disagree (16% vs. 8% overall). Otherwise, there are no significant differences by local area.

Those aged 18-34 are significantly more likely to believe there is community cohesion in their local area than other groups (80% vs. 69% of those aged 35-64, and 64% of those aged 65+).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, those who think Oxford has a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration are less likely to agree with the statement (39% vs. 79% of those who think it isn’t a big problem).

There are no significant differences between white and BME respondents.
4.2 Respect and consideration

Residents were also asked for their views on whether their local area has a problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration. Eight in ten (81%) think this is either not a very big problem (52%) or not a problem at all (29%), while around one in ten (11%) think it is either a fairly (9%) or very (2%) big problem.

Q17. In your local area, how much of a problem do you think there is with people not treating each other with respect and consideration?

![Figure 4.2 - Problems with lack of respect and consideration](image)

Once again, those in the South East of Oxford are significantly more likely to think there is a big problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration in their local area.

Those aged 55-64 are more likely than average to think there is a big problem with respect and consideration in their local area (15% vs. 11% overall). Those living in single person households (16%) and social tenants (23%) are also more likely to think this is a big problem.

In addition, those with a health problem or disability that limits their day-to-day activities are more likely to perceive this to be a big problem (17%, rising to 19% of those whose activities are limited a lot). There are no significant differences by ethnicity.
4.3 Participation in regular volunteering

In order to gauge levels of community involvement and engagement across Oxford, residents were asked how often they have given unpaid help to any groups, clubs or organisations over the last 12 months. Three in ten volunteer at least once a month (30%), including 18% who volunteer at least once a week.

A further 14% have volunteered in the last year but less often than once a month, while 46% have not given any unpaid help at all over this period. The proportion of those volunteering in the last week and month are both significantly higher than the equivalent figure for Council B.

Q28. Overall, about how often over the last 12 months have you given unpaid help to any group(s), club(s) or organisation(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oxford CC (886)</th>
<th>Council B (1160)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not given any unpaid help at all over the last 12 months</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/Not applicable</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3 – Volunteering in the last 12 months

Those in the North of Oxford are more likely to volunteer at least once a month (38%), whereas those in the South East – where there is less community cohesion – are less likely (20% vs. 30% overall).

Women are more likely to volunteer at least monthly (33% vs. 30%), as are those aged 35-64 (36%) or 65+ (34%) compared with those aged 18-34 (22%). In terms of tenure, owner occupiers are more likely to volunteer at least monthly (38%), in particular those who own outright (41%), although this finding may be more a reflection of their age. Similarly, private renters – 75% of whom are 18-34s – are less likely than average to volunteer with this frequency (19%).

As we often find, those who give regular unpaid help or support to family, friends, neighbours or others are also more likely to volunteer with a group, club or organisation at least once a month (57% vs. 30% overall), including 35% who volunteer at least once a week (vs. 18% overall).

---

7 Council B asked ‘How often, if at all, have you given unpaid help in the following ways? Given unpaid help either by taking part in or supporting any group, club or organisation (e.g. helping to run an activity or event, coaching, counselling, raising money, admin help)’
Feeling safe
5 Feeling safe

This section considers residents’ perceptions of safety, crime and anti-social behaviour issues in Oxford. Also covered are residents’ awareness of Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs), as well as the Police and the Council’s record in dealing with the anti-social behaviour issues that matter.

Summary

- The vast majority of Oxford residents feel safe during the day both in their local area (94%) and in the city centre (92%). At night, however, this falls to seven in ten (69%) who feel safe in their local area and just short of six in ten (56%) who feel safe in the city centre.
- Overall, the two biggest anti-social behaviour problems are seen to be car-related – speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving (40%), and cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (35%). Other common problems relate to the appearance of the local area – rubbish or litter lying around (26%), and pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (22%).
- The least problematic anti-social behaviour issues include abandoned or burned out vehicles (3%), people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (5%) and conflicts or disputes between neighbours (7%).
- Those in the South East area of Oxford are more likely to see a range of anti-social behaviour issues as a big problem in their local area.
- The anti-social behaviour issues considered to have shown highest net improvement in the last twelve months are noisy neighbours or loud parties (+5 ppts) and abandoned or burned out vehicles (+ 5 ppts).
- The issues with the lowest net improvement scores are cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (-15 ppts) and speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving (-14 ppts).
- 14% think there is a big problem with alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre during the day, but this rises to 52% when thinking about the city centre after dark.
- The same proportion think alcohol-related anti-social behaviour has increased as decreased during the day (6%), but at night 15% think it has increased compared with just 3% who think it has decreased – a net score of +12 ppts.
- 14% know how to contact their Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG), while a further 51% think they could find out if they wanted to. 30% wouldn’t know how to find out; the remaining 6% are not interested.
- Around half (54%) agree that the Police are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area – this falls to a third (35%) when considering the record of the Council on this issue.
5.1 Community safety

To gain further insight into residents’ views of their local area, survey respondents were asked whether they feel safe in their local area and the city centre, both during the day and at night.

During the day, the vast majority of residents feel safe, both in their local area (94%) and the city centre (92%).

After dark, however, the proportion feeling safe in their local area drops to seven in ten (69%), and in the city centre to just below six in ten (56%). Around one in seven (15%) feel unsafe in their local area after dark, while one in five (19%) feel unsafe in the city centre.

**Q11a-d. How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside...?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>Neither / nor</th>
<th>Fairly unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...in your local area during the day (958)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in the city centre during the day (959)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in your local area after dark (963)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in the city centre after dark (953)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

**Figure 5.1 – Feeling safe in your local area/the city centre**

In terms of differences by local area, those in the South East area of Oxford are more likely than average to feel unsafe in their local area after dark (27% vs. 15% overall), reflecting these residents’ perceptions that crime is more of an issue in this area and that there is less social cohesion.

Certain groups of people are more likely to report feeling unsafe either in their local area or the city centre, including:

- Women;
- Social tenants;
- Those with a disability or health problem;
- Those who disagree that the Police / the Council are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime;
• Those who think their local area has a big problem with people not treating each other with respect and consideration.

5.2 Are public services dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour

Respondents were asked for their general views about whether the Police and Oxford City Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area.

Overall perceptions are more positive towards the Police than the Council in this regard – over half (54%) agree that the Police are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime in their local area, whereas around a third (35%) agree Oxford City Council are doing so. However, negative sentiment is equal for both the Police and the Council, with around one in eight (12%) disagreeing with each statement.

Q12a-b. How much do you agree or disagree that the following organisations are dealing with antisocial behaviour and crime issues that matter in your area?

![Figure 5.2 – Perceived record of the Police and Oxford City Council on anti-social behaviour](image)

Those with a disability (46%) and white respondents (52%) are both less likely than average to agree that the Police are dealing with the crime and anti-social behaviour issues that matter (vs. 54% overall).

With regard to the Council, those aged 65+ (43% vs. 30% of 18-34s) and social renters (55% vs. 31% of owner occupiers) are more likely to agree the Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, those who feel safe after dark in their local area are more likely to agree that the Police (60% vs. 54% overall) and the Council (41% vs. 35% overall) are tackling the problem. Those who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things are also more likely to agree that the Council is dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour in their local area (42% vs. 35% overall).

There are no significant differences by local area.
5.3 Anti-social behaviour

Residents were asked about a broad range of different types of anti-social behaviour, and whether these are considered to be a problem in their local area. The findings have been split out over two charts with those perceived to be the biggest problems shown in the figure below.

Overall, the two biggest anti-social behaviour problems in Oxford were seen to be car-related – speeding vehicles/motorbikes and dangerous driving (40%), and cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (35%). Other common problems related more to the appearance of the area, such as rubbish or litter lying around (26%) or pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (22%).

Q19. For each type of anti-social behaviour, please tell us if this is a problem in your area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>A very big problem</th>
<th>A fairly big problem</th>
<th>Not a very big problem</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>DK / No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding vehicles/motorbikes/dangerous driving (945)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (949)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around (947)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (940)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs (945)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties (944)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti &amp; other deliberate damage to property or vehicles (943)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places (938)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.3 – Most problematic anti-social behaviour issues

In terms of age differences, those aged 65+ are more likely than average to think there is a big problem with a range of anti-social behaviour issues, including cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (42% vs. 35% overall), rubbish or litter lying around (32% vs. 26% overall), pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (30% vs. 22% overall) and vandalism and graffiti (21% vs. 17% overall).

Similarly, those aged 35-64 are more likely than average to think there is a big problem with rubbish or litter lying around (29% vs. 26% overall) and vandalism and graffiti (20% vs. 17% overall), but also with people using or dealing drugs (23% vs. 19% overall) and people being drunk or rowdy in public places (19% vs. 17% overall).

Social renters are more likely than average to think there is a big problem with cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (47% vs. 35% overall), rubbish or litter lying around (37% vs. 26% overall) and noisy neighbours or loud parties (29% vs. 18% overall), while owner occupiers are more focused on big problems with vandalism and graffiti compared to others (21% vs. 17% overall).
BME respondents more than others consider noisy neighbours or loud parties to be a problem (28% vs. 15% of white respondents), while white respondents are more likely to think there is a big problem with cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (37% vs. 25% of BME respondents).

From the list of fifteen types of anti-social behaviour provided to respondents, the issues rated least problematic are detailed in the chart below, including abandoned or burned out vehicles (3%), people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (5%) and conflicts or disputes between neighbours (7%).

**Q19. For each type of antisocial behaviour, please tell us if this is a problem in your area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>A very big problem</th>
<th>A fairly big problem</th>
<th>Not a very big problem</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
<th>DK / No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets (936)</td>
<td>3 11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping (941)</td>
<td>4 11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly posting (930)</td>
<td>4 9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (949)</td>
<td>4 9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts or disputes between neighbours (934)</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being attacked/ harassed (skin colour, ethnic origin, religion, sexual orientation) (941)</td>
<td>4 23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burned out vehicles (942)</td>
<td>4 23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)

**Figure 5.4 – Least problematic anti-social behaviour issues**

Again, there are some significant sub-group differences in perception. For example, those aged 65+ are more likely to think there is a big problem with fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (17% vs. 13% overall).

**Social tenants** consider fly tipping (22% vs. 14% overall), conflicts or disputes between neighbours (20% vs. 7% overall) or people being attacked or harassed because of ethnicity, religion or sexual orientation (14% vs. 5% overall) to be more of an issue than others.

**Women** are more likely to think there is a problem with people being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (6% vs. 3% of men). **White** respondents are more likely to think there is a big problem with fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (15% vs. 5% of BME respondents).
The chart below shows any anti-social behaviour issues significantly more likely to be perceived as a problem in each local area of Oxford.

Q19. For each type of antisocial behaviour, please tell us if this is a problem in your area.

**Figure 5.5 – Anti-social behaviour by local area**

Overall, nine of the fifteen anti-social behaviour issues are considered to be more of a problem by those in the South East compared with the overall average, in particular rubbish and litter lying around (41% vs. 26% overall) and fly tipping (32% vs. 14%) overall.

Those in Cowley are particularly more likely to see speeding or dangerous driving as a problem (61% vs. 40% overall), while those in the East are significantly more likely to see noisy neighbours and loud parties (44% vs. 18% overall) and rubbish and litter lying around (44% vs. 26% overall) as problematic. There were no anti-social behaviour issues considered to be more of a problem in the North, North East or Central, South and West areas of the city.

If the anti-social behaviour identified in the previous question is linked to a property, respondents were asked whether they know who the property in question is occupied by. Three in five (62%) said they don’t know; however 14% are thought to be social tenants, 13% are thought to be private tenants and 7% are thought to be the owners.

Geographically, those in the East of Oxford are significantly more likely to mention private tenants (36% vs. 13% overall), while those in the South East of Oxford are more likely to mention social tenants (25% vs. 14% overall), in particular Housing Association tenants (12% vs. 5% overall).
To gauge the direction of travel over the last twelve months, respondents were also asked whether the different anti-social behaviour issues had got better, worse or stayed the same over this time period. Again, these findings are split over two charts, with those in the figure below showing the types of anti-social behaviour that are perceived to have shown highest net improvement in the last year – that is, the proportion saying ‘Better’ minus the proportion saying ‘Worse’.

The anti-social behaviour issues showing greatest improvement in the last twelve months are noisy neighbours and loud parties (+5 ppts) and abandoned or burned out vehicles (+5 ppts).

### Q21. In your opinion have the following types of anti-social behaviour got better, worse or stayed the same over the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Net improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties (911)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned or burned out vehicles (893)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being attacked/harassed (skin colour, ethnic origin, religion, sexual orientation) (891)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts or disputes between neighbours (898)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets (901)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly posting (887)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping (894)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 5.6 – Anti-social behaviour issues with highest net improvement scores
The figure below shows the types of anti-social behaviour that received negative net improvement scores – that is, the proportion saying that an issue has got worse over the last year outweighs the proportion saying it has got better. Overall, the issues with the lowest net improvement scores are cars being parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (-15 ppts) and speeding vehicles, motorbikes and dangerous driving (-14 ppts).

Q21. In your opinion have the following types of antisocial behaviour got better, worse or stayed the same over the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Net improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement staining or dropped chewing gum (908)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (897)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places (903)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti &amp; other deliberate damage to property or vehicles (898)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs (904)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around (911)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding vehicles/ motorbikes/ dangerous driving (897)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (911)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 5.7 – Anti-social behaviour issues with lowest net improvement scores

There are no clear patterns in the differences between demographic sub-groups in terms of the net improvement scores given for each type of anti-social behaviour.

The figure below shows any types of anti-social behaviour that are significantly more likely to have been seen to improve or get worse over the last twelve months across the local areas of Oxford. Encouragingly, those in the Cowley area are more likely than average to think four types of anti-social behaviour have shown an improvement in the last twelve months; however, the problem of cars parking inconveniently, dangerously or illegally is more likely than average to be seen as getting worse.

The only other significant difference by local area is in the East of Oxford, where respondents are more likely than average to see rubbish or litter as an issue that has got worse over the last year, an issue identified earlier in the report as being in need of improvement in this area. Although a range of anti-social behaviour issues are seen to be more of a problem by those in the South East (see Q19 above), these issues are no more likely than average to be seen as getting worse over the last year.

Again, there are no significant differences in the North, North East, or Central, South & West areas of the city.
Q21. In your opinion have the following types of antisocial behaviour got better, worse or stayed the same over the last 12 months?

Cowley
- Groups hanging around the streets (15% better vs. 8% overall)
- People being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (15% vs. 7%)
- People being drunk or rowdy in public places (14% vs. 7%)
- Fireworks being set off that are not part of an organised display (13% vs. 6%)

East
- Rubbish or litter lying around (22% worse vs. 12% overall)

Cars parked inconveniently, dangerously or illegally (30% worse vs. 21%)

Base: All valid responses (ranges from 887 to 911)

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 5.8 – Anti-social behaviour issues by local area
5.4 Alcohol-related anti-social behaviour

It can be seen in an earlier question that 17% of residents considered people being drunk or rowdy in public to be a big problem. However, respondents were asked more specifically about the prevalence of alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre. 14% think this is a big problem during the day, while over half (52%) think this is a problem at night.

Q13a-b. In your opinion how much of a problem, if any, is alcohol-related antisocial behaviour in Oxford city centre?

![Figure 5.9 – Alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in Oxford city centre](image)

Again, a number of demographic sub-groups are more likely to consider alcohol-related anti-social behaviour to be a problem in Oxford city centre. During the day, those aged 35+ (17%), social tenants (23%) and those with a disability (19%) are all more likely to consider alcohol-related anti-social behaviour to be a big problem in Oxford city centre (vs. 14% overall).

At night, those aged 35-64 (56%) are more likely to think this is a big problem (vs. 52% overall), while those aged 65+ are more likely to say they ‘Don’t know’ (38% vs. 19% overall) – perhaps reflecting that they may be less likely to go out in the city centre at this time. Perhaps unsurprisingly, another group more likely to think alcohol-related issues are a big problem at night are those saying they feel unsafe in the city centre at this time (83% vs. 52% overall).

As with the previous questions on different types of anti-social behaviour, respondents were then asked whether they think alcohol-related anti-social behaviour specifically has increased, decreased or stayed the same in the last year.

During the day, the same proportion think it has increased as decreased (6%), while almost half (46%) think it has remained about the same; those remaining (43%) say they don’t know.
At night, however, while 3% think alcohol-related anti-social behaviour has decreased, 15% think it has increased – a net score of +12 percentage points. Around four in ten say it has stayed the same (38%) or that they don’t know (43%).

Q14a-b. Do you think that alcohol-related antisocial behaviour in Oxford city centre has increased, decreased or stayed the same over the last 12 months?

During the day, those aged 35+ (7%) are more likely to think the problem has increased over the last twelve months (vs. just 3% of those aged 18-34), as are those who disagree that the Police (15%) or the Council (18%) are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter (vs. 6% overall).

At night, those aged 65+ (21%), social renters (25%) and those with a disability (24%) are all more likely to think the problem has increased (vs. 15% overall). This is also the case for those who feel unsafe in the city centre at this time (39%), as well as those who disagree that the Police (32%) or the Council (38%) are dealing with anti-social behaviour issues and crime (vs. 15% overall).

5.5 Neighbourhood Action Groups

In Oxford, there are a number of Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs). Each group covers a part of the city and is made up of Police Officers, Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), Oxford City Council’s Community Response Team, local councillors and other partner officers. These NAGs tackle the neighbourhoods’ community safety priorities.

Respondents were asked whether they know how to contact their NAG and, if not, whether they think they could find out or not. Overall, 14% say they know how to contact their NAG (6% definitely, 8% think so). Almost nine in ten (86%) say they don’t know, including half of respondents overall (51%) who think they could find out if they wanted to, three in ten (30%) who don’t know how they would find out, and 6% who say they don’t know and are not interested in NAGs.
Figure 5.11 – Contacting your Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG)

There are no significant differences by local area with regard to awareness of NAGs.

Those aged 65+ are more likely to say they know how to contact their NAG (22% vs. 8% of 18-34s), as are those who own their home outright (20% vs. 7% of private renters). However, private renters are more likely to say that they don’t know how to contact their NAG and are not interested (10% vs. 6% overall), perhaps reflecting the more transient nature of this population.

Furthermore, those who feel informed about the Council are more likely to know how to contact their NAG (18% vs. 8% who do not feel informed).
Health and well-being
6 Health and well-being

This section explores the findings related to the physical and mental health and well-being of residents.

Summary

• Residents’ self-assessed health is significantly better in Oxford than in Council B (77% vs. 64% good).
• Older respondents, social renters, those who live alone or those with a disability are less likely to be in good health.
• As with self-assessed health, the mental well-being of Oxford residents is better than of those in Council B.
• The average well-being index score amongst all residents is 25.3 out of a maximum 35, and the majority of them (73%) score between 20 and 29 points on the scale. The profile of residents with a lower well-being score is fairly similar to the profile of those in poor health.
• One in five respondents (19%) report a long-term health condition or disability that limits their day-to-day activities.
• Just under one in five residents (19%) provide unpaid help or care to someone else; and they are less likely to do so than those in Council B (19% vs. 33%).
• Results are generally consistent at a small area level.

6.1 Perceived health

Almost eight in ten (77%) respondents rate their health as either very good or good. This contrasts with one in six who consider it to be fair (17%) and just one in twenty (6%) who rate it as bad or very bad.

When looking at the contextual data that is available, residents’ self-assessed health is significantly better in Oxford than in Council B (77% vs. 64% good).

Results are consistent at a small area level.
Figure 6.1 – Overall self-assessed health

The greatest differences are between age groups, with younger people more likely to rate their health positively: 90% of those aged 18-34 rate their health as very good or good; this drops to 72% of those aged 35-64 and just 58% of those aged 65+.

Very good or good health is also less common among:

- Social renters (51%) than owner-occupiers (78%) or private tenants (88%);
- Those who live alone (68%) compared to respondents overall (77%); and
- Those with a disability (25%) than those with no disability (89%).

Assessments of personal health also vary by other factors or measures of lifestyle. Good or very good health is less widespread among:

- Those who have not volunteered at all in the last 12 months (74%) compared to those who have (81%);
- Those with a negative outlook on their personal finances in the next year (55% of those who believe their finances will get worse vs. 89% who believe their finances will improve);
- Those who disagree that people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well (64% vs. 82% of those who agree).
6.2 Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-being Short Scale (WEMWBS)

We used the Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Short Scale (WEMWBS) consisting of seven statements (shown below) to calculate an overall well-being score. Residents were asked to indicate how frequently they have experienced certain feelings in the last two weeks prior to the completion of the survey. The scale ranged from 1 (none of the time) to 5 (always) and therefore the maximum an individual could score is 35 points across the seven statements.

The seven statements that contribute to this well-being index score are shown in the chart below, ranked highest to lowest. For instance, eight in ten (78%) residents have often or all the time been able to make up their own mind about things but less than four in ten (38%) have felt relaxed.

Compared to Council B, Oxford’s results are more positive on all measures.

**Figure 6.2 – Mental health & well-being index**
The range of scores associated with these combined statements can be seen in the pie chart below.

**Q26. Below are some statements about feelings and thoughts. Please tick the box that best describes your experience of each over the last two weeks?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local areas</th>
<th>Well-being index score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East (91)</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (164)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East (123)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley (101)</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, South &amp; West (96)</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East (232)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.3 – Mental health and well-being index

It shows that the majority of residents (73%) score between 20 and 29 points out of 35 on the scale. One in seven (16%) score 30+ points, suggesting a high quality of mental well-being and one in ten (11%) score less than 20 points, suggesting they have a low quality of mental well-being.

The average well-being index score amongst all residents is 25.3 out of a maximum 35.

The profile of those with a lower well-being score tends to generally mirror the profile of those in poor health:

- Those aged 35-64 (24.81) compared to those aged 18-34 (25.83). That said, it is worth noting that the mental well-being of older respondents aged 65+ is in line with the average score;
- Those who live alone (24.3) compared to respondents overall (25.31);
- Social renters (22.6) compared to owner-occupiers (25.51); and
- Those with a disability (22.52) compared to those with no disability (25.94).
6.3 Health problems or disabilities

One in five respondents (19%) report a long-term health condition or disability that limits their day-to-day activities. Overall results are similar across the different small areas – however, those in the South East are more likely to say that their activities are limited a little because of their long-term health condition or disability (19% vs. 12% overall).

Q31. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to the question.]

Figure 6.4 – Limited activities

The incidence of a long-term limiting health and/or disabilities is very similar to that for fair or poor health: it is much greater among those aged 65+ (44%) than younger respondents aged 35-64 (22%) or 18-34 (6%). Similarly, it is more pronounced among social renters (44% compared to 19% of owner-occupiers and 5% of private tenants). Looking at differences amongst owner-occupiers only, those who have owned their home outright (32%) are significantly more likely than those who have bought it on mortgage (8%) to report a long-term health condition or disability that limits their day-to-day activities.
6.4 Care given to others

Just under one in five residents (19%) provide unpaid help or care to someone else. Most of these provide less than 20 hours care a week (16% of all residents) and only a minority provide more than that (1% of all residents provide 20-49 hours a week and 2% of all residents provide 50 or more hours a week).

Residents in Oxford are significantly less likely than those in Council B to provide unpaid care or support to family members, friends or neighbours (19% vs. 33%).

Once again, results are consistent at a small area level.

Q27. Do you look after, or give any unpaid help or support to family members, friends, neighbours or others because they have: - long-term physical or mental ill-health or disability? - problems related to old age?*

Figure 6.5 – Support to family members, friends or neighbours

Those more likely to care for others include older respondents aged over 35 (29% vs. 19% respondents overall), owner occupiers (27% vs. 19% respondents overall) or those with a disability of their own (30% vs. 19% overall); conversely younger residents aged 18-34 (5% vs. 19% overall) or private renters (5% vs. 19% overall) are the least likely to provide care.
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7 The economy

This section looks at the perceived economic performance of the local area and respondents’ outlook on their personal finances.

Summary

- It is encouraging to see that respondents in Oxford are much more optimistic about the economy of their local area than those in Council B (53% vs. 11% agree that their local area is thriving), and that their positive views mirror the national outlook on the state of the economy. Those in the East and the Central, South and West are the most optimistic, whereas those in the South East and Cowley are the most pessimistic.
- Economic optimism is greater amongst those positive about their local area or the Council, but it is generally consistent amongst the key demographic groups.
- Six in ten Oxford residents have been affected in some way by the current economic climate, although this is significantly lower than Council B (66%).
- One in five believe their financial circumstances will improve. Reflecting their economic optimism, those living in Oxford are significantly more positive about their personal finances than those in Council B. Residents’ economic outlook on their personal finances is consistent at a small area level.

We know from our monthly issues index that although the economy remains a top concern for the general public, it continues to fall as concern shifts to race relations and the NHS. For instance, in March 2015, half as many as in 2010 mentioned the economy as the most important issue facing Britain today (28% vs. 55% in 2010).

National economic optimism is also at relatively high levels, and it has been recovering in 2015 after a dip in 2014. Please see the figure below which tracks public attitudes on the long-term economic condition of the economy since the late nineties.
Q. Do you think that the long-term economic condition of the economy will improve, stay the same or get worse?

Figure 7.1 – Economic optimism index

7.1 The state of the local economy

Over half of respondents believe their local economy is thriving (12%) or on the way up (41%), whilst a fifth believe the local economy is not doing well (17%) or really struggling (5%).

It is very positive to see that respondents in Oxford are much more optimistic than those in Council B (53% vs. 11% agree that their local area is thriving) – and their positive outlook mirrors with the national picture.

Opinions differ at a small area level, with those in the East (71% vs. 53% overall) and the Central, South and West (66%) being the most optimistic. Conversely, those in the South East (43%) and Cowley (37%) are the most pessimistic.
Figure 7.2 – State of the economy

Older respondents aged 65+ are significantly less positive about their local economy (43% vs. 53% overall); but other than that, attitudes are similar by the other key demographics.

Economic optimism is greater amongst those positive about their local area or the Council:

- Those who are satisfied with their local area (58% believe the economy in their local area is thriving or on the way up vs. 31% of those who are dissatisfied);
- Those who are satisfied with the Council (59% vs. 36% of those who are dissatisfied);
- Those who agree the Council provides value for money (64% vs. 39% of those who disagree).
7.2 Financial security

Overall six in ten residents (60%) believe they have been affected in some way by the current economic situation - although this is significantly fewer than those in Council B\(^8\) who have been financially affected (66%).

Residents have been affected in different ways; mostly by not being able to afford a holiday (30%), not being able to buy a home or move home (23%), having difficulties paying fuel and energy bills or reduced job security (both 17%). Over one in ten say they have found it difficult to pay their rent or mortgage (12%) or afford food (11%).

Compared to those in Council B, Oxford residents are more likely to have been affected by the current economic situation by not being able to buy a home or move home (23% vs. 14% in Council B). However, the proportion of Oxford residents who have been affected by the economic climate in any other way is significantly lower than in Council B.

**Figure 7.3 – Financial security**

The mean number of financial problems that residents report is 2.7, however, this increases significantly for the following groups:

- Those with a disability (3.5 vs. 2.5 for those with no disability);
- Middle aged residents (3 for those aged 35-64 vs. 1.8 for those aged 65+);

---

\(^8\) It is worth noting that not all option codes are directly comparable, as these differed slightly for Council B, as follows:

- Difficulties paying for childcare was combined with education (5% in total who have been affected through at least one of these in locality B);
- Difficulties repaying interest was phrased as “difficulties paying interest on loans”.

---
• Those with children in household (3.3 vs. 2.5 for those living alone);
• Social renters (3.5 vs. 2.3 for owner occupiers);

Results are fairly consistent at a small area level. That said, compared to the overall results, a higher proportion of those living in Cowley have had difficulties paying their rent or mortgage (23% vs. 12% residents overall), getting access to credit (13% vs. 7% overall) or paying for education (12% vs. 5% residents overall).

7.3 Residents’ personal finances in the next 12 months

A fifth of Oxford residents believe that their finances will either get better (19%) or worse (19%) over the next 12 months. However, over half of residents (54%) believe their finances will remain the same.

As with opinions on the economy of the local area, those living in Oxford are significantly more positive about their personal finances than those in Council B (19% vs. 6% in Council B believe their financial circumstances will improve).

Residents’ economic outlook on their personal finances is consistent at a small area level.

Q24. Do you think that your personal financial circumstances will improve, stay the same or get worse over the next 12 months?

Figure 7.4 – Personal finances

Across other key-groups of residents, those most optimistic about their personal finances are aged 18-34 (29% vs. 19% overall), private renters (28% vs. 19% overall), White (20% vs. 19% overall) or in good health (22% vs. 19% overall). Conversely, those who are the least optimistic are aged 35 and over (13% vs. 19% overall), living alone (11% vs. 19% overall), in poor health (1% vs. 19% overall) or care for other people (9% vs. 19% overall).
Council performance
8 Council performance

The final section of the report examines residents’ overall perceptions of the Council, as well as their views on the services it provides and the value for money it represents. Also included are whether residents feel they have been treated with respect and consideration by public services, and how informed they feel about both the services and benefits provided by the Council, and what to do in extreme weather conditions such as flooding.

Summary

- Seven in ten (71%) are satisfied with the way the Council runs things, compared to 12% that are dissatisfied. Levels of satisfaction are significantly higher than both Council A (52%) and Council B (47%).
- Key drivers of satisfaction with the Council include agreeing that it provides value for money, being satisfied with the local area as a place to live and being satisfied with a range of environmental services.
- Two in five (43%) agree the Council provides value for money, significantly higher than both Council A (35%) and Council B (33%). 17% think it does not provide value for money.
- Key drivers of value for money include overall satisfaction with the way the Council runs things and feeling informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions.
- Two thirds (68%) think they have been treated with respect and consideration by public services all or most of the time over the last year. Just 6% think has rarely or never been the case.
- Almost three in five (57%) feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides, in line with Council A and Council B. Nearly two in five (37%) say they do not feel informed.
- Two in five (41%) feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding; but half do not (50%).
- Satisfaction with Council services is highest for parks and open spaces (88%), recycling and refuse collection (82%) and museums and galleries (74%). However, levels of dissatisfaction are highest for sport and leisure facilities (18%), the local transport network (17%) and local bus services (14%).
8.1 General satisfaction with the Council

In order to gain insight into residents’ perceptions of Oxford City Council, respondents were asked for their overall view about the Council’s performance. Seven in ten (71%) are satisfied with how the Council runs things, including 15% who are very satisfied. A further 15% say they have no views either way, while 12% say they are dissatisfied with the Council (3% very dissatisfied).

Encouragingly, the proportion feeling satisfied with the Council (71%) is significantly higher than both Council A (52%) and Council B (47%), while levels of dissatisfaction are significantly lower (12% vs. 28% in Council A and 26% in Council B).

Figure 8.1 – Satisfaction with the Council

There are no significant differences in satisfaction with the way Council runs thing by local area.

In terms of age, those aged 35-64 are less likely than average to be satisfied with the Council (67% vs. 71% overall). Levels of active dissatisfaction are higher than average amongst those who own their home outright (18%), those whose activities are limited by a disability or health condition (18%) or those who give unpaid help, care or support (18% vs. 12% overall).

Residents who believe the Council provides value for money are more likely to be satisfied with the way it runs things generally (91%), as are those who feel informed about the services and benefits it provides (83%), and those who think the Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area (84% vs. 71% overall).

Those with a more optimistic view about the local economy are also more likely than average to rate the Council’s performance positively (78% of those who think it is thriving or on the way up are satisfied with the Council vs. 62% of those who think it is not doing well or really struggling).
8.2 Key drivers of Council satisfaction

To enable us to see what is driving satisfaction with the way the Council runs things, key drivers analysis was undertaken to see what elements have the most influence on the way residents answered this question. Once again, it cannot account for all factors which may impact on impressions of the Council, simply those covered in the survey.

Out of the 55% that we can predict, the following figure shows that perceived value for money is the most dominant factor – i.e. the thing most likely to influence perceptions within the model. This is followed by overall satisfaction with the local area as a place to live.

Views on the Council’s environmental services are also important factors; satisfaction with the Council is tied in with satisfaction with recycling/refuse collection, parks and open spaces and keeping residential streets clear of litter. Also significant is a sense of being treated with respect and consideration by public services.

Other factors included in the model are satisfaction with the local transport network, satisfaction with theatres and concert halls and a sense that the problem of abandoned or burned out vehicles has improved over the last twelve months.

**Positive drivers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive driver</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Oxford City Council provides value for money</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with your local area as a place to live</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with keeping residential streets clear of litter</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with recycling and refuse collection</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated with respect and consideration by your local public services</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with parks and open spaces</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with local transport network</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour - Abandoned or burned out vehicles has got better</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with theatres/concert halls</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (974)

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 8.2 – Key drivers of satisfaction with the Council
8.3 Value for money

Value for money has long been known to be linked to satisfaction with local authorities and we already know it is a key driver of satisfaction with Oxford City Council. With reductions in local government funding meaning authorities are having to find new ways to deliver and fund services, councils will need to work hard to ensure residents still believe they are getting value for money.

Overall, two in five residents (43%) agree that the Council gives value for money, compared with 17% who disagree. Around a third (32%) say they neither agree nor disagree, while 7% don’t know.

The proportion agreeing that the Council provides value for money (43%) is significantly higher than both Council A (35%) and Council B (33%). Similarly, levels of active disagreement with the statement are significantly lower (17% vs. 28% in Council A and 34% in Council B)\(^9\).

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that Oxford City Council provides value for money?

![Figure 8.3 – Value for money](image)

Those living in Central, South & West are less likely than average to agree that the Council provides value for money (32% vs. 43% overall).

In terms of age, those aged 65+ are more likely to agree the Council provides value for money (50%, rising to 55% of those aged 75+ vs. 43% overall), as are social renters (57% vs. 39% of owner occupiers). The latter could perhaps reflect the fact that social tenants are more likely to be exposed to the Council and the services it provides on a more regular basis.

---

\(^{9}\) Please note that Council B asked about ‘good value for money’ rather than just ‘value for money’.
Those who are satisfied with the Council overall are more likely to think it provides value for money (56%), as are those who feel informed about the services and benefits it provides (56%) and those who think the Council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter (61% vs. 43% overall).

Again, those with a more optimistic view of the local economy are more likely to have more positive perceptions about the value for money offered by the Council (52% of those who think the local economy is doing really well or on the way up agree with the statement vs. 32% of those who think it is not doing well or really struggling).

### 8.4 Key drivers of value for money

To enable us to see what affects the Council’s perceived value for money, key drivers analysis has also been conducted on results for this question. Once again, it cannot account for all factors which may impact on impressions of the Council, simply those covered in the survey.

Out of the 50% that we can predict, the following figure shows that overall satisfaction with the way the Council runs things is the most dominant factor – i.e. the thing most likely to influence perceptions in the model. This is followed by whether residents feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding.

Other factors associated with perceived value for money include satisfaction with the local transport network, sport and leisure facilities, and the area overall as a place to live. Also significant are a sense of being treated with respect and consideration by local public services, a belief that the Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides, and a view that the Police are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter – particularly abandoned and burned out vehicles, safety in the city centre and people being drunk or rowdy in public.

**Figure 8.4 – Key drivers of value for money**
8.5 Perceived treatment by public services

As shown above, a sense of being treated with respect and consideration by local public services is a key driver of satisfaction with the Council and perceived value for money. Over the last year, around two thirds (68%) think that this has been the case either all of the time (34%) or most of the time (34%). Encouragingly, just 6% think this has been the case either rarely (4%) or never (1%).

Q18. In the last year would you say that you have been treated with respect and consideration by your local public services, such as Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council and Thames Valley Police?

Figure 8.5 – Respect and consideration from public services

Those in the South East area of Oxford are significantly more likely than average to say they have been treated with respect and consideration either rarely or never over the last year (11% vs. 6% overall). This perhaps reflects the less positive views of these residents around feeling safe, anti-social behaviour and community cohesion that are discussed in previous sections.

Those aged 65+ are more likely to say they have been treated with respect and consideration all or most of the time (72% vs. 65% of those aged 35-64). Those with a disability, however, are less likely to think this has been the case (60%, falling to 53% of those who activities are limited a lot vs. 68% overall).

Those who are positive about other factors of Council performance are also advocates:

- Those who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things (78% feel they are treated with respect and consideration all or most of the time vs. 68% overall);
- Those who agree the Council provides value for money (81%);
- Those who feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides (77%); and
- Those who agree that the Police (78%) / the Council (83%) are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their local area.
8.6 Information provision

Good information and communication are important elements of service delivery for local authorities. For decades, a key finding in all of Ipsos MORI’s work has been that Councils which do better at keeping people informed about services tend to be better regarded. We also know that feeling informed is a key driver to perceived value for money in Oxford.

Overall, almost three in five (57%) say they feel well informed about the services and benefits Oxford City Council provides, compared to almost two in five (37%) who say they do not feel informed.

The proportion saying they feel informed about Oxford City Council (57%) is in line with both Council A (60%) and Council B (57%)

**Q4. Overall, how well informed do you think Oxford City Council keeps residents about the services and benefits it provides?**

![% Informed % Not informed](chart)

**Local areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Informed</th>
<th>% Not informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East (277)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (197)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, South &amp; West (111)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East (147)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East (104)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley (133)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contextual data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>% Informed</th>
<th>% Not informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford CC 2014/15 (969)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council A 2014 (757)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council B 2012 (1207)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ipsos MORI

**Figure 8.6 – Keeping residents informed about services and benefits**

Those in the North East area of Oxford are more likely than average to say they feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides (65% vs. 57% overall).

Those aged 65+ (69%) and those aged 35-64 (62%) are more likely to feel they are kept up to date than those aged 18-34 (49%). Also more likely to feel informed are owner occupiers (61%) and social renters in particular (69%) compared with private renters (50%), perhaps reflecting the age profiles of these different tenures.

White respondents are more likely to say they feel knowledge about what the Council does (59% vs. 51% of BME respondents), as are those living in single person households (66% vs. 57% overall).

---

10 Please note that after the main question, Council B included an additional line of clarification – “By benefits we mean any positive impacts it has had on the local area.”
Those who are satisfied with the way the Council runs things (67%), those who think the Council provides value for money (74%) and those who think the Council are dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter (70%) are all more likely than average to feel they are kept up to date about the services and benefits the Council provides (vs. 57% overall). Notably, those who say they know how to contact their Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) are also more likely to feel informed (77%).

Residents were also asked how informed they feel about what to do in extreme weather conditions, such as flooding. In addition to feeling informed about services and benefits the Council provides, we know that this is a significant key driver of perceived value for money.

Fewer say they feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions (41%). Half of residents (50%) feel either not very well or not at all informed.

**Figure 8.7 – Feeling informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions**

Those in the North area of Oxford are more likely than average to say they feel kept up to date about what to do in extreme weather conditions (55% vs. 41% overall). Those in the North East, however, are more likely than average to say they do not feel informed (58% vs. 50% overall).

Those aged 65+ are more likely to say they feel knowledgeable about what to do (46% vs. 41% overall), as are white respondents (43% compared to 37% of BME respondents).

In addition, those who feel informed about the services and benefits the Council provides overall are more likely to feel informed about what to do in extreme weather conditions (54%), as are those who know how to contact their Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) (67% vs. 41% overall).
8.7 Satisfaction with Council services

Residents were also asked for their views on some of the services provided or supported by Oxford City Council and/or Oxfordshire County Council. The services with highest levels of satisfaction include parks and open spaces (88%), recycling and refuse collection (82%) and museums and galleries (74%). Those with the lowest satisfaction levels are sport and leisure facilities (46%), and community centres (40%).

However, because of the varying proportion of those saying they ‘Don’t know’ (most likely because they are non-users of the service), the Council services with lowest levels of satisfaction are not necessarily those rated the most negatively. Active levels of dissatisfaction are highest for sport and leisure facilities (18%), the local transport network (17%) and local bus services (14%).

Q9a-k. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>% Very satisfied</th>
<th>% Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>% Neither / nor</th>
<th>% Dissatisfied</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces (928)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling and refuse collection (969)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums / galleries (917)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local bus services (946)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatres / concert halls (910)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local transport network (905)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries (921)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community recycling facilities (935)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tips / Household waste recycling centres (939)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport / leisure facilities (855)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres (907)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.8 – Satisfaction with Council services

Indicative benchmarking data is also available for some of the services asked about from the Council B survey in 201211. Aside from local tips and household waste recycling centres, levels of satisfaction are all significantly higher in Oxford City Council than in Council B.

---

11 Please note that Council B used a different question wording to the Oxford City Council survey – ‘The council is a key provider of public services locally, so we would like your views on some of the services we provide. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following services provided or supported by the council?’
There are a number of significant differences by local area in terms of satisfaction with Council services:

- Those in the North of Oxford are more likely to be satisfied with both museums and galleries, and theatres and concert halls, but less likely to be satisfied with recycling and refuse collection, the local transport network and local bus services.

- Those in the South East of Oxford are more likely to be positive about local tips and household waste recycling centres and community centres, but less likely to be satisfied with parks and open spaces.

- Those in the Central, South and West of Oxford are less likely to be satisfied with local bus services.

- Those in the North East are more likely to be satisfied with recycling and refuse collection.

- Those in Cowley are more likely to be satisfied with local bus services.

There are also a range of significant differences between demographic sub-groups. In terms of age, those aged 65+ are more likely to be satisfied with a range of Council services – recycling and refuse collection, local tips and household waste recycling centres (HWRCs), community recycling facilities, local bus services, the local transport network, and local libraries. Those aged 35-64 are more likely to be positive about local tips and HWRCs, as well as sport and leisure facilities. The only significant difference amongst 18-34s is that they are less likely to be satisfied with local tips and HWRCs.

Owner occupiers are more likely to be positive about recycling and refuse collection, local tips and HWRCs, and theatres and concert halls, but are less likely to be positive about the local transport network and sport and leisure facilities. Social tenants are more likely to be positive about community centres and sport and leisure facilities, but less likely to be positive about parks and open spaces, and recycling and refuse collection. The only significant difference amongst those in private rented accommodation is that they are less likely to be satisfied with the provision of local tips and HWRCs.

Women are more likely to be satisfied with libraries, theatres and concert halls, and parks and open spaces; however, men are less likely to be satisfied with theatres and concert halls. White respondents are more likely to be satisfied with museums and galleries, and theatres and concert halls, but are less likely to be satisfied with community centres; BME respondents are less satisfied with museums and galleries.

Finally, those with children in the household are more likely than average to be positive about local tips and HWRCs, local libraries and community centres. Residents whose activities are limited by a health problem or disability are less likely to be satisfied with sport and leisure facilities, museums and galleries, and theatres and concert halls.

8.8 Reasons for dissatisfaction with Council services

Residents were also given the opportunity to provide an explanation for their dissatisfaction with Council services. These comments have been reviewed and a summary of some of the recurring themes is included in the table below.
Please note, however, that these perceptions are by no means a representation of all residents’ views in Oxford. The comments have not been quantified and some of the perceived issues represent only a very small number of survey respondents. Therefore, the reasons for dissatisfaction included in the table should only be considered as an indicative summary of the comments received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council service</th>
<th>Key reasons for dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community centres                        | • Lack of community centres in local area  
• Centres being closed down (especially Cowley)  
• Lack of activities for older people |
| Community recycling facilities (e.g. clothes banks) | • Lack of community recycling facilities in local area  
• Clothes banks being full / overflowing |
| Libraries                                 | • Closure of local libraries (or perceived threats of closures)  
• Shortened / limited opening hours |
| Local bus services                        | • Costs/expensive – acts as disincentive to stop using cars  
• Poor routes / inter-connectedness of local areas – having to go into the city centre and back out again to get to different areas  
• Punctuality / reliability problems  
• Infrequent services / scheduling issues  
• Overcrowding on some services |
| Local tips / Household waste recycling centres (e.g. Redbridge) | • Proximity to nearest tip  
• Lack of access without cars  
• Perceived unfriendliness / unhelpfulness of staff  
• Problems getting there due to queues / traffic congestion |
| Local transport network                   | • Traffic congestion (especially at peak times / rush hour)  
• Condition of road surfaces / potholes  
• Disruption / road closures / roadworks  
• Safety of cycling routes |
| Museums / galleries                       | • Lack of museums / galleries in local area |
| Parks and open spaces                     | • Cleanliness issues / litter / graffiti  
• Lack of bins / bins not being emptied  
• Dog fouling problems |
| Refuse collection                         | • Infrequency of collections  
• Lack of food waste collections for those living in flats  
• Refuse collectors not returning bins neatly to properties / damaging bins  
• Not enough recycling options available  
• Charging for garden waste collection |
| Sport / leisure facilities                | • Lack of sports facilities / swimming pools in local area  
• Cost of private facilities |
| Theatres / concert halls                  | • No large concert hall in local area suitable for classical music events / orchestras etc. |
9 Technical report

9.1 Respondent profile

The following figure shows the profile of respondents, both weighted and unweighted, and the key demographic profile of the Oxford population aged 18+. The unweighted sample of respondents is close to that of the borough population by gender and ethnicity. However, as with almost all postal surveys, younger people are far less likely to take part which means the sample is biased towards older people aged 55+.

Figure 9.1 – Respondent profile
9.2 Demographics

The following figures show that over a quarter (27%) have at least one child living in the household, while three in ten are in a single person household (33%). Over half of respondents are owner occupiers (54%), a quarter rent from a private landlord, whilst one in seven (15%) are social renters.

Figure 9.2 – Household demographics
9.3 Small areas

It is reassuring to see that at a small area level, the profile of residents who responded to the survey matches the profile of Oxford residents overall. This can be seen in the chart below.

![Chart showing the profile of Oxford Residents across different areas.](chart)

*based on 2014 estimates commissioned by the Oxfordshire County Council. It is believed that the County Council estimates are more reliable than the ONS estimates.

Base: All valid responses (963)

Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 9.3 – Profile of Oxford Residents

9.4 Sample frame and design

The Post Office Small User Address File (PAF) was used as the sampling frame for the survey. This was chosen as it comprises the most up-to-date source of addresses available.

Oxford is a university city, with students making up a significant proportion of the population. However, many students live in communal establishments (e.g. halls of residence) which are only represented by one address in the PAF, preventing surveys being sent to those living in individual rooms or student flats. We acknowledge that this limits the extent to which the survey can be considered representative of the entire population of Oxford.

However, student populations by their very nature tend to be transient and so the Residents’ Survey – which included questions around satisfaction with various Council services, and whether anti-social behaviour has got better or worse over time – may not have been seen as relevant (particularly amongst those in their first year of study, who may have only moved into the Oxford area in September/October 2014). Because of these factors, the decision was taken to consult with these students separately through an existing student forum.
9.5 Weighting

Data were weighted back to the known population profile of the borough to counter-act non-response bias. Data are weighted by age within gender bands and balanced by household size. The weighting profile was based on the 2011 Census information.

9.5.1 Data analysis, editing and coding

All completed postal questionnaires were processed through scanning and manual verification. The key advantages of scanning is that results can be turned around faster than manual keying in of data, making it less resource-intensive and therefore more cost effective. Our scanning software is programmed to ask for verification where it is not 100% certain, so errors are kept to a minimum.

9.5.2 Statistical reliability

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total “population”, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been surveyed and responded. But we can predict the variation between the sample results and the “true” values from knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually 95% - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” value will fall within a specified range.

The table below illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the “95% confidence interval”. An indication of approximate sampling tolerances is given in the table below. Strictly speaking, the tolerances shown here apply only to random samples, so the comparison with postal research is indicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample on which the survey results are based</th>
<th>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% or 90% ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 surveyed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 surveyed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 surveyed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983 surveyed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, with a sample of 983 where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 19 in 20 that the “true” value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been surveyed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 3 percentage points from the sample result, which is very accurate.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be “real”, or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been surveyed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. if it is “statistically significant”, we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume the “95% confidence interval”, the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample at sub-group level compared</th>
<th>Differences required for significance at or near these percentage levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% or 90% ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 and 100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and 200</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and 400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 and 500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix
10 Appendix

The following charts show the results for Oxford City Council compared to the results for other local authorities which undertook a residents’ survey in 2013-14 and who uploaded their findings to the LG Inform website.

10.1 LG Inform additional benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>% Very satisfied</th>
<th>% Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>% Neither/nor</th>
<th>% Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>% Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>% Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury Borough Council (669)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hartfordshire Council (1198)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Borough Council (792)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes Council (1345)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council (969)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Borough Council (1934)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Borough Council (1520)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool Borough Council (6026)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage Borough Council (1294)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (1119)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale Borough Council (903)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above) Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 10.1 – Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live
Figure 10.2 – Satisfaction with the way the Council runs things

- % Strongly agree  - % Tend to agree  - % Neither/nor  - % Tend to disagree  - % Strongly disagree  - % Don’t know

Tewkesbury Borough Council (689)
- 8  48  34  11  2  3

Chesterfield Borough Council (792)
- 5  43  14  12  4  12

Bournemouth Borough Council (1934)
- 8  41  36  14  3  4

Milton Keynes Council (1345)
- 5  48  45  15  6  4

West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)
- 6  37  31  15  5  4

Oxford City Council (967)
- 6  37  24  12  5  7

Stevenage Borough Council (1294)
- 4  39  23  16  4  4

East Hertfordshire Council (1198)
- 3  37  33  14  4  3

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (1119)
- 5  33  24  17  6  5

Swale Borough Council (903)
- 8  32  22  22  6  9

Hartlepool Borough Council (6026)
- 4  30  22  22  7  3

Scarborough Borough Council (1520)
- 3  29  22  22  8  3

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 10.3 – Agree the council provides value for money

- % Strongly agree  - % Tend to agree  - % Neither/nor  - % Tend to disagree  - % Strongly disagree  - % Don’t know

Tewkesbury Borough Council (689)
- 8  48  34  11  2  3

Chesterfield Borough Council (792)
- 5  43  14  12  4  12

Bournemouth Borough Council (1934)
- 8  41  36  14  3  4

Milton Keynes Council (1345)
- 5  48  45  15  6  4

West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)
- 6  37  31  15  5  4

Oxford City Council (967)
- 6  37  24  12  5  7

Stevenage Borough Council (1294)
- 4  39  23  16  4  4

East Hertfordshire Council (1198)
- 3  37  33  14  4  3

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (1119)
- 5  33  24  17  6  5

Swale Borough Council (903)
- 8  32  22  22  6  9

Hartlepool Borough Council (6026)
- 4  30  22  22  7  3

Scarborough Borough Council (1520)
- 3  29  22  22  8  3

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI
### Figure 10.4 – Feel safe in your local area after dark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Very safe</th>
<th>% Fairly safe</th>
<th>% Neither/nor</th>
<th>% Fairly unsafe</th>
<th>% Very unsafe</th>
<th>% Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Borough Council (792)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury Borough Council (689)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hertfordshire Council (1198)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council (963)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

### Figure 10.5 – Feel safe in your local area during the day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Very safe</th>
<th>% Fairly safe</th>
<th>% Neither/nor</th>
<th>% Fairly unsafe</th>
<th>% Very unsafe</th>
<th>% Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council (956)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury Borough Council (689)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hertfordshire Council (1198)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Borough Council (1520)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Borough Council (792)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes Council (1345)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool Borough Council (6028)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Borough Council (1934)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage Borough Council (1294)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI
Figure 10.6 – Feel Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough Council</th>
<th>% Very well informed</th>
<th>% Fairly well informed</th>
<th>% Not very well informed</th>
<th>% Not well informed at all</th>
<th>% Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury Borough Council (G09)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hertfordshire Council (1198)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage Borough Council (1294)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Borough Council (792)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool Borough Council (6028)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council (966)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes Council (1345)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Borough Council (1934)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Borough Council (1520)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couthend-on-Sea Borough Council (1119)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI

Figure 10.7 – Agree that your local area is a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough Council</th>
<th>% Definitely agree</th>
<th>% Tend to agree</th>
<th>% Neither / nor</th>
<th>% Tend to disagree</th>
<th>% Don’t know</th>
<th>% Too few people in area</th>
<th>% All same background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council (966)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Borough Council (1934)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes Council (1345)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage Borough Council (1294)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire Borough Council (1113)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (1119)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool Borough Council (6028)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All valid responses (see above)  
Source: Ipsos MORI