

Stock Village

Millennium Report


2000



STOCK VILLAGE APPRAISAL

FOREWORD

Stock is enjoyed for its village life, community spirit, atmosphere, amenities, peaceful environment, quality of life, it's a pleasant well kept village, it's a nice place to bring up children, it has interesting buildings. These are just a few of the reasons given by the people of Stock for living here. There are many other reasons and of course many expressions of concern given by the people who want to maintain Stock as a pleasant place to live. This document gives the reader an insight into the way others in the village live their lives, what they enjoy about the village and how they want to see the village cater for its residents in this new millennium. The survey was carried out throughout the whole village, everyone had an opportunity to contribute. The facts and figures are available in this document in summary and hopefully user friendly format. Greater detail and full list of comments can be obtained by visiting the local library where the summary of the raw data is held as produced by the steering committee.



Questionnaires were delivered to 914 households in Stock inviting a response from all members of the household over 11 years of age. 415 were completed and returned, representing 45% of the total village. The project team considered this an encouraging response, far above their original expectations.

The appraisal highlighted the areas of greatest current concern such as levels of traffic passing through the village, parking in the village, development proposals generally throughout the wider area, policing, security, and maintenance of highways and pavements. Peoples concerns and wishes for the village have been made public. Anyone can use the information now and in the future to factually point out what the people of Stock want and need for the future.

Who knows what this information will be used for in the future. It is satisfying though to know we have the record should we need it or should our descendents just be a little curious as to how we lived our lives...

Gary R Stringer



The favourite response given in the appraisal has to be the following:

When asked whether they had lived in Stock all their life the answer given was:

'not yet I'm still alive'


Due to the nature of the questionnaire and the responses and concerns raised some repetition within this document is necessary in order that each section gives a true record of comments received for that section.

The People of Stock

Of the 949 people in the households analysed by the appraisal 51 % were women. Analysis of the age groups showed 4% were under 5 years of age, 11% were 5-15, 6% 16-24, 20% 25-44, 33% 45-64, 26% 65+.

19% had lived in Stock less than 5 years, 38% 5-20 years, 29% 20-40 years, 7% over 40 years and only 7% had lived in Stock all their lives.

Reasons given for moving to Stock - 86 comments received including the following: work location, parents living here, love the area, village/community life, amenities, retire to peaceful environment, delightful village, sheltered housing, quality of life, well kept village, parish church, farming locally, cricket club, pubs, good pleasant village environment.




Employment

Each person of the household was asked to indicate their sector of work and location.

Of the 653 completing this section 25% were employed, 10% were self-employed, 7% were in full time education, 12% were housewives or househusbands, 2% sick or disabled and 44% retired.

4% were working in agriculture or horticulture, 5% in manufacturing, 4% in retail, 12% in the service industry, 9% in financial services, 1% in tourism, 10% in local/public services, 6% in construction/property, 2% in transport/ communications, 0% in food processing and 47% retired. 12 people were looking for work mainly in medical, I.T. and teaching professions.



When asked for comment on improvements for local employment for a more sustainable local economy there were very few comments received. Comments that were received included the following - promotion of local shops (7), promotion of small business start-ups (3), relaxed planning regulations on previously used horticultural buildings (1).

Traffic & Transport



Parking in the village centre caused problems for 46%. At the school 6% had problems. 37% had problems at the doctors surgery. 12% had problems with the entrance to their property being blocked by parked cars.

Public transport was found to be unsatisfactory by 19%. satisfactory by 51% and 30% thought it excellent or good.

When asked how public transport was rated 128 comments were received. 68 people stated that they do not use it, 20 people thought it too expensive, 29 stated that the service was poor, and further thoughts included that there was a good a.m. service but poor p.m. service, poor weekend service and no service to Ingatestone Station.

612 people (94%) thought there were major danger-spots in Stock, only 42 people (6%) were satisfied. When asked where the major danger spots in the village are 317 comments were received. The greatest concern was the poor visibility at the zebra crossing, followed by the High St junctions with Mill Rd, Swan Lane, Common Road and concerns over the narrow pavement outside the Cock. The many other concerns included traffic speeds generally throughout the lanes in the village particularly Smallgains Lane and Downham Road, weight/volume of traffic, nervousness on paths with vehicles mounting pavements, poor visibility and requests for additional zebra crossings at The Cock Inn and Downham Road.




Traffic speeding was thought to be the worst traffic problem in the village with 28% citing it as their biggest concern, followed by heavy goods vehicles 27%, careless parking 13%, lack of parking space 12%, traffic noise 10% and pedestrian/vehicle conflict 10%. Speed control measures supported were traffic calming 42%, lower speed limits 35% and extension of restricted speed area 23%. 10 people raised comment on HGV's passing through the village and also their use of Well Lane and Smallgains Lane. There were calls to limit weight and width of vehicles. Other comments included school parking, over-grown hedges, parking generally and speed limits.

When asked what speed control measures would be supported in Stock 113 comments received including - Reduction of speed limit to 20mph, speed cameras, HGV restriction, village bobby, speed bumps, build a by pass, close lanes except for access, digital sign, extend kerbs, flashing lights, mini roundabout, traffic lights, width restriction, flashing speed limit signs, island in High St, more signage, psychological barriers such as village gateway.

Education & Training

Analysis was carried out to determine how well the village catered for education and to what extent resources outside the village had to be utilised to meet this need.



THE OLD SCHOOL STOCK 1839-1989

Of those attending playgroups 30% went to those outside Stock. Likewise those attending nursery school elsewhere (64%), reception/infant school (26%), Junior school (41%).

Quality of training. The play groups, the nursery school, the reception/infant school and the junior school all received a high proportion of excellent and good ratings.


85 comments received including the following - In favour of after-school club, holiday club, better school transport, youth club, better play area and facilities, swimming pool & tennis court.

When asked what other Education and Training Facilities were wanted by Stock residents 73 comments were received including the following - craft classes, computer club, table tennis, investment club, youth club, financial club, evening classes in village hall run by ECC, evening opening for library, exchange scheme, languages, photography, net-ball, badminton, internet café, local history, music.

Housing & Development

On the question of housing and development 36% thought the existing number of houses was about right. 35% thought we had too much new housing, 25% thought new housing was too expensive with 4% believing there was too little new housing.

When asked what people thought of the number of houses built over the last 10 years, 48 comments received included the following - more affordable homes for the young, housing too expensive, prevent development between Stock and Chelmsford, infrastructure at its capacity, existing density enough.



New housing. 87% were against 'edge of village' expansion. 90% were against development of the green belt. 59% supported development of Brownfield sites. 89% were against increasing density of housing within the village.

Additional accommodation- 5% were in favour of large family homes, 26% favoured small family homes, 16% favoured homes for the elderly, 9% homes for single people and 45% wanted no further homes.

When asked to comment on any need for additional accommodation in Stock, 48 responses were received, these included affordable housing, sheltered/nursing accommodation, better mix of housing.

Industry & Warehousing - 90% of people were against further development of the Temple Farm area. 145 comments were received including 67 raising concerns regarding higher levels of traffic on B1007. Other comments included, banning HGV's, concerns over pollution, damage to Green Belt. 3 people thought it would provide more jobs for the area.

Healthcare

People were asked where their Doctors Surgery/Clinic was located. 84% went to Stock with 15% attending Billericay, 2% Chelmsford. 95% had no problems collecting medicine on prescription.

Getting to hospital, doctors, chemist, chiropodist, optician, dentist or 'other' was not a significant problem for the majority although of concern to those without their own transport. 28 comments were received, the worst being problems getting to the hospital for 7 people and lack of local dentist for 4 people.

Healthcare services were rated by categories. Overall only 2% thought them unsatisfactory. For the benefit of readers requiring more in-depth analysis information within the data gives details of each healthcare service and the rating of each.

When asked 'where is your Doctor', those not attending Stock went to Basildon, Hutton, Ingatestone or Shenfield.

15 comments were received with regard to health problems that effect daily living, these included 3 people wanting specific parking, 2 people saying the pavements were unsatisfactory for the disabled, 3 people would like a scheme for the lonely to talk to others. Complimentary comments were received for the 'Stock Cares' helpers.



Emergency & Community Services

Fire, ambulance, hospital, police (emergency), police (bobby), traffic reports (radio) were rated excellent, good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The overall average showed 38% thought to be unsatisfactory. By far the greatest concern was with policing with 86% believing the police presence on the beat unsatisfactory and 44% thought the police emergency service unsatisfactory.

The Neighbourhood Watch scheme was thought to work by 43%. 14% thought it didn't work and 43% had no opinion. Of the 36 comments received 19 stated that there should be more participation and communication.

Anti-social behaviour was rated in 4 categories of concern. A lot, sometimes, rarely, or not at all. Theft was the greatest concern with 37% concerned 'a lot'. Under this category vandalism accounted for 24%, drunkenness 10%, and mugging 6%. Of the 53 comments received, 10 mentioned the Beer Festival and pub noise, 13 litter and rubbish, 7 cars speeding, 8 dog fouling, 3 inconsiderate parking and 2 people complained about 'snobbery'.

16% said there were areas in Stock in which they felt unsafe. 95 comments received. 26 people were concerned about unlit lanes after dark, 12 thought the B1007 dangerous whilst walking, 11 were concerned about Common Road and Well Lane, 10 were concerned about Back Lane and School Lane with 7 people worried when in the Woods. 4 people raised their concerns about pub closing time and the Beer Festival.



Community Services - People thinking a greater police presence was required accounted for 88%, better consultation between police and local people 81%, neighbourhood watch 84%, improved street lighting 56%, more drug/drink education and prevention 57%, more activities for young people 89%, a 'good neighbour' type scheme 81%, cable TV 23%, better satellite TV reception 18%, better on-digital TV reception 24%, allotments 31%, public toilets 33%. 35 comments were received including 7 people wanting a village 'bobby', 7 wanting a children's play area, 6 wanting public toilets, telephone and a car park and 3 wanting more street lighting.

The standard of Environmental Services was rated excellent, good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The greatest concern was street lighting with 32% rating it as unsatisfactory. Snow clearance rated unsatisfactory by 29%, roadside care/street cleaning 28%, mains electricity supply 14%, TV reception 7%, mains gas supply 8%, mains water supply 5%, radio reception 4%, refuse collection 2%. Of the 61 comments received, 14 people mentioned power cuts, 15 people thought street cleaning and attending to hedges & ditches was poor, 6 people mentioned the condition of road surfaces, 6 people had poor radio reception, 4 people received poor standard of telephone and mobile service, 3 people mentioned poor street lighting and 3 people highlighted a poor gas service.

The state of roads, pavements, verges, street lighting, village greens, Stock Common, hedges and ditches was rated excellent, good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The greatest concern was pavements with 40% rating them as unsatisfactory. Street lighting was rated unsatisfactory by 33%, hedges & ditches 27%, verges 23%, roads 20%, Stock Common 16% village greens 3%. 85 comments were received, some of which covered more than one topic. 21 people thought ditches were in poor condition, 20 had similar thoughts with regard to hedges and verges, 15 thought pavements dangerous, 5 wanted better dog fouling cleansing, 10 wanted better parking, 22 wanted a play area, 2 wanted improved street lighting.

Recycling was favoured by the majority with 85% of the people of Stock prepared to separate items of refuse. The bottle bank 'was or would be' used by 72%, public bulk rubbish lorry 56%, visiting skip for garden waste 61%, newspaper bank 67%, clothes bank 57%, can bank 57%.

The number/location of litter bins was thought to be poor by 24% of people. The number/location of dog bins was thought to be poor by 42% of people.

The facilities in Stock thought to need improving were, for pedestrians 75%, cyclists 54%, wheelchairs 76%, pushchairs 71%, partially sighted 78%. Comments were received from 22 people including 8 people who wanted improvements to pavements. 2 wanted safer horse riding facilities, 1 wanted further benches for the elderly and 3 people were concerned about cars blocking footpaths.

Retail & Other Facilities



The questionnaire asked how often people used the shops and services in Stock. The local shop was used by 23% daily and 54% weekly. Public Houses in Stock were used daily by 4% and weekly by 30%. The library 1% using it daily and 27% weekly. The post office was used daily by 8% and weekly by 63%. The Doctors Dispensary was used daily by 1% with 23% using it weekly. Comments included - People wanting a greengrocers (57), butcher (48), restaurant or tea shop (12), bakery (8), bank or cash point (8), chemist (7), fishmongers (2), DIY shop (1). 3 people stated that no further retail outlets were required.

The reasons for using the local shop were, good value 6%, social contact 18%, time saving 25%, saving transport costs 15%, lack of transport 4%, last minute items 33%. A larger library would be welcomed by 61% of the people, longer opening hours by 65%. When asked why people shop in Stock comments included - bread very good, convenience, support local shops, enjoy walking to village, internet facility in library, no car, staff helpful, personal service, polite, buy lottery tickets, 'use or lose'.

Recreation & Leisure

54% of people blamed poor publicity for not participating in existing Stock based recreation or leisure facilities. 31% said they had no interest in the current activities. 4% said they did not have the transport. 2% said there was no provision for the disabled. 8% said they had no-one to go with.

When asked what prevented them from participating in existing Stock based recreational or leisure facilities replies received included - Age, work pressures, 'am I welcome to join or must I be introduced', need to know, busy life, prepared to teach advanced gardening classes, need computer club, health, mainly aimed at elderly, unfriendly to newcomers, geared around the retired age group, too old.

When asked 'what activities would you like to see for all', replies received included - aerobics, gym, archery, arts & crafts, badminton, swimming, table tennis, short tennis, clay pigeon shooting, coffee morning club, community centre, computer classes, tap dancing, country & western, dance classes, keep fit, yoga, film club, tai chi, musical events, natural history, pottery, song writing, ramblers/walkers, darts, golf for children, talks, tea shop, bridge, scrabble, board games, weight watchers, health farm.

When asked what activities would you like to see for the young, replies received included - youth club, astro-turf, badminton, better playground, cubs, scouts, brownies, guides, computer club, football, rugby, youth club, maths, English, snooker, toddlers group, play area, pony club, tennis, tumble tots, music group.


When asked what activities would you like to see for the elderly, replies received included -arts/crafts, bridge,



chess, scrabble, community/disabled centre, keep fit, lunch club, music/dancing, rambling, short mat bowls, tea dances, social club, swimming group, whist drive.

From a communications point of view its interesting to note many people are asking for activities that we already have. Perhaps we could learn something from this feedback.

Communication and Information



Where do the people of Stock get information about what events are taking place in Stock? Stock Press 32%, notices in shops/pubs etc 28%, official notice boards 27%, local papers 14%. 49% thought the information about what is going on in Stock was reasonable with 34% saying it was good and 17% saying it was poor. Comments included - extended coverage of Stock Press (29), leaflets/newsletters (49), Parish Council newsletter (14), information by post (9), Local Authority mailshots (8), internet (7), local press (7), better notice boards (6).

63% of people thought that matters being considered at national, county and district level which have an impact on Stock e.g. Planning, Transport, Health Care, are not adequately reflected in the communications they receive. 74% of people would like to see an improvement in the quality, timeliness or relevance of the information concerning Stock available to their household.


Local Government

Although 79% were not satisfied with the way money was spent in local government only 43% were happy to pay higher taxes to meet additional needs. 61% of the people had not attended a Parish Council meeting. Of the 39% who do attend 95% had attended during the last year. 54% said they knew who their local Parish Councillors were, 36% said they knew who their Borough Councillor was and 27% said they knew who their County Councillor was.

Religion

Active members of the local churches were The Church of England 70%, The Free Church 13%, The Roman Catholic Church 17%. People attending places of worship outside of Stock did so for the following reasons. Time of services are better 30%, religion/denomination not catered for 37%, better facilities for children 22%, access problems in local place 4%, poor local information 7%.

When asked why people worshiped outside the village comments included - already belonged to a church elsewhere before moving to Stock, different style of service, family connections, prefer lower church, style of service, friends elsewhere.



Environment

People were asked what they thought should be done to enhance the local environment of Stock. By far the greatest desire was to reduce traffic. This was the concern of 70% of the people responding. Other

suggestions were less dog fouling 55%, less litter 46%, planting of trees/hedges 37%, removal of overhead cables 34%, increased street lighting 30%, improved rights of way 28%, bus shelter improvements 16%, reduction of highway signage 10%, reduction of private security lighting 8%, increase of private security lighting 5%, reduction of street lighting 4%.

People were asked what features of the village/surrounding countryside were important to them. They were asked to categorise a list of headings as essential, necessary or don't mind. In order of priority the Green Belt was considered essential by 92%, Green Fields 89%, Trees 89%, Wildlife 87%, Conservation Areas 87%, Woods 84%, Common 81%, Rights of Way 80%, Hedges 78%, Historical Buildings 73%, Pond 60%.




Pottery Cottage
Stock

The extension to Swan Woods was supported by 87% with 10% expressing no opinion.

People were asked to express their view on the appearance of parts of the village. 84% though the overall appearance was good or satisfactory however hedges and ditches were the greatest concern with 31% saying they were 'poor'. The ponds were considered poor by 24%, the surrounding roads 14%, the High Street 7%, and the Common just 5%.

Play Area - 34% thought improvements were essential with 24% saying they were necessary. Roads and Highway footpaths - 39% thought improvements were essential with 38% saying they were necessary. Bridleways/footpaths - 30% thought improvements were essential with 42% saying they were necessary.

General comments for this section included - requests for better footpath signage, better play area, dog proof play area required, need to cut back overhanging trees in High St, play area required to rear of village hall, pot holes need attention, cricket pavilion need improving, ditches need clean up & clearance for drainage, banning lorries from village lanes, extend 30mph zone, dog fouling and speed cameras.



Acknowledgments

Some years have now elapsed since the village appraisal was carried out. A great deal of time was put into this project by a dedicated team intent on recording history at the end of the millennium. It is these people that have devoted their time and those that have generously given funds that we have to thank for the facts that are now on file and in the library archives forevermore and it is these facts that have been used to compile this document that gives everyone the opportunity to understand and remember village life as it was at this historic time. The data is of course available for anyone in need of such information now or in the future. A reference copy of this document together with a copy of detailed comments received will be placed on file in the local library and held by the Parish Clerk. A copy for the archives will be forwarded to Essex County Council. This document is intended as an interpretation or summary of the data.

Special thanks go to Barry Woodgate, Mark Levett & Kay Eaton who put so much time into this project. Douglas Mann who sadly died whilst in the process of preparing the final document helped considerably with the graphic design in earlier documents.

Initiated by -	Borough Councillor Gary Stringer
Steering Committee -	Chairman - Barry Woodgate John Dickson, Kay Eaton, Stephanie Harbott, Margaret Carter, Tony Barker, Tom Willis, Mark Levett, Phil Gane, Jim Powell
Parish Council -	Sally Johnson
Rural Community Council of Essex -	Jan Cole
Financial support -	SHELL Employees Action Grants Committee Rural Community Council of Essex Crondon Park Golf Club Stock Parish Council
Publishing & Financial Support -	Heybridge Publicity
Facilities -	Sir John & Lady Carter
Illustrations -	Terry Vanner
Front cover illustration -	Jim Powell



Household Section

H1 - How many people, including children, normally live in your household 956

H2 - Please enter the number of people in your household, in each age group

	Male	Female	Total	%
0 to 4	19	21	40	4%
5 to 10	30	30	60	6%
11 to 15	24	23	47	5%
16 to 17	8	6	14	1%
18 to 24	19	19	38	4%
25 to 44	101	93	194	20%
45 to 59	105	115	220	23%
60 to 64	42	50	92	10%
65 to 74	71	81	152	16%
75 to 84	37	29	66	7%
85 +	10	16	26	3%
			949	100%

H3 - How long has your household lived in Stock

	Male	Female	Total	%
Under 5 years	76	6	82	19%
5 to 20 years	148	15	163	38%
20 to 40 years	106	17	123	29%
over 40 years	28	4	32	7%
all your life	25	5	30	7%
			430	100%

H4 - If you moved to Stock, what was your main reason to reside here

	Total	%
Good commuting	41	9%
Family connections	49	11%
Suitable housing	145	32%
Country life	187	41%
Availability of good schools	33	7%
	455	100%

Personal Section

P1 - For each person of the household over the age of 16 (please indicate an appropriate category.)

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Employed		70	41	16	2	2	1	132	20%
Self employed		39	15	3	0	0	0	57	9%
Part-time employed		6	19	1	2	0	0	28	4%
Part-time self-employed		3	3	0	0	0	0	6	1%
Unemployed		0	2	0	1	0	0	3	0%
In government training scheme		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
In government training scheme part-time		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0%
In full-time education		1	3	24	10	5	0	43	7%
Unwaged housewife/househusband		16	64	0	0	0	0	80	12%
Retired		189	97	3	1	0	0	290	44%
Permanently sick/disabled		7	4	2	0	0	0	13	2%
								653	100%

P2 - For each person, please indicate their sector of work and location

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Agriculture/Horticulture		12	6	4	0	0	0	22	4%
Manufacturing		22	7	2	0	0	0	31	5%
Retail		9	12	3	1	0	0	25	4%
Service Industry		33	20	8	6	2	0	69	12%
Financial Services		35	12	7	1	0	0	55	9%
Tourism		3	1	1	0	0	0	5	1%
Local/Public Sectors		23	29	4	0	0	1	57	10%
Construction/Property		28	6	2	0	2	0	38	6%
Transport/Communication		6	2	1	1	0	0	10	2%
Food Processing		1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0%
Retired		174	95	3	1	0	0	273	47%
								587	100%

P3 - For residents looking for work, please state person looking for work

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	0	4	4	3	1	0	12

P4 - Do residents feel that there should be more opportunities for employment in Stock			
	Yes	No	Total %
	95	231	326
	29%	71%	100%

Traffic Section

T1 - Do you experience any of the following parking problems

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total %
Parking problems in Village centre	184	113	12	2	1	1	313 46%
Parking at the School	20	21	0	0	0	0	41 6%
Parking whilst visiting the Doctors' Surgery	134	97	16	4	1	1	253 37%
Cars blocking the entrance to your property	53	23	2	2	0	0	80 12%
							687 100%

T2 - How do you rate public transport

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total %
1 = excellent	8	4	1	0	0	0	13 3%
2 = good	72	46	10	4	2	1	135 27%
3 = satisfactory	138	88	20	9	3	0	258 51%
4 = unsatisfactory	58	26	8	4	1	0	97 19%
							503 100%

T3 - Do you think there are any major danger-spots on the roads in Stock

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total %
1 = yes	336	212	41	15	6	2	612 94%
2 = No	26	13	2	1	0	0	42 6%
							654 100%

T4 - Do you think traffic problems in Stock are caused by any of the following

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total %

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total %
Traffic speeding	333	237	46	17	5	0	638 28%
Traffic noise	121	81	18	6	1	0	227 10%
Heavy Goods Vehicles	321	232	46	15	5	1	620 27%
Pedestrian/Vehicle conflict	119	86	17	6	1	1	230 10%
Lack of parking space	157	93	16	4	1	1	272 12%
Careless parking	166	108	20	5	3	1	303 13%
							2290 100%

T5 - Which of the following speed control measures would you support in Stock

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total %
Extension of the speed limit area	135	94	20	9	3	0	261 23%
Introduce a lower speed limit	212	143	28	8	1	0	392 35%
Traffic calming	245	178	34	14	3	0	474 42%
							1127 100%

Education & Training Section

S1 - Please enter the number of children and adults in your household who attend the following

	Stock	Outside Stock	Stock	Outside Stock
Play Group	16	7	70%	30%
Nursery School	5	9	36%	64%
Reception/ Infant School	20	7	74%	26%
Junior School	23	16	59%	41%
Secondary School	1	46		
Sixth Form College	0	4		
University	0	14		
Vocational/ Professional Training	1	23		
Other Leisure/ Interest Training	36	71	34%	66%
	102	197		

S2 - For each of the people in your household undergoing education and training, please give a view on the quality of tuition and the adequacy of financial, material and personnel resources

	Tuition	Resources	Tuition %	Resources %
Play Group				
1 = excellent	7	2	33%	12%
2 = good	6	8	29%	47%
3 = satisfactory	8	7	38%	41%
4 = unsatisfactory	0	0	0%	0%
	21	17	100%	100%
Nursery School				
1 = excellent	3	2	33%	22%
2 = good	4	4	44%	44%
3 = satisfactory	2	3	22%	33%
4 = unsatisfactory	0	0	0%	0%
	9	9	100%	100%
Reception/Infant School				
1 = excellent	9	7	39%	35%
2 = good	11	10	48%	50%
3 = satisfactory	2	2	9%	10%
4 = unsatisfactory	1	1	4%	5%
	23	20	100%	100%

Junior School				
1 = excellent	9	9	36%	45%
2 = good	10	8	40%	40%
3 = satisfactory	3	1	12%	5%
4 = unsatisfactory	3	2	12%	10%
	25	20	100%	100%
Secondary School				
1 = excellent	10	10	36%	33%
2 = good	15	14	54%	47%
3 = satisfactory	3	4	11%	13%
4 = unsatisfactory	0	2	0%	7%
	28	30	100%	100%

Sixth Form College				
1 = excellent	1	1	17%	17%
2 = good	2	2	33%	33%
3 = satisfactory	2	2	33%	33%
4 = unsatisfactory	1	1	17%	17%
	6	6	100%	100%
University				
1 = excellent	1	1	14%	9%
2 = good	2	3	29%	27%
3 = satisfactory	2	4	29%	36%

4 = unsatisfactory 2 3 29%
7 11 100%

Vocational/Professional Training

1 = excellent 1 2 11%
2 = good 5 7 56%
3 = satisfactory 3 3 33%
4 = unsatisfactory 0 0 0%

9 12 100%

Other Leisure/Interest Training

1 = excellent 7 11 20%
2 = good 17 16 49%
3 = satisfactory 9 13 26%
4 = unsatisfactory 2 2 6%

35 42 100%

S3 - What additional facilities or resources, including Sporting facilities, could be provided to support the educational needs of the Junior and Secondary age children

Comments summarised in report. Full list of comments available in library or through Parish Clerk.

S4 - Do you consider facilities in the area for education and training are adequate

	Vocational	Professional	
Yes	112	83	72%
No	43	38	28%
	155	121	100%

S5 - Please state here other Educational and Training Facilities you would like for Stock residents

Comments summarised in report. Full list of comments available in library or through Parish Clerk.

Housing & Development Section

H1 - What do you think about the number of houses that have been built in Stock over the last 10 years

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
About right		165	116	15	3	1	0	300	36%
Too much new housing		151	107	21	10	3	0	292	35%
Too little new housing		13	9	3	3	1	1	30	4%
Too expensive housing		109	69	18	7	2	1	206	25%
Comment/location								828	100%

H2 - Chelmsford Borough Council have issued a planning discussion document. They are considering the A12/B1007 interchange area as a possible location for the further development of Industry and Warehousing

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		38	24	5	0	2	0	69	10%
No		317	236	46	20	4	1	624	90%
								693	

H3 - Do you support any of the following means of meeting the demands for new housing

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Edge of Village expansion		40	25	7	3	0	1	76	13%
Yes		265	193	33	10	4	0	505	87%
No								581	100%

Development in Green Belt

Yes		9	3	1	0	0	0	13	2%
No		282	211	39	14	4	0	550	98%
								563	100%

Development of Brownfield sites

Yes		199	142	20	6	1	1	369	59%
No		135	93	20	8	2	0	258	41%
								627	100%

Increased density of housing within Village

Yes		31	25	4	1	0	0	61	11%
No		266	193	35	13	4	0	511	89%
								572	100%

H4 - What kind of additional accommodation do you think Stock needs

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Large family homes		24	15	1	1	0	0	41	5%

Small family homes		117	74	11	3	1	1	207	26%
Homes for the elderly		71	50	5	0	0	0	126	16%
Homes for single people		36	25	8	2	0	1	72	9%
No further homes		192	132	26	10	3	0	363	45%
								809	100%

Healthcare Section

C1 - Is your Doctors Surgery/Clinic in

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Stock		328	243	62	21	6	1	661	84%
Billericay		62	43	6	5	1	0	117	15%
Chelmsford		5	4	1	1	1	0	12	2%
								790	100%

C2 - Do you have any problems in collecting medicine on prescription

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		13	4	2	1	0	0	20	3%
No		372	284	64	24	8	1	753	95%
Not applicable		8	7	2	0	0	0	17	2%
								790	100%

C3 - Do you have any difficulty in getting to the following

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Hospital		34	27	7	3	0	0	71	10%
Yes		298	236	48	18	6	0	606	90%
No								677	100%
Doctor		11	9	3	2	0	1	26	4%
Yes		320	254	54	21	6	0	655	96%
No								681	100%
Chemist		21	15	5	2	1	0	44	7%
Yes		290	235	49	19	5	0	598	93%
No								642	100%
Chiropodist		15	8	1	0	0	0	24	5%
Yes		230	184	31	11	3	0	459	95%
No								483	100%

Optician	Yes	21	15	3	1	0	0	0	40	6%
	No	284	230	44	17	5	0	0	580	94%
									620	100%
Dentist	Yes	27	17	6	1	0	0	0	51	8%
	No	293	237	49	20	6	0	0	605	92%
									656	100%
Other medical facilities	Yes	9	6	2	2	0	0	0	19	5%
	No	184	153	23	7	2	0	0	369	95%
									388	100%

C4 - If you have used any of the following services during the last year, how do you rate the service

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Doctor									
1 = excellent		179	135	26	9	2	0	351	55%
2 = good		112	87	15	6	3	1	224	35%
3 = satisfactory		28	19	8	3	1	0	59	9%
4 = unsatisfactory		4	1	2	1	0	0	8	1%
								642	100%
District Nurse									
1 = excellent		46	28	4	0	0	0	78	57%
2 = good		24	18	5	1	1	0	49	36%
3 = satisfactory		6	2	0	0	0	0	8	6%
4 = unsatisfactory		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
								137	100%
Health visitor									
1 = excellent		15	13	1	0	0	0	29	63%
2 = good		5	3	0	0	0	0	8	17%
3 = satisfactory		2	1	0	1	0	0	4	9%
4 = unsatisfactory		3	2	0	0	0	0	5	11%
								46	100%
Home help									
1 = excellent		2	3	1	0	0	0	6	60%
2 = good		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	10%
3 = satisfactory		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	20%
4 = unsatisfactory		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	10%
								10	100%
Ambulance									
1 = excellent		25	13	3	0	0	0	41	58%

2 = good	10	11	1	0	0	0	0	22	31%
3 = satisfactory	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	7%
4 = unsatisfactory	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4%
								71	100%
Maternity care									
1 = excellent	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	9	45%
2 = good	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	45%
3 = satisfactory	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	10%
4 = unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
								20	100%

C5 - Do you have a health problem/disability which effects your day-to-day living

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		41	21	5	1	0	0	68	9%
No		329	257	59	23	8	2	678	91%
								746	100%

C6 - Is there a need for any of the following in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Nursing Home		60	45	9	1	0	0	115	27%
More sheltered housing		79	54	8	2	0	0	143	33%
Residential provision for people with disabilities		44	25	6	2	0	0	77	18%
Baby Clinic		24	24	4	0	1	0	53	12%
Family Planning Clinic		18	18	2	0	1	0	39	9%
								427	100%

Emergency & Community Services Section

E1 - What are your views on the standard of the following services in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Fire									
1 = excellent		20	14	3	1	1	1	40	12%
2 = good		49	40	8	3	0	0	100	30%
3 = satisfactory		83	56	12	3	1	1	156	47%
4 = unsatisfactory		17	16	3	1	1	0	38	11%
								334	100%

Ambulance (emergency)

1 = excellent	30	14	4	1	1	1	51	14%
2 = good	63	39	11	4	0	0	117	33%
3 = satisfactory	76	56	9	3	0	0	144	40%
4 = unsatisfactory	18	19	5	2	1	0	45	13%
							357	100%

Hospital (transport)

1 = excellent	14	7	1	0	0	0	22	9%
2 = good	36	23	3	0	0	0	62	25%
3 = satisfactory	50	36	5	3	1	0	95	38%
4 = unsatisfactory	37	29	4	1	0	0	71	28%
							250	100%

Police (emergency)

1 = excellent	10	8	1	1	0	0	20	5%
2 = good	35	21	7	1	0	0	64	17%
3 = satisfactory	64	53	4	3	0	0	124	33%
4 = unsatisfactory	85	57	13	7	2	1	165	44%
							373	100%

Police (Bobby)

1 = excellent	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	1%
2 = good	12	8	2	0	0	0	22	4%
3 = satisfactory	24	16	1	2	0	0	43	8%
4 = unsatisfactory	224	174	32	10	2	1	443	86%
							514	100%

Traffic reports (radio)

1 = excellent	13	9	1	0	0	0	23	8%
2 = good	39	27	4	2	0	0	72	26%
3 = satisfactory	68	55	9	3	2	1	138	49%
4 = unsatisfactory	23	20	4	0	0	0	47	17%
							280	100%

Overall totals

Excellent	162	8%
Good	437	21%
Satisfactory	700	33%
Unsatisfactory	809	38%
	2108	100%

E2 - Does the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme in Stock work

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		149	107	21	6	0	0	283	43%
No		43	32	9	4	1	0	89	14%
No Opinion		145	111	17	5	4	1	283	43%
								655	100%

E3 - Which, if any of the following crimes and anti-social behaviour concern you in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Theft									
1 = a lot		108	69	16	8	3	1	205	37%
2 = sometimes		101	81	10	4	0	0	196	35%
3 = rarely		48	29	5	1	0	0	83	15%
4 = not at all		39	27	7	2	1	1	77	14%
								561	100%
Mugging									
1 = a lot		11	7	2	1	0	0	21	6%
2 = sometimes		14	9	1	1	1	0	26	7%
3 = rarely		41	29	5	3	0	0	78	21%
4 = not at all		131	97	18	5	2	1	254	67%
								379	100%
Vandalism									
1 = a lot		70	40	11	5	2	2	130	24%
2 = sometimes		107	83	18	7	1	0	216	40%
3 = rarely		57	35	8	1	0	0	101	19%
4 = not at all		44	36	6	2	1	0	89	17%
								536	100%
Drunkenness									
1 = a lot		20	13	4	3	1	1	42	10%
2 = sometimes		62	50	11	4	0	0	127	29%
3 = rarely		66	43	8	4	1	0	122	28%
4 = not at all		79	59	8	1	1	0	148	34%
								439	100%

E4 - Are there any areas in Stock in which you feel unsafe

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		65	37	7	1	2	0	112	16%
No		300	217	45	13	3	2	580	84%
								692	100%

E5 - Do you think that any of the following measures are needed

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
A greater Police presence									
Yes		298	212	40	14	5	1	570	88%
No		35	29	8	4	1	1	78	12%
								648	100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Roadside care/Street cleaning								
1 = excellent	18	13	1	0	0	0	32	5%
2 = good	4	43	6	2	0	0	115	18%
3 = satisfactory	169	117	23	9	4	2	324	50%
4 = unsatisfactory	100	62	13	4	0	0	179	28%
							650	100%
Winter weather service (snow clearance)								
1 = excellent	10	5	0	0	0	0	15	3%
2 = good	45	32	3	0	0	0	80	14%
3 = satisfactory	159	111	25	11	3	2	311	55%
4 = unsatisfactory	89	57	13	3	1	0	163	29%
							569	100%
TV Reception								
1 = excellent	50	36	3	0	0	0	89	14%
2 = good	145	87	19	6	0	0	257	40%
3 = satisfactory	122	99	15	7	4	2	249	39%
4 = unsatisfactory	28	15	3	2	0	0	48	7%
							643	100%
Radio reception								
1 = excellent	65	45	3	0	0	0	113	19%
2 = good	136	87	16	5	0	0	244	40%
3 = satisfactory	115	87	18	7	3	1	231	38%
4 = unsatisfactory	14	7	1	0	0	0	22	4%
							610	100%

E7- What do you think of the state of the following

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Roads								
1 = excellent	7	5	0	0	0	0	12	2%
2 = good	95	54	13	4	4	1	171	25%
3 = satisfactory	188	141	27	11	1	1	369	54%
4 = unsatisfactory	76	45	10	4	0	0	135	20%
							687	100%
Pavements								
1 = excellent	5	4	1	0	0	0	10	1%
2 = good	56	33	6	4	2	0	101	15%
3 = satisfactory	141	110	29	9	1	1	291	43%
4 = unsatisfactory	152	92	14	6	2	1	267	40%
							669	100%
Verges								
1 = excellent	7	4	1	0	0	0	12	2%
2 = good	77	52	10	2	0	0	141	21%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
3 = satisfactory								
	183	131	26	11	1	2	354	54%
4 = unsatisfactory								
	81	55	11	5	2	0	154	23%
							661	100%
Street lighting								
1 = excellent	11	9	2	1	0	0	23	4%
2 = good	65	39	9	3	0	0	116	18%
3 = satisfactory	162	109	21	5	2	0	299	46%
4 = unsatisfactory	107	77	17	10	3	2	216	33%
							654	100%
Village Greens								
1 = excellent	37	21	6	3	0	0	67	10%
2 = good	170	124	26	11	4	2	337	51%
3 = satisfactory	133	87	17	4	1	0	242	36%
4 = unsatisfactory	12	7	1	0	0	0	20	3%
							666	100%
Stock Common, incl Play area								
1 = excellent	21	11	4	3	0	0	39	6%
2 = good	143	102	19	6	3	1	274	42%
3 = satisfactory	131	83	17	5	2	1	239	36%
4 = unsatisfactory	49	42	8	4	0	0	103	16%
							655	100%
Hedges and Ditches								
1 = excellent	7	4	2	0	0	0	13	2%
2 = good	81	60	9	2	1	0	153	23%
3 = satisfactory	168	110	24	12	3	1	318	48%
4 = unsatisfactory	94	65	14	3	1	1	178	27%
							662	100%

Overall totals
 Excellent 176 3%
 Good 1293 25%
 Satisfactory 2279 44%
 Unsatisfactory 1475 28%
5223 100%

E8 - Would you be prepared to keep certain items separate from your refuse, if separate collection was made

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		335	239	45	15	3	1	638	85%
No		41	26	9	6	3	1	86	11%
No Opinion		13	10	3	0	0	0	26	3%
								750	100%

E9 - Would you/Do you use the following in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Bottle Bank	Yes	257	175	29	11	4	2	478	72%
	No	100	66	16	6	1	0	189	28%
								667	100%
Visiting Public bulk rubbish Lorry	Yes	164	132	20	5	2	1	324	56%
	No	137	85	21	8	2	0	253	44%
								577	100%
Visiting Skip for Garden Waste	Yes	183	146	20	5	3	1	358	61%
	No	125	75	21	8	1	0	230	39%
								588	100%
Newspaper Bank	Yes	220	169	21	4	2	0	416	65%
	No	110	84	18	8	2	1	223	35%
								639	100%
Clothing Bank	Yes	166	135	24	7	2	1	335	57%
	No	141	87	17	6	2	0	253	43%
								588	100%
Can Bank	Yes	171	133	19	5	2	0	330	57%
	No	133	83	20	8	2	1	247	43%
								577	100%

E10 - Are the number/location of Litter Bins/Dog Bins in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Litter Bins	Good	54	39	11	4	3	2	113	17%
	Reasonable	137	94	19	9	2	0	261	40%
	Poor	87	54	11	2	0	0	154	24%
	No opinion	65	45	9	3	0	0	122	19%
								650	100%
Dog Bins	Good	18	12	2	1	0	0	33	6%
	Reasonable	72	50	9	2	0	0	133	23%
	Poor	124	90	20	6	2	0	242	42%
	No opinion	85	62	10	4	1	0	162	28%
								570	100%

E11 - Should the facilities in Stock be improved

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Pedestrians	Yes	212	152	34	12	5	2	417	75%
	No	72	51	13	5	1	0	142	25%
								559	100%
Cyclists	Yes	119	88	25	7	4	1	244	54%
	No	103	83	12	8	1	1	208	46%
								452	100%
Wheelchairs	Yes	187	139	25	8	3	1	363	76%
	No	58	37	9	5	2	1	112	24%
								475	100%
Pushchairs	Yes	162	124	23	7	4	2	322	71%
	No	66	47	11	6	1	0	131	29%
								453	100%
The partially sighted	Yes	163	125	23	6	4	1	322	78%
	No	49	31	7	4	1	1	93	22%
								415	100%

Retail & other Facilities Section

F1 - How often do you use the following shops and services in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Local Shop	1 = daily	99	53	13	4	2	1	172	23%
	2 = weekly	213	153	24	8	2	0	400	54%
	3 = rarely	74	47	17	8	0	0	146	20%
	4 = never	5	1	5	2	2	1	16	2%
								734	100%
Public houses	1 = daily	18	6	2	0	0	0	26	4%
	2 = weekly	114	78	16	2	0	0	210	30%
	3 = rarely	192	141	22	7	3	2	367	53%
	4 = never	41	23	15	10	2	0	91	13%
								694	100%

Recreation and leisure Section

L1 - Please list the current sporting, recreational & Leisure activities in which each member takes part

Person	In Stock	Out of Stock
	1	Full list of comments on library copy
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	698	100%

Post Office

1 = daily	37	17	1	1	0	0	0	56	8%
2 = weekly	249	167	28	10	4	2	460	63%	
3 = rarely	85	69	21	8	1	0	184	25%	
4 = never	17	6	7	1	1	0	32	4%	
							732	100%	

Doctors' Dispensary

1 = daily	8	1	0	1	0	0	10	1%
2 = weekly	87	56	10	1	1	0	155	23%
3 = rarely	196	144	40	15	3	1	399	58%
4 = never	65	43	6	4	2	1	121	18%
							685	100%

F2 - If you usually shop in Stock, is it because

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
The local shops give good value	57	31	3	1	0	0	92	6%
You like the social contact	150	106	16	4	1	0	277	18%
It saves time	204	149	27	11	2	1	394	25%
It saves transport costs	126	73	21	7	3	1	231	15%
You don't have transport to go elsewhere	32	15	11	3	2	1	64	4%
You need 'last minute' items	268	201	31	13	1	0	514	33%
							1572	100%

F3 - Do you think the Library is sufficient for the needs of the village

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Larger Library needed								
Yes	129	94	27	11	3	1	265	61%
No	87	66	12	4	1	0	170	39%
							435	100%
Longer opening hours needed								
Yes	128	104	28	9	3	1	273	65%
No	76	54	9	5	2	0	146	35%
							419	100%

L2 - For those activities organised locally, what improvement would each member like to see

Person	Activity	Comment
	1	Full list of comments on library copy
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	

L3 - What clubs or activities would you like to see started or developed in Stock

For all	For the young	For the elderly	For the disabled
			Full list of comments on library copy

L4 - What, if anything, prevents you from participating in existing Stock-based recreational or leisure facilities

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Don't know what's going on (poor publicity)	88	62	16	6	2	2	176	54%
No interest in current activities	52	33	9	3	2	1	100	31%
No transport	5	6	1	1	0	1	14	4%
No provision for the disabled	6	1	1	0	0	0	8	2%
No-one to go with	13	9	4	0	1	0	27	8%
							325	100%

Communication and information Section

C1 - Where do you usually get information about what events are taking place in Stock

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Official Notice Boards		217	153	15	4	0	0	389	27%
Notices in Shops/Pubs etc		207	156	22	9	3	1	398	28%
Stock Press		242	177	27	7	1	1	455	32%
Local Papers		97	82	9	6	1	1	196	14%
								1438	100%

C2 - Do you think the information about what is going on in Stock is

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Good		132	95	15	3	0	0	245	34%
Reasonable		180	124	25	10	5	1	345	49%
Poor		63	44	10	4	0	0	121	17%
								711	100%

C3 - Do you think that matters being considered at national, county and district level which have an impact on Stock e.g. Planning, Transport, Health Care, are adequately reflected in communications you receive

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		124	78	15	6	1	0	224	37%
No		202	151	23	5	2	0	383	63%
								607	100%

C4 - Would you like to see and improvement in the quality, timeliness or relevance of information concerning Stock available to your household

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Yes		195	151	29	13	3	1	392	74%
No		73	58	7	1	1	0	140	26%
								532	100%

Local Government Section

G1 - Are you satisfied with the way money is spent

Yes 278 79%
No 75 21%

G2 - Would you be prepared to pay slightly higher Council Tax to meet additional needs

Yes 153 43%
No 206 57%

G3 - Has any member of the household attended Parish Council meetings

Yes 148 39%
No 236 61%

G4 - If yes how many members attended

Number 141

G5 - If yes, how recent was the attendance

Within the last year Yes 74 95%
No 4 5%
1 to 2 years ago Yes 40 93%
No 3 7%
over 2 years ago Yes 48 94%
No 3 6%

G6 - Do you know who your local Parish Councillors are

Yes 203 54%
No 174 46%

G7 - Do you know who your Borough Councillor is

Yes 131 36%
No 237 64%

G8 - Do you know who your County Councillor is

Yes 102 27%
No 276 73%

Religious Section

R1 - Are you an active member of

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
The Church of England	88	64	13	5	1	0	171	70%
The Free Church	17	12	3	1	0	0	33	13%
The Roman Catholic Church	26	14	1	0	0	0	41	17%
							245	100%

R2 - If you attend places of worship outside of Stock, is this because

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Time of Services are better	7	5	2	0	0	0	14	30%
My religion/denomination is not catered for	11	4	2	0	0	0	17	37%
Better facilities for children	3	4	0	1	1	1	10	22%
Access problems in local place	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	4%
Poor local information	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	7%
							46	100%

Environment Section

A1 - What do you think should be done to enhance the local environment of Stock

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Planting of Trees/Hedges	160	122	27	7	0	0	316	37%
Improved rights of way	124	85	21	6	1	0	237	28%
Reduced traffic	315	218	41	13	4	0	591	70%
Increase of Street Lighting	132	94	20	8	2	1	257	30%
Reduction of Street lighting	19	14	3	1	0	0	37	4%
Increase of private Security Lighting	24	12	5	0	0	0	41	5%
Reduction of private Security Lighting	34	24	6	2	0	0	66	8%
Less Litter	205	136	30	12	5	0	388	46%
Less dog fouling	243	179	31	10	2	0	465	55%
Bus shelter improvement	75	38	15	7	3	1	139	16%

Reduction of highway signage 43 30 7 2 0 0 82 10%

Removal of Overhead Cables 160 106 20 4 0 0 290 34%

2909

Total of 849 eligible respondents

849

A2 - Which of the following features of the village/surrounding countryside are important to you

Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Woods								
1 = essential	310	218	38	15	3	1	585	84%
2 = necessary	53	37	7	4	3	1	105	15%
3 = don't mind	4	3	3	0	0	0	10	1%
							700	100%
Common								
1 = essential	289	198	35	11	2	0	535	81%
2 = necessary	56	41	8	4	2	1	112	17%
3 = don't mind	7	6	2	0	1	0	16	2%
							663	100%
Hedges								
1 = essential	276	191	30	9	2	1	509	78%
2 = necessary	64	44	11	6	3	0	128	20%
3 = don't mind	6	7	2	1	0	0	16	2%
							653	100%
Trees								
1 = essential	317	219	39	13	2	1	591	89%
2 = necessary	36	26	4	2	3	0	71	11%
3 = don't mind	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	1%
							666	100%
Wildlife								
1 = essential	309	216	39	14	5	1	584	87%
2 = necessary	40	26	5	2	1	0	74	11%
3 = don't mind	5	5	2	2	0	0	14	2%
							672	100%
Pond								
1 = essential	191	130	25	12	1	1	360	60%
2 = necessary	82	54	11	3	3	0	153	26%
3 = don't mind	41	38	5	0	1	0	85	14%
							598	100%
Green fields								
1 = essential	307	213	42	15	5	1	583	89%
2 = necessary	39	23	4	1	1	0	68	10%

3 = don't mind	4	1	0	1	0	0	6	1%
Historic buildings							657	100%
1 = essential	231	160	28	10	0	0	429	73%
2 = necessary	60	48	8	3	2	0	121	21%
3 = don't mind	18	13	4	1	2	0	38	6%
Rights of way/footpaths							588	100%
1 = essential	270	194	35	12	4	0	515	80%
2 = necessary	56	41	7	1	1	0	106	16%
3 = don't mind	9	8	2	2	1	0	22	3%
Green belt							643	100%
1 = essential	327	227	41	15	5	1	616	92%
2 = necessary	25	16	3	1	1	0	46	7%
3 = don't mind	5	2	1	0	0	0	8	1%
Conservation Areas							670	100%
1 = essential	295	203	36	14	1	0	549	87%
2 = necessary	34	26	5	2	3	0	70	11%
3 = don't mind	7	4	1	0	0	0	12	2%

A4 - Is the appearance of the following

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Common									
1 = good	177	120	27	8	3	0	0	335	50%
2 = satisfactory	162	115	15	6	3	1	0	302	45%
3 = poor	19	11	4	2	0	0	0	36	5%
								673	100%
Ponds									
1 = good	72	44	11	2	1	0	0	130	20%
2 = satisfactory	195	134	18	10	3	1	0	361	56%
3 = poor	76	59	14	3	1	0	0	153	24%
								644	100%
High Street									
1 = good	132	87	11	3	0	0	0	233	35%
2 = satisfactory	201	144	31	11	5	1	0	393	58%
3 = poor	25	16	5	2	1	0	0	49	7%
								675	100%

Surrounding roads

1 = good	69	52	9	2	0	0	132	20%
2 = satisfactory	235	158	28	10	4	1	436	66%
3 = poor	47	32	8	3	1	0	91	14%
							659	100%

Hedges/ditches

1 = good	54	35	6	0	1	0	96	14%
2 = satisfactory	188	141	20	9	2	0	360	54%
3 = poor	108	67	22	8	3	1	209	31%
							665	100%

1 = good	926	28%
2 = satisfactory	1852	56%
3 = poor	538	16%
Totals	3316	100%

A5 - Would you like to see improvements made to any of the following

	Person	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	%
Play area									
1 = essential	82	63	15	5	0	1	1	166	34%
2 = necessary	65	43	7	1	1	0	0	117	24%
3 = don't mind	99	77	18	8	4	0	0	206	42%
								489	100%

Roads & Highway footpaths

1 = essential	123	78	15	5	4	1	226	39%
2 = necessary	108	88	18	7	1	0	222	38%
3 = don't mind	65	47	11	5	2	0	130	22%
							578	100%

Bridleways/footpaths

1 = essential	83	57	15	7	3	0	165	30%
2 = necessary	117	88	19	8	2	0	234	42%
3 = don't mind	79	63	11	1	1	1	156	28%
							555	100%