



# Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council

## *Citizens Engagement Survey 2024 report*

This report has been  
prepared by Matt Miller  
in September 2024

Version 2.0 - Final





APSE (Association for Public Service Excellence) is a not for profit local government body working with over 300 councils throughout the UK. Promoting excellence in public services, APSE is the foremost specialist in local authority front line services, hosting a network for front line service providers in areas such as waste and refuse collection, parks and environmental services, leisure, school meals, cleaning, housing and building maintenance.

APSE provides services specifically designed for local authorities, such as benchmarking, consultancy, seminars, research, briefings and training. Through its consultancy arm APSE delivers expert assistance to councils with the overt aim of driving service improvement and value for money through service review and redesign. APSE delivers in excess of 100 projects a year and clients benefit from the consultancy's not for profit ethical approach to consultancy services.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



GB 11409



GB 11132



GB 14074

# Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council Survey report

## Contents

|                                                          |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction .....</b>                             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. Demographic Data .....</b>                         | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>3. Relative importance of different services.....</b> | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>4. Service by service ratings .....</b>               | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>5. Overall score and additional comments .....</b>    | <b>18</b> |
| <b>6. Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>          | <b>20</b> |

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 APSE Solutions was engaged to carry out a repeat survey of citizens on behalf of Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council (CC&G). This would be a follow up survey to one carried out by APSE in 2021/22 and cover the same questions to provide a like for like comparison. Following service areas were included in the survey:
- Refuse Collection
  - Street Cleansing
  - Parks and Open Spaces
  - Sport and Leisure
  - Births Deaths and Marriages
  - Community Facilities
- 1.2 The survey was a whole population survey with no sampling. The invitation to participate was distributed widely, with no apparent bias toward any demographic, geographical or other group. Although designed to be completed on-line, using a smart phone or computer, options were available for telephone and postal completion. Estimates vary but recent research indicates that around 7% of the UK adult population are almost completely offline<sup>1</sup>. Digital exclusion can impact on older people, those with certain disabilities and economically marginalised groups. OFCOM estimates that 6% of households didn't have access to the internet at home in 2023. Of this 6%, 39% are aged 65 and over<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.3 The survey resulted in 2,701 responses in total, with a completion rate of 76%. Regardless of what proportion of the total population it represents, this is a statistically significant number. This means we can have a high degree of confidence (95%) that the views expressed will be in line with those of the population as a whole, give or take 2%.
- 1.4 Response levels for sub-groups were obviously significantly lower in number, meaning that it is less possible to be confident that the views expressed are reflective of the view of those groups as a whole. So, for example, with 218 under 25s completing the survey, caution should be exercised in interpreting the views
- 

<sup>1</sup> Lloyds Bank UK Consumer Digital Index 2020

<sup>2</sup> OFCOM Adult's Media Use and Attitudes Report 2024

expressed in so far as this sub-group is concerned. This is even more the case for combinations of subgroups, e.g., people under 25 living in Moyle, of which only ten responded. For these smaller groups of respondents results should be regarded as indicative rather than definitive.

- 1.5 A full set of graphs and tables are appended to this summary report as are all additional comments.
- 1.6 Please note that due to rounding, percentages may total slightly more or less than 100%.

## 2. Demographic Data

### Area of Residence

- 2.1 The survey was distributed throughout the CC&G area. The table below compares the breakdown of responses by area with that of the entire population as given in the 2021 Census. The total population according to the census is approximately 141,750 people.

|            | <b>Proportion of Responses<br/>2021/22</b> | <b>Proportion of Responses<br/>2024/25</b> | <b>Proportion of<br/>CC&amp;G Population</b> |
|------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Coleraine  | 31%                                        | 38%                                        | 43%                                          |
| Limavady   | 18%                                        | 19%                                        | 24%                                          |
| Ballymoney | 20%                                        | 17%                                        | 22%                                          |
| Moyle      | 15%                                        | 14%                                        | 12%                                          |
| Other      | 16%                                        | 13%                                        |                                              |

- 2.2 The proportion of respondents from each council area varied with the proportion of CCG residents for each area in the population, though only by a maximum of 5%. The disparity may be related to the fact that 13% of respondents chose not to identify with any of the area choices. The most frequently mentioned alternatives were Portrush and Portstewart with a combined total of 166 responses. Ballycastle (32) and Garvagh (20) were the next highest "other" responses.

## Age Profile

| Age profile of survey respondents |         |         | Age profile of population |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------------|
|                                   | 2021/22 | 2024/25 | 2021 Census               |
| Under 18                          | 0.75%   | 1.08%   | 22%                       |
| 18-24                             | 1.99%   | 7.02%   | 8%                        |
| 25-34                             | 9.31%   | 20.56%  | 11%                       |
| 35-44                             | 15.43%  | 20.45%  | 12%                       |
| 45-54                             | 19.81%  | 16.63%  | 14%                       |
| 55-64                             | 26.15%  | 18.52%  | 14%                       |
| 65+                               | 26.2%   | 15.29%  | 19%                       |
| Prefer not to say                 | 0.35%   | 0.45%   |                           |

2.3 Whilst the data sets are not directly comparable, it is clear that the age profile of respondents is different from that of the population as a whole but they are arguably more in line with the census figures than the previous survey. In particular, the proportion of older participants, 65+, has shrunk compared with those in the 25-34 and 35-44 brackets. This change shows that the younger generation are potentially more engaged with council services than previously and wish to make their opinions heard. Two thirds of those respondents aged between 25 and 44 reported that they have dependent children living with them and it is feasible that they engaged with the survey in the hopes of improving services for their families in future years.

## Gender

2.4 The gender split of respondents was 59% female and 40% male. This is disproportionate to the 51% female to 49% male split of the population as a whole. 0.26% of respondents opted for the 'neither' category of gender identification and just over 1% didn't wish to answer the question. There does not seem to be any strong correlation between gender and levels of overall satisfaction, although women scored the overall performance of the council slightly lower than men at 3.1 out of 5, as against 3.2 out of 5. This is a reverse on the previous survey results.

## Religion

2.5 The proportion of Catholics and Protestants responding to the survey have both decreased from the previous survey with an associated increase in the other survey options. Interestingly, the proportion of those identifying as having another religion has tripled and is noticeably higher than the respective proportion of the population.

| Religion          | Proportion of Responses 2021/22 | Proportion of Responses 2024/25 | Proportion of Population |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Catholic          | 29%                             | 26%                             | 38%                      |
| Protestant        | 44%                             | 41%                             | 45%                      |
| No religion       | 19%                             | 22%                             | 16%                      |
| Other religion    | 1%                              | 3%                              | 1%                       |
| Prefer not to say |                                 | 8%                              |                          |

## Disability Status

2.6 The proportion of respondents describing themselves as having a disability was 21%, which is an increase from the previous survey. This compares to 26% categorised as having a 'limiting long term illness' according to the 2021 Census data. The latter is a wider definition which includes conditions that would not necessarily be defined as disability. 21% can be considered a good level of response for this important sub-group. The actual number of responses (555) allows a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error.

## Dependent Children

2.7 The 2021 census data indicate that 46% of the CC&G population have dependent children in their household. Amongst survey respondents the proportion is 43.7%. The discrepancy here is relatively minor and shows that the survey covers a good proportion of families in line with the census

## 3. Relative importance of different services

3.1 Respondents were asked to say how important individual council services are to them. This was not a ranking exercise – respondents were free to determine the importance to them of each service on a standalone basis.

- 3.2 Refuse collection was ranked as being more important than any of the other service areas, with nearly 85% of respondents rating the service as very important or important to them, compared to the second highest rating of 80% for street cleaning. This is a noticeable drop on the previous survey which ranked these two areas as 94% and 82% respectively
- 3.3 These two service areas, as well as parks and open spaces (76%), are the ones used and accessible by virtually all residents so can be expected to rank highly on importance to residents.
- 3.4 The other services are less universal but all were considered to be, extremely important, very important or important to at least 88% of respondents. This is a slight increase on the previous survey results.
- 3.5 The drop in importance for refuse collection and street cleaning, whilst still of significant importance to residents, could signify that these are seen as services which tend to continue irrespective of resident feedback. This is in contrast to services focused on community and sport and leisure which have noticeably increased in importance implying that these are services where the council need to look at further engagement with residents on what they'd like to see.

#### How important to you are the following council services?

|                                                | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | NOT APPLICABLE | TOTAL |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------|
| Refuse collection                              | 61.37%<br>1,347     | 23.37%<br>513  | 11.57%<br>254 | 2.64%<br>58        | 0.46%<br>10          | 0.59%<br>13    | 2,195 |
| Street cleaning                                | 45.57%<br>993       | 34.19%<br>745  | 15.24%<br>332 | 3.26%<br>71        | 0.78%<br>17          | 0.96%<br>21    | 2,179 |
| Parks and open spaces                          | 47.92%<br>1,036     | 27.80%<br>601  | 19.89%<br>430 | 2.96%<br>64        | 1.02%<br>22          | 0.42%<br>9     | 2,162 |
| Sport and Leisure                              | 34.53%<br>749       | 32.55%<br>706  | 23.14%<br>502 | 7.51%<br>163       | 1.48%<br>32          | 0.78%<br>17    | 2,169 |
| Births deaths and marriages                    | 30.45%<br>662       | 26.13%<br>568  | 29.99%<br>652 | 9.43%<br>205       | 2.58%<br>56          | 1.43%<br>31    | 2,174 |
| Car parks                                      | 34.11%<br>744       | 30.95%<br>675  | 25.17%<br>549 | 7.06%<br>154       | 1.60%<br>35          | 1.10%<br>24    | 2,181 |
| Community facilities such as community centres | 34.40%<br>751       | 29.18%<br>637  | 25.29%<br>552 | 7.74%<br>169       | 2.75%<br>60          | 0.64%<br>14    | 2,183 |

## 4. Service by service ratings

- 4.1 Respondents were asked to say how important a range of factors were to them as well as to rate how well the council is doing in relation to each factor for each service area. In this way it is possible to gain a clearer understanding of what is most important to people and in particular to identify any aspects of services that are perceived to be performing less well but which are of high importance to people. This can help with future service planning.



## Refuse collection

4.2 The factors considered most important for refuse collection were Service Reliability and Frequency of Collection, closely followed by Level of Recycling. Most elements scored well, over 76%, in terms of perceptions of performance with a rating of excellent or good. Service Reliability and Attitude of Staff were particularly well regarded at 83% and 81% respectively.

4.3 The Level of Recycling scored least well of all the factors on performance and was rated as good or excellent by only 67% of respondents. This was a significant drop from 78% in the previous survey with the main drop coming from the 'Excellent' score with a higher proportion now rating the service as 'Average'.

4.4 Refuse collection is still the most important service to the residents of CC&G and is also the one rating highest in terms of performance. This is the same as the previous survey.

**Thinking about refuse collection, please tell us how important the following things are to you.**

|                           | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff         | 35.92%<br>778       | 29.87%<br>647  | 26.92%<br>583 | 6.19%<br>134       | 1.11%<br>24          | 2,166 | 3.93             |
| Frequency of collection   | 54.15%<br>1,168     | 30.00%<br>647  | 13.58%<br>293 | 1.99%<br>43        | 0.28%<br>6           | 2,157 | 4.36             |
| Level of recycling        | 43.71%<br>945       | 31.78%<br>687  | 19.61%<br>424 | 3.65%<br>79        | 1.25%<br>27          | 2,162 | 4.13             |
| Bins returned to location | 33.94%<br>730       | 33.57%<br>722  | 25.38%<br>546 | 6.51%<br>140       | 0.60%<br>13          | 2,151 | 3.94             |
| Service reliability       | 54.01%<br>1,171     | 31.69%<br>687  | 12.87%<br>279 | 0.92%<br>20        | 0.51%<br>11          | 2,168 | 4.38             |

**Please tell us how well think the refuse collection service is doing in relation to the following.**

|                           | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR         | VERY POOR   | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff         | 39.23%<br>834 | 41.35%<br>879 | 15.62%<br>332 | 2.63%<br>56  | 1.18%<br>25 | 2,126 | 4.15             |
| Frequency of collection   | 33.24%<br>723 | 45.10%<br>981 | 16.28%<br>354 | 4.00%<br>87  | 1.38%<br>30 | 2,175 | 4.05             |
| Level of recycling        | 20.55%<br>441 | 46.41%<br>996 | 25.44%<br>546 | 5.82%<br>125 | 1.77%<br>38 | 2,146 | 3.78             |
| Bins returned to location | 33.04%<br>717 | 42.58%<br>924 | 15.90%<br>345 | 6.31%<br>137 | 2.17%<br>47 | 2,170 | 3.98             |
| Service reliability       | 39.49%<br>857 | 43.36%<br>941 | 13.04%<br>283 | 2.63%<br>57  | 1.47%<br>32 | 2,170 | 4.17             |

## Street Cleansing

- 4.5 The Emptying Litter Bins is the aspect of cleansing that is most important to respondents followed by Fly Tipping. This is a flip on the results of the previous survey. Performance on both was rated relatively low, with Fly Tipping being one of the few areas of service to gain less than a 50% Good or Excellent rating with a score of 41%. Emptying of Litter Bins was scored more highly, with 50% saying it is Good or Excellent. These were both slightly worse than in the previous survey
- 4.6 The Attitude of Staff, which was scored important or higher by just over 90% of respondents, scored well on performance with 75% rating it as good or excellent. This is, however, also a drop on the previous survey's scores. As a direct comparison the survey indicates that the local population are less satisfied with Street Cleansing as a whole. This could be down to a reduction in the quality of service but also, as a more visible day to day issue, it is one that residents are more likely to notice and comment on.
- 4.7 With the exception of the emptying of bins and fly tipping, the areas of highest importance to residence didn't change much between surveys. Both of these categories fell quite sharply in the very and extremely important scores and also dipped on the performance measures with less residents rating them good or excellent.
- 4.8 Frequency of street sweeping also declined in performance despite maintaining its importance. This could be due to street sweeping being quite a visible service, and residents noticing more when it doesn't happen. This doesn't directly mean that the streets are dirtier, just that residents aren't seeing the sweepers as much. That being said, residents also marked the cleaning of town centres 10% lower in performance compared to the previous survey with approximately 5% of this decline moving to the 'poor' score.

**Thinking about street cleansing, please tell us how important the following things are to you.**

|                              | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff            | 29.89%<br>625       | 33.00%<br>690  | 27.55%<br>576 | 7.65%<br>160       | 1.91%<br>40          | 2,091 | 3.81             |
| Frequency of street sweeping | 39.51%<br>844       | 35.91%<br>767  | 21.11%<br>451 | 3.09%<br>66        | 0.37%<br>8           | 2,136 | 4.11             |
| Cleansing of town centres    | 48.74%<br>1,047     | 31.70%<br>681  | 17.13%<br>368 | 1.96%<br>42        | 0.47%<br>10          | 2,148 | 4.26             |
| Emptying of litter bins      | 59.28%<br>1,278     | 28.80%<br>621  | 9.93%<br>214  | 1.81%<br>39        | 0.19%<br>4           | 2,156 | 4.45             |
| Fly tipping                  | 58.08%<br>1,236     | 24.95%<br>531  | 13.49%<br>287 | 2.54%<br>54        | 0.94%<br>20          | 2,128 | 4.37             |

**Please tell us how well you think the street cleansing service is performing in relation to the following.**

|                              | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR          | VERY POOR    | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff            | 27.97%<br>551 | 47.11%<br>928 | 20.41%<br>402 | 3.50%<br>69   | 1.02%<br>20  | 1,970 | 2.02             |
| Frequency of street sweeping | 14.07%<br>293 | 37.88%<br>789 | 31.40%<br>654 | 11.57%<br>241 | 5.09%<br>106 | 2,083 | 2.56             |
| Cleansing of town centres    | 15.80%<br>333 | 39.75%<br>838 | 29.27%<br>617 | 11.10%<br>234 | 4.08%<br>86  | 2,108 | 2.48             |
| Emptying of litter bins      | 13.69%<br>291 | 36.52%<br>776 | 31.95%<br>679 | 13.08%<br>278 | 4.75%<br>101 | 2,125 | 2.59             |
| Fly tipping                  | 10.93%<br>216 | 29.74%<br>588 | 37.08%<br>733 | 14.82%<br>293 | 7.44%<br>147 | 1,977 | 2.78             |

### **Parks and Open Spaces**

- 4.9 The data shows that dog bins, litter bins and toilets in parks are the most important elements of the service to residents with each scoring 84% or higher for extremely or very important in the ratings. Unfortunately, these are also the service elements that scored least well on performance, with fewer than 50% of respondents rating them as good or excellent. The toilets were the lowest rated area with only 37% of respondents scoring them good or excellent.
- 4.10 As with most of the services, the Attitude of Staff, whilst not being the most important factor, is rated highly. In this case 72% of respondents rated it as good or excellent. Whilst this was the highest scoring category for performance, it was a drop on the previous survey where it achieved a score of 80%.
- 4.11 Whilst decreasing slightly in terms of the importance associated with it, toilets in parks increased its ranking from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> most important factor in this year's survey. Litter bins were, again, the most important factor (86%) but had a noticeable 6% drop in the percentage score for very or extremely important. Children's play areas marginally increase it's ranking for importance from 5<sup>th</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> with a maintained score of 81%.
- 4.12 Whilst the rankings for performance ratings of good or excellent stayed broadly the same as the earlier survey, performance ratings all dropped with the exception of litter bins in parks which stayed the same. The toilets in parks were ranked as the worst performing area with a combined score of 37% which was a 1% drop on the previous survey. The attitude of staff continued to be the best performing area but dropped significantly from 81% to 72%. The largest drop in performance came from flower beds and floral displays which dropped by 12% to 68%.

**Thinking about parks and open spaces, please tell us how important the following things are to you.**

|                                                 | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff                               | 36.00%<br>720       | 32.75%<br>655  | 25.30%<br>506 | 4.60%<br>92        | 1.35%<br>27          | 2,000 | 3.97             |
| Flower beds and floral displays in public areas | 27.97%<br>601       | 33.78%<br>726  | 27.22%<br>585 | 9.63%<br>207       | 1.40%<br>30          | 2,149 | 3.77             |
| Outdoor pitches and playing fields              | 35.77%<br>762       | 33.80%<br>720  | 24.18%<br>515 | 4.79%<br>102       | 1.46%<br>31          | 2,130 | 3.98             |
| Children's play areas                           | 49.43%<br>1,049     | 31.15%<br>661  | 14.75%<br>313 | 3.35%<br>71        | 1.32%<br>28          | 2,122 | 4.24             |
| Public parks                                    | 45.96%<br>985       | 33.88%<br>726  | 16.94%<br>363 | 2.33%<br>50        | 0.89%<br>19          | 2,143 | 4.22             |
| Toilets in parks                                | 54.03%<br>1,161     | 29.97%<br>644  | 12.89%<br>277 | 2.37%<br>51        | 0.74%<br>16          | 2,149 | 4.34             |
| Litter bins in parks                            | 57.01%<br>1,228     | 28.69%<br>618  | 12.49%<br>269 | 1.44%<br>31        | 0.37%<br>8           | 2,154 | 4.41             |
| Dog bins in parks                               | 55.82%<br>1,190     | 27.91%<br>595  | 12.34%<br>263 | 2.81%<br>60        | 1.13%<br>24          | 2,132 | 4.34             |

**Please tell us how well you think parks and open spaces is performing in relation to the following**

|                                                 | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR          | VERY POOR    | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff                               | 24.45%<br>456 | 47.08%<br>878 | 23.97%<br>447 | 3.65%<br>68   | 0.86%<br>16  | 1,865 | 3.91             |
| Flower beds and floral displays in public areas | 22.09%<br>467 | 45.55%<br>963 | 23.89%<br>505 | 6.76%<br>143  | 1.70%<br>36  | 2,114 | 3.80             |
| Outdoor pitches and playing fields              | 16.16%<br>328 | 46.40%<br>942 | 29.31%<br>595 | 6.26%<br>127  | 1.87%<br>38  | 2,030 | 3.69             |
| Children's play areas                           | 13.68%<br>282 | 41.22%<br>850 | 30.31%<br>625 | 10.14%<br>209 | 4.66%<br>96  | 2,062 | 3.49             |
| Public parks                                    | 12.81%<br>265 | 41.78%<br>864 | 30.80%<br>637 | 10.44%<br>216 | 4.16%<br>86  | 2,068 | 3.49             |
| Toilets in parks                                | 10.54%<br>219 | 26.87%<br>558 | 33.17%<br>689 | 20.13%<br>418 | 9.29%<br>193 | 2,077 | 3.09             |
| Litter bins in parks                            | 12.35%<br>259 | 35.32%<br>741 | 34.75%<br>729 | 12.96%<br>272 | 4.62%<br>97  | 2,098 | 3.38             |
| Dog bins in parks                               | 9.79%<br>201  | 30.48%<br>626 | 36.12%<br>742 | 15.00%<br>308 | 8.62%<br>177 | 2,054 | 3.18             |

## **Sport and Leisure**

- 4.13 The top-ranking aspect for Sport and Leisure, in relation to importance, was the Cleanliness of Changing Rooms and Toilets, closely followed by the Feeling of a Safe Environment at 88% and 87% respectively. The Value for Money of Charges was joint third with Disability Access at 81%. All areas ranked above 73% for importance.
- 4.14 The service scores highly on performance for all factors with the most important coming out particularly well. Only value for money (49%) failed to score over 50% for good or excellent. Once again, staff attitude was highly rated within this service area.

- 4.15 Compared to the previous survey, all areas saw a drop in importance of between 1% and 4%, though all were scored 73% or higher for very and extremely important. This shows that on the whole, leisure services is an important service to local residents. The cleanliness of changing rooms and toilets moved slightly ahead of people wanting a feeling of a safe environment though both scored highly at 88% and 87% respectively. Disability access and value for money were the next most important areas and scored 81% and were also tied for importance in the last survey. As with the last survey, the temperature of water in pools was of least importance with a score of 73%.
- 4.16 All surveyed areas in leisure services dropped in performance between the two surveys with none scoring above 74% for good and excellent ratings. The feeling of a safe environment dropped the most falling from 77% to 68%. Staff attitude was the highest performer but still fell 7% on the previous survey. The quality of the equipment with centres fell marginally but only by 1-2%. Value for money was the worst performing area and the only one to fall under 50% on performance. This had a 6% drop on the last survey to 49%. The cleanliness of changing and toilet facilities is also a potential area of concern having fallen 5% to a rating of 58%.

**Thinking about sport and leisure, please tell us how important the following things are to you.**

|                                                    | EXTREMELY<br>IMPORTANT | VERY<br>IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY<br>IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL<br>IMPORTANT | TOTAL | WEIGHTED<br>AVERAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Attitude of staff                                  | 42.83%<br>842          | 34.38%<br>676     | 19.79%<br>389 | 2.19%<br>43           | 0.81%<br>16             | 1,966 | 4.16                |
| Cleanliness of<br>changing<br>rooms/toilets        | 56.22%<br>1,135        | 31.90%<br>644     | 9.81%<br>198  | 1.49%<br>30           | 0.59%<br>12             | 2,019 | 4.42                |
| Temperature of water<br>in swimming pools          | 40.13%<br>777          | 32.54%<br>630     | 23.04%<br>446 | 3.10%<br>60           | 1.19%<br>23             | 1,936 | 4.07                |
| Disability access                                  | 51.62%<br>1,018        | 29.72%<br>586     | 14.20%<br>280 | 3.55%<br>70           | 0.91%<br>18             | 1,972 | 4.28                |
| Feeling of a safe<br>environment                   | 61.12%<br>1,234        | 25.46%<br>514     | 11.05%<br>223 | 1.58%<br>32           | 0.79%<br>16             | 2,019 | 4.45                |
| Quality of fitness<br>and gym equipment            | 41.74%<br>816          | 33.71%<br>659     | 20.10%<br>393 | 3.12%<br>61           | 1.33%<br>26             | 1,955 | 4.11                |
| Quality of other<br>equipment                      | 39.88%<br>778          | 36.55%<br>713     | 19.68%<br>384 | 2.77%<br>54           | 1.13%<br>22             | 1,951 | 4.11                |
| Value for money of<br>charges to use<br>facilities | 51.47%<br>1,035        | 29.74%<br>598     | 16.66%<br>335 | 1.69%<br>34           | 0.45%<br>9              | 2,011 | 4.30                |

**Please tell us how well you think sport and leisure is performing in relation to the following.**

|                                              | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR         | VERY POOR   | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff                            | 27.42%<br>507 | 46.08%<br>852 | 21.25%<br>393 | 4.06%<br>75  | 1.19%<br>22 | 1,849 | 3.94             |
| Cleanliness of changing rooms/toilets        | 14.55%<br>270 | 43.21%<br>802 | 28.66%<br>532 | 9.86%<br>183 | 3.72%<br>69 | 1,856 | 3.55             |
| Temperature of water in swimming pools       | 14.29%<br>247 | 43.92%<br>759 | 30.90%<br>534 | 8.22%<br>142 | 2.66%<br>46 | 1,728 | 3.59             |
| Disability access                            | 15.95%<br>270 | 45.30%<br>767 | 29.06%<br>492 | 7.50%<br>127 | 2.19%<br>37 | 1,693 | 3.65             |
| Feeling of a safe environment                | 19.61%<br>358 | 48.08%<br>878 | 25.63%<br>468 | 4.93%<br>90  | 1.75%<br>32 | 1,826 | 3.79             |
| Quality of fitness and gym equipment         | 20.29%<br>345 | 48.24%<br>820 | 24.24%<br>412 | 6.00%<br>102 | 1.24%<br>21 | 1,700 | 3.80             |
| Quality of other equipment                   | 15.01%<br>257 | 47.43%<br>812 | 29.96%<br>513 | 5.78%<br>99  | 1.81%<br>31 | 1,712 | 3.68             |
| Value for money of charges to use facilities | 12.17%<br>224 | 36.88%<br>679 | 38.02%<br>700 | 9.18%<br>169 | 3.75%<br>69 | 1,841 | 3.45             |

## **Births Deaths and Marriages**

- 4.17 Births deaths and marriages was one of the lower scoring services in so far as importance to respondents is concerned. This is likely because it is not service used by most residents on a regular basis.
- 4.18 The Attitude of Staff and the Standard of Upkeep of Cemeteries were considered to be the most important aspect for this service with both scoring a 81% for extremely and very important combined. The Availability of Funeral slots was third with a score of 76% for the same rankings. The 2 lowest scores were for the 2 wedding related categories. These both scored 59% showing that council run marriage related services are still important to residents.
- 4.19 Performance ratings for the factors where they were rated good or excellent are all above 50% with the exception of toilet provision in cemeteries. The Attitude of Staff being the highest rated at 78%. Value for money scored the second lowest, perhaps indicating that the cost of funerals is an issue for some residents.
- 4.20 The 2 factors relating to weddings and the opening hours of registration services all saw an increase in importance to residents compared to the previous survey, though these remained in the bottom half of all the factors for very and extremely important. The attitude of staff and cemetery upkeep were both the ranked highly in both surveys with staff attitude reducing importance slightly but still having a rating of over 81%.
- 4.21 Comparing performance to the previous survey, 3 areas marginally increased their performance in the combined good and excellent categories. These were choice of wedding venue, value for money of bereavement service and toilet provision in cemeteries. The increase were only of 1%-2%. These 3 areas were also the 3 lowest ranked areas for performance. Only 2 areas changed their rankings with the availability of wedding slots and the opening hours of registration services swapping 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>



places with the availability of wedding slots now been the 4<sup>th</sup> highest performing area. The attitude of staff, availability of funeral slots and upkeep of cemeteries all declined in performance between surveys but were still rated as 65% or higher and made up the top 3 highest performing areas. The upkeep of cemeteries dropped significantly from a rating of 82% for good and excellent performance to 70%.

### Thinking about births, deaths and marriages, please tell us how important the following things are to you

|                                        | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff                      | 50.76%<br>971       | 30.06%<br>575  | 15.73%<br>301 | 2.30%<br>44        | 1.15%<br>22          | 1,913 | 4.27             |
| Standard of upkeep of cemeteries       | 44.60%<br>859       | 36.40%<br>701  | 15.42%<br>297 | 2.70%<br>52        | 0.88%<br>17          | 1,926 | 4.21             |
| Availability of funeral slots          | 46.40%<br>870       | 29.23%<br>548  | 20.80%<br>390 | 2.56%<br>48        | 1.01%<br>19          | 1,875 | 4.17             |
| Toilet provision in cemeteries         | 34.08%<br>651       | 30.26%<br>578  | 24.19%<br>462 | 9.74%<br>186       | 1.73%<br>33          | 1,910 | 3.85             |
| Opening hours of registration service  | 33.46%<br>640       | 33.61%<br>643  | 26.40%<br>505 | 5.02%<br>96        | 1.52%<br>29          | 1,913 | 3.92             |
| Availability of wedding slots          | 27.09%<br>480       | 31.77%<br>563  | 31.66%<br>561 | 6.83%<br>121       | 2.65%<br>47          | 1,772 | 3.74             |
| Choice of wedding venues               | 27.46%<br>482       | 31.68%<br>556  | 28.49%<br>500 | 9.06%<br>159       | 3.30%<br>58          | 1,755 | 3.71             |
| Value for money of bereavement service | 43.06%<br>800       | 32.29%<br>600  | 20.56%<br>382 | 3.01%<br>56        | 1.08%<br>20          | 1,858 | 4.13             |

### Please tell us how well you think births, deaths and marriages is performing in relation to the following.

|                                        | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR          | VERY POOR   | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|----------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of staff                      | 34.07%<br>554 | 44.40%<br>722 | 18.94%<br>308 | 2.03%<br>33   | 0.55%<br>9  | 1,626 | 4.09             |
| Standard of upkeep of cemeteries       | 19.85%<br>337 | 50.00%<br>849 | 24.26%<br>412 | 4.42%<br>75   | 1.47%<br>25 | 1,698 | 3.82             |
| Availability of funeral slots          | 17.11%<br>244 | 47.83%<br>682 | 28.96%<br>413 | 5.12%<br>73   | 0.98%<br>14 | 1,426 | 3.75             |
| Toilet provision in cemeteries         | 12.69%<br>195 | 33.31%<br>512 | 32.40%<br>498 | 16.20%<br>249 | 5.40%<br>83 | 1,537 | 3.32             |
| Opening hours of registration service  | 14.53%<br>223 | 45.86%<br>704 | 31.99%<br>491 | 5.54%<br>85   | 2.08%<br>32 | 1,535 | 3.65             |
| Availability of wedding slots          | 14.94%<br>201 | 46.17%<br>621 | 31.75%<br>427 | 6.02%<br>81   | 1.12%<br>15 | 1,345 | 3.68             |
| Choice of wedding venues               | 16.58%<br>224 | 42.64%<br>576 | 33.90%<br>458 | 6.00%<br>81   | 0.89%<br>12 | 1,351 | 3.68             |
| Value for money of bereavement service | 14.34%<br>204 | 39.49%<br>562 | 37.17%<br>529 | 6.32%<br>90   | 2.67%<br>38 | 1,423 | 3.57             |

## Off-Street Parking

- 4.22 Off street parking is another service where all the named factors received high scores, 69% or more, in relation to their importance to respondents with the availability of off-street parking in Town Centres scoring most highly followed Security of Car Parks and the Attitude of Parking Enforcement Staff.
- 4.23 Perceptions of performance were amongst the lowest of all the services, with only the Attitude of Parking Enforcement Staff scoring higher than 50% for good or excellent. Charges for Off-street parking scored lowest of the factors (35%), although a large majority (71%) considered them to be average or better. This was a 6% decrease on the previous survey results of 77%.
- 4.24 Whilst all factors continued to score highly, they all saw a decrease in importance on the previous survey. The security of off-street parking dropped the most with a drop of 6% to a score of 79%, the availability of parking dropped 3% to 85%, and the upkeep of off-street car parks also dropped by 3% to 75%. The availability of parking remained the highest ranked and parking charges stayed as the least important factors.
- 4.25 The rankings for performance varied very little compared to the previous survey with only staff attitude, now ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, and car park upkeep swapping position. Parking charges was the only area to see any improved performance with a small 1% increase. It continued to be ranked the lowest area with a score of 35%. No area within parking scored higher than 52% on the combined good and excellent performance ratings with this being staff attitude. All other ratings were scored under 50%.

### Thinking about off-street parking, please tell us how important the following things are to you

|                                                    | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of parking enforcement staff              | 47.24%<br>993       | 32.40%<br>681  | 17.55%<br>369 | 2.14%<br>45        | 0.67%<br>14          | 2,102 | 4.23             |
| Availability of off-street parking in town centres | 52.94%<br>1,133     | 32.15%<br>688  | 12.62%<br>270 | 1.92%<br>41        | 0.37%<br>8           | 2,140 | 4.35             |
| Upkeep of off-street car parks                     | 43.05%<br>917       | 32.30%<br>688  | 21.03%<br>448 | 3.05%<br>65        | 0.56%<br>12          | 2,130 | 4.14             |
| Security of off-street car parks                   | 46.97%<br>999       | 31.73%<br>675  | 17.16%<br>365 | 3.71%<br>79        | 0.42%<br>9           | 2,127 | 4.21             |
| Charges for parking                                | 43.55%<br>918       | 25.19%<br>531  | 21.25%<br>448 | 6.21%<br>131       | 3.80%<br>80          | 2,108 | 3.98             |



**Please tell us how well the off-street parking service is doing in relation to the following.**

|                                                    | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR          | VERY POOR     | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|------------------|
| Attitude of parking enforcement staff              | 15.04%<br>295 | 36.80%<br>722 | 34.05%<br>668 | 9.33%<br>183  | 4.79%<br>94   | 1,962 | 3.48             |
| Availability of off-street parking in town centres | 11.17%<br>236 | 33.46%<br>707 | 32.80%<br>693 | 16.23%<br>343 | 6.34%<br>134  | 2,113 | 3.27             |
| Upkeep of off-street car parks                     | 11.71%<br>244 | 35.75%<br>745 | 38.82%<br>809 | 10.41%<br>217 | 3.31%<br>69   | 2,084 | 3.42             |
| Security of off-street car parks                   | 10.02%<br>204 | 31.93%<br>650 | 39.83%<br>811 | 14.00%<br>285 | 4.22%<br>86   | 2,036 | 3.30             |
| Charges for off-street parking                     | 9.26%<br>193  | 25.37%<br>529 | 36.07%<br>752 | 16.12%<br>336 | 13.19%<br>275 | 2,085 | 3.01             |

## Community Facilities

- 4.26 Respondents to this section placed greatest importance on Community Facilities for Young People followed by the General repair and upkeep of facilities. The Attitude of Staff drop slightly in position from the previous survey but still had a combined score of 78% for being very or extremely important.
- 4.27 Community facilities for young people scored lower for performance than any other service element, with 32% recording a poor or very poor rating. Given the under representation of younger people amongst respondents this points to a need to engage with the group. With nearly 44% of respondents having dependent children, this high importance and low satisfaction on facilities for younger people implies that families would like more/better facilities for young people further strengthening the case to engage with the community on this. A number of respondent's additional comments also suggests that facilities for young people is an area for improvement. Only the attitude of staff scored over 50% with a score of good or excellent for performance in this service area.
- 4.28 Compared to the previous survey, all factors, with the exception of staff attitude, saw an increase in score for performance. Community facilities for young people was ranked number one for importance with a rating of 80% for very or extremely important. This was an increase from being ranked number four, with a score of 78%, in the previous survey. Both surveys highlighted how important community facilities are to residents with all the scores previously being 73% or higher and currently 75% or higher. Staff attitude dropped from the top ranking factor to 4<sup>th</sup> but only reduced by 3% in the scoring. This reflects how close the scores were with only 5% between the highest and lowest ranked factors.
- 4.29 Despite the generally negative view of the performance of community facilities, with every area apart from staff attitude falling below 50%, most of the areas scoring below 50% improved on the results of the previous survey. This shows that community facilities are moving in the right direction, but still needs work and engagement with residents. The largest improvement was for community facilities for young people

rising from 31% to 36%, though this was still the lowest area for performance in this service area. Whilst staff attitude did decline by 3% it still scored 73%.

### Thinking about community facilities such as community centres how important are the following things to you

|                                                           | EXTREMELY IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT | IMPORTANT     | NOT VERY IMPORTANT | NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Attitude of staff                                         | 45.76%<br>841       | 32.05%<br>589  | 19.80%<br>364 | 2.07%<br>38        | 0.33%<br>6           | 1,838 |
| Range of available community services and facilities      | 41.08%<br>769       | 36.81%<br>689  | 18.06%<br>338 | 3.21%<br>60        | 0.85%<br>16          | 1,872 |
| Community facilities for young people                     | 48.70%<br>915       | 31.08%<br>584  | 16.44%<br>309 | 2.87%<br>54        | 0.90%<br>17          | 1,879 |
| General repair and upkeep of community facilities         | 45.01%<br>848       | 33.65%<br>634  | 18.15%<br>342 | 2.28%<br>43        | 0.90%<br>17          | 1,884 |
| Opening times and availability of community facilities    | 44.86%<br>842       | 32.87%<br>617  | 18.38%<br>345 | 2.45%<br>46        | 1.44%<br>27          | 1,877 |
| Ease of booking arrangements for community facilities     | 39.48%<br>734       | 35.56%<br>661  | 20.60%<br>383 | 3.44%<br>64        | 0.91%<br>17          | 1,859 |
| Value for money of charges for using community facilities | 43.81%<br>817       | 32.76%<br>611  | 19.84%<br>370 | 2.90%<br>54        | 0.70%<br>13          | 1,865 |

### Please tell us how well community facilities such as community centres are doing in relation to the following

|                                                           | EXCELLENT     | GOOD          | AVERAGE       | POOR          | VERY POOR     | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| Attitude of staff                                         | 26.44%<br>437 | 46.34%<br>766 | 22.75%<br>376 | 2.72%<br>45   | 1.75%<br>29   | 1,653 |
| Range of available community services and facilities      | 9.93%<br>172  | 34.64%<br>600 | 33.49%<br>580 | 14.72%<br>255 | 7.22%<br>125  | 1,732 |
| Community facilities for young people                     | 12.13%<br>207 | 23.61%<br>403 | 32.40%<br>553 | 20.09%<br>343 | 11.78%<br>201 | 1,707 |
| General repair and upkeep of community facilities         | 11.30%<br>194 | 34.30%<br>589 | 35.29%<br>606 | 13.22%<br>227 | 5.88%<br>101  | 1,717 |
| Opening times and availability of community facilities    | 11.33%<br>192 | 31.62%<br>536 | 37.70%<br>639 | 12.98%<br>220 | 6.37%<br>108  | 1,695 |
| Ease of booking arrangements for community facilities     | 11.29%<br>183 | 36.15%<br>586 | 37.63%<br>610 | 10.18%<br>165 | 4.75%<br>77   | 1,621 |
| Value for money of charges for using community facilities | 12.26%<br>201 | 32.68%<br>536 | 37.93%<br>622 | 10.37%<br>170 | 6.77%<br>111  | 1,640 |

## 5. Overall score and additional comments

- 5.1 Respondents were asked to give the council an overall star rating. The average rating was 3.1 out of 5. Clearly the council is viewed in a generally positive light, though there is room for improvement.
- 5.2 As with the previous survey, the residents of Moyle gave lower scores on average than those of the other areas giving the council a star rating of 2.8. The areas with

the highest overall average rating were Ballymoney and Limavady with 3.3 which is a slight decrease on the previous survey.

### Thinking about the council as a whole how many stars would you give it for overall performance

|   | 1             | 2             | 3             | 4             | 5             | TOTAL | WEIGHTED AVERAGE |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------|------------------|
| ☆ | 13.80%<br>294 | 15.16%<br>323 | 31.03%<br>661 | 25.96%<br>553 | 14.04%<br>299 | 2,130 | 3.11             |

- 5.3 1,105 respondents took the opportunity to comment further on any aspect of council performance not covered in the survey. The full list is appended but some of the themes can be identified using a word cloud which maps the frequency with which individual words occur in the comments. An example word cloud can be seen below:

families Portstewart events swimming pool clean want provide access  
 especially waste Limavady shop etc community centre will walk lack  
 change staff Planning car park well think year rates put S see  
 time seems local tourists town centre keep many  
 around also know Coleraine come go footpaths  
 facilities disgrace services live town enough  
 area play parks council Ballymoney need building  
 parking open good feel community council needs  
 people left use new work place road allowed poor  
 things yet nothing Ballycastle dog fouling residents help  
 make young people public even one bins look charge children great  
 much street leisure centre money spent take less given council area pay  
 longer Portrush now lot business

- 5.4 Some recurring themes in the comments are the need for more facilities for young people and a perception that some areas do less well than others in so far as council services are concerned. This might suggest a need for further engagement at a local level.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

- 6.1 The survey resulted in an good response rate with 68% of 2,701 people who responded completing it fully. The outputs are therefore a good indicator of how the citizens of CC&G view the services the council provides.
- 6.2 As might be expected, the universal services that nearly everybody receives are perceived to be the most important on average. Refuse collection tops the list. It is also the service that scored most highly on questions around performance. This service is evidently highly regarded and delivering against resident priorities.
- 6.3 The comments section included a number of references to the need for more facilities for young people. Given the underrepresentation of that group amongst respondents this perhaps indicates a need for more targeted engagement with the younger members of the population. As also mentioned in the relevant section, with a large proportion of respondents having dependants living with them, the lack of satisfaction for youth facilities and the case for further investment and consultation is amplified.
- 6.4 There was a significant number of respondents who provided additional comments. The general feel of these comments was ranked as negative by the analysis software. This isn't a surprise for this type of survey where you are asking for where areas could be improved.
- 6.5 Staff attitude was consistently one of the highest rated factors across all service areas which should be taken as a highly positive result. Often staff are the face of a council and the only element of the council that they might have direct contact with. Having residents recognise their hard work is a factor that should be applauded.

### **Disclaimer**

APSE reports are provided for outline information on matters of costs, productivity and quality to inform decision making. They do not represent formal advice. Users are reminded to ensure that any decisions should be subject to the usual processes before acting on reports or performance information. This includes matters of due diligence within your council or organisation