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1 Key findings

1.1 Overall perceptions of local area and Hounslow Council

In terms of overall perceptions of the local area as a place to live, resident satisfaction is in line with nationwide polling conducted by the LGA. Over four-fifths (82%) are satisfied with their local area as a place to live, and when asked to think of three words to describe their local area, the terms used are correspondingly positive (‘Good’, ‘Nice’, ‘Friendly’, ‘Safe’, etc). Over two-thirds (67%) are also satisfied with how Hounslow Council runs things, again in line with nationwide benchmark figures. However, agreement that the Council provides value for money is higher than the national average (55% cf. 49%). To identify how this score can be improved further still, those disagreeing that the Council provides value for money were asked why. The leading service-related reasons given for disagreement are ‘Poor state of roads/pavements/footpaths’ (15%) and ‘Lack of cleanliness/dirty area’ (14%). This is in keeping with the prominence of street-cleaning and road and pavement repairs when residents are asked which areas they think the Council should focus on (see section 1.6), and the high proportion feeling that rubbish or litter lying around is a problem (section 1.7).

1.2 Detailed perceptions of Council performance

To obtain a more detailed picture of how residents think the Council is performing, residents were given a series of positive statements and asked whether they think they apply to the Council. On all these measures, residents were more likely to feel that they applied to the Council (‘a great deal’ or ‘to some extent’) than not apply (‘not very much’ or ‘not at all’). In particular, two-thirds or more believe that the statements ‘Is doing a good job’, ‘Is trustworthy’, ‘Has staff who are friendly and polite’, ‘Keeps residents informed about what it is doing’, and ‘Is making the area a better place to live’ apply to the Council.

1.3 Local services

Residents were asked to rate the key services that the Council provides, plus local transport services. Transport services are among the most highly-rated services among the resident base as a whole, and when looking at perceptions among users of each service this is accentuated, with bus, tube, and train services the most highly rated services. Around four in five users of these services rate them as excellent, very good, or good. Users of Council-supported activities for teenagers/young people are least likely to give this service a positive rating; however, for this service users are still more than twice as likely to give a positive rating as a negative rating (54% cf. 20%).
1.4 Communications

On the broad measure of how well residents feel that the Council keeps them informed about the services and benefits it provides, 71% feel that the Council keeps residents well informed. Positively, this is ahead of the nationwide LGA benchmark (64%).

Looking at how residents obtain most of their information about the Council and the services it provides, Council-produced sources are much the most used, in particular Hounslow Matters (cited by 33% of residents). Those who feel well informed about Council services and benefits are more than twice as likely to mention Hounslow Matters as an information source, compared to those who do not (39% cf. 19%). This suggests that Hounslow Matters is performing a valuable function in keeping residents informed.

1.5 Local democracy

This research also aimed to assess residents’ awareness of their elected representatives. Fewer than one in five (18%) were able to name their MP, while awareness of local representatives was lower still. Just over one in ten (12%) were able to name one or more of their local councillors, and only 2% could name all three of their councillors.

1.6 Residents’ concerns

In order to provide an assessment of resident priorities moving into 2015, residents were asked which three areas (from a list of 18 possible areas) the Council should focus on in the next year. Keeping Council Tax low is the most commonly chosen priority (by 30% of residents), a notable finding given the budgetary constraints faced by local authorities in the current climate. Beneath this, more than a quarter selected the level of crime (28%), affordable homes (27%) and street cleaning (27%) as priorities. A further quarter mentioned road and pavement repairs (25%).

1.7 Community safety

All residents were asked about how safe they feel in their local area, and how much of a problem various forms of anti-social behaviour are where they live. The vast majority (91%) feel safe during the day, while after dark 60% feel safe and 23% feel unsafe. The most common reason given for feeling unsafe after dark is gangs of youths hanging around (22%), and in keeping with this a significant minority (40%) of all residents cite groups hanging around the streets as a problem in their local area. However, the form of anti-social behaviour most identified as a problem is rubbish or litter lying around, which 51% feel is a problem.
1.8 Cycling

On the basis that various Hounslow Council activities have a focus on encouraging cycling in the borough and improving safety for cyclists, two questions were included on the theme of cycling.

To assess usage levels, residents were asked whether they cycle regularly (at least once a month) within the borough. One in ten (10%) do so as part of a work commute, while 22% cycle for pleasure or leisure. Asked about cycling infrastructure, only around a third (35%) of cyclists agree that there are enough cycle routes and lanes within the borough, with a majority (55%) disagreeing that this is the case. Cyclists’ views on the safety of existing cycle routes and lanes are mixed, while views on traffic management systems such as crossings, lights, and junctions are on balance positive. Over half (53%) of Hounslow cyclists agree that these systems take into account the needs of cyclists, while 33% disagree.
2 Introduction

2.1 Background

In 2014, BMG Research was commissioned to undertake a survey of London Borough of Hounslow residents. This document summarises the findings of the 2014 survey conducted among 1,272 local residents aged 18+ in September and October 2014. A separate cross-tabulated data report is available for more detailed analysis.

2.2 Methodology

The survey was administered on a face-to-face basis, using CAPI technology at pre-selected sampling points across Hounslow. To generate these sampling points Index of Multiple Deprivation scores (IMD) were ranked from high to low at Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) level within each ward. These were then segmented into quintiles within each ward. After the LSOAs within the borough had been sorted in this way, sampling points (COAs) were selected randomly and all addresses were identified from the postcode address file within each COA to form the sample. A target of approximately 10 interviews was to be achieved per sampling point with 6 sampling points selected per ward to generate circa 62 interviews per ward. Whilst the interviewers were able to approach any address within a sampling point, quotas were set by age, gender and ethnicity within each ward to ensure a representative spread by demographic profile.

2.3 Reporting

Based on the Hounslow population aged 18+ being 196,470 as recorded by the 2011 census, a sample size of 1,272 has a confidence interval of ±2.74 at a 95% level of confidence. This means that we can be 95% certain that the percentages reported from this sample are within 2.74 percentage points of the percentages that would be observed if the entire Hounslow population was interviewed.

Weights have been applied to the data by ward, age, gender, ethnicity and economic status using 2011 census statistics to ensure that the data is fully representative at the borough level. Analysis has been provided in this report at Area Forum scale and in one instance at ward level. However, it should be noted that the ward level data is indicative rather than fully representative.

Throughout this report the word “significant” is used to describe differences in the data. This indicates where the data has been tested for statistical significance using the t-test. This testing identifies ‘real differences’ (i.e. difference that would occur if we were able to interview all residents in the borough rather than just a sample). However, as already noted the actual percentages reported in the data may vary by ±2.74 percentage points at the 95% confidence level on an observed statistic of 50%. In tables any figures shown in bold are significantly different to one or more comparable figures.
Figures and tables are used throughout the report to assist explanation and analysis. Although occasional anomalies appear due to 'rounding' differences, these are never more than +/-1%. These occur where rating scales have been added to calculate proportions of respondents who are satisfied at all (i.e. either very or fairly satisfied).
Residents were asked to rate their general perceptions of the area in which they live, before being asked for their perceptions of Hounslow Council’s performance.

## 3 Overall perceptions of local area and Hounslow Council

Residents were asked to rate their general perceptions of the area in which they live, before being asked for their perceptions of Hounslow Council’s performance.

### 3.1 Overall perceptions of local area

A key proxy measure of whether the Council is having a positive impact on changing lives for the better is whether overall satisfaction with the local area among residents is high. As shown below, over four-fifths (82%) of Hounslow residents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live, including nearly one in three (29%) who are very satisfied. Just 9% are dissatisfied. This is broadly in line with the latest nationwide polling conducted by the LGA (July 2014), which shows 80% satisfied and 11% dissatisfied with their local area as a place to live.

**Figure 1: Satisfaction with local area as a place to live (All responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LGA has now conducted eight waves of national polling with a consistent question set, allowing trends on key measures to be identified. This polling has been conducted by telephone and although this methodological difference should be noted, this LGA data will be referred to throughout this report to provide context to the Hounslow findings.
Nationally, satisfaction with the way Councils run things has consistently been at or above the eight in ten mark since 2012 as shown by the figure below, although with a slight decline in the last two waves.

Figure 2: National trend in satisfaction with local area as a place to live – LGA Polling

Looking at responses by Area Forum, the vast majority of Chiswick residents (95%) are satisfied with their local area as a place to live, significantly more than residents of other areas. Isleworth and Brentford residents are also significantly more likely to be satisfied than Central Hounslow residents, and Heston and Cranford residents, where around three-quarters of residents are satisfied. Bedfont, Feltham, and Hanworth residents’ satisfaction with their local area is around average for this survey (81% satisfied).

Table 1: Satisfaction with local area as a place to live - by Area Forum (All responses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont, Feltham, Hanworth</th>
<th>Central Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses of more than 0% but less than 0.5% are shown as *%
Residents were then asked to give three words that they would use to describe their local area as a place to live. In keeping with the overall satisfaction scores, the first words used tend to be positive (‘Good’, ‘Nice’, ‘Friendly’, ‘Safe’, etc). Whilst ‘Quiet’ is also widely used, ‘Noisy’ is one of the most-used negative words – albeit less mentioned than ‘Quiet’. ‘Dirty’ is also one of the most-used negative terms.

**Figure 3: Words used to describe local area as a place to live (First mention)**

![Word cloud showing words like nice, safe, friendly, quiet](image)

Unweighted base: 1,272

Looking at all three words used to describe the local area, the responses are again dominated by ‘Good’, ‘Nice’, ‘Friendly’, ‘Safe’, and ‘Quiet’. ‘Noisy’ and ‘Dirty’ are the most used negative terms.
Figure 4: Words used to describe local area as a place to live (All mentions)

Unweighted base: 1,272
3.2 Overall satisfaction with how Council runs things

Turning to perceptions of Hounslow Council, residents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the way the Council runs things. All respondents were reminded beforehand that Hounslow Council is responsible for a range of services such as parks, leisure centres, planning, social care services, recycling, road maintenance, and street cleaning.

Just over two-thirds (67%) of residents are satisfied with the way Hounslow Council runs things, including a relatively low proportion (12%) who are very satisfied. Nearly one in six (16%) are dissatisfied with Hounslow Council. As with the measure of satisfaction with local area as a place to live, these scores are in line with the July 2014 LGA nationwide polling data (67% satisfied with how their Council runs things, compared to 18% dissatisfied).

Figure 5: Satisfaction with the way Hounslow Council runs things (All responses)

Unweighted base: 1,272 (Hounslow); 1,001 (LGA)
Nationally, satisfaction with the way Councils run things has consistently been around the seven in ten mark since September 2012 as shown by the figure below.

**Figure 6: National trend in satisfaction with the way Councils run things – LGA Polling**

Looking at Council satisfaction by Area Forum, Chiswick residents are again the most likely to be satisfied. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of Chiswick residents are satisfied, significantly more than Heston and Cranford (63%) and Isleworth and Brentford (64%) residents. However, spatial differences in satisfaction with the Council are less pronounced than observed in relation to satisfaction with the local area.

**Table 2: Satisfaction with the way Hounslow Council runs things - by Area Forum (All responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont, Feltham, Hanworth</th>
<th>Central Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unweighted Bases**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Perceptions of Council providing value for money

Residents were then asked to consider the range of services Hounslow Council provides to the community, not just the services their household uses. With this in mind, they were asked to what extent they agree that the Council provides value for money. Just over half (55%) agree that Hounslow Council provides value for money, while 18% disagree. Just over one quarter (26%) of residents are either neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, or don’t know, perhaps indicating uncertainty on this issue.

On value for money perceptions, Hounslow Council records significantly higher scores than the July 2014 LGA nationwide data, which shows that 49% agree that their Council provides value for money and 22% disagree.

Figure 7: Agreement that Hounslow Council provides value for money (All responses)

![Chart showing agreement levels]

LGA polling July 2014
Agree: 49%
Disagree: 22%

Unweighted base: 1,272 (Hounslow); 1,001 (LGA)
Nationally, agreement that Councils provide value for money has fallen in the last two waves of polling, as the figure below indicates, but has generally fluctuated round the 50% mark since the start of 2013.

Figure 8: National trends in perceptions of Councils providing value for money—LGA Polling

![Figure 8: National trends in perceptions of Councils providing value for money—LGA Polling](image)

Unweighted bases in parenthesis

As with satisfaction with the way the Council runs things, Heston and Cranford/Isleworth and Brentford residents give significantly lower ratings for the Council’s performance on value for money—compared to Bedfont, Feltham, and Hanworth residents.

Table 3: Agreement that Hounslow Council provides value for money - by Area Forum (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont, Feltham, Hanworth</th>
<th>Central Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted Bases</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
<td><strong>257</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>251</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who disagreed that the Council provides value for money were asked, as an open-ended question about why they gave this answer. The responses given have been grouped into themes post fieldwork. Some residents refer here to the amount of money they pay the Council (‘high level of Council Tax’ - 10%, ‘don’t do much for what we pay/don’t give value’ – 15%). However, those disagreeing that the Council provides value for money are more likely to refer to perceived shortcomings in the services they receive, suggesting that the standards of service provision are at least as important as the levels of Council Tax in shaping value for money perceptions.

Of the service-related reasons given for disagreement that the Council provides value for money, the most frequently mentioned are ‘poor state of roads/pavements/footpaths’ (15%) and ‘lack of cleanliness/litter/dirty area’ (14%). The impact of poor road/pavement maintenance and street cleaning is highly visible, to nearly all residents, so it is perhaps not surprising that these are key in negative value for money perceptions.

Figure 9: Reasons for disagreement that Hounslow Council provides value for money (All responses above 1% from those who disagree that Council provides value for money)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor state of roads/pavements/footpaths</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t do much for what we pay/don’t give value</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cleanliness/litter/dirty area</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of Council Tax</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor refuse/recycling service</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parking facilities inc. too expensive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don’t listen/act on our concerns</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/unsafe area/lack of policing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor services offered</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No help/support offered</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have the wrong priorities/waste money</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of greenery maintenance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They just don’t care</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of investment in the area</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 235
As might be expected perceptions of whether Hounslow Council provides value for money are also interlinked with other viewpoints. As shown by the figure below, those who are satisfied with the Council overall, those who feel informed about its services and benefits and those who are satisfied with their local area are all significantly more likely to agree that Hounslow Council provides value for money than those providing the opposing view.

Figure 10: Link between value for money perceptions and other viewpoints (All responses)
4 Detailed perceptions of Council performance

Having given overall perceptions of their area and Hounslow Council, residents were then given a series of positive statements around the Council’s performance on a range of more detailed measures, and asked to state to what extent they thought these statements apply to Hounslow Council. These were asked as a single battery of questions but have been grouped by theme below.

4.1 General performance

On all the positive statements around the Council’s general performance, residents are more likely to agree that the statement applies to the Council ‘a great deal’ or ‘to some extent’, than to say it applies ‘not very much’ or ‘not at all’. On the broadest measures, over two thirds (69%) feel that ‘Is doing a good job’ applies a great deal/to some extent to the Council. The measures attracting least agreement are ‘Speaks up for my Borough across London and nationally’, and ‘Is doing a better job now than one year ago’. However, as shown by the table below these statements attracted the most ‘Don’t know’ responses. In particular, ‘Speaks up for my Borough’ attracted relatively little negative response while 31% were unable to answer this question.

Table 4: Extent to which residents feel statements apply to Hounslow Council - General performance (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Summary: A great deal/to some extent</th>
<th>Summary: Not very much/Not at all</th>
<th>Net balance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is doing a good job</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>+43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is trustworthy</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>+45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is efficient and well run</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does enough for people like me</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks up for my Borough across London and nationally</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>+25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is doing a better job now than one year ago</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,272

In this and subsequent tables in this section of the report a net balance score is shown. This has been calculated by subtracting those who gave a negative response from the proportion who gave a positive response in order to illustrate if the overall balance in public opinion is positive or negative.
4.2 Listening and communicating

Of all the positive statements around the Council’s performance on the theme of listening and communicating, residents were, as with general performance, more likely to agree that the statement applies to the Council ‘a great deal’ or ‘to some extent’, than to say it applies ‘not very much’ or ‘not at all’. ‘Has staff who are friendly and polite’ attracted the highest level of agreement and also significantly less negativity on than the other statements. Positive net balance score are evident for all statements in the table below.

Table 5: Extent to which residents feel statements apply to Hounslow Council - Listening and communicating (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Summary: A great deal/to some extent</th>
<th>Summary: Not very much/Not at all</th>
<th>Net balance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has staff who are friendly and polite</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps residents informed about what they are doing</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>+43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts on the concerns of local residents</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens to the concerns of local residents</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves residents when making decisions</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easy to get through to on the phone</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds quickly when asked for help</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,272
4.3 Making the local area a better place to live and work

Residents were also asked to respond on whether the Council is making the local area a better place to live and work. As with the other statements in this section, these attracted net agreement, although more so on making the local area a better place ‘to live’ than ‘to work’.

Table 6: Extent to which residents feel statements apply to Hounslow Council – Making the local area a better place to live and work (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Summary: A great deal/to some extent</th>
<th>Summary: Not very much/Not at all</th>
<th>Net balance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is making the local area a better place for people to live</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is making the local area a better place for people to work</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>+32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,272
5 Local services

Moving on from the Council as a whole, residents were asked to give their perceptions and usage of Council-run services, plus local transport services.

5.1 Use of Council-provided services

Residents were given a list of Council-provided services and facilities and asked to identify which they or anyone else in their household had used in the last 12 months. With the exception of activities for children and young people, the services featured in this question were those available to all residents. Nearly all have used one of the listed services in the last 12 months, with refuse and recycling collection the most used (85% cf. 84%). Arts, heritage, and cultural facilities, and activities for teenagers/young people, were much the least used (18% cf. 16%). It is possible that there may be residents who have used these services without being aware that the Council supports them, but this issue is outside the scope of this survey.

Figure 11: Council-provided services used in the last 12 months (All responses)

Unweighted sample base: 1,272
There are significant differences in take-up of Council services by age. For example, nearly a quarter (24%) of 18-24 year olds have used ‘Activities for teenagers/young people’ in the last 12 months, higher, naturally, than other age groups. Use of Council leisure and sports facilities also declines broadly in line with age, while library use is lowest among the youngest and - in particular - oldest residents. The latter may be due to the reduced likelihood of those aged 65+ to have children in their household – this is discussed below.

Table 7: Council-provided services used in the last 12 months - by age (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection services</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection services</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds and open spaces</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council leisure and sports facilities</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council supported arts heritage and cultural facilities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers/young people</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table below indicates, take-up of the following services and facilities is significantly higher amongst residents with children: parks, playgrounds and open spaces; libraries; council leisure and sports facilities; and activities for teenagers and young people.

Table 8: Council-provided services used in the last 12 months - by children/no children (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>No children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection services</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection services</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds and open spaces</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council leisure and sports facilities</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council supported arts heritage and cultural facilities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers/young people</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Public transport use

Residents were also asked about their usage of public transport. Nearly all residents say they or family members have used public transport in the last 12 months to travel within Hounslow, with just 5% saying they have not used any form of public transport. Bus services are the most used, with 90% of residents saying they (or family members) have used these in the last 12 months to travel within Hounslow.

Figure 12: Public transport used in the last 12 months (All responses)

![Bar chart showing usage of public transport]

Unweighted sample base: 1,272

With the exception of the train which is used significantly more by males than females (77% cf. 72%) usage of public transport by gender was consistent. This one variation may be related to the incidence of work travel/commuting among males relative to females.
The figure of around nine in ten using bus services is consistent across all age groups (with the partial exception of those aged 55-64, where 85% have used bus services). Tube and train services, by contrast, are more used by younger residents, but around two-thirds of those aged 65+ still say that they or a family member have used these services in the last 12 months to travel within Hounslow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public transport use - by age (All responses)</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tube services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Train services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None of these</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted Bases</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Perceptions of local services

In addition to the more general perceptions of the Council, residents were also asked to comment on specific services and activities, mostly provided by the Council but also local transport services. Among the thirteen service areas presented to respondents, local transport services are among the most highly rated, in particular bus services, which over three-quarters (79%) rate as excellent, very good, or good. Activities for teenagers/young people attract much the lowest proportion rating the service as excellent/very good/good (29%).

The service which receives the most negative response is repair of roads and pavements, which one-third (33%) rate as poor/very poor/extremely poor. This is in keeping with the findings on value for money, which found repair of roads and pavements was the top reason given by residents who disagree that the Council provides value for money (see section 3.3). Whilst residents who give this service a negative rating are more likely to rate it poor (16%) than very poor (9%) or extremely poor (8%), repair of roads and pavements nonetheless has the highest proportion rating the service as extremely poor. The full breakdown of responses can be seen in Appendix 2.

In the table overleaf, all responses above 0% but below 0.5% are shown as *%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Excellent/Very good/Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor/Very poor/Extremely poor</th>
<th>Don’t know/refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus services</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube services</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train services</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds and open spaces</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council leisure and sports facilities</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair of roads and pavements</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council supported arts heritage and cultural facilities</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers/young people</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed in sections 5.1 and 5.2, residents were also asked whether they have used these services in the last 12 months (with the exception of those services that residents cannot choose to use or not use - street cleaning, street lighting, and repair of roads and pavements). It is important to analyse perceptions of services by users of these services, not just the resident base as a whole – this is particularly relevant for less-used services such as activities for teenagers/young people and council supported arts, heritage and cultural facilities.

In all cases, the proportion giving each service a positive rating is higher among users of the service than the resident base as a whole. However, when looking at the data for service users, the tendency to give the highest ratings to transport services, seen among the resident base as a whole, is accentuated. Bus, tube and train services are the services most likely to receive positive ratings from their users, in particular bus services, which 82% of users rate as excellent/very good/good. As with the data for all residents, users of activities for teenagers/young people are least likely to rate the service positively, with users of Council supported arts, heritage and cultural facilities also less likely to give positive ratings. It should be borne in mind that users of activities for teenagers/young people are still more than twice as likely to give a positive rating as a negative rating (54% rate the service as excellent/very good/good compared to 20% rating the service poor/very poor/extremely poor).

Figure 13: Proportion rating local services as excellent/very good/good - Users of each service vs. all residents (Based on all responses)

Unweighted sample base: 1,272 (All residents). Sample bases vary for service users
5.4 Awareness of Council public health services

Residents were then asked if they were aware that the Council now provides key public health services. Around half are aware of the Council’s services to help people stop smoking, and its sexual health/contraception services. By contrast, just under four in ten (39%) are aware of its alcohol treatment and support services.

Figure 14: Proportion aware of Council public health services (All responses)

As the table below indicates, awareness of the Council’s public health services is lowest among those aged 65+. There may therefore be potential to increase awareness of smoking and alcohol services in particular among this group. No significant variations in awareness were evident by gender.

Table 11: Proportion aware of Council public health services - by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services to help people stop smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual health and contraception services</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol treatment and support services</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents were then asked a series of questions around the theme of Council communications, and on their internet access.

### 6.1 Keeping residents informed about services and benefits

Analysis of the national data set from the 2008 Place Survey confirmed the long-held belief that well informed residents are more likely to be satisfied with their Council. Over seven in ten (71%) residents feel they are well informed. Just over a quarter (26%) feel they are not well informed; however this group is dominated by those who feel they are ‘not very well’ informed (19%) rather than ‘not well at all' informed (8%). Moreover, the proportion who feel well informed is higher than the national average produced by the latest round of LGA polling, which indicated that 64% feel well informed about their Council’s services and benefits.

**Figure 15: Overall, how well do you think Hounslow Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides? (All responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well at all</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: Well**

- 71%

**Summary: Not well**

- 26%

Unweighted sample base: 1,272

Aside from a marginal downwards trend in the last two waves, the proportion feeling well informed in LGA national polling has remained largely stable around two-thirds of those interviewed.
Looking at the data by Area Forum, Bedfont, Feltham and Hanworth/Heston and Cranford residents are the most likely to feel well informed. By contrast, around one in three residents of other areas do not feel well informed.

**Table 12: Overall, how well do you think Hounslow Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides? - by Area Forum (All responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont, Feltham, Hanworth</th>
<th>Central Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well informed</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well informed</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In keeping with their more positive responses throughout this survey, those aged 65+ are more likely to feel well informed, as the table below indicates. No significant differences on this measure were evident by gender.

Table 13: Overall, how well do you think Hounslow Council keeps residents informed about the services and benefits it provides? - by age (All responses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Well informed</th>
<th>Not well informed</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Unweighted Bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes less than 0.5%

6.2 How residents obtain information about the Council and Council services

Residents were asked from which sources they obtain most of their information about the Council and the services it provides, prompted with a list of potential sources. Council-produced sources are much the most used: Hounslow Matters (33%), Leaflets, posters or other Council printed matter (24%) and the Council website (21%). Almost no residents said that they obtained most of their information from democratic representatives (either through direct contact with Councillors or attending Council meetings), although it is possible that more residents use these methods on an occasional basis. This is in keeping with residents’ low awareness of who their local Councillor is (section 7.1).
Figure 17: Sources from which residents obtain most of their information about Hounslow Council and the services it provides (All responses)

Looking at how residents obtain their information about the Council by age, consumption of Hounslow Matters for this purpose is highest among those aged 45+. However, around a quarter of residents below this age nonetheless say they get most of their information about the Council and Council services from Hounslow Matters, and it is among their top information sources. Positively, those who say they feel well informed about Council services and benefits are more than twice as likely to mention Hounslow Matters at this question, compared to those who do not (39% cf. 19%), This pattern is not seen for any of the other information sources at this question, suggesting that Hounslow Matters is performing a valuable function in keeping residents informed.

Council printed matter (aside from the print version of Hounslow Matters) is also most cited among 18-24 year olds (32% of this group).

The Council website is most cited by those aged under 55, which is partly but not entirely the result of lower Internet access among older residents (discussed in more detail in section 6.4). While 56% of those aged 65+ have home Internet access, just 3% of those in this age group cite the Council website at this question. This suggests that even older residents with Internet access require more encouragement to use the Council website than younger residents.

Social media is cited by a small minority of residents, even among 18-24 year olds (3% of this group mention social media).
Table 14: Sources from which residents obtain most of their information about Hounslow Council and the services it provides - by age (Top responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Matters</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets, posters or other Council printed matter</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Council website</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Press</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the key sources of information about Hounslow Council were broadly similar by gender one significant difference is apparent with males significantly more likely that females to receive information from the local press (12% cf. 6%).
6.3 Interest in monthly news email

Residents were told that the Council is planning to introduce a monthly email news service, and asked if they would be interested. The majority (59%) of residents are interested. Among those who do not currently feel well informed about Council services and benefits, 61% express an interest in the new service, suggesting that it may improve perceptions of Council information services if executed correctly.

Figure 18: Interest in monthly news email (All responses)

Looking at interest in the monthly news email by area: as the figure below indicates, interest is significantly higher in Chiswick, which as discussed in section 6.1 is one of the areas where residents are more likely to feel that the Council does not keep residents well informed about services and benefits. Interest is lowest in Bedfont, Feltham, and Hanworth, where residents are least likely to feel they are not well informed. This suggests again that the email may improve perceptions among residents and areas who currently do not feel that the Council communicates with them adequately, rather than just reaching residents who are already satisfied with this.
Similarly, when viewed by age interest in the email tends to be higher among 25-54 year olds, who are among the age groups most likely to say that the Council does not keep residents well informed about services and benefits. However, 55-64 year olds are also among those who are more likely to say they do not feel well informed currently, and among this group interest in the email is significantly lower than those aged 25-54.

No variations in interest in a monthly e-mail service are evident by gender.
6.4 Internet access

Residents were asked if they have Internet and email access at home. Nearly nine in ten have both (89% cf. 88%). A small minority (2%) do not have access to the Internet at home but access it elsewhere, while 9% do not use the Internet at all.

Figure 21: Internet access (All responses)

Older residents are, unsurprisingly, less likely to have Internet/email access, as the table below indicates:

Table 15: Access to home Internet/email - by age (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have home Internet access</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have home email access</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking in more detail at those who do not have access to the Internet at home, this group is dominated by those who do not use the Internet at all (83%), while 8% of those without home Internet access do access the Internet in libraries.

**Figure 22: How/if those without home Internet access use the Internet (All without home Internet access)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public access (libraries)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet cafes</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer of friend or family member</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared computer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not use the Internet</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted sample base: 189


7 Local democracy

7.1 Awareness of elected representatives

The first question included in the survey which aimed to assess resident awareness of their elected representatives focused on the two MPs who represent the Hounslow constituencies. All survey respondents were asked if they could name the MP who represents the constituency that they live in. The names of these individuals were within the survey script, but were not shown to respondents. A majority of seven in ten (71%) could not name their parliamentary MP, with a further 11% providing an incorrect name. A total of 18% of residents did name either Mary Macleod or Seema Malhotra as their MP unprompted. While the proportion naming each of these MPs is shown in the figure below, the variations in constituency coverage across the borough means that these figures should not be interpreted directly as Mary Macleod being more successful in establishing public awareness than Seema Malhotra.

Figure 23: Can you name the elected Member of Parliament (MP) who represents the constituency you live in? (All responses)

The age groups most likely to give the answer don’t know when asked to name their parliamentary MP are those aged 18-24 (86%) and those aged 25-34 (81%). In comparison 62% of those aged 65+ answered don’t know to this question.
The next question focused on the three elected councillors that represent each ward in Hounslow. In each ward the survey script used by interviewers showed the correct councillors for that location. Residents were asked whether they could name any of the three elected councillors in their ward. Interviewers recorded how many of the names they gave were correct and if any incorrect named were given. The overall findings from this question for the borough are shown in the figure below. The most common response (85%) was that individuals could not give the names of their councillors or did not know. Overall:

- 7% of residents could name one out of the three councillors for their ward;
- 3% of residents could name two out of the three councillors for their ward;
- 2% of residents could correctly name all three councillors for their ward.

This data is shown in the figure below. Please note that individual respondents could fall into multiple categories. For example, an individual may have named two councillors correctly and then may have given a third incorrect name.

**Figure 24: In the area of Hounslow where you live you have three elected councillors. Can you name one or more of them? (All responses)**

- Named one correctly: 7%
- Named two correctly: 3%
- Named three correctly: 2%
- Incorrect names mentioned: 3%
- Do not mention any names / don't know: 85%
- Mentioned names and none are correct: 1%

Unweighted sample base: 1272
Looking specifically at those residents who did not mention any councillor names or said don’t know the proportion giving this response is highest among those aged 18-24 (96%) and is lowest among those aged 65 and over (75%).

Figure 25: Inability to name local councillors within demographic groups (All responses)

As the Councillor names presented to respondents varied on a ward by ward basis, the results for this question are summarised by ward in the table below. For each ward the base size of interviews per ward is stated. These base sizes mean that these levels of councillor awareness at ward level are indicative rather than statistically robust.
Table 16: Awareness of ward councillors by ward (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Named one correctly</th>
<th>Named two correctly</th>
<th>Named three correctly</th>
<th>Incorrect names mentioned</th>
<th>Do not mention any names / don’t know</th>
<th>Mentioned names and none are correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (1272)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfont (61)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford (59)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Homefields (63)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Riverside (66)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford (63)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltham North (63)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltham West (64)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanworth (63)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanworth Park (65)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston Central (63)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston East (62)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heston West (63)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Central (63)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Heath (62)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow South (67)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow West (65)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleworth (62)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterley and Spring Grove (70)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syon (63)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnham Green (65)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted bases in parenthesis
When probing awareness of the identity of the leader of the Council and their deputy only 2% of residents were able to correctly name the leader as Steve Curran and 1% could correctly name Amrit Mann as deputy. A majority of 95% were not able to mention a name and/or said don’t know.

Figure 26: Can you name the leader or deputy leader of the Council? (All responses)

Almost identical results were seen for the final question on this topic which asked residents if they could name either the mayor or her deputy. As shown by the figure below 2% of residents were able to correctly name the mayor as Corinna Smart and 1% could correctly name Bishnu Bahdaur Gurung as her deputy.

Figure 27: Can you name the current Mayor or Deputy Mayor of Hounslow?
8 Residents’ concerns

In order to provide an assessment of resident priorities moving into 2015, all respondents were presented with a list of 18 possible areas of Council focus. From this list residents were asked to select up to three that they feel the Council should focus on more in the next year, Figure 31 below combines all of the responses given and shows that keeping Council Tax low is most commonly chosen as a priority, a notable finding given the budgetary constraints that local authorities face. Beneath this, more than a quarter selected the level of crime (28%), affordable homes (27%) and street cleaning (27%) as priorities. A further quarter mentioned road and pavement repairs (25%).

Figure 28: What three things from the list below do you think the Council should focus more on in the next year? (All responses)

Street scene issues, housing and crime, commonly feature highly in questions of this type, what is notable is that beneath this top tier of priorities issues around young people in terms of job prospects and activities are seen as areas for particular focus going forward, ahead of more traditional Council functions such as sports and leisure and cultural activities. These responses do not in any way suggest that leisure and centres and libraries provision should be reduced or stopped, the wording of the question being about greater focus; suggesting that young people issue are perceived to be more pressing than other issues.
Breaking responses down spatially shows some variation in the priorities for focus expressed by residents:

- The proportion who selected keeping Council Tax low as an area for future focus is significantly higher among Chiswick residents (35%).
- The level of crime is most commonly selected as a priority by Central Hounslow residents (35%). Residents in this area as will be shown later in the report also perceive some crime and ASB issues to be more of a problem locally.
- The issue of road and pavement repairs is most commonly cited as a priority by those in Central Hounslow (31%) and those in Chiswick (37%). These proportions are significantly higher than those seen in the other Area Forums.

Table 17: Top five issues for more Council focus by Area Forum (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Forum</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedfont Feltham Hanworth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Council Tax low</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable homes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for young people</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job prospects for young people</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Hounslow</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable homes</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and pavement repairs</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Council Tax low</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiswick</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and pavement repairs</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Council Tax low</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable homes</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heston and Cranford</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable homes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Council Tax low</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and pavement repairs</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isleworth and Brentford</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Council Tax low</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable homes</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job prospects for young people</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of crime</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents’ concerns

Given the different spaces that males and females might experience on a daily basis and their potentially different usage of services the top five issues for each gender are listed below. Among males the most common responses were:

- Keeping Council Tax low (30%);
- The level of crime (28%);
- Road and pavement repairs (27%);
- Affordable homes (26%); and,
- Street cleaning (25%).

Among females the same five issues were selected albeit with a slightly different level of frequency:

- Keeping Council Tax low (30%);
- Affordable homes (29%);
- Street cleaning (28%);
- The level of crime (28%); and,
- Road and pavement repairs (22%).

Residents having been presented with this list of 18 issues were also given the opportunity to mention any other issues that require more attention from Hounslow Council. Parking related issues were the most commonly raised; however, as only 28% of residents raised any issues, this does not amount to a significant proportion of responses.

Figure 29: Any other issues requiring more attention from Hounslow Council (All responses excluding none, don’t know, etc)
9 Community safety

In order to provide an assessment of community safety perceptions in Hounslow, all residents were asked about how safe they feel in their local area both during the day and after dark. Residents were also asked to consider how much of an issue six crime and anti-social behaviour issues are where they live.

9.1 Feeling safe

During the day, the vast majority of Hounslow residents feel safe outside in their local area. Nine in ten residents (91%) feel safe during the day in the local area including 44% who give the most positive response of very safe. As is common in such questions, perceptions of safety fall after dark with 60% of residents feeling safe outside locally in these circumstances and 23% feel unsafe.

Figure 30: Perceptions of safety in the local area (All responses)

Unweighted sample base: 1272

Perceptions of safety outside after dark vary by gender with females significantly more likely to feel unsafe in this scenario than males (28% c.f. 18%). However, the proportion who feel unsafe outside after dark in their local area does not vary significantly by age group.
Breaking these responses down by Area Forum shows that when considering their safety outside after dark, residents of the Chiswick Area Forum most commonly feel safe (82%). In contrast, those in Central Hounslow and Heston and Cranford most commonly feel unsafe in their local area after dark (32% and 34% respectively).

Table 18: Perceptions of local safety by Area Forum (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont</th>
<th>Feltham</th>
<th>Hanworth</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local area during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither safe nor unsafe</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local area at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither safe nor unsafe</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted sample base</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who indicated that they feel either fairly or very unsafe in their local area after dark were asked to give a reason for this in their own words. After the completion of fieldwork these responses were reviewed and where possible were grouped into common themes. As is shown by the figure below the most common reasons given by those feeling unsafe locally after dark are gangs of youths hanging around (22%), drug users and/or dealers (16%) and drunken behaviour (16%). Beneath this, poor street lighting and burglaries were mentioned by at least one in ten of those who feel unsafe locally after dark.

**Figure 31: Can you explain why you feel unsafe in your local area after dark? (All those who feel unsafe)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangs of youths hanging around</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug users/drug dealers</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunken behaviour</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor street lighting</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglaries</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General level of crime</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muggings</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of people around</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/robbery (inc vehicle theft)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of police presence</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many strangers around</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its too quiet/ not many people around</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular reason</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted sample base: 304

The base size of 304 means that responses to this question do not support further analysis at an Area Forum level.
9.2 Anti-social behaviour

When asked about six specific types of anti-social behaviour in Hounslow, in five out of six instances more residents feel that each are not a very big problem or not a problem at all, than a problem. The exception is rubbish and litter lying around which marginally more residents describe a problem (51%) than not a problem (49%). In a finding that resonates with the reason given for feeling unsafe in the local area, two in five residents feel that groups hanging around the streets is a key issue, with 40% describing this as a problem to some extent.

Overall the anti-social behaviour issues most commonly described as a very big problem are:

- Rubbish and litter lying around (19%);
- Groups hanging around the streets (16%); and,
- People using or dealing drugs (15%).

A full breakdown of views per issue is shown in the table below.

Table 19: Thinking about this local area, how much of a problem do you think each of the following are? (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>A very big problem</th>
<th>A fairly big problem</th>
<th>Not a very big problem</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
<th>Don't know / No opinion</th>
<th>Summary: A problem</th>
<th>Summary: Not a problem</th>
<th>Net balance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours or loud parties</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>+69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>+48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the Area Forum level the top three issues described as a very big problem are shown in the table below. Rubbish and litter lying around features prominently in all locations and is most commonly cited as a very big problem by Heston and Cranford residents (30%) and those in Central Hounslow (25%). These proportions are significantly higher than in the other Area Forums so it should be investigated whether there are particular street cleanliness issues in these locations to address. Notably residents in these two Area Forums also more commonly perceive that people using or dealing drugs is a very big problem (26% and 21% respectively).

Table 20: Top three issues described as a very big problem by Area Forum (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very big problem by Area Forum</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedfont Feltham Hanworth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Hounslow</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiswick</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heston and Cranford</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People using or dealing drugs</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isleworth and Brentford</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish or litter lying around</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups hanging around the streets</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People being drunk or rowdy in public places</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 Effectiveness of Council working with the Police to address crime and anti-social behaviour

Linking the views on community safety back to the public bodies who have responsibilities in these area, all residents were asked to consider how effective they think the Council is at working with the Police to address crime and anti-social behaviour in their local area. A majority of 58% agree that the Council is effectively working with the police, with one in nine (11%) disagreeing. However, it is notable that 16% gave a neutral opinion at this question and a further 15% answered don’t know suggesting that there may be some scope to improve public awareness of the Council’s work on the issue of anti-social behaviour.

Figure 32: How effective do you think the Council is at working with the Police to address crime and anti-social behaviour in your local area? (All responses)

Further analysis shows that residents of Bedfont, Feltham and Hanworth most commonly state that Hounslow Council is effective at working with the police to address crime and ASB in the local area (70%). This proportion drops to 48% among Heston and Cranford residents and to 54% in Central Hounslow, the two areas were perceptions of ASB issues are higher.

Overall, among those who feel safe in their local area after dark 68% feel the Council is effectively working with the Police to tackle crime and ASB. Among those who feel unsafe after dark this proportion drops significantly to 41%, suggesting that perceptions of the Council’s success and wider safety perceptions are interlinked.
9.4 Getting on well together

To provide a measure of community cohesion within Hounslow all residents were asked to what extent they agree or disagree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together. By getting on well together residents were advised this meant treating each other with respect. Historically this question included the word ‘ethnicity’ but the exact wording used in this survey is that suggested by the Local Government Association, where ‘different backgrounds’ is left to the respondent to define.

Overall, more than four in five residents (84%) agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on together including a quarter (26%) who give the most positive response of very satisfied. Just one in twenty (6%) residents disagree that this is the case.

Figure 33: To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together? (All responses)

Unweighted sample base: 1272
Spatially those living in the Chiswick Area Forum are most likely to agree that people of different backgrounds get on well together in the local area. This proportion drops to 77% among residents of Bedfont, Feltham and Hanworth. Indeed, the 13% who disagree people of different backgrounds get on well in this Area Forum is significantly higher than in every other location within the borough.

**Table 21: Agreement that people of different backgrounds get on well together by Area Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont</th>
<th>Central Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While ethnicity was not the sole focus of this question, clearly it is important to identify if perceptions of community cohesion vary by ethnic group. Breaking down responses in this way shows no significant variation in agreement or disagreement by ethnicity which is a positive finding.

### 9.5 Pulling together to improve the local area

As local authority budgets become ever tighter, the social capital within communities is becoming ever more important. It is likely that services traditionally delivered by Councils will require new models of delivery with an enhanced role for residents, who may be required to have more direct roles and responsibilities for certain services. To measure current perceptions of the role residents currently play in their local area all were asked to what extent they agree or disagree that people in their local area pull together to improve the local area. In response just under six in ten (59%) agree people do pull together in this way, while 18% disagree. A further one in five (19%) gave the neutral response of neither agree nor disagree, which may be indicative of current efforts of residents in making local improvements not being obviously attributable to residents.
Figure 34: To what extent would you agree or disagree that people in this local area pull together to improve the local area? (All responses)

No significant variation in agreement is evident by gender. By age the greatest variation in opinion is seen among younger residents. Those aged 16-24 are least likely to agree that people in the local area pull together to make improvements (49%) while those aged 25-34 most commonly agree (64%). At Area Forum level, agreement that people pull together to help improve the local area ranges from 48% in Heston and Cranford to 79% in Chiswick. Disagreement on the other hand is highest in Heston and Cranford and in Bedfont, Feltham and Hanworth at 24%. As already noted, the latter Area Forum is the one with the lowest perceived level of community cohesion.

Table 22: Views on people pulling together to improve the local area by Area Forum (All responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bedfont Feltham Hanworth</th>
<th>Central Hounslow</th>
<th>Chiswick</th>
<th>Heston and Cranford</th>
<th>Isleworth and Brentford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted Bases</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6 Unpaid help

To provide an indication of how much voluntary activity currently takes place within the borough all residents were asked to indicate over the last year how many hours a month they had given in unpaid help to any group(s), club(s) or organisation(s)? Respondents were asked to only include work that is unpaid and not for their family and to exclude giving money. The most common response to this question was that residents have not given any unpaid help at all over the last twelve months to any groups, clubs or organisations. This was the answer given by 72% of residents. As shown by the figure below, the next most common response was that an average of 0-5 hours a month on unpaid time is given by residents, with 18% indicating this is the case.

Figure 35: Over the last year on average how many hours a month have you given unpaid help to any group(s), club(s) or organisation(s)? (All responses)

Non-volunteers are more commonly found within the Area Forums of Central Hounslow (81%), Heston and Cranford (80%) and Isleworth and Brentford (75%). In demographic terms it is the youngest and oldest residents in the borough most commonly state that they do not provide any unpaid help. With this proportion peaking at 79% among those aged 25-34 (79%) and those aged 65+ (also 79%). Residents who are Asian or Black also are significantly more likely not to currently provide unpaid help to any groups clubs or organisations (80% and 82% respectively).
Figure 36: Proportion who do not provide unpaid help to groups, clubs or organisations (All responses)

- Total (1272): 72%
- Male (612): 74%
- Female (660): 71%
- 18-24 (119): 72%
- 25-34 (248): 79%
- 35-44 (277): 67%
- 45-54 (197): 64%
- 55-64 (173): 69%
- 65+ (252): 79%
- White (707): 67%
- Mixed (35): 57%
- Asian (425): 80%
- Black (74): 82%
- Other (23): 74%
10 Cycling

On the basis that various Hounslow Council activities have a focus on encouraging cycling in the borough and improving safety for cyclists, two bespoke questions on this topic were included at the end of the survey.

10.1 Residents cycling within the borough

Among all residents 22% indicate that they cycle for pleasure/as a leisure activity at least monthly. One in ten (10%) residents cycle within the borough as part of a work commute with the same regularity. The proportion who cycle as part of a commute rises to 12% among those aged under 65 years of age.

Figure 37: Do you regularly, (at least once a month) cycle within borough...? (All responses)

![Chart showing cycling preferences]

Unweighted sample base: 1272

Residents who cycle for pleasure within the borough are more commonly male than female (28% cf. 16%) and are more commonly aged under 54 as shown by the figure below. This graph also illustrates that white residents are most likely to cycle for pleasure (28%)
Figure 38: Profile of leisure cyclists within the borough (All responses)

- Total (1272) - 22%
- Male (612) - 28%
- Female (660) - 16%
- 16-24 (119) - 23%
- 25-34 (248) - 25%
- 35-44 (277) - 27%
- 45-54 (197) - 25%
- 55-64 (173) - 15%
- 65+ (252) - 10%
- White (707) - 28%
- Mixed (35) - 23%
- Asian (425) - 17%
- Black (74) - 10%
- Other (23) - 4%
10.2 Perceptions of cycling infrastructure

All cyclists, whether this be for commuting or leisure purposes were asked to respond to three statements about cycling provision within Hounslow. As shown in Table 21 only a third (35%) of cyclists agree that there are enough cycle routes and lanes within the borough, with a majority of 55% disagreeing this is the case. Views on whether existing cycle routes and lanes are safe are mixed, with equal proportions agreeing and disagreeing that this is the case (43% and 42% respectively). Views on traffic management systems such as crossings, lights and junctions are on balance positive with 53% of Hounslow cyclists agreeing that these take into account the needs of cyclists, with a third (33%) disagreeing.

Table 23: As a cyclist how strongly do you agree or disagree that...? (All cyclists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Definitely disagree</th>
<th>Total: Agree</th>
<th>Total: Disagree</th>
<th>Net balance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are enough cycle routes and lanes within the borough</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle routes and lanes within the borough are safe for cyclists</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic management systems such a crossings, lights and junctions take into account the needs of cyclists</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the assumption that cycling for commuting purposes and/or for leisure will in most instances start/end at a residents’ home, analysis of these views has been undertaken by Area Forum. This shows that those most likely to disagree there are enough cycle routes within the borough are cyclists living in Chiswick (77%). Chiswick cyclists also most commonly disagree that cycle routes and lanes within the borough are safe for cyclists (62%) and that traffic management takes into account the needs of cyclists (58%).
### Appendix 1: Sample profile

The table below shows the composition of the survey sample prior to the application of weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Irish</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Other White</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Other Mixed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian: Indian</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian: Pakistani</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian: Bangladeshi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian: Chinese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian: Other Asian</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black: African</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black: Caribbean</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black: Other Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household composition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One adult under 60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One adult aged 60 or over</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults both under 60</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults, at least one 60 or over</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more adults 16 or over</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee in full-time job (30 hours plus per week)</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee in part-time job (under 30 hours per week)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed full-time</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed part-time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a government supported training programme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time education at school, college or university</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and available for work</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently sick/disabled</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly retired from work</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after the home</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something else</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 year and up to 2 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2 years and up to 5 years</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years and up to 10 years</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say / Don't know</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from Housing Association</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting from Hounslow Council/Hounslow Homes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent from private landlord</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A residential home</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table on the next page shows the full range of answers given by all respondents at Q7 (Perceptions of local services). All responses of more than 0% but less than 0.5% are shown as *%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>Don’t know/refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds and open spaces</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair of roads and pavements</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council leisure and sports facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council supported arts heritage and cultural facilities</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teenagers/young people</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Compliance with International Standards


Interpretation and publication of results

The interpretation of the results as reported in this document pertain to the research problem and are supported by the empirical findings of this research project and, where applicable, by other data. These interpretations and recommendations are based on empirical findings and are distinguishable from personal views and opinions.

BMG will not publish any part of these results without the written and informed consent of the client.

Ethical practice

BMG promotes ethical practice in research: We conduct our work responsibly and in light of the legal and moral codes of society.

We have a responsibility to maintain high scientific standards in the methods employed in the collection and dissemination of data, in the impartial assessment and dissemination of findings and in the maintenance of standards commensurate with professional integrity.

We recognise we have a duty of care to all those undertaking and participating in research and strive to protect subjects from undue harm arising as a consequence of their participation in research. This requires that subjects’ participation should be as fully informed as possible and no group should be disadvantaged by routinely being excluded from consideration. All adequate steps shall be taken by both agency and client to ensure that the identity of each respondent participating in the research is protected.
With more than 25 years' experience, BMG Research has established a strong reputation for delivering high quality research and consultancy.

BMG serves both the public and the private sector, providing market and customer insight which is vital in the development of plans, the support of campaigns and the evaluation of performance.

Innovation and development is very much at the heart of our business, and considerable attention is paid to the utilisation of the most up to date technologies and information systems to ensure that market and customer intelligence is widely shared.