



**SURREY COMMUNITY SURVEY 2003
TRANSPORTATION FINDINGS
AND WAY FORWARD**

16 JULY 2004

KEY ISSUE

An in depth countywide residents survey was carried out between October and December 2003. It is important to fully understand the transportation results and to agree what countywide and local actions need to be undertaken to respond to residents concerns, perceptions and desires for improvement.

SUMMARY

The detailed survey results have been examined which compare the 11 Borough/District Areas. Where there have been significant differences (more than 10%) these have been drawn out and commented upon.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

For information only

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 MORI Local Government Research Unit on behalf of Surrey County Council under took a residents survey during September and early October 2003 . The specific issues covered by the survey were: Satisfaction with Surrey as a place to live: Satisfaction with, and perceptions of, the County Council; Residents' priorities; Attitudes towards (sixteen) Council services; Library usage; Use of waste and recycling facilities; Satisfaction with, and importance of, transport within Surrey; and County communications. This report concentrates on "satisfaction with, and importance of, transport in Surrey".
- 1.2 Of the sixteen services listed by MORI in the survey as provided by the County Council, those provided or facilitated by the Transportation Service were listed as 4th and 5th in **importance**. Local train services which the service helps to promote came 7th. However, satisfaction with road maintenance was shown to be the most influential driver of **satisfaction** with Surrey County Council overall than any other service covered by the survey.
- 1.3 This report responds to the issues raised regarding highways, public transport and Local Transportation Offices. It also briefly reviews the statistical acceptance of the report and proposes an action plan for the Transportation Service.

Issues regarding Highway Services

- 1.4 The survey highlighted the following key issues:
- Satisfaction with road maintenance is a more important driver of satisfaction with Surrey County Council than any other service assessed in the survey;
 - Improving satisfaction with road maintenance will have a positive impact on satisfaction with Surrey County Council as a whole;
 - 32% of residents are satisfied and 46% are dissatisfied with the level of road maintenance;
 - 34% of residents are satisfied and 42% are dissatisfied with the level of pavement maintenance;
 - 96% of residents view road and pavement maintenance as being important to them;

Issues regarding Public Transport

- 1.5 The survey highlighted the following key issues:
- Local bus and rail services were rated respectively as 4th and 7th most important out of the 16 services surveyed.
 - Local rail services were identified as the most commonly used form of public transport in Surrey, supporting the patronage data held by the County Council. Annual rail usage is twice that of bus and the figures

for commuting to work show that rail is three times more likely to be used than bus. .

- Bus usage based on numbers of passengers per head of population compares favourably with the rest of the South East but the survey tends to suggest that it is slightly lower than in the South East as a whole.
- Bus users are shown to be most dissatisfied with the condition and availability of bus shelters (District/Borough Council function), frequency of bus services and level of bus fares.
- Bus users are most satisfied with the ease of boarding and alighting, personal security and attitude of bus drivers.
- Younger residents surveyed indicated that they would use bus services if the services were more reliable.
- Residents indicate that they would use public transport more if it were 'better' or 'better connected'.

Local Transportation Service Offices

- 1.6 Part of the survey concentrated on “transport contact questions” and the results are quite mixed. When the respondents were asked, whom they would contact if they had concerns regarding transport or highways, most people indicated they would go to the Borough or District Council. The respondent’s instinct for contacting County Hall or the Local Transport Office was never first.
- 1.7 The majority (89%) of residents from the survey are not aware that Surrey has eleven Local Transport Offices in their area to deal with local residents’ transport concerns. Awareness appears to be highest among the 55-64 age group at 14% compared to an overall awareness of 9%.

The following table gives a ranking for awareness:

Local Office	Residents Awareness Value
Surrey Overall	9%
Spelthorne	18%
Runnymede	16%
Mole Valley	13%
Elmbridge	11%
Guildford	7%
Reigate & Banstead	6%
Surrey Heath	6%
Tandridge	6%
Waverly	6%
Woking	6%
Epsom & Ewell	5%

Statistical Acceptance of the Survey

- 1.8 The survey employed a very robust methodology – face to face interviewing, among a statistically significant sample size.
- 1.9 This means that we can be 95% confident that at County level, a response (egxx% would use buses more if...) is an accurate reflection of residents' views to within plus/minus 3% of the percentage shown in this survey. At District/Borough level, however, accuracy falls to plus/minus 10%, so that only differences of 10% or more between districts should be considered real.

Proposed Action Plan Countywide

- 1.10 A number of actions are in hand or are proposed at a county level in order to respond to the survey results. These are:
- Seeking a positive image of transportation by using a consistent branding.
 - Prudential funding has been obtained and is being targeted appropriately
 - More information is to be given at road works consistent with the agreed branding.
 - Better co-ordination of road works will be achieved through the new Traffic Management Bill and the appointment of a Traffic Manager.
 - Best practice from the eleven Local Transport Offices will be shared.

2.0 ISSUES AT A BOROUGH / DISTRICT LEVEL

- 2.1 The detailed survey results have been examined. There are very few results that show a plus/minus 10% difference between districts/boroughs compared to the county average. The exceptions are:
- 2.2 **Satisfaction with Road and Pavement Maintenance**
34% county wide yet 47% and 49% respectively for Runnymede area. This would seem to reflect the fact that the roads and pavements in the Borough are in relatively good condition through efficient maintenance over last 20 years. It is important that the level of investment is maintained if the roads and pavements are not going to be allowed to deteriorate in the future.
- 2.3 **Provision and maintenance of cycle-way/cycle paths**
39% of Runnymede residents were satisfied compared to a county average of 27%. This would seem to be a reflection on the progress made in recent years in building new high quality cycle routes.
- 2.4 **Maintenance of street lights**
81% of residents were satisfied compared with a county average of 68%. This was the highest satisfaction level in the county (lowest was 51%). This result is thought to directly reflect the expertise and commitment of

David Piesley, who has been responsible for borough Highway Lighting for the last 10 years and who manages a small but dedicated team of Borough Council direct labour. He has to ensure that our limited funds are utilised to the maximum potential. It is important that the County Council maintains these standards when David retires in 2005/06 and with the introduction of any new form of contract.

2.5 **Resident Awareness Value (Paragraph 7)**

It is pleasing to note that the awareness of residents of the local transportation service is the second highest at 16%. In order to maintain this awareness we will continue to increase the distribution of the "transportation link" newsletter. We will also be developing a dedicated transportation service web site over the next 12 months. In addition we have produced an up to date leaflet, which has recently been distributed to all library and other outlets throughout the borough. A number of copies have been sent to all county and borough members and other key partners for their use.

2.6 **Comment on County Wide Action Plans (paragraph 10)**

It is important that LTS staff take every opportunity to explain to our customers that Surrey County Council is responsible for transportation services in Runnymede. Where we work jointly with other partners such as the Police or the Borough Council we will endeavour to ensure recognition is given to the County Council's contribution towards the partnership.

We work closely with the other 10 transportation service offices to share best practice when ever possible. We have particular close working relationships with our neighbouring areas of Woking, Elmbridge, Waverley, Surrey Heath and Spelthorne.

2.7 **Utilising the survey for identifying trends**

While comparisons between the 11 borough/districts areas is on the whole not statistically significant a repeat MORI survey in say 2 years time (December 2006) would be very useful in identifying any changes in residents perception of awareness of who delivers the transportation service in Runnymede and the satisfaction with that service. It is also very useful to attempt to detect any change residents attitudes to use of non car travel modes and to identify whether their needs priorities are changing. It is suggested that the Local Committee may wish to ask for a survey to be repeated every two years.

LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER:	Gerald Cole
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	01932 794141
BACKGROUND PAPERS:	None
