

## SECTION 1 – YOUR HOUSEHOLD

The results belie a common perception that the civilian part of Pirbright has an ageing demographic. In fact the majority of those responding are in the 25 to 59 year old age group with a normal distribution of younger and older residents on either side. Most residents live in detached or semi-detached houses that are owner occupied. Very few people are seeking to move. The apparent discrepancy between the 727 residents shown in Q1 and the figures in Section 2 is because the youngest age group (0-10) is excluded from Qs 8 and 9. The number of respondents aged from 18-85+ represents 42.7% of the civilian electorate and also corresponds with the overall response rate of 42% to the questionnaire. Of the 294 questionnaires returned, only 285 could be processed because the remaining 9 did not supply enough information in this section for complete analysis. Some respondents left later questions unanswered, presumably because they were considered irrelevant to their own circumstances.

**Question 1:** How many people live in your household?

285 responses are shown unless stated otherwise

727 residents were included in the responses.

**Question 2:** How many people are there in your household in each age group?

0-4	5-10	11-15	16-17	18-24	25-44	45-59	60-64	65-74	75-84	85+
56	51	42	7	35	192	144	56	80	40	24
7.7%	7%	5.8%	0.96%	4.8%	26.4%	19.8%	7.7%	11%	5.5%	3.3%

**Question 3:** Where does your household live?

Please enter the postcode

Postcode

This question was asked in order to identify parts of the parish where there might be particular problems.

**Question 4:** What type of dwelling do you live in?

	Agree
Detached house	143 (50.2%)
Semi detached house	94 (33%)
Bungalow	29 (10.2%)
Terraced house	9 (3.2%)
Flat/maisonette	6 (2.1%)
Other (please specify – e.g. granny flat)	2 (0.7%)
Sheltered housing with warden	1 (0.4%)
Purpose built for elderly or disabled but no warden	1 (0.4%)
Specially adapted housing	0 (0%)

**Question 5:** Is your dwelling...?

	Agree
Owner occupied	249 (87.4%)
Private rented	12 (4.2%)
Local Authority rented	11 (3.9%)
Housing Association rented	4 (1.4%)
Provided as part of employment (e.g. MOD)	7 (2.5%)
Shared ownership (part owned/part rented)	2 (0.7%)

**Question 6:** Is any member of your household currently looking for alternative accommodation?

	Agree
Whole family	13 (4.6%)
Daughter	6 (2.1%)
Son	7 (2.5%)
Parents	2 (0.7%)
<i>Comment: "Son looking for alternative accommodation – soon we hope".</i>	

**Question 7:** Why does the household/individual plan to move?

	Agree		Agree
For job reasons	7 (2.5%)	For education	2 (0.7%)
Need a larger house	5 (1.8%)	Need a smaller house	2 (0.7%)
For family reasons	4 (1.4%)	To move to a more urban area	1 (0.4%)
To move to a more rural area	3 (1.1%)	Need a cheaper house	0 (0%)
To meet the needs of an elderly or disabled person	3 (1.1%)	Family break up	0 (0%)

## SECTION 2 – HOUSING IN PIRBRIGHT

There are roughly equal numbers of men and women represented in the survey. As in Section 1, the age range is predominantly in the middle years (25-59 age group) with an approximately equal number of younger and older residents on either side.

In the majority of cases the house is the main residence. Most people thought that the number of new houses built in the last decade was “about right” but significant minorities either had no opinion, or thought that there had been too few small and too many large, expensive houses built. Seventy one percent supported the need for more housing for young people but the housing needs of single persons and elderly people were also recognised (Lifetime Homes are included as policy in the core strategy of the new Guildford Development Framework).

Some thought that there should be no more new houses built in Pirbright. Emphasis was placed on the conversion of existing larger houses into smaller accommodation and the limiting of development to brown field sites.

**Question 8:** What is the sex of your household for up to six residents?

620 respondents

Person	Totals
Male	293 (47.3%)
Female	327 (52.7%)

**Question 9:** Where questions in the following sections are to be answered by individuals, please tick the age group of person 1, 2, 3 and so on.

Person	Respondents
11-15	41 (6.6%)
16-17	8 (1.3%)
18-24	31 (5%)
25-44	193 (31.1%)
45-59	148 (23.9%)
60-64	55 (8.9%)
65-74	80 (12.9%)
75-84	40 (6.5%)
85+	24 (3.9%)

**Question 10:** Is this your main residence?

Yes	No
282 (98.9%)	2 (0.7%)

**Question 11:** If you have any plans, however vague, to extend your dwelling what are your main reasons?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

	Agree	Comment
Increase our living space (e.g. larger kitchen or living room)	36 (12.6%)	
Increase the number of bedrooms for our growing family	25 (8.8%)	
Add a cloakroom or an extra bathroom	23 (8.1%)	
Increase the value of our property	18 (6.3%)	
Provide more facilities (e.g. a games room or a utility room)	16 (5.6%)	
Other	12 (4.2%)	“Home office/conservatory.”
Provide accommodation for elderly relative(s)	6 (2.1%)	
Provide accommodation for grown-up children	6 (2.1%)	

**Question 12:** What do you think about the number of houses that have been built in Pirbright over the last 10 years?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

	Agree
About right	125 (43.9%)
No opinion	63 (22.1%)
Too few small houses	54 (18.9%)
Too expensive	38 (13.3%)
Too many big houses	38 (13.3%)
Too few new houses	28 (9.8%)
Too many new houses	17 (6%)

**Question 13:** Would you support the principle of new housing designed to meet the needs of local people?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

Yes	No	No opinion
202 (70.9%)	44 (15.4%)	20 (10.2%)

**Question 14:** What type of accommodation do you think Pirbright needs most?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments /Analysis</b>
Homes for young people	111 (38.9%)	<i>“Must be affordable.” A scheme of 13 affordable houses for people with a local connection was built in 2006.</i>
Small family homes	92 (32.3%)	
Homes for older people	77 (27%)	
No further homes are needed	60 (21.1%)	
Homes for single people	32 (11.2%)	
Large family homes	20 (7%)	
Homes for people with disabilities	16 (5.6%)	
Other	13 (4.6%)	<i>“Homes for locals.” “There are currently too few houses for people starting on the housing ladder.” “Need rental housing.”</i>

**Question 15:** What types of houses are needed in Pirbright?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Semi-detached houses	73 (25.6%)	
Cottages	70 (24.6%)	
Terraced houses	62 (21.8%)	
There is no need for any of them	54 (18.9%)	
Bungalows	53 (18.6%)	
Flats and maisonettes	36 (12.6%)	
Detached houses	28 (9.8%)	
Other	16 (5.6%)	<i>“Sheltered housing.” “A larger Abbeyfield.” “A nursing home.” “Conversion of existing homes into smaller units.”</i>

**Question 16:** What type of housing development would be acceptable in Pirbright?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
Conversion of redundant buildings	141 (49.5%)	<i>“Build only on brown field sites.”</i>
Small groups of less than 10	108 (37.9%)	<i>“ No modern closes!”</i>
Single dwellings in controlled locations	92 (32.3%)	
None	38 (13.3%)	
Other	12 (4.2%)	This generated a number of responses – concerns about fitting into the conservation area were noted, as were problems with on-road parking.

**Question 17:** Is sufficient publicity given to planning applications that affect Pirbright?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
101 (35.4%)	116 (40.7%)	56 (19.6%)	<b>PPC has already introduced a new system to help neighbours have their say at meetings of its Planning Committee.</b>

**Question 18:** What is your opinion of the way the planning system is implemented in Pirbright?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC

<b>Totally satisfied</b>	<b>Quite satisfied</b>	<b>Quite dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>No opinion</b>
15 (5.3%)	99 (34.7%)	56 (19.6%)	26 (9.1%)	74 (26%)
<p><b>Comments/Analysis:</b> It was difficult to judge whether some responses referred to the Borough or Parish Council. <i>“Can be bizarre.” “O.K. as far as I know.” “Utterly disgraceful – needs an inquiry.” “Not enough publicity given planning the settlement boundary.” “Redraw the settlement boundary.” “More notice needed.” Parish Councils are allowed only 2 weeks in which to comment. “Guildford seems reasonable; Parish Council seems to lack competencies and might be seen as inappropriately biased.” “Unsure of local process.” PPC has now produced a leaflet describing the process. “Information poor, difficult to gain access to information.” Information about current applications is now available on PPC’s website. GBC also has an excellent website.</i></p> <p><b>N.B. Pirbright is surrounded by Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), and is thus affected by the Government’s Special Protection Area (SPA) policy, implemented by Natural England, which prohibits all residential development within 400m of SPA land, and restricts it within 5km, unless appropriate avoidance for its impact is included. It is anticipated that GBC’s interim policy to enable compliance will be reviewed in the next few months. Other planning policies, such as the settlement boundary and conservation area, remain in place and are expected to be retained in the core strategy of the new Guildford Development Framework, currently under preparation.</b></p>				

**SECTION 3 –PUBLIC SERVICES & TRANSPORT**

**Most people travel by car and although the majority cited no or rare difficulties in leaving Pirbright, those that did were mainly concerned about rush hour traffic and the bottleneck of the Pirbright Railway Arch. The inconvenience of not being able to turn right at the junction of Cemetery Pales and the A322 also featured. Many danger spots were pinpointed for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists with the railway arch again topping the list.**

**Although only a small minority of all respondents said that they would use a voluntary car or a “Good Neighbour” scheme (Qs24-25), the numbers expressing an interest represent a high proportion of respondents who say they have difficulties in visiting medical and other facilities (Q.22), or need help in the home or with shopping (Q.23). Both these schemes therefore merit further investigation.**

**The local bus services were criticised for being infrequent, unreliable, restricted in routes and costly. Few responded to the Peribus question and some were unaware of the service (Q.27). However, it was appreciated by those who did respond and well supported for financial assistance from PPC (Q.35). With some exceptions the majority were satisfied with the community awareness of the PPC but somewhat less so with that of the GBC and the SCC and there was a similar feeling about the efficiency with which the councils publicise activities and decisions (Qs 28 & 29).**

**Question 19:** Do you experience transport difficulties in getting out of Pirbright to other places?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/ SCC Highways Department

	Agree	Analysis
Never	149 (52.3%)	
Occasionally	75 (26.3%)	
Often	34 (11.9%)	The most common problem locations cited were Gole Rd and Pirbright Arch at rush hours, School Lane when children are delivered and picked up, and the Volvo garage when a transporter is parked there. Some mentioned the problem of no right turn at the junction of Cemetery Pales and the A322. Insufficient parking at Brookwood Station was also cited.

**Question 20:** What is your main means of transport?

**585 respondents**

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/ SCC Highways Department/Peribus Association

	Agree	Analysis
Car	491 (83.9%)	
Train	31 (5.3%)	
Public bus	29 (5%)	
Bicycle	18 (3.1%)	
Other	12 (2.1%)	
Community bus	4 (0.7%)	There is very strong community support for the service (see Qs 27 & 35).

**Question 21:** Are there any locations in Pirbright that your household considers dangerous?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/ SCC Highways Department

Yes	No	No opinion
178 (62.5%)	74 (26%)	15 (5.3%)

**Comments/Analysis:** dangers for walkers and/or drivers and/or cyclists, were cited as traffic speed and volume; locations prone to flooding; street parking; lack of pavements, cycle lanes, street lighting, pedestrian crossings on main roads. 38 specific locations were named, with the top 10 as: *Pirbright Arch, School Lane, White Hart Corner, Church Lane, Cemetery Pales-Chapel Lane junction, Gole Road, Ash Road-Fox Corner junction, Dawney Hill, Rowe Lane, Pirbright to Fox Corner.* **Action has been agreed by SCC Highways for pedestrian safety improvements at Pirbright Arch and it is hoped there will be further improvements in other areas under Phase II of the Road Safety Scheme.**

**Question 22:** Do you have difficulties in doing/visiting the following...?

**66 respondents**

**Potential delivery partner/s:** Surrey Community Action/Peribus Association/SCC Social Services

	Agree	Comment
Dentist	25 (37.9%)	
Hospital	24 (36.4%)	
Optician	15 (22.7%)	
Travelling to the shops	15 (22.7%)	
The Doctors’ surgery	13 (19.7%)	“Not open at convenient times for commuters.”
Carrying your shopping	11 (16.7%)	
Chiropodist	10 (15.2%)	
Collecting prescriptions	10 (15.2%)	
Cashing your pension/benefit/other	10 (15.2%)	
Other	9 (13.6%)	

**Analysis:** More use could be made of the Peribus for shopping, although this might not be possible for our young people who also cited problems with travelling to the shops in their questionnaire.

**Question 23:** Do you need help with...?

32 respondents

*Potential delivery partner/s:* SCC Social Services

	Agree	Analysis
Housework	19 (59.4%)	
Other	15 (46.9%)	A relatively large number but not informative without further specification.
Bathing	9 (28.1%)	
Shopping	7 (21.9%)	
Cooking	5 (15.6%)	
Dressing	5 (15.6%)	

**Question 24:** If there were a voluntary car scheme in Pirbright, would you use it...?

417 respondents

*Potential delivery partner/s:* SCA/Community Association

	Agree	Comment
Never	344 (82.5%)	"Not yet."
Occasionally	59 (14.1%)	
Weekly	11 (2.6%)	
Monthly	3 (0.7%)	

**Question 25:** If there were a Good Neighbour Scheme in Pirbright, would you use it...?

384 respondents

*Potential delivery partner/s:* SCA/Community Association

	Agree	Comment
Never	279 (72.7%)	"I would in years to come."
Occasionally	85 (22.1%)	
Monthly	10 (2.6%)	
Weekly	10 (2.6%)	

**Question 26:** Would your household like to see improvements to the public bus service...?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* SCC Passenger Transport Group

	Agree	Analysis
Timetable	77 (27%)	Many people complained about not being able to return from Guildford after 6pm.
Routes	38 (13.3%)	
Reliability	42 (14.7%)	53% ticked this box in the young people's questionnaire.
Cost	28 (9.8%)	Many of our young people complained about cost.
Bus stop location	15 (5.3%)	The bus stop should be reinstated at Swallow Corner.
Disability access	8 (2.8%)	
Other	7 (2.5%)	

**Analysis:** Additional buses required, especially at evenings and weekends. Routes should include the hospitals, Aldershot, Farnborough and Camberley. Bus stops should be equipped with electronic indicator board; fares should be cheaper. **SCC has been asked about possible reinstatement of the bus stop at Swallow Corner.**

**Question 27:** Would you like to see improvements to the Peribus Community Bus...?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* Peribus Association

	Agree
Routes	9 (3.2%)
Timetable	9 (3.2%)
Other (please specify)	5 (1.8%)
Reliability	2 (0.7%)
Disability access	1 (0.4%)
Cost	1 (0.4%)

**Comments/Analysis:** Some respondents unaware of the service. Information should be included on the village web site (**it is now**). However there were many favourable comments: "Important service." "Works well." Vast majority in favour of funding support from PPC (**see Q. 35**).

**Question 28:** Do you feel your elected representatives in local government are sufficiently aware of local concerns and feelings?

*Potential delivery partner/s:* PPC/GBC/SCC

	Fully aware	Quite aware	Not aware	No opinion
Pirbright Parish	85 (29.8%)	96 (33.7%)	28 (9.8%)	38 (13.3%)
Guildford Borough	34 (11.9%)	101 (35.4%)	61 (21.4%)	47 (16.5%)
Surrey County	21 (7.4%)	68 (23.9%)	78 (27.4%)	67 (23.5%)

**Analysis:** Mostly satisfied with PPC, decreasing satisfaction from PPC to GBC to SCC.

**Question 29:** How well do the councils publicise their local decisions and activities?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC/SCC

	<i>good</i>	<i>reasonable</i>	<i>poor</i>	<i>no opinion</i>
Pirbright Parish	111 (38.9%)	95 (33.3%)	37 (13%)	25 (8.8%)
Guildford Borough	45 (15.8%)	113 (39.6%)	72 (25.3%)	28 (9.8%)
Surrey County	19 (6.7%)	70 (24.6%)	112 (39.3%)	51 (17.9%)

**Analysis:** Mostly satisfied with PPC, decreasing satisfaction from PPC to GBC to SCC.

**Question 30:** Would you like to see recycling provision improved...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** GBC/Parish Newsletter for publicity

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
Free collection of bulky items	164 (57.5%)	
By increasing the range of roadside collection services	143 (50.2%)	<i>“Textiles”, “Silver foil”, “Shoes”, “Books”, “Furniture.”</i> Many were unaware of cardboard collection. <b>Plastics are now collected (except yoghurt pots).</b>
Free green waste collection	137 (48.1%)	
By increasing the facilities at Lord Pirbright’s Hall	86 (30.2%)	<b>Foil and shoes are collected from LPH.</b>
Other	15 (5.3%)	

**Question 31:** In the last 5 years, have you been affected by any of the following in Pirbright?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** Surrey Police

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comment/Analysis</b>
Not concerned	39 (13.7%)	
Vandalism	34 (11.9%)	Mainly to cars, children’s playground, bus stop shelters and cricket pavilion.
Property theft	29 (10.2%)	Mainly from cars, cricket pavilion and of bicycles.
Vehicle theft	15 (5.3%)	
Other	15 (5.3%)	<i>“‘Road rage’ - unprovoked attack by a driver.”</i>
Alcohol/drug abuse	4 (1.4%)	
Mugging	0 (0%)	None of the young people reported mugging in their questionnaire.

**Question 32:** Do you think any of the following measures are needed...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** Surrey Police

	<b>Agree</b>	
A greater police presence	105 (36.8%)	
Better consultation between police and local people	51 (17.9%)	
CCTV	26 (9.1%)	
More drug/drink education and prevention	14 (4.9%)	
Other	8 (2.8%)	Suggestion for CCTV in LPH Playground and at the churchyard.

**Comments/Analysis:** *“Better maintenance of street lights”/“No more street lights”. “Speed detection measures on most approach roads.”* **This is already being addressed through the Community Speed Watch scheme.**

**Question 33:** Do you consider the Police Community Support Officer scheme to be...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** Surrey Police

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comment/Analysis</b>
Reasonable	101 (35.4%)	Mainly satisfied. <i>“Very efficient.”</i>
Good	84 (29.5%)	Mainly satisfied.
No Opinion	50 (17.5%)	
Poor	34 (11.9%)	
Do not have one	1 (0.4%)	Some areas unaware of presence of PCSO.

**The questionnaire was sent out while new PCSO was still training. Probably more residents would be aware if asked this question again.** *“Police should enforce speed limits.”*

**Question 34:** If you are not already in one, would you like to join a Neighbourhood Watch Scheme?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** Surrey Police

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
Yes	111 (38.9%)	<b>A meeting was held to set up a local scheme but was poorly attended. Needs more publicity. There are areas in Pirbright that already operate a scheme.</b>
No Opinion	43 (15.1%)	
No	39 (13.7%)	

#### SECTION 4 – PARISH SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The high number of responses to questions in this section suggests, not surprisingly, that there is a strong interest in preserving and developing parish services and facilities. The clear pride taken in Lord Pirbright's Hall and approval of the way it is managed (Qs 35, 37 & 44) are accompanied by suggestions for further improvement. There are also significant expressions of concern about: the lack of activities for young people (Qs 42-43); how information is communicated to the parish and ways this could be made more effective and more inclusive (Qs 45-48); and how to restore some form of village shop (Qs 51-52). These are concerns reflected in other sections of the questionnaire and in the "round up" questions at the end (Qs 64-66). The formation of a Community Association, open to all parish residents, would act as a channel for these concerns and aid the process of follow-up action as a delivery partner.

**Question 35:** The Parish Council may use its budget (precept) to supply services or give grants of varying amounts to other organisations in the village. Some examples are listed below. Do you approve?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC – Information only, no action suggested.

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Lord Pirbright's Hall (LPH)	238 (83.5%)	"A credit to the village." "A valuable resource."
Peribus	217 (76.1%)	"An excellent service."
Church (for Parish Newsletter)	196 (68.8%)	
Church (for churchyard maintenance)	179 (62.8%)	
Surrey Heathland Project	174 (61.1%)	
Fox Corner Wildlife Area	173 (60.7%)	
Cricket Club	151 (53%)	"The pavilion needs refurbishment."
Twining Association	69 (24.2%)	
Suggestions for other grants	22 (7.7%)	Suggestions for other grants include the Rawlins Club, Cunningham House, Tennis Club and the creation of a youth club. However, not everyone agreed: "All organisations should find their own funds".

**Pirbright Tennis Club has now received a grant towards interim improvements to the car park. PPC, as trustees of the cricket pavilion, is currently considering improvements to its facilities.**

**Question 36:** Would you be willing to pay a slightly increased precept as part of your council tax to provide or improve more amenities in Pirbright?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC – Information only, no action suggested.

Yes	No	No opinion	Comment/Analysis
121 (42.5%)	117 (41.1%)	32 (11.2%)	Almost equally balanced for and against an increased precept. One comment was: "As long as the increase was guaranteed to be used in Pirbright".

**Question 37:** Lord Pirbright's Hall is a charity subsidised by grants from PPC and GBC. Do you think...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC – Information only, no action suggested.

	Agree	Comment/Analysis
That's fine	228 (80%)	<b>Clear majority for present funding scheme</b>
Grants should be reduced by increasing hiring fees	28 (9.8%)	"Reduce the grant by increasing the hall charges, especially to non-residents." <b>Non-residents already pay double the charge paid by parishioners.</b>
Grant should be reduced by organising fundraising events	12 (4.2%)	

**Question 38:** Should the following be provided in the village...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC/SCC

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Cycle paths	91 (31.9%)	There was a response of 70% from the young people's questionnaire.
Wheelie bins (instead of bin bags)	85 (29.8%)	Added comments in favour: 17 and against: 23 –e.g. "Protect against wildlife" but "Unightly" and "Difficult for older people". <b>GBC has a scheme whereby older people can request refuse collection from the rear of their property.</b>
Public Conveniences	72 (25.3%)	Also strong comments for (15) and against (13). LPH was the preferred site. "Open daytime only, near playground." "Should be unobtrusive and vandal proof." Queries were raised about responsibility, maintenance and staffing.
More street lighting	67 (23.5%)	Locations included: Dawney Hill, Gole Road, Guildford Road, Vapery Lane, The Gardens, Church Lane, School Lane. Some comments were strongly against. The response was similar in the young people's questionnaire.
More litter bins	56 (19.6%)	"At Mill Lane car park." Young people also requested more litter bins.
More dog waste bins	48 (16.8%)	For Chapel Lane, Village Green and Church Lane
Other	9 (3.2%)	Extra notice boards (see also Q.46); more benches for elderly; but there were also comments from those who disagreed: "Too many signs already."

**Question 39:** Are local social facilities satisfactory for people...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Community Association/Social Club/local clubs and societies

	<i>good</i>	<i>reasonable</i>	<i>poor</i>	<i>no opinion</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Aged up to 16	12 (4.2%)	23 (8.1%)	90 (31.6%)	57 (20%)	"Nothing for 11-16 year olds."
Aged 17-25	4 (1.4%)	39 (13.7%)	64 (22.5%)	61 (21.4%)	"Social facilities = the pub."
Aged 26-60	47 (16.5%)	95 (33.3%)	16 (5.6%)	33 (11.6%)	
Aged over 60	75 (26.3%)	56 (19.6%)	10 (3.5%)	51 (17.9%)	
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	"Need a youth club."

**Analysis:** There was rather more satisfaction with activities for 26+ than for those younger. But neither approval nor complaint is strongly expressed in numbers.

**Question 40:** Should these amenities be improved?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Community Association

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
Lord Pirbright's playground	58 (20.4%)	"Improve/modernise/repair/paint." "More for younger children." "A disgrace – dangerous." "Best in the area." <b>The roundabout had recently been vandalised at the time of the questionnaire's distribution; it has now been repaired.</b>
Cricket and football pitches	42 (14.7%)	"Improve drainage."
Green storage hut (next to Hall)	37 (13%)	"Replace." "Pull down." "Eyesore." "Provide more storage." "Change to WC." <b>The hut provides storage space for extra furniture from the Hall and Pirbright Players scenery.</b>
Village green	36 (12.6%)	"Improve drainage." "Clean pond." "More benches/no more benches."
Lord Pirbright's Hall	32 (11.2%)	Improve/modernise/enlarge kitchen. <b>See also Q.44</b>
Lord Pirbright's recreation ground	26 (9.1%)	
Fox Corner Wildlife Area	20 (7%)	Parking at Fox Corner wildlife area.
Other	14 (4.9%)	"Yellow hatching to keep entry to footpath from car park to doctor's surgery clear of cars." Pre and postnatal classes, walking group, skateboard park, climbing wall, book club.
Car parks	13 (4.6%)	Parking at Fox Corner wildlife area.

**Relatively low response to this Q. suggests overall satisfaction with the above amenities.**

**Question 41:** Do any of the following reasons prevent you from attending sports, social or cultural activities in the village...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Community Association/Social Club/MoD Youth & Community Centre

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
Unsuitable timing	42 (14.7%)	
No interest	36 (12.6%)	
Other	26 (9.1%)	Adults and young people cited lack of publicity in their questionnaire.
No transport	4 (1.4%)	
Too expensive	4 (1.4%)	
Access problems	1 (0.4%)	

**There does not seem to be a major issue here but comments suggest that there should be flexibility in the timing of activities, with more in the evenings to suit people who are at work/school during the day.**

**Questions 42& 43:** Which new activities/ amenities should be provided in Pirbright?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Community Association/ Social Club/MoD Youth & Community Centre

	<b>Agree</b>		<b>Agree</b>
Youth football	95 (33.3%)	Volleyball/netball	48 (16.8%)
Youth club	89 (31.2%)	Drop-in facilities for over-50s	42 (14.7%)
Adult education classes	79 (27.7%)	Music society	41 (14.4%)
Swimming pool	77 (27%)	Judo	26 (9.1%)
Keep fit	72 (25.3%)	Other (please specify)	26 (9.1%)
Junior badminton*	68 (23.9%)	Internet café facilities	25 (8.8%)
Yoga	67 (23.5%)	Band	24 (8.4%)
Scouts/Guides***	65 (22.8%)	Weekly lunch club	18 (6.3%)
Colts cricket	64 (22.5%)	Adult tap dancing	17 (6%)
Organised rambling/walks	55 (19.3%)	Snooker	14 (4.9%)
Creative arts for children*	53 (18.6%)	Billiards** & Darts**	9 (3.2%)

**Comments/Analysis:** Note the emphasis on Youth and Sport. Youth club, music society, band and keep fit scored more highly than youth football in the young people's questionnaire. "Expand and integrate the Social Club more into the village." **See also Qs40 & 41**

\*Now available on Mondays at LPH. \*\*Available at the Social Club. \*\*\*Brookwood Brownies are currently recruiting.



**Question 44:** Do you think the facilities at Lord Pirbright’s Hall are adequate for local needs…?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Community Association

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
Main Hall	154 (54%)	“An excellent facility.”
Kitchen	136 (47.7%)	“Improve/modernise/enlarge kitchen.”
Cloakrooms	132 (46.3%)	
Parking	127 (44.6%)	“Extra for the disabled.”
Clubroom	122 (42.8%)	“Better ventilation.”
Stage	120 (42.1%)	“Electric curtains/modernise lighting.”
Committee Room	106 (37.2%)	
People with mobility difficulties	80 (28.1%)	
Storage	77 (27%)	<b>See also Q.40</b>
Other	7 (2.5%)	“Needs a full makeover to meet the needs of the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century.”

**Question 45:** Where do you usually get information about events taking place in Pirbright…?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Parochial Church Council

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
Parish Newsletter	263 (92.3%)	“Very good communication.” “Poor source of information.”
Notice boards	95 (33.3%)	<b>See also Q.46</b>
Other	42 (14.7%)	
Local paper	30 (10.5%)	
Free paper	10 (3.5%)	Some would like to receive a free paper but there is no delivery in Pirbright.
Note high readership of and dependence on the Newsletter for information.		

**Question 46:** How would you like to see provision of local information improved?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Parochial Church Council

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
Internet website	95 (33.3%)	<b>Two web sites now exist.</b>
Separate village & church newsletters	80 (28.1%)	“Definitely no! The church would be the loser.”
New village newsletter	76 (26.7%)	“No, maintain current balance.”
More notice boards	22 (7.7%)	Suggested locations include: Fox Corner, West Heath, Stanford, Dawney Hill, Village School, bottom of Mill Lane, Thompsons Close, Gole Road, by bus stops.
Other	8 (2.8%)	70% of young people opted in their questionnaire for a flyer sent direct to them to advertise events for their age group. <b>A newsletter is now sent out to young people with information about activities during school holidays.</b>

**Question 47:** Would you like to see the newsletter include more on the following…?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Parochial Church Council

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
Local events	145 (50.9%)	
Leisure	99 (34.7%)	
Sports	81 (28.4%)	
Arts	67 (23.5%)	
Other (please specify)	15 (5.3%)	Information on local trades people, local employment opportunities, school activities, correspondence column are all suggested.

**Question 48:** How do you think the newsletter should be funded?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Parochial Church Council

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comments/Analysis</b>
By a combination of below	137 (48.1%)	
By including advertising	67 (23.5%)	“Small ads/private sales.” “Envelope for donations; other forms of donation.” “No change.”
By the Parish Council	45 (15.8%)	<b>PPC already pays 50% of the production costs of the newsletter.</b>
By charging subscribers	8 (2.8%)	
By the clubs & societies	4 (1.4%)	<b>Some clubs &amp; societies already make a donation to the newsletter costs.</b>
By the Church	1 (0.4%)	
<b>The response to Qs45-48 suggests some consideration of a review might be appropriate of arrangements for funding the newsletter and the best way to make local secular information more widely available, with the website as a possible modern channel. The interests of those without internet access would have to be taken into account.</b>		

**Question 49:** Does your family need any of the following in Pirbright...?

*Potential delivery partner/s: - No Action suggested.*

	Agree	Analysis
Holiday Play scheme	37 (13%)	
Play group	24 (8.4%)	<b>There are Mother &amp; Toddlers groups in the village and Pirbright Camp.</b>
More registered childminders	21 (7.4%)	<b>There is an independent nursery in School Lane.</b>
<b>A surprisingly small response.</b>		

**Question 50:** If the following mobile services were provided, would you use them regularly?

*Potential delivery partner/s: Surrey Community Action (village shops advisor)*

	Agree	Analysis
Post Office	125 (43.9%)	
Greengrocer	110 (38.6%)	
Fishmonger	103 (36.1%)	<b>A fishmonger does already appear from time to time.</b>
Chiropodist	45 (15.8%)	
Youth drop-in centre	16 (5.6%)	A low response, but 50% of young people ticked this box in their questionnaire. <b>See also Q.43.</b>
Other	7 (2.5%)	A baker was one suggestion.
<b>It appears there would be custom for mobile services. Possible providers should be informed.</b>		

**Question 51:** If a community shop were opened in Pirbright how often would you use it?

*Potential delivery partner/s: Surrey Community Action (village shops advisor)*

**530 respondents**

	Agree
Weekly	303 (57.2%)
Occasionally	150 (28.3%)
Don't know	47 (8.9%)
Would not use	17 (3.2%)

**Analysis:** 70% of young people stated they would use one weekly in their questionnaire. **It is clear that there is a desire to have a village shop. However problematic this may be, it is one of the top priorities that the follow-up to this questionnaire will have to address, including the possibility of a supermarket-run village shop.**

**Question 52:** Would you volunteer to help with the community shop in the following ways?

*Potential delivery partner/s: Surrey Community Action (village shops advisor)*

**274 respondents**

	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally	Couldn't help	Don't know
Counter work	6 (2.2%)	21 (7.7%)	61 (22.3%)	99 (36.1%)	17 (6.2%)
Accounts	2 (0.7%)	8 (2.9%)	18 (6.6%)	104 (38%)	21 (7.7%)
Shelves	12 (4.4%)	18 (6.6%)	62 (22.6%)	85 (31%)	19 (6.9%)
Supplies	5 (1.8%)	16 (5.8%)	53 (19.3%)	88 (32.1%)	19 (6.9%)

**Analysis:** Numbers suggest that it would be possible to staff a community shop, although probably not fulltime, seven days a week. Some young people also said they would volunteer to work in a shop.

**Question 53:** Is the parish church in Pirbright important to you...?

*Potential delivery partner/s: Parochial Church Council – Information only, no action suggested.*

	Agree	Analysis
As an historic building	191 (67%)	It is valued by the majority, including young people.
As a focal point for the community	163 (57.2%)	
For weddings and funerals	118 (41.4%)	
For worship	101 (35.4%)	
Because every place should have one	93 (32.6%)	
For baptisms	85 (29.8%)	

**Question 54:** If you attend places of worship outside Pirbright, what are the reasons?

*Potential delivery partner/s: Parochial Church Council – Information only, no action suggested.*

	Agree
Not applicable	84 (29.5%)
My religion/denomination not catered for	26 (9.1%)
Prefer type of service available	24 (8.4%)
Other (please specify)	14 (4.9%)
Better facilities for children	8 (2.8%)
Times of services	4 (1.4%)
<b>Analysis: There seems no major issue here.</b>	

## SECTION 5– NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Problem areas were identified with flooding, exacerbated by the 2006 cloudbursts, as a major concern and with Mill Lane and Pirbright Arch topping the listings. Specific locations were also identified in respect of fly tipping, litter, dog fouling and graffiti. The favoured solutions included the organisation of volunteer Clean-Up days, entering a Best Kept Village competition and introducing new fixed penalties for offenders. The installation of hanging baskets was suggested, as was a limit on the feeding of ducks on the village pond to discourage rats.

Some thought that a project to record special features of the village would be worthwhile, while it was pointed out that some documentation already existed in this area.

Improved maintenance was mainly advocated for ditches, roadside hedges, footpaths and bridleways. Although specific problem areas were identified on footpaths, others felt that mud, water, bushes and nettles were only to be expected in the countryside while the organisation of volunteer footpath wardens was also suggested. Many were unaware that a series of local walking routes are available in a booklet from the Parish Shop (and now on the parish website).

All the main routes through Pirbright suffered from traffic including excessive volume, speed and noise. There was also concern about examples of light pollution with one suggestion to “Remove Woking”! There was support for a volunteer Community Speed Watch Scheme, which has since been inaugurated.

**Question 55:** Do you think there are places in Pirbright where the following are a problem...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC/SCC

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Flooding	154 (54%)	22 locations cited. The most common citations were: Mill Lane, Pirbright Arch, The Green, Vapery Lane, School Lane, Church Lane, Guildford Road, Queens Road, Cemetery Pales, Rowe Lane. Young people also expressed concerns about this. <i>“Maintain storm drains.” “Prevent surface water entering sewers.”</i> <b>Action has begun on clearing watercourses throughout the parish. Action will be needed to ensure landowners are aware of responsibilities for maintenance.</b>
Fly tipping	106 (37.2%)	27 locations cited. The commonest citations were: Mill Lane car park, Henley Park Road, Church Lane, Gole Road, Rowe Lane, Dawney Hill (by Pirbright Arch), the commons. <i>“Reduce fly tipping locally by making the use of council tips free for all classes of waste.”</i>
Litter	66 (23.2%)	28 locations cited. The main citations were: Church Lane, Mill Lane, The Green, Gole Road, Dawney Hill, Aldershot Road. Young people were also concerned about this.
Dog fouling	34 (11.9%)	12 locations cited. The main citations were: Mill Lane, The Green and Guildford Road. <i>“Educate dog owners.”</i> <b>See also Q. 38.</b>
Graffiti	17 (6%)	Pirbright Arch, canal locks, cricket pavilion, bus stops, Cemetery.

**Question 56:** What should the Parish Council do to keep Pirbright clean and tidy...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/ GBC/Community Association

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Organise volunteer “Clear up” days	111 (38.9%)	<b>Probably worth doing, plus entry to BKV competition.</b>
Enter a “Best Kept Village” competition	104 (36.5%)	43% ticked this box in the young people’s questionnaire.
Use new powers to issue fixed-penalty notices to litter/graffiti offenders	99 (34.7%)	36% ticked this box in the young people’s questionnaire. <b>Possibly worth doing.</b>
Put up notices	26 (9.1%)	
Pay for a road sweeper	25 (8.8%)	
Pay for a litter warden	21 (7.4%)	
Other (please specify)	8 (2.8%)	<i>“Limit feeding of birds on village pond to discourage rats.”</i> <i>“Improve tree maintenance.”</i>

**Question 57:** Which of the following features need to be better maintained in Pirbright?

**305 respondents**

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC/SCC/Community Association/individual landowners

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Ditches	194 (63.6%)	Mill Lane, Vapery Lane, Rowe Lane. <b>See also Q.55.</b>
Hedges	159 (52.1%)	Guildford Road, Church Lane, Dawney Hill, Malthouse Lane.
Footpaths/Bridleways	136 (44.6%)	School Lane to Dawney Hill, School Lane to Church Lane, Guildford Road. <i>“Who evaluates footpaths?”</i>
Streams	101 (33.1%)	Mill Lane, Church Lane. <b>See also Q.55.</b>
Ponds	55 (18%)	Village Pond, Swallow Pond. <i>“Mosquito control needed.”</i>
Commons/Heathland	40 (13.1%)	
Wildlife habitats	34 (11.1%)	
Other	17 (5.6%)	Walls along Cemetery Pales.

**Question 58:** Do you think a project should be organised to record special features in Pirbright (e.g. history/people/buildings/activities)?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Community Association/GBC Community Partnership/local museums

Yes	No	No opinion	Comments/Analysis
140 (49.1%)	39 (13.7%)	69 (24.2%)	"Include in website." "Involve local museums." "Some good historical documentation already exists."
<b>Probably worth doing.</b>			

**Question 59:** Do you ever experience any of the following difficulties when using footpaths...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC/SCC/landowners

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Bushes/nettles	95 (33.3%)	School Lane to Church Lane, Gole Road to Village, Church Lane to Mill Lane, School Lane to Gole Road. 50% ticked this box in the young people's questionnaire.
No difficulty experienced	88 (30.9%)	
Mud/water	77 (27%)	Gole Road to Village, Mill Lane to Henley Park, School Lane to Church Lane. 30% ticked this box in the young people's questionnaire.
High stiles	32 (11.2%)	From Grove Farm Nursery to Whites Farm, Henley Park to Mill Lane, School Lane to Church Lane, Mill Lane to Church Lane.
No signposts	24 (8.4%)	At footpath entry by Rails Farm.
Other	18 (6.3%)	"Bulls in field!" "Problems for pushchairs."
Locked gates	17 (6%)	Church Lane to Mill Lane.
<i>"Mud, water, bushes and nettles are to be expected in the countryside." "Organise volunteer footpath wardens."</i>		

**Question 60:** What should be done to make local lanes, footpaths and bridle ways more attractive...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC/SCC/Community Association/landowners

	v. important	important	worth doing	unnecessary	don't know
Removal of litter	43 (15.1%)	25 (8.8%)	52 (18.2%)	13 (4.6%)	1 (0.4%)
Roadside verges mown	26 (9.1%)	29 (10.2%)	66 (23.2%)	17 (6%)	2 (0.7%)
Verges allowed to grow	21 (7.4%)	20 (7%)	67 (23.5%)	12 (4.2%)	6 (2.1%)
Repair gates, stiles etc	26 (9.1%)	27 (9.5%)	40 (14%)	13 (4.6%)	1 (0.4%)
More sign posting	7 (2.5%)	8 (2.8%)	43 (15.1%)	37 (13%)	3 (1.1%)
Accessible for disabled	20 (7%)	17 (6%)	52 (18.2%)	15 (5.3%)	12 (4.2%)
<b>Comments/Analysis:</b> The figures show that most of the above are worth doing. "Definitely no more signs." "Install pedestrian crossings at Mill Lane/Pirbright Terrace junction, White Hart corner, Doctors' Surgery, Avenue de Cagny." "Prevent motorbikes and 4WDs between Chapel Lane and Malthouse Lane."					

**Question 61:** Would any of the following encourage more use of footpaths?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/SCC/Community Association

	Agree	Analysis
Leaflets of walks to buy	142 (49.8%)	<b>Walking routes are available in a leaflet from the Parish Shop and also now on the parish website.</b>
Provision of maps to buy	73 (25.6%)	
Organisation of guided walks in the area	60 (21.1%)	<b>The Heathland Project organises walks on the commons.</b>
No opinion	51 (17.9%)	

**Question 62:** Are you affected by any of the following problems...?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/GBC

	Agree	Comments/Analysis
Traffic noise	103 (36.1%)	11 locations cited, e.g. Guildford Road, Gole Road, Ash Road, Fox Corner, Dawney Hill.
Motor cycle noise	94 (33%)	11 locations cited, especially Guildford Road and Gole Road.
Noise pollution	46 (16.1%)	Lord Pirbright's Hall, Social Club, Gole Road.
Light pollution	20 (7%)	5 locations cited: Volvo garage; tennis court floodlights, Lord Pirbright's Hall, Swallow Corner roundabout, neighbouring security lights. "Remove Woking."
<i>"Lower the speed limit on the Aldershot and Guildford Roads." "Ban 5 or 7.5 tonne vehicles through Pirbright."</i>		
<b>Some speed reductions are being considered by SCC Highways.</b>		

**Question 63:** Would members of your household be prepared to take part in Pirbright's Community Speed Watch Scheme, organised by the police, in order to reduce speeds through the village?

**Potential delivery partner/s:** PPC/Surrey Police

Yes	No	Analysis
72 (25.3%)	158 (55.4%)	<b>The scheme has now begun with a small group of volunteers and more will be recruited.</b>

**Question 64:** How is the quality of life in Pirbright compared to 10 years ago?

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Comment/Analysis</b>
Worse	117 (41.1%)	<i>“Traffic speeds.” “Lost 3 shops in the community.”</i>
Don’t know	80 (28.1%)	Some people had not lived in Pirbright long enough to comment.
The same	60 (21.1%)	
Better	18 (6.3%)	

**Question 65:** If Pirbright’s Community Action Plan can achieve only one thing, what would your household like that to be?

**Comments/Analysis:** The protection of the village character and resurrection of the sense of community was a common theme – one typical comment was: *“Try to keep Pirbright a ‘traditional’ village where people know each other and urbanisation is kept to a minimum.”* Items listed were: restoration of the post office and village shops, the reduction and slowing down of traffic through the village, facilities for children and young people, maintenance of the Green Belt.

**Question 66:** Are there any other issues not raised in this questionnaire that you would like the CAP to address?

**Comments/Analysis:** *“Create a lido/swimming pool.” “Arrange a prescribed secondary school catchment area.” “Install deer warning signs along Ash Road and around Bullswater Common.” “Permit fishing on the village pond.” “Give more publicity to the two existing Charitable Trusts in the village.”*

**Relatively few respondents answered this question.**

## **Conclusion**

Of the 694 questionnaires delivered (one to each household in the civilian part of Pirbright) 294 were returned, an overall response rate of 42%. While this response may seem low, it is apparently fairly typical of returns experienced with other such exercises in Surrey and elsewhere nationally. Nevertheless, the results have to be evaluated in the knowledge that they cannot be taken as reflecting the views of the majority (i.e. 58%) of the village population. On the other hand, the views do represent the opinion of those residents who took the trouble to respond and to show an interest in influencing the future well being of the community. The results provide information relevant to a particular place at a particular time and the report may therefore be regarded as a snapshot but should be followed up with our potential delivery partners as a living document and a basis for future surveys.

The concerns of Pirbright reflect the common concerns of the nation and perhaps particularly those of the south east of England: increasing numbers of cars and lorries; excessive traffic noise and speed; racing motor bikes; dangerous road crossings; the closure and loss of the post office and local shops; the desire to maintain the peaceful rural character of the village and to preserve and improve its amenities. Flooding has become a major preoccupation, exacerbated by recent unusually heavy rain in August 2006 just before the questionnaire was distributed –this is now being addressed. Some areas feel that they are not recognised as part of the village – these include Fox Corner, Gole Road, and the Cowshot part of Queens Road, and many would like to see the return of a community feeling in Pirbright – this could be helped by the creation of a Community Association, as described earlier.

Communication is clearly an issue – some activities and facilities already exist but not everyone is aware of them: the youth club in Pirbright Camp, the swimming pool in Alexander Barracks that may be used by a civilian group in the evenings – are just two examples. Hopefully regular publication of the Clubs & Societies leaflet, the Young People’s newsletter and the new websites, in addition to the Parish Newsletter, will help to address this problem. Many of our clubs and societies are attended and strengthened by members from outside the village (Rawlins, Bowls, Tennis, Pirbright Players all have members from Brookwood and elsewhere) and we could do likewise and join one of Brookwood’s clubs. We already use their shops, thus providing them with sustainability in an era when small businesses are fighting to survive.

Some suggestions lend themselves to “self-help” solutions e.g. need for a book club, cleaning up of litter, volunteer footpath wardens. Perhaps predictably, a number of suggestions are in direct opposition to each other, e.g. More street lighting/Decrease light pollution; Increase notice boards/No more signs; Provide WC/ Do not provide WC; Wheelie bins/No wheelie bins etc. More research will be necessary before decisions can be made on any of these.

***Pirbright’s draft Community Action Plan was completed in March 2007, for presentation to Pirbright Parish Council at its monthly meeting and then to the Parish at the Annual Parish Meeting in April 2007. The final action plan was completed in March 2008.***