



Derby Pointer Citizens' Panel – April 2010 survey results

RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That the results of April 2010 Derby Pointer survey are noted.
- 1.2 Agree the service managers' improvement plans outlined in Appendices 3 – 6.
- 1.3 To note this is the last survey using 'Derby Pointer Citizens' Panel' brand. Future surveys will be sent to the rebranded '**Reach Out Panel**'.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 This report provides an update on the key results of the April 2010 Pointer Panel survey and the proposed service improvements to be put in place.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 The questionnaire was sent out on 5 April 2010 to 934 Derby Pointer Panel members. The response rate was 65% (609).
- 3.2 The results reported here represent replies received from 609 respondents and should be taken as accurate to within a confidence interval of +/-2.2%. The topics covered in the survey were:
 - Anti-Social Behaviour
 - Local Decision Making
 - Council Tax Payments
 - Derby Adult Learning Services
 - Allestree Park and Sinfin Golf Course
 - Street Cleaning and Waste Management

- 3.3 A full summary of the key results is shown at Appendix 2. The main issues are set out here:

Anti-Social Behaviour

- 3.3.1 Overall, respondents thought the following anti-social behaviour issues were a 'very/fairly big problem' in their local area, rubbish or litter lying around, 42% (253), teenagers hanging around the streets, 33.2% (199) and vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles, 25.5% (153).

Local Decision Making

- 3.3.2 There was an equal split in the number of respondents who 'definitely/tend to agree', 42.7% (257) or 'tend to/definitely disagree', 42.5% (256) they can influence decisions affecting their local area.
- 3.3.3 Over a third of respondents, 43.3% (256) said they were 'very/fairly satisfied' with the opportunities for participation in local decision-making provided by Derby City Council. 36.1% (214) were neither satisfied/dissatisfied and 13.6% (80) 'fairly/very dissatisfied'.

Council Tax Payment

- 3.3.4 The top three reasons given why respondents don't pay their Council Tax by Direct Debit were 'the current Direct Debit dates do not meet my needs 20.1% (65)', 'I don't trust Direct Debit, 17% (55)', and 'I'm worried the Council will make a mistake, 13.9% (45)'.

Derby Adult Learning Services

- 3.3.5 Overall, 20.6% (122) of respondents had taken part in adult learning courses in the last three years compared to 79.4% (469) who had not.
- 3.3.6 The main reasons for doing an adult learning course was to 'learn a new skill 59.5% (72)', 'gain a qualification, 33.9% (41)', and 'something to do in my spare time, 33.1% (40)'.
- 3.3.7 The main reasons that stop respondents doing adult learning courses were 'never thought of taking a course, 30.1% (135)', 'too expensive, 27.4% (123)', and 'doesn't fit in with my work hours, 20.9% (94)'. The top method for telling respondents about adult learning courses was 'leaflet delivered to your home 69.1% (391)'.

Allestree Park and Sinfin Golf Courses

- 3.3.8 Overall, respondents 'strongly agree/agree', 49.9% (259) it was a good idea for Allestree Park and Sinfin Golf Courses to be managed and maintained by a private company compared to 23.1% (120) who 'disagreed'.

Street Cleaning and Waste Management

- 3.3.9 It's important to note that the Council's Streetpride initiative was launched **after** the April 2010 survey on 17 May 2010. So the following results provides a useful baseline of panel members views before the launch of Streetpride and to benchmark future improvement trends since the launch of Streetpride.
- 3.3.10 More than half of respondents said street cleanliness had 'stayed the same' 62.7% (378) in their local area. However, 21.1%(127) said it was 'worse' and only 15.6% (94) said it was 'better'.
- 3.3.11 78.7% (470) of respondents were 'very/fairly satisfied' with the waste collection service overall.
- 3.3.12 A high percentage of respondents 80.3% (459) were 'very/fairly satisfied' with the doorstep recycling collection service overall.
- 3.3.13 70.8% (375) of respondents were 'very/fairly satisfied' with the provision of local recycling facilities overall.
- 3.3.14 76.5% (325) of respondents were 'very/fairly satisfied' with the local tip/household waste recycling centre overall.

For more information contact:

Elphia Miller, Consultation Support Officer, 01332 256258
elphia.miller@derby.gov.uk

Background papers:

April 2007, October 2007, June 2008, October 2008, July 2009 and October 2009 panel survey results

White Paper: Communities in Control; real people, real power – July 2008

Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) Customer Insight: Through a Total Place Lens (March 2009)

The Drivers of Satisfaction with Public Services – Research Study Conducted for the Office of Public Services Reform, April – May 2004.

List of appendices:

Appendix 1 - Implications

Appendix 2:

Key results – page 6

Anti-Social Behaviour – page 6-8

Local Decision Making – page 8-11

Council Tax Payments – page 11

Derby Adult Learning Services – page 12 - 13

Allestree Park and Sinfin Golf Course – page 13 - 14

Street Cleaning and Waste Management – page 14 - 20

Appendix 3 – Local Decision Making Improvement Plan – page 21

Appendix 4 – Council Tax Payments Improvement Plan – page 22

Appendix 5 – Derby Adult Learning Service Improvement Plan – page 23

Appendix 6 – Street Cleaning and Waste Management Improvement Plan – page 24

IMPLICATIONS

Financial

- 1.1 Each Panel questionnaire costs £4640.00. This includes panel members being able to complete the surveys on-line.
- 1.2 Other financial implications for the survey will depend on the action plan produced as a result of the findings.

Legal

- 2.1 The Local Government Act 1999 requires the Council to consult its citizens on its general direction and on issues relating to specific services. The Council must also show how the results have been used to improve services.
- 2.2 The Pointer Panel is also an important tool to enable us to meet our 'duty' to inform, consult and involve under Section 138 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

Personnel

- 3.1 None.

Equalities Impact

- 4.1 The Panel is representative, as possible, of the Derby population and this Representativeness is reviewed annually during panel refreshment.
- 4.2 Service managers are responsible for assessing the equalities impact of their service improvement plans.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

- 5.1 Anti-social behaviour results contribute to the Council's objective of **'City for Stronger, Safer and Cleaner Communities - to improve levels of safety and cleanliness and to develop confidence and pride across our communities and neighbourhoods'**.
- 5.2 Local decision-making results contribute to the Council's objective of **'City for Stronger, Safer and Cleaner Communities - to promote local democracy and active citizenship – ensure citizens and staff engage in decision making'**.
- 5.3 Council Tax Payments results contribute to the Council's objective of **'Council Organisational Development - to deliver value for money across all services'**.

- 5.4 Derby Adult Learning Services results contribute to the Council's objective of **'City Growth – to help create a healthy, vibrant economy with the physical and educational infrastructure to sustain the prosperity of business and citizens'**.
- 5.5 Allestree Park and Sinfin Golf Course results contribute to the Council's objective of **'Cultural City – to improve the range and quality of Derby's cultural and leisure opportunities and facilities'**.
- 5.6 Street Cleaning and Waste Management results contribute to the Council's objective of **'City for Stronger, Safer and Cleaner Communities - to improve levels of safety and cleanliness and to develop confidence and pride across our communities and neighbourhoods'**.
- 5.7 Derby Cityscape results contribute to the Council's objective of **'City Growth - to help create a healthy and vibrant economy with the physical and educational infrastructure to sustain the prosperity of business and citizens'**.

KEY RESULTS

1 Results interpretation

- 1.1 'Base' where stated in the charts or tables, refers to the number of respondents to the question on which the statistics quoted are based. Numbers in brackets indicate the actual number of responses. Percentages stated have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number.
- 1.2 In some cases, % stated in the tables will add up to more than 100% or the number of respondents stated. This is because these results are for a 'multiple choice' question, which allowed respondents to tick more than one response.
- 1.3 2008 Place Survey results where stated are for information purposes only. The Place Survey which was scrapped by the Local Government Minister on 10 August 2010 and used to be carried out every two years to collect performance information for the national indicators. The survey was sent to a random sample of 5,000 Derby households. The results were weighted/calculated by the Audit Commission and cannot be compared directly to the Panel survey results which is not analysed in the same way.
- 1.4 The survey results suggest that panel members hold more positive views about their local area and Council service provision than residents who took part in the 2008 Place Survey. This may be due to the fact that compared to the general public, panel members are consulted more often, and have greater involvement and familiarity with the Council. Panel members are more likely to think they have more influence in local decision-making, and view Council services more positively. Therefore, it would be difficult to construe from these results with certainty any upward movement on satisfaction levels, since the 2008 Place Survey.

2 Anti-Social Behaviour

- 2.1 The Derby City Community Safety Partnership defines anti-social behaviour as ...

 'unreasonable behaviour which causes or is capable of causing nuisance or annoyance to some person (who need not be a particular identified person)'

 Types of anti-social behaviour include, but is not limited to – noise nuisance, verbal abuse, gathering of groups, damage to property, graffiti, harassment and fly tipping.
- 2.2 Derby Community Safety Partnership's, Anti-Social Behaviour Team works with the Police and other organisations to deal with people who commit anti-social behaviour and to prevent it from happening again.
- 2.3 Perceptions about ASB were last collected in the 2008 Place Survey and the question was asked in April 2010 survey to find out panel members views about anti-social behaviour in their local area. By local area we mean within 15-20 minute walking distance from their home.

- 2.4 Overall, Table 1 shows that of the seven types of anti-social behaviour, 'rubbish or litter lying around', 'teenagers hanging around the streets' and 'vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles' were the main problems in local areas.

Table 1: Anti-social behaviour problems in local areas?

	April 2010			
	Total very big /fairly big problem		Total not very big/not a problem at all	
	%	n	%	n
Noisy neighbours or load parties	14.3	85	85.3	508
Teenagers hanging around the streets	33.2	199	66.2	398
Rubbish or litter lying around	42	253	57.6	347
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles	25.5	153	73.6	442
People using or dealing drugs	16.7	99	70.1	414
People being drunk or rowdy in public places	16	96	79.4	476
Abandoned or burnt out cars	4.5	27	90.6	540

Base: variable

- 2.5 By ward, the perception of anti-social behaviour was highest in Alvaston 30.8% (8), Arboretum 47.4% (9), Normanton 58.3% (14) and Sinfin 46.7% (7) and the lowest in Allestree 1.7% (1), Littleover 2.4% (1) and Mickleover 3.4% (2).
- 2.6 This question on anti-social behaviour was used in the Place Survey to provide data to calculate the following national indicator ...
- NI17 Perceptions of anti-social behaviour – Overall, the 2008 place survey results showed that 20.7% (283) of the general population perceive there to be high levels of anti-social behaviour in their local area. The overall figure for the panel survey was 14.5% (86) of respondents, suggesting that panel members perceive lower levels of anti-social behaviour than the general population.
- 2.7 The Head of Crime Reduction, Derby Community Safety Partnership provided the following feedback about the anti-social behaviour results ...

“ The use of the Pointer Panel to ask residents about their perceptions of ASB is one of the several measures identified in response to a predicted failure of the City to meet its LAA target in respect of National Indicator NI17 – Perceptions of Anti-Social Behaviour. The 2008 Place Survey produced a perception figure of 20.7%. The target for the 2010 survey is 18.8%, and it was not predicted we would achieve this. This forecast appeared to be based largely on the absence of data indicating an improvement, rather than any indicating a deterioration – this is a problem

associated with many of the national indicators which utilise the Place Survey as the principle means of measurement.

Whilst acknowledging the caution which should be exercised in making direct comparison between the Pointer Panel and the Place Survey, the results obtained would seem to be very positive – 14.5% of Pointer Panel respondents perceiving high levels of ASB, which is not only lower than the established Place Survey figure but also lower than the target figure for 2010.

This I feel gives stronger grounds for optimism that we are heading in the right direction with our efforts to target ASB, and how these efforts are making an impact in the lives of local residents.

We do not intend to be complacent however, and intend to utilise the Pointer Panel again in October to ask the same question, to allow direct comparison and give an indication of trends which can be expressed with greater confidence. The One Derby survey which will be sent to a random sample of 2,500 Derby residents in October 2010 will include the ASB question from the 2008 Place Survey. The One Derby survey will use the same methodology as the Place Survey which will allow direct comparisons to be made with the 2008 Place Survey results.

A number of other measures have already been taken or are under development to improve the service we deliver to customers, and improve perceptions of ASB and associated confidence levels in the Council and Police and relevant other National Indicators. This includes the publication of local minimum standards ('Respect for Derby'), improved identification and support of those most vulnerable to harm through ASB, and targeting efforts in 'confidence coldspots'. September 2010 will also see a repeat of 'Operation Relentless', which will again be coordinated by the CSP from a City perspective, highlighting partnership working and tackling ASB".

3. Local Decision Making

- 3.1 Public consultation and participation were key elements of the previous Governments local government modernising agenda. A range of new legislation was put in place including the White Paper: Communities in Control; Real people, Real power – July 2008 which put local people at the heart of the design and delivery of local public services and introduced the duty for councils to respond to petitions. Section 138 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 came into effect on 1 April 2009 and imposed a duty on all councils to inform, consult and involve individuals, groups, businesses or organisations in decisions that affect them.
- 3.2 The empowerment theme continues with the present Government through its 'Devolution and Localism Bill' which was set out in the Queen's Speech on 25 May 2010. The Bill sets the foundations for the 'Big Society Programme' a major reform agenda aimed at shifting power from the central state back into the hands of individuals, communities and councils. Amongst other things, the Bill will give communities the right to bid/take over local services and residents the power to instigate local referendums on any local issue.

- 3.3 Public consultation is an established part of Council's service planning/delivery process. The Council has had a 'Consultation Strategy' in place since September 2006 to guide/support good practice consultation and various qualitative and quantitative methods are used to get residents views which include: Derby Pointer Citizens' Panel; Neighbourhood Forums; Derby 50+ Forum; Diversity Forums; Voices in Action – Youth Forum; Your City, Your Say – residents' consultation web page and service specific consultations using focus groups, postal and online surveys.
- 3.4 The Policy, Research and Engagement Unit included two questions in April 2010 to gauge panel members perceptions about the participation opportunities provided by the Council and their ability to influence decisions affecting their local area.
- 3.5 The results in Table 2 show that overall over a third of respondents (43.3%/256) were 'very/fairly satisfied' with the participation opportunities provided by the Council.

Table 2: % respondents satisfied/dissatisfied with the opportunities for participation in local decision-making provided by Derby City Council

	April 2010	
	%	n
Very satisfied	7.8	46
Fairly satisfied	35.5	210
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36.1	214
Fairly dissatisfied	9.5	56
Very dissatisfied	4.1	24
Don't know	7.1	42
Base	592	

- 3.6 However, the results in Table 3 were not so conclusive and there was a 50/50 split overall in the percentage of respondents who 'definitely/tend to agree, 42.7%/257' or 'definitely/tend to disagree, 42.5%/256' that they can influence decisions affecting their local area.

Table 3: % respondents who agree/disagree they can influence decisions affecting their local area.

	April 2010	
	%	n
Definitely agree	6.8	41
Tend to agree	35.9	216
Tend to disagree	29.9	180
Definitely disagree	12.6	76
Don't know	14.8	89
Base	602	

- 3.7 The National Indicator NI4: % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality was collected through the 2008 Place Survey. Excluding 'don't know' from the analysis, the panel survey showed that 50.1% (257) of respondents agreed that they can influence decisions in their local area – much higher than the 29.2% (336) recorded in the 2008 Place Survey.

- 3.8 Additional analysis showed there was a link between community involvement and respondents 'satisfaction' with Council services.
- 3.9 The results in Table 4 show that respondents who agree (85.1%) they can influence decisions affecting their local area, and those who are satisfied (87.1%) with the opportunities for participation in local decision-making provided by the Council, were more likely to express overall satisfaction with the waste collection service.

Table 4: Example to show the relationship between influencing decisions/opportunity for participation and satisfaction with services.

		Q15f) The waste collection service overall						Total	
		Very/ fairly satisfied		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		Very/ fairly dissatisfied		Count	Row %
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %		
Q2) Do you agree or disagree that you can influence decisions affecting your local area?	Definitely/ tend to agree	212	85.1%	18	7.2%	19	7.6%	249	100.0%
	Definitely/ tend to disagree	178	70.1%	36	14.2%	40	15.7%	254	100.0%
	Don't know	75	86.2%	4	4.6%	8	9.2%	87	100.0%
Q3) Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the opportunities for participation in local decision-making provided by Derby City Council?	Very/ fairly satisfied	217	87.1%	12	4.8%	20	8.0%	249	100.0%
	Neither/ don't know	182	71.7%	36	14.2%	36	14.2%	254	100.0%
	Very/ fairly dissatisfied	58	73.4%	10	12.7%	11	13.9%	79	100.0%
Total	All respondents	470	78.7%	60	10.1%	67	11.3%	597	100.0%

- 3.10 Community involvement is one of the key ways for the Council to improve residents perceptions about it services and was a key finding of the recent Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) report 'Customer insight: through a Total Place Lens (March 2009)' which states ...

"Starting with the customer is increasingly recognised as the most productive way of designing or re-designing services. Basing developments on a real insight into customer needs, aspirations and behaviours should produce better services, as well as provided a solid platform for cross-organisational collaboration"

- 3.11 Services can be more effective and efficient if they are based on what residents and communities want. Where resources are targeted in a focused way, responding to the greatest areas of need, they can be used more effectively. For example, community input into the new 'Street Pride' initiative could transform the way street cleaning is done in the neighbourhoods by targeting the biggest problems first, leading to a cleaner neighbourhoods, satisfied residents and reduced costs. Conversely, not involving communities can lead to poor services and be very costly. Services designed without community input risk wasting public money because they will be unused or underused if they are not what people need.

- 3.12 Public engagement and a customer service focus are equally important and interdependent. They need to be seen as part of a virtuous circle – with councils, and their local partners shaping services, being closely informed by what matters to people locally.
- 3.13 The Council's 'one Derby, one council' transformation programme and ongoing financial pressures means that, more than ever, there is the need to collaborate with local people to provide responsive, value for money services. Invariably, difficult decisions about service priorities will have to be made and it will be important for local people to be involved/have 'ownership' over the eventual outcomes.
- 3.14 An improvement plan outlining the proposed actions to address the issues raised is shown at Appendix 3.

4. Council Tax Payments

- 4.1 Direct Debit is the preferred Council Tax payment method for the Council because it ensures payments are made on time, and the administration cost for processing Direct Debits is lower than for other payment methods which helps to keep collection costs down.
- 4.2 The Head of Exchequer Services confirmed that more than half (64.7%) of Council Tax payers pay by Direct Debit. We wanted to find out what stops more people paying by Direct Debit and why some people, who don't pay by Direct, pay their Council Tax late and run the risk of being sent reminders for the overdue payment.
- 4.3 The main reasons why respondents don't pay by Direct Debit were ...
- The current direct Debit dates (1st, 7th, and 15th) do not suit my budget, 20.1% (65)
 - I don't trust Direct Debit , 17% (55)
 - I am worried the Council will make a mistake, 13.9% (45)
 - I would rather pay my Council Tax weekly or every two weeks, 6.2% (20)
 - Prefer to pay by other means (cash, cheque etc), 3.8% (8).
- 4.4 Similar reasons around inconvenient date, finances were given as to why respondents don't pay their Council Tax on 1st of the month ...
- Doesn't fit in with budget/salary payment/pension payment, 11.2% (23)
 - Income is variable, 5.8% (12).
- 4.5 There is scope to communicate more about how safe and secure paying by Direct Debit is and, if practicable, to offer alternative payments dates that fit in with people's finances. An improvement plan outlining the proposed actions to address the issues raised is shown at Appendix 4.

5. Derby Adult Learning Services

- 5.1 Derby City Council Adult Learning Service offers a range of learning opportunities for adults, in the daytime and evening, in schools, community centres and other places in the city. These include courses leading to a qualification, for example, a GCSE or computer qualification and courses that are just for pleasure, such as, arts and craft, keep-fit and wine tasting.
- 5.2 We wanted to find out what stops people doing adult learning courses and the best way for us to promote them.
- 5.3 Only 20.6% (122) of respondents had taken part in any adult learning courses in the last three years, compared to 79.4% (469) who had not.
- 5.4 The 122 respondents who attended a course did so in their own time (92.5%/111) and paid for the course (56.7%/68).
- 5.5 The main reasons why respondents attended a course were to:
- Learn a new skill, 59.5% (72)
 - Gain a qualification, 33.9% (41)
 - Something to do in my spare time, 33.1% (40)
 - Improve my employment prospects, 30.6% (37)
 - Meet like minded people, 16.5% (20)
 - Help family/children with education, 13.2% (16).
- 5.6 When asked 'what stops you attending courses' lack of information about courses and costs were some of the main reasons stated by respondents ...
- Never thought of taking a course, 30.1% (135)
 - Too expensive, 27.4% (123)
 - Doesn't fit in with my hours of work, 20.9% (94)
 - Can't find out what's available, 10.7% (48)
 - Too far to travel, 7.6% (34).
- 5.7 The top five courses that interested respondents were ...
- Computing, 35.7% (179)
 - Art & Craft, 29.3% (147)
 - Keep fit, 25.3% (127)
 - Modern Foreign Languages, 25.1% (126)
 - Cookery, 21.5% (108).

- 5.8 The local press and direct mailouts were considered the best way to tell respondents about the courses available.
- Leaflet delivered to your home, 69.1% (391)
 - Local newspaper, 50.9% (288)
 - Posters/leaflets in public buildings, for example libraries, 36% (204)
 - Local radio, 24.7% (140)
 - Adult learning website: www.adult-learning-derby.org.uk, 24% (136)
 - Derby City Council website: www.derby.gov.uk, 22.6% (128).
- 5.9 To increase take-up of adult learning courses more needs to be done to publicise them through direct mailings to households and consideration given to reducing course costs. An improvement plan outlining the proposed actions to address the issues raised is shown at Appendix 5.

6. Allestree Park and Sinfin Golf Course

- 6.1 The Council currently manages these golf courses. However, we've not been able to invest the money needed to keep the facilities up-to-date to meet customer expectations, and they are losing the Council money because people are not using them.
- 6.2 The most cost effective way to improve the golf courses would be to get a private company to manage and maintain the golf courses for the Council. A contract would be drawn up between the Council and the private company to make sure ...
- Substantial investment is made to improve the facilities at both courses including a driving range at Sinfin.
 - Golfing costs are affordable for local people.
 - Access to the golf courses and parks for residents will not change
 - More children, women, people on low incomes, disabled people and minority groups are encouraged to use the facilities.
 - There would be some income for the Council.
- 6.3 The results in Table 5 show that overall 49.9% (259) respondents 'strongly agree/agree' it is a good idea for a private company to manage and maintain the golf courses.

Table 5: % respondents who 'agree' Allestree and Sinfin Golf courses should be managed and maintained by a private company.

	April 2010	
	%	n
Strongly agree	16.4	85
Agree	33.5	174
Neither agree nor disagree	27	140
Disagree	12.7	66
Strongly disagree	10.4	54
Base	519	
Results exclude 'don't know'		

- 6.4 Respondents in 'Allestree' tended to agree 41.8% (23) with the statement compared to 38.2% (21) who disagreed. Similarly, in 'Sinfyn' respondents tended to agree 57.2% (8) with the statement than 'disagree' 21.4% (3).
- 6.5 The Head of Parks, Neighbourhoods has confirmed that as the results show that a majority of respondents support the transfer of golf course management and maintenance to a private operator, these services will transfer to a private operator by December 2010.

7. Street Cleaning and Waste Management

- 7.1 It's important to note that the April 2010 survey was done **before** the launch of the Council's Streetpride service on 17 May 2010. Streetpride gives residents more control over the appearance of their streets and combines all current services like street cleaning, road maintenance and refuse collection across four different zones in the city – North, East, West and City Centre. Each zone is managed by a dedicated management team which works with the Neighbourhood Boards to give residents the ability to prioritise what their communities need so they can decide, for example if litter is their biggest concern or whether it's potholes that create the most problems in their community.
- 7.2 In the first three months since Streetpride was launched, they have:
- removed 453 incidents of litter
 - removed 504 incidents of graffiti
 - mended 1154 potholes
 - responded to 88% of customer reports within their response time
 - received 22,399 phone calls to the golden number (0333 200 6981)
 - answered 99.2% of all calls within an average of 10 Seconds
 - dealt with 3901 emails
- 7.3 The performance data above and following comments received about Streetpride indicate the service has been a great success.

Jackie Blaney is a resident and Neighbourhood Board member for the Alvaston ward. She writes about the canal path...

"This is a lovely area for dog walking and cycling but it's been a dumping ground for food cartons, cans and plastic bottles for as long as I can remember. I reported the problem to Streetpride and they have made an amazing difference. It is now a pleasure to walk down. I've never seen the canal path as clean as it is today"

Karen Sparkes of Mickleover called in with issues before and after the introduction of Streetpride. Karen reports...

“For a few years where I take my dog for a walk everyday, the dog waste bin is always overflowing. Previously, I have called Derby Direct and have been waiting 25 minutes to get through and then was passed from person to person. On three occasions - by email from work, by email from home and by telephone, I have contacted Streetpride regarding dog fouling, overflowing litter bins and a dead animal on the carriageway. On all occasions, my query has been dealt with promptly, efficiently and politely. My report on overflowing litter bins, resulting from myself and another early morning dog walker picking up cans/bottles/chip wrappers etc left by the previous evening’s congregation, also resulted in Streetpride saying that they would monitor the area - which they have and it is much better”

Pete Matthews, Housing and Neighbourhood Manager for Mackworth, expressed thanks on behalf of their Neighbourhood Forum on the “very prompt and good work that is being done on Mackworth’s roads”. He added “Streetpride is the way forward, providing excellent customer services to the residents of Mackworth and Derby. We now have a clear structure and it is this joined up approach that means we now receive quick responses to any problems we have raised”

Comments provided by Nick Sykes, Media and Public Relations Officer from a follow up article that will be done about Streetpride in the next ‘your derby’ magazine.

- 7.4 So within this context, the following results provide a useful baseline of panel members’ views **before** the launch of the Streetpride and to track future public perceptions about the street cleaning and waste management service.
- 7.5 The main method for collecting performance data about satisfaction levels with street cleaning and waste management was through the recently scrapped Place Survey which was carried out every two years and the results reported to the Audit Commission. The last survey was done in 2008.
- 7.6 The Street Cleaning and Waste Management Service thought it would be a useful interim exercise to include the questions asked in 2008 Place Survey to gauge panel members’ ‘satisfaction’ with street cleaning and waste management.
- 7.7 Customer satisfaction is influenced by various issues based around people’s personal experience of a service. Research carried out by MORI Social Research Institute: The Drivers of Satisfaction with public Services for the Office of Public Services Reform, April – May 2004 identified a set of five factors that drive satisfaction across public services. The key drives in order of their impact are:
 - 7.7.1 **Delivery** – the service delivers the outcome it promised and manages to deal with any that may arise.
 - 7.7.2 **Timeliness** – the service responds immediately to the initial customer contact and deals with the issue at the heart of it quickly and without passing it on between staff.
 - 7.7.3 **Professionalism** – staff are competent and treat customers fairly.

7.7.4 Information – the information given out to customers is accurate and comprehensive and they are kept informed.

7.7.5 Staff attitude – staff are friendly, polite and sympathetic to customer needs.

- 7.8 The results in Table 6 show that satisfaction the delivery and timeliness drivers tends to be high, especially on ratings for the 'bin provided', 'the place to leave waste for collection' and the 'reliability of the waste collection service'. Levels of dissatisfaction was highest in respect of 'how clean/tidy streets are following a collection', 'collection of bulky waste' and the 'waste collection service overall'.

Table 6: Household Waste Collection

	April 2010			
	Total very/fairly satisfied		Total fairly/very dissatisfied	
	%	n	%	n
The bin provided for your general household waste.	87.4	524	6.7	40
The place you have to leave your waste for collection.	85.4	504	3.9	23
The reliability of the waste collection.	81.2	484	11	66
How 'clean and tidy' the street is following the waste collection.	66.9	400	19.9	119
The collection of bulky household waste.	37	219	14.1	83
The waste collection service overall.	78.5	470	11.1	67

Base: variable

- 7.9 Excluding 'it does not apply/don't know' responses from the percentage calculations. Overall, 78.7% (470) of respondents were satisfied with household waste collection which was slightly higher than the 72% (1005) satisfaction levels expressed in the 2008 Place Survey.
- 7.10 By ward, satisfaction with the household waste collection service overall was highest in Spondon 91.9% (45), Littleover 92.3% (36), and lowest in Arboretum 47.6% (10) and Normanton 52% (13).

- 7.11 The results in Table 7 show that satisfaction with the delivery drivers for the doorstep recycling service was high, especially for 'container provided for recycling items' and 'the place to leave items for collection'. The areas with the highest levels of dissatisfaction were 'reliability of collection', 'how clean/tidy streets are following collections' and 'recycling collection service overall'.

Table 7: Doorstep Recycling Collection

	April 2010			
	Total very/fairly satisfied		Total fairly/very dissatisfied	
	%	n	%	n
The container provided for items of recycling	85	506	5.7	34
The place you have to leave your items for recycling awaiting collection	82.2	485	4.6	27
The reliability of the collection of items for recycling.	76.9	454	10.5	62
How 'clean and tidy' the street is following the collection of items for recycling.	66.3	394	16	95
The recycling collection service overall.	77.3	459	8.6	51

Base: variable

- 7.12 Excluding 'it does not apply/don't know' responses from the percentage calculations. Overall, 80.3% (459) of respondents were satisfied with the doorstep recycling collection household waste collection which was higher than the 68% (854) satisfaction levels expressed in the 2008 Place Survey.
- 7.13 By ward, satisfaction with the doorstep recycling collection service overall was highest in Allestree 91.6% (55), Littleover 89.7% (35), Spondon 89.6% (43) but lowest in Arboretum 47.4% (9) and Normanton 52% (13).

- 7.14 Generally, the results in Table 8 show that although respondents were satisfied with local recycling facilities, especially the 'items you can deposit for recycling' there was dissatisfaction with the 'location of the recycling facilities', 'how clean and tidy the site is' and 'local recycling facilities overall'.

Table 8: Local Recycling Facilities

	April 2010			
	Total very/fairly satisfied		Total fairly/very dissatisfied	
	%	n	%	n
The location of the recycling facilities.	64.4	383	10.1	60
The items you can deposit for recycling.	68.7	403	6.7	39
How 'clean and tidy' the site is.	52.4	308	16.3	96
The provision of local recycling facilities overall.	64.1	375	10.6	62

Base: variable

- 7.15 Excluding 'it does not apply/don't know' responses from the calculations. Overall, 70.8% (375) of respondents were satisfied with local recycling facilities. However, this question was not asked in the 2008 Place Survey, so there are no results to compare.
- 7.16 By ward, satisfaction with the local recycling facilities overall was highest in Spondon 93.2% (41), Sinfin 86.7% (13), Allestree 85.7% (48) but lowest in Derwent 24.3% (15), Mackworth 45% (9) and Normanton 45% (10).

- 7.17 Lastly, the results in Table 9 show that satisfaction with the delivery drivers for the local tip/household waste recycling centre was fairly high, especially for the 'recycling facilities at the site', 'opening hours' and 'how clean the site is'. The areas with the highest levels of dissatisfaction were 'how helpful the staff are', 'the location of the site' and 'how user friendly the site is'.

Table 9: Local Tip/Household Waste Recycling Centre (Raynesway)

	April 2010			
	Total very/fairly satisfied		Total fairly/very dissatisfied	
	%	n	%	n
The location of the site.	68.9	316	9.2	42
The opening hours of the site.	72.8	334	3.9	18
The recycling facilities at the site.	80	368	3.5	16
How clean the site is.	69.8	319	5.7	26
How helpful the staff are.	63.4	291	16	46
How 'user friendly' the site is – the ability to deposit your waste easily.	69.8	319	8.1	37
The local tip/household waste recycling centre overall.	71.2	325	5.7	26

Base: variable

- 7.18 Excluding 'it does not apply/don't know' responses from the percentage calculations. Overall, 76.5% (325) of respondents were satisfied with the local tip/household waste recycling centre which was higher than the 68% (796) satisfaction levels expressed in the 2008 Place Survey.
- 7.19 By ward, satisfaction with the local tip/recycling centre overall was highest in Abbey 95% (19), Spondon 89.7% (35), Blagreaves 86.4% (19) but lowest in Sinfin 57.2% (4) and Normanton 58.8% (10).
- 7.20 When asked about the cleanliness of streets in their local area, 15.6% (94) of respondents said it has 'got better' over the last three years, and 21.1% (127) said it has 'got worse'. The majority of respondents felt it had 'stayed the same', 62.7% (378). Respondents in 'Arboretum (12) and 'Normanton (12) were more likely to think that cleanliness of streets in their area has got worse.
- 7.21 Street cleaning and waste management are some of the Council's most visible service that affects people's daily lives, and how they perform and are publicised can influence people's perceptions of Council.
- 7.22 The Council's recently implemented 'Street Pride' initiative with its focus on street-based issues and problems in local neighbourhoods should improve residents' perceptions/satisfaction levels with street cleaning and waste management.

- 7.23 However, as with any service, steps must be taken to manage customer expectations of the street cleaning and waste management service because misplaced/un-realistic customer expectations can lead to dissatisfaction, even where we are meeting the required service standards.
- 7.24 An improvement plan outlining the proposed actions to address the issues raised is shown at Appendix 6.