

QUESTION 1	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How important are the following characteristics of the Parish to you?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate each of 10 features that characterise the environment of the Parish, on a scale of "importance" from 1 to 5.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p> <p>The question listed 10 of many possible characteristic and features of the Parish that have previously been suggested as being of importance to people in the parish, and the opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p> <p>The question asked "<i>how important...to you</i>" and assumed people would answer on the basis rating the overall importance of each item in the context of their personal appreciation of their own lives.</p> <p>It is also possible to infer how people <b>ranked</b> each item in the list according to importance, by comparing the charts for all the items in the list, although this assumption is problematical, as the question did not specifically ask people to rank each item against the others in the list.</p>	<p>The pattern of 'high importance' (score 5) given for all 10 items in the list is significant.</p> <p>Roughly twice as many people gave a score of 5 ("highly important") to each item compared to the number of people who gave a score of 4 - which in turn shows roughly twice as many people rating importance at 4 compared to the number of people who gave a score of 3...and so on.</p> <p><b>Overall, a broad consensus exists in the parish that a very high importance is placed on the natural environmental and the wellbeing of residents. This finding suggests that people in the parish are generally supportive of overarching guiding principals of Sustainability to guide future development and land usage in the Parish.</b></p>

QUESTION 2	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How important are the following items to your enjoyment of life in the Parish?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate eight aspects about living in the Parish, on a scale of "importance" from 1 to 5.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p> <p>The question listed 8 of the many aspects of daily life in the Parish that have previously been suggested as being of importance to people in the parish.</p> <p>The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>People awarded the highest score of 5 (<i>"highly important"</i>) more often than any other score to all items <b>except</b> in one case (<i>"Activities and groups in the Parish"</i>).</p> <p>However, a top rating of 5 was given by more than 50% of people to only 2 of the listed items (<i>"Tranquillity and quiet"</i> and <i>"Easy access to the countryside"</i>), <b>which suggests a high value placed on both the natural environment and on community and personal well-being.</b></p> <p>The (comparatively) even distribution of scores for importance assigned to 3 aspects, namely <i>"A sense of belonging to a community"</i>, <i>"Activities and groups in the Parish"</i> and <i>"A distinct identity"</i> <b>suggests that people appear more ambivalent about the strength of community cohesiveness in the Parish.</b></p> <p>It is possible that people's responses refer to a smaller sub-set of "the community" - those that people habitually associate with -rather than to the community of the Parish as a whole. <b>In this case, community cohesiveness may be more fragmented than the responses appear to suggest.</b> (This conclusion is supported by the qualitative data in which many people in Rogate felt unable to express preferences for the settlements near Rake, and <i>visa versa</i>).</p>

QUESTION 3	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How concerned are you about the following issues affecting life in the Parish?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate their level of “concern” for 18 of aspects of life in the parish, varying from the state of natural environment, to services provided in the parish and to traffic related issues.</p> <p>The question did not distinguish between explicitly to ‘concern for the person himself or herself’ and ‘concern for the community as a whole’, which may have elicited different responses.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>High levels of community concern (where over 50% of people in the survey give the highest score of 5 - “<i>Very concerned</i>”) are evident in 6 of the 18 items in the list, which relate to utilities, traffic and maintenance of woodland.</p> <p>Low to medium levels of community concern were recorded for 3 of the items listed in this question: “<i>Local employment availability</i>”, “<i>Public facilities (health, recreation, learning)</i>”, and “<i>Visitor attractions and accommodation</i>”</p> <p>Many of the 18 ‘issues’ listed are by their nature more likely to adversely affect only a minority of the population in the Parish. <b>Therefore, if responses were guided mainly by concern for the respondents’ personal situation, the charts may mask the significance of concerns to the wellbeing of the community as a whole.</b> For example, despite the parish being an affluent area, any minority of less well-off residents may have deep and possibly justified concerns about the costs or access to basic services and facilities.</p> <p>Furthermore, although the charts indicate low concern about “<i>Over-crowding in current accommodation</i>”, some level of concern exists and warrants further attention, as <b>it may be considered socially undesirable to tolerate any families living in overcrowded accommodation at all.</b></p> <p><b>Again, whilst more “local employment” may be considered desirable as a long-term Sustainability objective (so more young people can remain in the Parish), a respondent currently enjoying secure employment outside the Parish, may not consider this aspect as a current concern at the personal level but may agree about the need for more local employment generally.</b></p>

QUESTION 4	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>What do you think about the <i>future availability</i> of housing in the Parish?</b></p> <p>This question sought community preferences for the quantum of future housing development based on 10 different dwellings types, construction, ownership and tenures.</p> <p>Specific numbers of housing needed were not asked for in this question, instead respondents were asked generally of notions “<i>many</i>” or “<i>few</i>” more might be needed, or not. Such notions will vary considerably.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p> <p>Options provided in this question vary by type of building (flat, bungalow, house...) and by tenure (rented, private, sheltered...) and by occupants (social, elderly, families...). This means that a direct comparison of all responses to the 10 items listed cannot be considered exclusionary. For example, the expressed wish by a substantial proportion of people of a need for “<i>a few more</i>” bungalows may relate to the needs of elderly and/or low-income occupants; similarly it may also reflect a preference for “<i>a few more</i>” eco-build homes, self-build and/or sheltered homes for such occupants.</p>	<p>The broad pattern of responses in the charts reveals a view that the general level of housing in the parish “<i>is about right now</i>”, with the exception that a general preference was expressed for “<i>a few more</i>” “<i>bungalows</i>”, “<i>family homes</i>” and “<i>low-cost Eco-homes</i>” are needed.</p> <p>The view that the parish will in future either “<i>need many more</i>” houses or has “<i>too many already</i>” were least widespread by a large margin - even considered together, these preferences amounted to less than the number of respondents who chose not to answer this question.</p> <p><b>Responses to this question suggests a broad reluctance for significant housing development in the Parish, balanced by a recognition that targeted housing may be needed to meet specific housing needs in the community.</b></p>

QUESTION 5	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>Do you think housing in the Parish adequately meets the needs of the community?</b></p> <p>In order to judge whether the community considers the current housing stock in the parish adequately meets the needs of people, proxy measures were utilised to elicit preferences for various housing options.</p> <p>This question did not explicitly ask if people would consider different housing options for themselves. Hence, respondents may have responded on the basis of perceived “<i>needs of the community</i>” as a whole, although it is likely that some may have referred their own particular personal circumstances.</p> <p>An editing error resulted in inconsistent headings to the question, which spanned 2 pages of the printed version, (“<i>Very interested - Not interested</i>” on page 4 became “<i>Yes I do – No I don’t</i>” on page 5. Many respondents corrected the error on their survey forms, but it cannot be assumed that others spotted the editing error, so any conclusions arising from this question need be accompanied with a clear caveat.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>Outcomes to this question were variable: most respondents, for example, were “<i>not interested</i>” in “<i>downsizing</i>” their home and many respondents were “<i>not interested</i>” in care homes, assisted living or live-work accommodation.</p> <p>On the other hand, a significant minority of respondents were “<i>very interested</i>” in seeing new houses being prioritised for local people and most respondents were <i>very or moderately interested</i> in “<i>new homes being designed to meet the needs of people on lower income levels</i>”.</p> <p>Three areas reveal responses that are (reasonably) evenly spread between “<i>very interested</i>” and “<i>not interested</i>”: new house building being prioritised for “<i>key workers</i>” (nurses, teachers), for “<i>land-based workers</i>” (agriculture, woodland and livestock) and to meet the needs of “<i>people on lower income levels</i>”.</p> <p><b>The concept of Sustainability includes supporting the wellbeing of the community. The findings in this question suggest that people generally endorse such a notion of community.</b></p> <p><b>It is notable that people reveal a moderate interest in the allocation of housing to key workers, land-based workers and lower-income members of the community, even in the absence of evidence presented in this survey of the needs of these groups.</b></p> <p><b>Implicit is the acknowledgement that successful and cohesive communities rely upon a range of occupations and that the valued natural environment requires careful management. Market forces alone cannot offer such services to the community.</b></p>

QUESTION 6	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>What scale of new development would you like to see in the Parish over the next 20 years?</b></p> <p>This question attempts to find the scale of possible future housing development in the Parish that people might be prepared to accept.</p> <p>The scales utilised were queried by some respondents, who would prefer a finer scale (counts of 5 perhaps).</p> <p>Any comparison of the range of development size selected for each different category of development should be done cautiously: different types of development inherently require different scales: for example, while houses might be considered as single units, a realistic local target for a renewable energy project such as domestic solar thermal installations might better be considered at the scale of dozens of houses.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p>	<p>Most respondents selected the lowest available band of unit numbers above zero in all categories of development except for “<i>retail provision</i>” – in that category, roughly equal numbers of respondents wanted either none or some retail development in the Parish.</p> <p>Only in the case of “<i>New homes and self-build</i>” did a significant number of respondents select more than the minimum on the scale provided (25% selected 10-20 units)</p> <p>A sizeable proportion of respondents declined to answer this question.</p> <p><b>The broad pattern of responses represent a conservative appraisal of the possible scale of any future development in the Parish.</b></p>

QUESTION 7	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>Where would you like to see any new development and changes in land usage in the Parish over the next 20 years and beyond?</b></p> <p>The prime objective of this question was to elicit suggestions on areas that respondents considered suitable for future development in the Parish, using descriptive responses (that are analysed elsewhere) in association with a map of the Parish.</p> <p>A secondary objective examined preferences on the “suitability” of 8 previously identified sites in the Parish for possible future development.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p>	<p>A wide spread of views was recorded about the suitability of the listed areas for future development.</p> <p>Three areas of proposed development attracting the greatest number of “<i>Highly unsuitable</i>” responses were located around the centre of Rogate village: “<i>Land in the centre of Rogate Village</i>”, “<i>Land west of Rogate Village Hall</i>” and “<i>Land surrounding the Rogate Rec Ground</i>”.</p> <p>A significant minority (45%) of respondents chose either to not answer this question or considered the suggested areas as “<i>highly unsuitable</i>” for development.</p> <p>Only the “<i>Land opposite Rake Garden Centre</i>” and “<i>Rogate Renault Garage and land south of A272</i>” recorded greater numbers of “very suitable” responses than other responses, although in both cases similar number of respondents chose not to answer this question.</p> <p><b>The community appears unwilling to accept development as proposed by a consultant’s report, which may alter the historical, architectural and cultural setting of Rogate village. This does not equate to an anti-development sentiment, as other areas in the Parish are regarded as more suitable for future development and land use change.</b></p>

QUESTION 8	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>If additional <i>housing</i> were to be developed in the Parish what is acceptable to you?</b></p> <p>From a list of 9 potential options, this question sought to establish the acceptability of the location, spatial clustering and distribution of possible future housing development in the Parish.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>The pattern of responses to this question revealed no broad consensus on the acceptable clustering of future housing development in the Parish, and a marginal preference for building conversions, extensions and clustering within existing settlements.</p> <p>Significantly, over 50% of people chose not to provide an answer for either option involving housing development in a “<i>single grouping</i>” or in a “<i>number of smaller developments</i>”.</p> <p><b>When considered together with other findings here that suggest an acknowledgment of the need for future development to meet the needs of the community, it appears, from the high number of uncommitted respondents in this question, that a debate over spatial clustering and distribution of any new housing in the Parish requires more informed consideration.</b></p>

QUESTION 9	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>If additional <i>workplaces</i> were to be developed in the Parish, what is acceptable to you?</b></p> <p>This question sought to establish the acceptability of the spatial distribution of possible future development of workplaces in the Parish, based on 4 options listed and the opportunity for respondents to offer their own suggestions too.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. .</p>	<p>The pattern of responses to this question revealed no broad consensus on the acceptable clustering or distribution of workplaces within the Parish.</p> <p><b>Significant minority preferred not to cluster new workplaces “<i>in a single grouping</i>” but instead to distribute these “<i>near to main highways</i>”. Nevertheless, broadly the responses views were ambivalent, with significant minority choosing not to answer the question. These findings suggest that tacit acknowledgement that workplaces with good access are needed in the Parish and locating them needs to be done sensitively.</b></p>

QUESTION 10	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How important to you are the <i>following facilities</i> already in the Parish?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate how important they considered a list of 14 current facilities in the Parish were to them.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>With two exceptions, facilities in the Parish were regarded as “<i>highly important</i>” by respondents, by a significant margin.</p> <p>Responses suggested that “<i>Vehicle garage services</i>” in the Parish were not important to over 50% of people, while “<i>Allotments in Hugo Platt</i>” were generally considered as of mixed importance. The former is likely to reflect the lack of vehicle fuel depots in the Parish and the ability people to travel by private transport to obtain fuel outside the Parish. The latter is likely to reflect the diminished provision of allotments and the inappropriateness of confining these to area of predominantly sheltered housing – although these clearly remain of significant importance to some people.</p> <p>Significant minorities of people chose not to answer the question relating to “<i>Pubs</i>” and to “<i>Playgrounds</i>” in the Parish, which the qualitative data suggests may be relate level of personal use by some respondents rather than a judgement on the importance of these two facilities to the community as a whole.</p> <p><b>The current range of facilities in the Parish is regarded as being important to the wellbeing of the community. It is reasonable to suggest that the Sustainability of the community would be affected by any changes in the range and level of facilities currently enjoyed in the Parish.</b></p>

QUESTION 11	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How important to you would <u>additional new facilities</u> be in the Parish?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate the importance of 13 possible new facilities in the Parish.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>Generally, people expressed mixed views on the importance of the new facilities suggested, with the notable exception of “<i>High speed internet access</i>”, which was predominantly regarded as “<i>Highly important</i>”.</p> <p>In all cases, except for of “<i>High speed internet access</i>”, “<i>Off-street parking</i>” and “<i>Better recycling facilities</i>”, more respondents selected “<i>Not important</i>” than any other rating on the 5-point scale provided.</p> <p>However, most of the proposed new facilities were assigned moderate “importance” to the people who responded - with the exception of “<i>High speed internet access</i>” (assigned high importance) and additional “<i>shops</i>”, “<i>garage services</i>” and “<i>pubs</i>” (all assigned low importance).</p> <p><b>“Moderate importance” ascribed to new facilities in the Parish may not reflect a view about a <u>known need for such facilities</u>, but rather may suggest the availability of a range of facilities outside the Parish is considered satisfactory to many respondents.</b></p> <p><b>In terms of community wellbeing and resilience, less dependency on facilities that require more travel and higher access costs would improve the long-term Sustainability of the community.</b></p>

QUESTION 12	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How would you like funds for <i>community projects</i> to be allocated?</b></p> <p>This question provided a list of 20 possible examples of community projects for the Parish and requested respondents to prioritize these suggestions, as well as to add their own ideas for community projects.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p>	<p>The pattern of responses revealed a broad spread of views about prioritising the suggested community projects.</p> <p>Significant minority of respondents afforded the highest priority for “<i>Traffic calming</i>” measures in both Rake and Rogate.</p> <p>In around half the suggested projects, proportionately more respondents chose not to prioritise the projects (including “Renewable energy schemes for groups of buildings”, “Creating a Natural play area at Bull Hill Green, Rake, owned by the Parish Council” and “Improving Oliver’s Piece, Rake”). Qualitative data suggests that, for some, this was due to unfamiliarity of the location or the project concept.</p> <p><b>In terms of promoting the wellbeing and addressing the needs of all residents and visitors in the Parish, the ambivalent responses suggest that greater public debate and consensus building on this matter would be useful and necessary prior to any attempt to short-list or rule out potential community projects.</b></p>

QUESTION 13	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How well do rate the existing educational facilities in the Parish?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate 9 categories of supplementary learning facilities within the Parish (excluding the current primary schools) on a 4 point scale from “<i>Poor</i>” to “<i>Very good</i>” plus a “<i>Don’t know</i>” option</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question. The opportunity was given to people on the questionnaire to offer other suggestions too.</p>	<p>Most respondents selected “<i>Don’t know</i>” in answer this question and in all options provided.</p> <p>The availability and suitability of out of school, informal and later-life learning experiences in the Parish appear to be largely unknown to many respondents.</p> <p><b>In terms of equipping the community to adapt and flourish in a rapidly changing world, it would be beneficial to promote greater awareness of and participation through such auxiliary learning experiences relevant to local conditions and circumstances.</b></p>

QUESTION 14	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>How good do you think the Parish's transport facilities?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to rate various aspects of transport, parking and mobility within the Parish (on a 4 point scale from "Poor" to "Very good" plus a "Don't know" option)</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p>	<p>Parking amenity, sense of road safety and road maintenance in the Parish were all rated "Poor" by most respondents, while a substantial minority rated pedestrian or cycle access and footpaths as "Satisfactory".</p> <p>Most people rated bus services as either "Unknown" or "Poor"</p> <p>"Parking at home" (both on-street and off-street) attracted an even spread (roughly) of ratings.</p> <p><b>Generally low ratings assigned to local public parking amenity and the condition of public highways road maintenance suggests a reliance on private vehicle travel that is not adequately supported by local transport infrastructure.</b></p> <p><b>Good standards of foot and cycle access is important to using and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport, the poor to moderate rating given by respondents in this question suggests that the community would benefit from improving and extending such provision.</b></p>

QUESTION 16	INTERPRETATION
<p><b>What priority should the Neighbourhood Plan put on creating and supporting local business and employment in our Parish?</b></p> <p>This question asked people to prioritise 11 suggested ideas for improving local business and employment, on a 5-point scale from 1 (Low Priority) to 5 (High Priority). People were also invited to suggest their own ideas to meet this objective.</p> <p>The first bar on each of the charts for this question shows the number of people who did not answer the question.</p>	<p>Significant numbers of respondents chose not to provide a preference in each of the suggestions provided in this question.</p> <p>Significantly, “<i>High Priority</i>” support was only given to 3 of the 11 ideas listed: “<i>The Parish should support suppliers of local businesses and products</i>”, “<i>Support the use and management of local natural resources for businesses and tourism</i>” and “<i>Support local farmers market</i>”.</p> <p>The greatest number of “<i>low priority</i>” preferences were assigned to 3 of 8 suggested projects: “<i>Allocate sites for small industrial units</i>”, “<i>Allocate land for renewable energy businesses</i>” and “<i>More accommodation is required in the Parish for tourists and visitors</i>”.</p> <p><b>Promoting new local employment opportunities, reducing local fuel poverty and minimising climate change impacts of energy consumption are fundamental to the prospects of a more sustainable community. The findings here suggest that this point is not widely appreciated and furthermore suggest a paucity of younger participants in the survey.</b></p> <p><b>Support for existing (especially farming) businesses and promoting the responsible use of local natural resources currently appear to be the preference of most respondents, which would contribute positively to the flourishing of the community as a whole, if widely supported.</b></p>