

Summaries of Questionnaires

The following summarises all questionnaire and other responses received up to the end of March 2105. These have been used as a basis for setting the policies to include in the version of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan that will go out to public consultation.

Applications to Join Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum

Approximately 450 residents have joined the Pyrford Neighbourhood forum. Of these around 180 took the opportunity to comment on their concerns together with the application.

(I still have to complete the analysis of these responses).

Like/Dislike/Change Questionnaire

In order to get a preliminary view of the concerns of Pyrford residents, a questionnaire was distributed to all households. Residents were asked to say what they liked and disliked about Pyrford and what changes they would like to see. In addition the responses from 4 people to versions of the policies posted on the Forum website have been included.

The responses are detailed in the attached spreadsheet split into the following broad categories.

	Total	Like	Dislike	Change	Wish List	Ex Web
Traffic (calming)	38		22	12	4	
Road Maintenance	21		9	11		1
Road Improvements	10			8	2	1
Parking	18		7	11	2	
Bus Services	15		7	8	1	
Cycling/Pedestrians	27	1	4	14	8	
Housing Standards	24	5	4	8	7	
Footpaths/Open Spaces	41	15	2	14	9	1
Recreational Areas	17		4	9	3	1
Social	18	10	3	4		1
Local Facilities	40	11	10	14	4	1
Multiple Categories	84	78	6			
Other Responses	14					
Ex Web	11					11
Total	379	120	78	110	40	17

In addition two multichoice questionnaires were made available at various public meetings and open days. Each one asked residents the extent to which they agreed with certain statements. The options were:-

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Questionnaire 1

Responders were asked whether the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should include the following objectives. There were 121 responders with answers as in the following table.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Protect the Green Belt in the Forum area	86 71.1%	29 24.0%	3 2.5%	0 0.0%	1 0.8%
Protect and improve existing footpaths	77 63.6%	40 33.1%	2 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Seek opportunities to create new footpaths	36 29.8%	53 43.8%	30 24.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Create and promote a footpath loop connecting Pyrford common to the canal to enhance recreational opportunities	47 38.8%	52 43.0%	18 14.9%	1 0.8%	0 0.0%
Protect open spaces such as vergers, greens and recreational space	83 68.6%	35 28.9%	1 0.8%	0 0.0%	1 0.8%
Protect and improve wildlife habitats in the area	71 58.7%	42 34.7%	6 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Protect existing trees and include trees in any future developments	63 52.1%	46 38.0	9 7.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Protect the Wey navigation and Wey and Bourne river valley wildlife corridors	70 57.9%	39 32.2%	10 8.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

There were respectively 2,2,2,3,1,2,3, and 2 blank entries to the 8 questions.

Although this questionnaire did not ask for further comments, 20 responders chose to make them split into a number of broad categories. These will be added to the analysis from the earlier questionnaire distributed to all residents and are included in the attached spreadsheet. The responses could be split into the following categories.

Specific footpaths and addition of bridlepaths	2
Pub/coffee shop/café (WIFI)	7
Tennis courts	2
Miscellaneous	5
General comments not relevant to Plan	4
Total	20

Questionnaire 2

Responders were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statements. There were 56 responders with the answers as in the following table.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
We should oppose all attempts to reclassify even the smallest plot of green belt land as suitable for development	30 53.6%	12.5 22.3%	3.5 6.3%	6 10.7%	2 3.6%
We should maximise amenity value (flora & fauna) of and access to our green belt land	38 67.9	14 25.0%	1 1.8%	0 0.0%	1 1.8%
We should negotiate hard with developers to extract the largest possible community levy	34 60.7%	10 17.9%	7 12.5%	0 0.0%	2 3.6%
4 ought to sacrifice a modest amount of green belt land as suitable for development	2 3.6%	8.5 15.2%	10.5 18.8%	18 32.1%	14 25.0%
We should expect to give up a similar pro-rate share of Pyrford green belt to other Woking Borough Neighbourhoods	2 3.6%	9 16.1%	14 25.0%	17 30.4%	12 21.4%
I feel erosion of Pyrford's green belt is inevitable	4 7.1%	14 25.0%	2 3.6%	22 39.3%	12 21.4%

There were respectively 2,2,3,3,1, and 2 blank entries to the 6 questions. For the first and fourth questions one responder entered 2/3 and this has been allocated 50% each to answer "Agree" and "Neutral".

In addition to the multichoice questions, responders were asked two further questions. Where would suggest that new house building within Pyrford would be acceptable? Have you any other comments to make on Pyrford's green belt?

There were 30 responses to the first question which could be split into the following broad categories:-

No new build	8
Prefer none but accept need	6
Infill only	3
General specification for suitable/unsuitable areas	5
Specific sites	8
Total	30

There were 20 responses to the second question which could be split into the following broad categories. These will be added to the analysis from the earlier questionnaire distributed to all residents.

Protect green belt absolutely	8
Pity to lose parts but may be necessary	4
Protect specific areas	5
Not relevant to green belt retention	3
Total	20

Online Questionnaire

Four people responded to a questionnaire on our website which asked if they agreed with our policies as posted at that time and also asked for any comments. Although the policies have been consolidated significantly since the time of these responses the broad contents are similar.

One responder on 29 November 2014 agreed with all 8 Built Environment policies, all 19 Open Spaces policies, and all 5 Social & Community Policies. This responder did not submit any comments.

Another responder on 29 November 2014 agreed with 2 out of 7 for Built Environment, 13 out of 17 for Open Spaces, and 5 out of 6 for Social and Community.

The only 2 policies agreed with in Built Environment related to “keeping with the original character of the surrounding area” and requirement for offstreet parking.

The 4 policies disagreed with in Open spaces related to protecting gardens from over development, retaining character and enhancing and formalising footpaths, and footpath loops.

The Social & Community policy disagreed with was “Representation will be made to designate the land behind the Arbor Youth Club for recreational use by children.”

He also submitted comments for Open Spaces and Social and Community. These and other responses are included in the table of total comments.

A responder on 2 December 2014 submitted comments but did not complete the agree/disagree section.

A responder on 5 March 2015 agree with all the policies and submitted comments.