

Your community - your say

Findings Report

Autumn 2012



Submitted by Impact Consultancy Services
Report published in December 2012

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank everyone who attended the Your community - your say events and shared their views and opinions about the future of public services in Herefordshire.

We would also like to thank those who helped us to reach a diverse range of groups to ensure the consultation was truly representative together with a number of officers from Herefordshire Council who were involved in supporting the overall process:

Local organisations

Age UK
Deaf Direct
Herefordshire Carers Support
Herefordshire Housing
Homestart
West Mercia Women's Aid

Community researchers

Debbie Baker
Janet Canterdale

Young researchers

Demi Burrows
Gio Clarke
Joshua Eames
Effie Gridley
Alex Griffiths
Raye Harvey
Maia Hughes
Mark Jones
Conor McGrath
Harry Pratlett
Tilly Stanik
Shelley Weston
Imogen Winter
Nicole Winterford

Herefordshire Council

Sharon Amery
Stephanie Brayford
Nina Bridges
Simon Licence
Philippa Lydford
Andy Preedy
Madeleine Spinks
Fran Warden

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Methodology	6 - 9
a) Your community - your say locality events	6 - 7
b) Targeted workshops	7
c) Cascading	8
d) Young and community researchers	8
e) Social media	8
f) Organisations / stakeholder perceptions	8 - 9
3. About the respondents	9
4. Countywide findings	9 - 21
4.1 Countywide findings by theme	10 - 16
Health services	10 - 11
The level of crime	11
Public transport	11 - 12
Affordable decent housing	12 - 13
Employment prospects	13 - 14
Education provision	14
Road and pavement repairs	14
Access to nature (footpaths and bridleways etc)	14
Clean streets	14 - 15
Refuse collection and disposal	15
Other issues	15 - 16
4.2 Countywide findings by group	16 - 21
a) Young people	16 - 17
b) Disabled people	18 - 19
c) Minority ethnic groups	19
d) Older people aged over 65	20
e) People aged 25 to 64	20 - 21
4.3 Perceptions of organisations and stakeholders	21 - 22
4.4 Variations with the Quality of Life survey findings	23 - 24
4.5 Comparisons and variations between urban and rural localities	24
4.6 Overview of participants' priorities	24 - 28
a) Findings from the events	25
b) Findings from group discussions and cascading	25 - 26
c) Polarised views of the importance of services	26 - 27
d) Suggestions for how things can be done differently	27 - 28
4.7 Perceptions about Herefordshire Council	28
5. Conclusion	29 - 31
a) Priorities	29

b) Common suggestions	29 - 30	
c) Suggestions for how decisions relating to services should be made	30 - 31	
6. Next steps	31 – 32	
a) Root and Branch Reviews and budget setting	31	
b) The decision making process	31 – 32	
c) How to take the YCYS process forward	32	
7. Appendices	33 - 47	
Appendix A	A list of YCYS events and workshops	33 - 34
Appendix B	Topic guide used at the YCYS locality events	35 - 38
Appendix C	A list of participating stakeholders	39
Appendix D	Consultation evaluation	40 - 41
Appendix E	Monitoring information	42 - 47

1) Introduction

Your community - your say (YCYS) was commissioned by Herefordshire Council in order to start the process of engaging Herefordshire residents in meaningful conversations about the future of public services in the county. The consultation process was set within the context of significant financial cuts resulting in major changes in the way the public services are commissioned and delivered. The YCYS consultation was the community engagement element of the 'Root and Branch Review Programme', an in-depth internal review of all services provided by and on behalf of the council, to help inform strategic and service planning and set future priorities for public services.

There were two parts to the engagement programme, the first being a large postal survey of 4,125 households called the Quality of Life survey in the spring of 2012. The findings from the 1,346 respondents was then used to inform the second phase, which was the Your community – your say process in the autumn of 2012.

To ensure that any decisions made as a result of this review were informed by up to date views from local residents, people were provided with a range of opportunities to have their say. This included:

- A series of open public meetings in each locality area across the county
- Targeted workshops with minority ethnic groups, young people, people with disabilities and other demographic and geographic 'gaps' identified during the process
- Enlisting support from organisations working with 'seldom heard' individuals and groups
- Recruiting young and community researchers
- An online discussion forum
- A Twitter page
- A Facebook page

The focus across these consultation channels was the collection of high quality information from residents to help the council understand and explore:

- Whether we are focusing on the right priorities
- Whether we are providing the services people believe are needed
- Which services matter most to the residents of Herefordshire and which are less important
- How services could be delivered differently.

YCYS was also used as an opportunity to test the statistical findings of the 2012 Quality of Life survey (QOL)¹ and to gain greater insight into the responses of this survey.

¹ The Herefordshire Quality of Life survey is a survey of residents' views within the county. The 2012 survey was posted to 4,125 households across Herefordshire and was based on the 2008 Place Survey with some changes to support the needs of ongoing service review and budgeting. 1,346 responses were received, giving an overall response rate of 33%. See www.herefordshire.gov.uk/factsandfigures/ for the results.

2) Methodology

The consultation process adopted for YCYS was underpinned by a strong commitment to the following principles:

- Accessibility, both in terms of physical access and being accessible to people with varying degrees of knowledge of prior engagement in the subject area.
- Openness and transparency.
- Inclusivity, ensuring the widest geographical and demographic reach.
- Feedback the outcomes of the consultation to both participants and non-participants.

These principles were used as a benchmark throughout the consultation process and informed the approaches used, the structure and content of events and post consultation activity.

The approach adopted for all the face to face engagement exercises was based on finding out which services participants felt to be priorities, which needed to be improved and how things could be done differently to improve service delivery. There was also a participative prioritisation exercise which invited discussion on which services were a 'must have', 'nice to have' and those which we 'could do without' or which we 'could do differently'. The findings of the Quality of Life survey were used as a starting point for all these discussions.

a) Your community - your say locality events

Between September and November 2012, 14 Your community - your say locality events were undertaken and a full list is available in Appendix A on page 33. These covered the nine localities² with additional events being held in the areas of Hereford, Golden Valley and Mortimer in order to increase the reach of the events. A total of 295 local residents participated in these events.

Prior to launching YCYS, meetings were held with all council lead locality officers and the relevant ward members, with the exception of Weobley. The purpose of these meetings was to seek guidance on the appropriate locations, venues and dates for the locality events, inform people about the proposed event format and to encourage councillor participation within the process. We also asked each councillor to invite a minimum of ten people from their local constituency to their nearest event.

For these events a World Café style approach was adopted which sees people being invited to take part in small group discussions based around a series of key questions and a copy of the topic guide used for these events is attached in Appendix B on page 35. The questions focused on what people saw as the key service priorities, what service areas people felt were in greatest need of improvement, what improvements people felt were needed and how people felt services could be delivered differently. This informal, participatory approach was used to encourage engagement and ownership by attendees and was designed as a listening exercise.

The group discussions were facilitated by a member of staff from Impact Consultancy Services, Community First, Herefordshire Council or NHS Herefordshire and discussions were recorded on large paper tablecloths. The participants were provided with some background information relating to council expenditure and a summary of the services delivered by the council to aid their discussions.

² Locality Working in Herefordshire. Nine locality areas have been identified to help structure service delivery closer to communities and to better address local needs. A number of organisations, including Herefordshire Council, are actively working to shape how services can be delivered and communities engaged on the basis of these nine areas. More information is available at: www.herefordshire.gov.uk/aboutlocalities.

West Mercia Police also sent a local representative, usually a local Community Support Officer, to the locality events, while a member of staff from Herefordshire Council's transport team also attended the majority of events as part of their consultation on the Local Transport Plan.

There are summary reports available for each of the locality events, with copies being sent directly to those participants who requested feedback. They can be viewed on the council website at: www.herefordshire.gov.uk/yourcommunityyoursay. There is also an overview of the evaluation from the events in Appendix D on page 40.

b) Targeted workshops

In addition to the locality events, a series of ten targeted events and workshops were also held to ensure the engagement of specific groups and to 'plug any gaps' identified through an analysis of the demographic profile of people attending the locality events. The inclusion of these additional events helped to redress the balance of the consultation findings and ensured they reflected a much wider range of views and perspectives from across different demographic and geographic areas. For example:

- A workshop for people from ethnic minorities was run in partnership with the International Saturday School on 16 October and was supported by staff from Herefordshire Council's equalities and diversity team. 20 participants attended with the majority being of Eastern European origin.
- A workshop for disabled people was run in partnership with Herefordshire Disability United on 17 October, which 14 people attend.
- A young people's workshop was held as part of the Shadow Board on 23 October.

In addition to the targeted workshops, consultation was also undertaken at the following meetings and venues:

- St Peters Centre open day in Peterchurch: 22 September
- Leominster Area Regeneration Company (LARC) meeting: 22 October
- Ocle Pychard Parish Council at Burley Gate Village Hall: 23 October
- Ledbury Children's Centre's Parents Forum: 31 October
- Herefordshire Carers Support Group meeting in Ross-on-Wye: 7 November
- Kington Children's Centre: 21 November
- Conningsby Children's Centre's Young Parent Group: 21 November

The findings from these targeted workshops and additional consultations have been integrated into the relevant locality summary reports and have also been analysed alongside information collected by cascading organisations and the young and community researchers. Where information relates to the views of a specific demographic group or common interest group, this has been collated and analysed separately to provide different perspectives. For example, older people, young people, ethnic minorities and carers.

c) Cascading

Cascading or ‘devolved consultation’ involved enlisting support from local organisations or individuals which already have existing relationships with those residents which may not routinely become involved in consultations. This approach was used to ensure that individuals or groups of people, whose views are often absent from these types of consultations, were able to contribute via professionals or volunteers, who they already have an existing relationship and contact with.

Following a recruitment drive, which was supported by the council’s signposting service, 12 organisations signed up to support the YCYS consultation, although only seven of these were able to support the process within the necessary timescales, these are indicated in bold:

Age UK

Barton Hill

Deaf Direct

Herefordshire Carers Support

Herefordshire Council’s gypsy and traveller liaison officer

Herefordshire Mind

Homestart

HVOSS

Kemble Housing

Red Cross Village Wardens

WM Housing

West Mercia Women’s Aid

d) Young and community researchers

In partnership with Herefordshire Council’s youth service, 12 young researchers from across the county were recruited to undertake consultation with their peers. 22 young people attended the initial briefing session regarding the opportunity which was followed by two further training sessions to ‘young people-proof’ the YCYS topic guide and develop the young people’s interview and research skills. The findings from the interviews undertaken by the young researchers have been integrated into the countywide findings by theme section on page 16. An evaluation of the process used by the young researchers is also included in Appendix D on page 40.

e) Social media

In order to ensure the consultation was accessible to those who were unable to or unlikely to attend the locality events, a range of social media consultation channels were developed and promoted alongside the events. These channels were also used as a way of promoting the events and raising the profile of the consultation.

Online forum: www.yourcommunityyoursay.co.uk

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/haveyoursay>

Facebook: www.facebook.com/YourCommunityYourSay

The comments received through these online channels have also been integrated into the countywide findings where appropriate or incorporated into the relevant locality summary reports.

f) Organisations / stakeholder perceptions

The perceptions of different organisations or stakeholders were collected through attendance at meetings for the Herefordshire Community Development Partnership and Herefordshire Community Development Workers Forum. During both of these meetings, attendees were invited to discuss the headline questions which were used as the basis for the locality events.

A complete list of the organisations represented at these meetings is included in Appendix C on page 39, while the information gathered from these sessions has been collated and is summarised in section 4.3 on page 21.

3) About the respondents

We engaged with approximately 1,427 people during the Your community - your say process³, with a total of 1,163 people being involved in meaningful conversations about public services. We had 295 participants at the 14 locality events, with a further 125 participating through targeted workshops or discussions held as part of a prescheduled meeting. The remainder were either engaged by the YCYS young and community researchers or through organisations that supported the cascading process.

An additional 264 people engaged with YCYS via the online channels described on page 8, with 189 people following the Twitter account, 45 people liking the Facebook page and a further 30 contributing their views via the discussion forum.

Just under half of those involved with the YCYS process were aged between 45 and 74, with over a third being under 25. This compares with 40% of Herefordshire's population aged between 45 and 74, just over a quarter of under 25 year olds and 11% aged 15 to 24. The YCYS locality events and workshops were most commonly attended by those aged between 45 and 74.

Overall, from those who completed an evaluation form, 886 people (81%) had never participated in any form of Herefordshire Council consultation. From the 295 people who attended a locality event, 114 (39%) also said that they had not previously participated in a Herefordshire Council consultation, while 45 (36%) of the 125 people who attended a targeted workshop or were engaged in discussion through various meetings, had also not previously participated.

Please note that 47 people from the locality events and 27 people from targeted workshops or meetings failed to state whether or not they had been involved in previous consultations.

The majority of participants attended a YCYS event as a result of an approach from their local councillor, a direct invitation or through word of mouth, although parish councils were also identified as a common source through which people received consultation information. There were only a small number of people who attended the events as a result of information received via the YCYS Twitter or Facebook pages and given the demographic of those attending the events, this was not surprising.

A full breakdown of the monitoring information collected is available in Appendix E on page 42.

4) Countywide findings

The findings below reflect the issues and perceptions that were consistently raised throughout the consultation process and are therefore deemed to be countywide issues, rather than those relating to a particular locality or group. Locality specific issues are highlighted in the YCYS summary locality reports, which are available for each area. These can be found on the council website at: www.herefordshire.gov.uk/yourcommunityyoursay.

³ These figures are based on information collected through evaluation forms completed by those who took part in the Your community – your say events. We are aware that some participants chose not to complete evaluation forms and as such actual participation figures will be higher.

The findings have been broken down into the following categories:

- By theme
- By group
- Perceptions of organisations and stakeholders
- Variations with the Quality of Life survey findings
- Comparisons and variations between urban and rural localities
- Overview of participants priorities
- Perceptions about Herefordshire Council

4.1) Countywide findings by theme

Health services

- Health services were consistently identified as a high priority across all age groups and localities.
- There seems to be a general high level of satisfaction with health services, specifically GP provision and local and county hospitals, across the county and a strong desire to retain the level of local and countywide provision currently available. However, there were some comments made in relation to Hereford County Hospital being understaffed and some felt that this impacted on the quality of health care delivered.
- During the course of the consultation, changes were made to the opening hours of minor injuries units in Ledbury, Leominster and Ross-on-Wye. There was significant concern expressed around this, as these services are needed locally, especially by those who would otherwise have to rely on public transport if they had to access health services in Hereford instead. It was felt that the lack of available public transport in the evenings would mean that accessing services in Hereford would be very difficult and that this would probably lead to additional demands on the ambulance service.
- Participants consistently identified that it is difficult to find an NHS dentist that will take on new patients. There were generally high levels of satisfaction with the quality of private dentistry provision in the county, while the specific need for a dentist in Leominster was raised.
- There were mixed reports about the service received through the out of hours GP service. Some residents felt that they were expected to wait too long to see an out of hours doctor, but participants were mostly satisfied with the GP Access Centre located next to Asda in Hereford.
- Access to health services for those without private transport was raised as an issue, particularly for those needing to access specialist treatment which is only available out of county, for example some cancer treatments.
- There was concern expressed that GP commissioning may impact on the speed of referrals to specialist care and treatment.
- There were concerns raised about the ageing population and the additional burden this will place on health services. There was also concern that the number of beds at Hereford County Hospital were insufficient to meet the needs of an increasing population in Herefordshire, which is likely to occur as a result of proposed housing developments.
- There are a number of health related services which are currently delivered by third sector organisations, which were consistently seen as being very important, for example meals on

wheels, West Mercia Women's Aid, advice services and support for carers and disabled people. It was felt that these services make a significant difference to the quality of life for residents and if they were lost, there would be a negative impact on individuals and communities.

The level of crime

- Policing was commonly identified as a high priority throughout the consultation.
- Although there was satisfaction with policing generally, some felt that there needed to be a greater police presence. Participants reported seeing Community Support Officers (CSOs), but felt that they did not have the same authority as police officers and were therefore less effective in preventing crime.
- Many participants felt that although maintaining a low crime rate is important, the fear of crime can make policing appear a higher priority than it actually is.
- Rural crime, for example the theft of agricultural machinery, oil or metal was perceived to be an issue which was becoming increasingly common.
- Speeding, particularly on rural roads and through residential areas, was consistently raised as a real area of concern, with a number of areas identifying this as being one of their top priorities.
- It was felt that the loss of local youth services may lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour and low level crime.

Public transport

- Public transport was consistently identified as a high priority across all age groups and localities and an area in need of improvement. However, there were mixed views about the future of council funded public transport and a general recognition that provision was not sustainable in its current form. It was clear that for some residents, particularly young, disabled and older people and those on a low income, public transport is deemed to be essential.
- Public transport was the area seen as most in need of improvement by young people with increased frequency of bus services and cleaner more affordable trains and buses recorded as the most common areas for improvement.
- The provision of bus passes for those aged over 65 was potentially seen as an area where money could be saved. It was suggested that blanket provision of bus passes was not needed and that it should only be given to people who really needed it. Furthermore, it was felt that people should be given a choice about how they would like assistance, for example, perhaps people could be given taxi vouchers rather than bus passes, as passes may not be useful to people living in rural areas which aren't served by a bus or to disabled people who can't access buses.
- Disabled people reported that there is a lack of accessible buses for wheelchair users and also a real lack of accessible taxis. It was also felt that bus drivers should receive disability awareness training.
- There was general consensus that evening and Sunday provision was unsatisfactory and this was most commonly raised by those in rural areas or in conjunction with access to leisure and social activities in Hereford city centre.

- Participants expressed strong support for more investment in community transport schemes, particularly demand-responsive services.
- The challenge of making public transport sustainable was recognised, but it was felt that investment should be made in demand-responsive travel rather than bus routes.
- Public transport was seen by some to be expensive, particularly those on a low income. For example, a return from Leominster to Hereford was reported as being £7, which for some is difficult to afford on a regular basis.
- It was felt that community transport needs to be joined up with other transport services and be as affordable as possible.
- There was a perception that running smaller buses would be more cost effective.

Affordable decent housing

- There was confusion about the term 'affordable decent housing' and general agreement that the term needed to be defined. For example, participants questioned whether the term related to social housing or the affordability of housing generally. However, despite the need for clarity, many participants stressed the need for more social housing and 'affordable housing'.
- There was a concern raised by some that the 'perceived need' for affordable housing is not always matched by demand. There were several examples offered of affordable housing being built but remaining unoccupied, although this was often seen to be because of the size or quality of the housing.
- It was generally felt that young people are unable to afford to buy property in the more rural areas of the county, resulting in several reports of young people moving out of Herefordshire.
- The options for older people to downsize but remain living independently, specifically to two bedroom and single storey properties, were reported as being very limited. This was often seen as one of the reasons for under occupancy. It was also felt that there is a 'window of opportunity', when older people feel that they can or want to move, however if options are limited then this is missed.
- There was general agreement that mixed housing development is needed. However, it was felt that there is little incentive for developers, who are driven by the need to make a profit as opposed to building affordable housing. It was also felt that land availability for development is limited, particularly in rural areas where it is owned privately and therefore less likely to be made available for affordable decent housing. However, it was felt that Community Land Trusts may offer opportunities for communities and parish councils in the future to provide affordable decent housing.
- More affordable rental properties across the county are also needed. It was felt that the need to have at least a 20% deposit to be able to secure a mortgage means that the demand for rental properties is currently high. However, many rental properties are seen as being overly expensive and even unaffordable.
- It was felt that empty properties need to be brought back into use before new housing is built and accommodation above shops in the market towns was particularly mentioned in relation to empty homes.
- Participants felt strongly that the social housing allocation procedure should prioritise people with a local connection to the area.

- Planning laws need to be relaxed to take into account the needs and variations in different areas.
- The limitations of existing infrastructure were commonly seen as an issue in relation to proposed housing development. For example, there were concerns that Herefordshire's roads, drainage and sewage systems would need to be significantly improved to allow for a significant rise in population. Those in rural areas in particular felt that sewage systems were at capacity and would not be able to accommodate more housing.
- It was perceived that accessing section 106 monies⁴ and using this to improve infrastructure, was the main incentive for housing development. However, it was felt that this approach distorts housing policy and is ineffective in addressing housing need.

Employment prospects

- Participants felt strongly that local people, including those from rural areas, should benefit from the opportunities presented by economic development schemes such as the Rotherwas Enterprise Zone.
- It was generally agreed that there is a need to attract larger employers into the county. However, it was also recognised that there is a range of reasons why Herefordshire may not be chosen by big employers, for example an inadequate broadband connection and the road system. Alongside attracting large employers, it was also felt essential to support small and medium sized businesses, as these are a major part of Herefordshire's economy. In relation to this, it was consistently highlighted that wherever possible local contractors, including developers should be used and that the commissioning processes used by Herefordshire Council and their partners should not exclude local and small contractors.
- Courses offered by local colleges should take into account the skills needed by local employers, ensuring local jobs are taken up by local people.
- There were some residents who were concerned that young people are not work ready and that there is a lack of work experience or apprenticeship opportunities available to them.
- The need to create job opportunities throughout the county and not just in Hereford was cited by many and was seen as a way of creating more sustainable communities.
- It was felt that an inadequate broadband connection holds back economic growth and prevents home working in many areas.
- The planning system was perceived to be hindering economic development and business growth.
- The lack of job centre plus services in some market towns was seen by some to disadvantage those who do not live in Hereford. This is due to the difficulty in accessing job centre plus services for those on low incomes, particularly if they have no form of private transport. The cost of travel to Hereford either to 'sign on' or look for job opportunities was seen to be very high and was a particular issue in Bromyard and Kington.
- One of the main barriers to local people being able to access employment opportunities was seen to be inadequate transport provision. It was felt that young people in particular were

⁴ Section 106 relates to monies paid by developers to local planning authorities, in order to offset the costs of the external effects of development.

disadvantaged by this. Although this was commonly raised in rural areas, it was also seen to be an issue in the towns too.

Education provision

- There was a perception that education provision across the county was generally good. There did however appear to be some difference in sixth form provision across the county, with not all options available at Hereford Sixth Form College being available at other centres. This was seen as being disadvantageous towards pupils.
- There is some evidence to suggest that there are insufficient nursery places available and this was raised as a particular issue in Leominster.
- Concerns were raised about the sustainability of small rural schools and the impact that school closures would have on rural communities. Those rural communities that do have schools were perceived as being more vibrant and active as a result.
- The need for a county university was consistently raised as a means of retaining and attracting more young people into the county and addressing specialist skills gaps.

Road and pavement repairs

- Whilst there was a general consensus across all events that the state of the county's roads and pavements were in need of improvement, this subject divided people in terms of the priority it should be given within the context of reducing budgets.
- There were high levels of dissatisfaction expressed about the quality of road and pavement repairs undertaken by Amey and it was generally felt that 'quick fix' temporary repairs were undertaken too often and these were seen to be a waste of money.
- There was general consensus that local contracts should be given to local companies, which would result in better quality workmanship and quicker response times. It was also felt that this could possibly be addressed by extending the parish lengthsman scheme.
- Strong support existed for a strategic programme of rolling maintenance to be undertaken and the need to adopt an 'invest to save' policy.
- There was a perception that the state of the roads was particularly dangerous for cyclists and deterred people from cycling.

Access to nature (footpaths and bridleways etc)

- Whilst there was a general consensus across many events that access to nature was important in terms of wellbeing and tourism, discussions relating to future investment and maintenance of the county's footpaths and bridleways divided people.
- This was an area where people generally agreed that things could be done differently and popular suggestions included extending the duties of the parish lengthsman and placing greater responsibility on landowners and communities for their local network of footpaths.

Clean streets

- Although people felt that clean streets were important, particularly in tourist areas, where an area could be improved, specifically around cleaning up dog mess and litter, people felt that it did not merit priority above more 'essential services' such as health services, public transport, policing and affordable decent housing.

- There were high levels of dissatisfaction expressed around the quality of work undertaken by Amey. It was also felt that Amey's response times were too slow and there was a perception that the service was not adequately monitored by Herefordshire Council.
- There was general consensus that this was a service that could be more efficiently and effectively run, if resources were devolved down to either town or parish councils or community run enterprises. In addition, this was an area which participants commonly felt that people should take a greater personal responsibility for. There were a few examples of localities already undertaking community led initiatives to tackle this issue, such as the Ross-on-Wye volunteer dog wardens and Leominster community litter picks.

Refuse collection and disposal

- Participants consistently reported a high level of satisfaction with residential refuse collection and doorstep recycling services.
- Access to recycling facilities for those materials not included in doorstep collections was an issue predominantly reported in rural localities. The removal of recycling points from some community venues, such as in Kington was also an issue especially for those residents who live in accommodation where 'green wheelie' bins can't be used.

Other issues

- There was a perception by many participants that all services had relative value and that too many cuts had already been made.
- Although it was felt that some services could be delivered more effectively by local communities, it was strongly expressed that community based solutions to service delivery and the use of volunteers should not be seen as a 'free' alternative.
- The investment in community development was seen by some to be critical in developing alternative service delivery options, particularly in relation to accessing specialist advice and support and external funding. However, despite this very few people prioritised community development services.
- It was felt that means testing might be appropriate for some services, as blanket provision of free services was not deemed to be appropriate in some cases, such as free bus passes for the over 65s.
- Many participants felt that there needed to be more clarity over the statutory duties of the council, in order to identify funding that is available for the delivery of non-statutory services.
- There was concern that any cuts will not be apportioned fairly and that market towns and rural areas will lose out to Hereford. Additionally, if charging for services is introduced, it was felt that this would unfairly disadvantage rural residents, for whom the cost of delivery will be more.
- There was a perception that key services are paid for by all the county's residents, but that Hereford residents benefit most from them.
- There was concern that there will be inadequate investment in young people due to all the resources being allocated to services for Herefordshire's ageing population. The importance of young people to the county was recognised.
- The wheelchair service was seen as very important for disabled people, but was seen as the 'Cinderella service'.

- Social care services were seen as a high priority for many, particularly disabled people and carers. In relation to this, those services which enable people to remain living independently in their own homes were seen as essential and a withdrawal or reduction of these would have a detrimental impact on resident's quality of life.

4.2) Countywide findings by group

The following information outlines the key issues highlighted by:

- Young people
- Disabled people
- Minority ethnic groups
- Older people aged over 65
- People aged 25 to 64

Please note that section 4.6 on page 24, outlines the service areas which are seen as less important by these five groups.

In addition to issues specific to these groups, it should also be recognised that there were certain services highlighted as being important by people who participated in the consultation via a cascading organisation. For example, those who were approached by West Mercia Women's Aid saw the provision of a women's refuge as very important along with the support services they offer.

Similarly, those people approached by Herefordshire Housing often cited the importance of affordable decent housing and more social housing as being important. Another issue which was commonly reported by those engaged through the cascading process, was a perceived lack of support for people with mental health issues.

a) Young people

The findings contained within this section of the report have been drawn from primary peer research undertaken by the YCYS young researchers and the consultation session with the Herefordshire Shadow Board. In a two week period in October, young researchers conducted 365 interviews with their peers aged between 7 and 25 across the county.

Public transport was by far the most common service identified as a priority by young people, with over half raising the issue. Although buses were most commonly referred to, trains also featured highly. Many respondents identified this as being particularly important due to the rural nature of the county and their reliance on public transport to get them to school or college and for social activities. In addition, the importance of public transport for elderly people was also highlighted.

Public transport was also the most common response in relation to services in greatest need of improvement, with increased frequency of bus services and cleaner more affordable trains and buses most commonly recorded. A number of comments about the provision of litter bins on buses were also recorded.

The need for a more reliable bus service was also highlighted, with a number of respondents referring to buses that were old or breaking down. The issue of overcrowding on buses and the need for larger vehicles, specifically for those taking students to school / college, was also raised. The accessibility of buses at the weekend, particularly on a Sunday and after school to accommodate those involved in after school activities, were recorded by a small number of people. There were also suggestions around introducing a swipe card system, which could be used across different bus companies, free transport for school and college students and the need for more bus shelters.

Health services were the second most common priority identified by young people with specific reference to the importance of access to GPs, dentists and the ambulance service. Whilst some areas of improvement were identified in relation to health services, such as the need for better 'out of hours' access, having to wait too long for an appointment and the need for more NHS dentists, these issues were not actually identified by a significant number of respondents. The specific need for a dentist in Leominster was also raised by several people.

Policing closely followed behind health services in terms of priorities and was also the fourth most common response in relation to services in greatest need of improvement. There was a clear view that there needs to be more police on the streets and that there was a specific need for the police to be tackling issues such as vandalism, drug taking and anti-social behaviour. One comment received was: "more police because there is too much crime and drugs on our streets".

Education provision was recorded as the fourth highest priority with the areas in need of improvement being identified as the need for more funding and improvements to facilities. Although again, these were not identified by a significant number of respondents.

Parks and open spaces, the fire service and public toilets were the next most commonly recorded priorities. Public toilets were identified as the second highest service in need of improvement with the majority of comments relating to the need for them to be cleaner. A significant number of young people said they didn't use public toilets as they were too dirty and had seen evidence of drug taking in them. It is worth noting that while public toilets were cited most frequently as being less of a priority for young people, this is directly linked to them not being used as they are regarded as unhygienic.

Despite the fact that **youth services** were identified as a high priority across the majority of locality events, they were actually afforded a similar priority as libraries, sports and leisure facilities and street lighting by young people themselves. Whilst they were listed as the sixth service most in need of improvement, with specific reference to the need for more youth provision in the form of new youth clubs, with existing ones being open more with more activities and entertainment such as a cinema, youth provision was not mentioned as frequently as may have been anticipated. In addition, youth clubs were the fifth most common service that young people said were less of a priority. Significantly, **parks and open spaces**, including skate and bike parks were given a greater priority than organised youth provision and were highlighted as a priority area in need of improvement.

This was most commonly linked to the need for parks and open spaces to be cleaner with many young people making reference to litter and drinking and drug taking in parks. A number of respondents also felt there needed to be more open spaces for young people and children, with one comment stating: "there are not enough safe places for children to play". Connexions was also referenced by a number of young people as a service that they had valued and wanted to see reinstated.

Clean streets were the tenth highest priority for young people and came up as the fifth service in greatest need for improvement. The most common improvement noted was the need for more litter bins, with a high number of requests for recycling bins in public places.

Whilst many young people found it difficult to think about how services could be delivered differently, the most common suggestion was that volunteers could play a greater role in service delivery. This was specifically mentioned in relation to running youth clubs and keeping the streets and other public places, including public toilets, clean. Another common suggestion was around those who are undertaking community service or claiming benefits should be enlisted to help with routine maintenance tasks such as litter picking and planting flowers. There were a few other popular ideas, including reducing street lighting or introducing more environmentally friendly street lighting.

b) Disabled people

The findings contained within this section have been drawn from consultation sessions undertaken in conjunction with Herefordshire Disability United, Ross Carers Group and Deaf Direct.

Unsurprisingly, many of the priorities and issues raised at these sessions relate to health and social care and accessibility issues. There was general consensus amongst respondents that the priorities and areas for improvement highlighted in the 2012 Quality of Life survey were reflective of the priorities for their locality and the county. In addition, public transport, public toilets, the wheelchair service, social care and car parking were also identified as priorities and areas in need of improvement.

For disabled people, access to **public transport** is a high priority particularly in relation to accessing health related services and appointments. The specific issues raised related to difficulties in accessing transport to specialist health care outside of Herefordshire, the inaccessibility of many 'accessible' buses for wheelchair users and the lack of wheelchair accessible taxis in the county. The lack of disability awareness trained taxi drivers was also mentioned.

The proposed closure of **public toilets** in Hereford city centre was a real concern for many people, particularly as many toilets in shops and cafes are not suitable for disabled access and are not open after 5pm. There was specific reference made to the East Street public toilets, which are under threat of closure, as it is the only one in the town centre that is good for wheelchair users.

The importance of retaining and improving the **wheelchair service** was a high priority for many people and was seen as an essential service for many disabled people and their carers. **Social care services** were deemed to be a high priority for many people and there was also strong support for the prioritisation of all services and facilities that enable disabled people to live independently in their own homes.

The issue surrounding personal budgets was raised by a number of respondents, specifically in relation to concerns that this may result in some services becoming out of reach, particularly for rural residents. Additionally, the amount of time taken for personal budget assessments to be undertaken was also highlighted along with a general request for better information and communication. In relation to this a number of people identified the importance of continuity of care and ensuring that people receive the right level of care.

The accessibility of **pavements** was consistently raised as a key priority by disabled people, with the issue of people parking on pavements and blocking dropped kerbs, preventing people in mobility scooters and wheelchairs from safely crossing the road being mentioned. A request was made for more enforcement to prevent people from parking on pavements and also the need for more dropped kerbs.

Car parking was also identified as being an area that was both a priority and in need of improvement. There were issues relating to the lack of disabled parking bays and the cost of parking both in Hereford city centre and at Hereford County Hospital.

There was strong support for continued funding for **voluntary and community sector organisations**, particularly those that deliver health and social care services, as these are seen to provide a life line for many disabled people and their carers.

There was general consensus that disabled people and their carers would like to be more involved in decision making, particularly where outcomes directly affect them, such as reducing the number of disabled parking bays or changes to the blue badge system. They also want to play a greater role in shaping and commissioning services.

It was also felt that there was a need for more cooperation and coordination between service providers, which could lead to greater efficiencies and cost savings.

In addition, concerns were raised about rural residents being disadvantaged in terms of accessing services, an issue which is reflected in the findings from the locality events.

c) **Minority ethnic groups**

The findings contained within this section have been drawn from a session held at the Herefordshire International School and through cascading data.

There was general consensus among participants that most of the priorities and areas for improvement highlighted in the Quality of Life survey were reflective of the priorities for the county. However, an exception to this was road and pavement repairs, which people felt didn't merit its place above affordable decent housing as the most important area for improvement. In addition, translation services and access to public transport in rural areas were also identified as priorities.

Health services within the county were generally regarded as being of high quality, with most participants stating they experienced no problems accessing health services. However, some reported finding it difficult to get appointments when they needed them and in accessing NHS dentists and consultants.

The accessibility of **affordable decent housing** was highlighted as a particular issue for this group with many people perceiving there to be a lack of affordable rental property, while the quality of 'affordable' rental property was poor. This was attributed largely to the requirements and high fees imposed by letting agencies within the county. The impact of this is that many Eastern European migrants are forced to take sub-standard private lettings within shared houses and are often paying above the market rate for a room, for example, £200 a week for a single room. Some also reported difficulties in accessing housing benefit and put this down to failures within the system as opposed to communication problems. It was also felt that migrants needed more help and support to find suitable accommodation, including support for those looking to buy a property.

Under **job prospects**, a number of residents reported that it has become increasingly difficult for non-English speaking migrants to find work, due to the fact that employers are demanding English speaking staff, this was particularly true of the service industry. In relation to this, it was felt there needed to be more opportunities for migrants to learn English and that these courses needed to be accessible, affordable and run at weekends and during the day time to accommodate people's working patterns.

While those participants from Hereford felt that **public transport** was generally good, it was highlighted as being an issue for those living in more rural areas with Clehonger and Kington specifically being mentioned in terms of poor public transport, particularly evening and Sunday services.

There were a number of comments made about the amount of time it takes Herefordshire Council to resolve issues, specifically benefits. The quality of service in relation to this was felt to be poor with people reporting inconsistencies in the information they had been given and having to wait three to nine months for decisions to be made. Significantly, it was felt that these problems were due to the process and internal systems, as opposed to language barriers.

A more general concern was raised about difficulties in reporting issues and accessing services from Herefordshire Council due to language barriers. A specific need for job centre interpreters, better information and support when accessing higher education and in applying for school places was requested. There was strong support for translation services to be retained.

d) Older people aged over 65

The findings contained within this section have been drawn from consultation sessions with Age UK, Ross Carers Group, Deaf Direct and attendees of the South Wye Lunch Club and North Tupsley Action Group (NTAG), along with interviews undertaken with older people by community researchers.

Health services were the most common priority identified by older people with specific reference to the importance of accessing a GP, dentist, hospitals and the ambulance service. There were some specific areas of improvement identified such as the need for better 'out of hours' access, having to wait too long for an appointment, the need for more hospital beds, district nurses and NHS dentists and having to travel to Worcester for some specialist treatment.

Public transport was the second most common service identified as a priority by older people. Bus services were most commonly referred to and using public transport to access health services was identified as a specific priority. There were only a small number of people who made reference to bus passes, but those that did placed a high value on them.

Public transport along with public toilets was the second most common response, in relation to services in greatest need of improvement. The suggestions made were around increasing the frequency of bus services and ensuring a more reliable bus service. Wheelchair accessible public transport was also highlighted as a priority. A few of the comments made, included: "let OAPs use bus passes before 9:30am, as this helps us get to doctors' appointments" and "too many buses have been cut, I can't get around, my daughter has to give me lifts."

Policing closely followed behind public transport in terms of priorities and was the fifth most common response in relation to services in greatest need of improvement. The main comments related to the need for an increased police presence on the streets.

Road and pavement repairs were the fourth highest priority and the service area most in need of improvement. The filling of potholes, maintenance of pavements and improvements to cycle lanes were all highlighted as specific issues.

While **public toilets** only came out as the eleventh highest priority, they were listed as the second most common response in terms of areas in need of improvement. The majority of comments were around the need for them to be cleaner and open after 5pm.

Car parking was the third highest service in need of improvement, but was afforded lower status in terms of priorities, reaching number nine. The improvements most commonly suggested were around the introduction of free or concessionary parking for OAPs, enforcement to reduce people parking on the pavements and the need for more car parking.

While **clean streets** were not deemed to be a high priority, they were the fourth most commonly recorded service in need of improvement, with the majority of comments relating to the presence of dog mess and litter. The need to clear blocked drains to prevent localised flooding was also raised as an issue.

e) People aged 25 to 64

The findings contained within this section have been drawn from consultation sessions with parents from Kington, Ledbury and Leominster children's centres, Herefordshire Housing and interviews with young and community researchers.

Health services were the most common service identified by this age group in terms of priority and the second most common as being in need of improvement. A specific priority was given to accessing dentists and the ambulance service while areas of improvement were identified around

the need for more GPs and funding, reduced waiting times and access to a dentist in the Leominster area. There was also reference to the need for better 'out of hours' access.

Public transport was highlighted as the second highest priority and the area in greatest need of improvement. Bus services were most commonly referred to with cheaper fares, more rural services and increased frequency recorded as the most common areas for improvement. The need for buses to be cleaner and to run later was also highlighted.

Policing was the third priority area for this group and fourth in terms of needing improvement. The comments received were in relation to increasing the number of local police.

Road and pavement repairs were third in terms of needing improvement but were perceived to be less of a priority, only reaching number six. The need to grit the roads, fill potholes and improve cycle lanes were all highlighted as specific issues.

Refuse collection and recycling was the fourth highest priority with specific importance being attributed to recycling. The prioritisation of recycling was also reflected in comments relating to the improvements needed, with increased access to local recycling facilities being most commonly recorded. The introduction of public recycling bins in town centres was also highlighted.

While **public toilets** only came out as priority number fifteen, they were the fifth most commonly recorded service area in need of improvement. The majority of comments related to the need for public toilets to be cleaner.

Education provision was the fourth highest priority but was not seen to be an area in need of significant improvement.

Car parking was the sixth most commonly recorded service in need of improvement but was afforded lower status in terms of priority, as it only reached number eighteen. The improvements all focused on the need for car parking to be cheaper.

In addition, the following issues were also raised by parents at Kington, Ledbury and Leominster children's centres:

- There is a lack of activities for young children across the county.
- The services and advice offered by the children's centres are highly valued and in many cases they are seen as the only place to access advice.
- The width of pavements, particularly in rural areas, is seen as a problem for those with pushchairs. This is potentially dangerous as people are forced to use the road, which in some cases may be very busy.
- It was felt that the condition of children's play areas needs to be improved, as many are littered with drug paraphernalia or dog mess and not seen as safe places to play.
- The availability of a local swimming pool was also seen as important, as a leisure option for children and parents.

4.3) Perceptions of organisations and stakeholders

The perceptions of organisations working within communities were collected from meetings with the Herefordshire Community Development Partnership and Herefordshire Community Development Workers Forum. Please see section 2f on page 8 for further details. At both of these meetings, attendees were invited to discuss their perceptions about what the highest and lowest priorities were for communities, in terms of public services, what service areas required greatest improvement and how services could be delivered differently.

The majority of priorities and areas for improvement raised through these meetings reflect many of the findings from the wider consultation.

A general issue was identified relating to the access of GP surgeries, specifically in communities where the surgery has closed, while anecdotal evidence was provided about the pressure on district nurses in the north of the county. The issue of waiting times to access health services was also raised, with specific reference to mental health and dementia support services. There were also concerns raised about waiting times for social service assessments. These issues were seen to be a particular priority as they often affect people in crisis and stakeholders agreed that funding for preventative health services should also be prioritised, but felt that funding short term preventative initiatives to meet artificial targets was a waste of money and should be avoided.

There was consensus amongst stakeholders that the migration of young people from the county was largely due to the lack of education and job opportunities and needs to be addressed as a priority. The Robert Owen Vocational School was provided as an example of an initiative that was trying to tackle this issue.

There was strong support for volunteering to be used more effectively as a way of addressing skills gaps and supporting people into employment. It was also suggested that changes to the benefit system could be made to accommodate people taking up volunteering opportunities. Stakeholders also identified systemic barriers for people with learning disabilities in accessing training and employment opportunities, which it was felt, could be addressed through more joined up working amongst service providers.

A need for more affordable decent housing was identified for young people in the county, specifically more affordable rental accommodation. This was felt to be an issue in part due to the lack of private landlords willing to rent to housing benefit tenants and as a result there is strong support for a clear social housing allocations policy. A few concerns were raised suggesting that Homepoint may not be the most appropriate way to address and support housing issues.

There was general consensus that planning policy needs to be relaxed and that parish councils, Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) and developers need to be working closely together to enable local solutions to affordable housing. It was also felt that there needed to be greater awareness and emphasis on the Community Right to Build rather than neighbourhood planning.

In addition to the points raised above, stakeholders also felt that improved public transport, the poor condition of the county's roads and speeding would be high priorities for communities in both rural and urban areas.

There were also concerns raised about the loss of youth provision within the county and the impact of further cuts in this area, along with the ageing demographic of the county and the knock on effect on other service areas.

Stakeholders agreed that there was a need for better joined up thinking and working across service areas and better partnership working between service providers, parish councils and communities, to develop local solutions to local service issues. There was also consensus that communities and parish councils would require additional resources and support, if they were going to play a greater role in direct service delivery. Additionally, there is a need for ongoing opportunities for communities to comment on and shape public services including accessibility to individuals in key influencing positions such as councillors, chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, Herefordshire Council directors.

The areas that were perceived to be less of a priority for communities were arts facilities and services and street lighting. There was also a view that spending on council buildings, restructuring and high salaries would also be viewed as low priorities.

4.4) Variations with the Quality of Life survey findings

There was broad consensus in the majority of localities about the priorities identified through the Quality of Life survey (QOL), particularly around the prioritisation of health services and job prospects, although all localities included additional priorities. In the majority of localities, there was some divergence about the relative importance and position of some of the priorities, as highlighted below:

- **Bromyard:** There was a general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for the Bromyard locality, although other additional areas in need of improvement were identified, including youth provision, broadband and road and pavement repairs.
- **Dorstone:** There was a general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for the Golden Valley locality, although similarly to Ewyas Harold below, there was surprise expressed that facilities for young children rather than young people was expressed as a priority and in need of improvement.
- **Ewyas Harold:** There was a general consensus that the QOL results were reasonably reflective of priorities for the Golden Valley locality, although people perceived that facilities and services for young people would have been more in need of improvement than those for young children.
- **Hereford St Barnabus:** There was general consensus that clean streets, which was the top priority listed, was less of a priority than the other areas listed.
- **Hereford Belmont:** There was a general consensus that whilst having a low level of crime and clean streets were important, people felt that there were higher priorities such as health services, job prospects and transport related issues, including traffic congestion and road maintenance. It was also agreed that affordable decent housing was a priority in the south of Hereford.
- **Ledbury:** There was a general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for the Ledbury locality. However, it was felt that youth provision, job prospects, roads and transport and tourism should also be added to the list of areas most in need of improvement.
- **Leintwardine:** There was a general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for this locality, although people had mixed views about affordable decent housing being at the top of the priority list, particularly those from Leintwardine village, along with the high priority afforded to refuse collection. In addition, it was felt that road safety and broadband should form part of the services most in need of improvement.
- **Leominster:** There was general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for this locality, although it was felt that clean streets was not a significant problem in the area and it was something that was already being addressed at a community level. Therefore, it didn't merit such a high priority on the most in need of improvement list.
- **Ross-on-Wye:** There was general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for this locality, but care for the elderly, public transport, broadband and sport and leisure provision were also rated as being priorities.
- **Shobdon:** There was a general feeling that some of the QOL results, affordable decent housing, job prospects and education provision, did not reflect the predominantly aged demographic of the area. Residents also had mixed views about affordable decent housing being at the top of the priority list, particularly those from Shobdon village and the high priority given to refuse collection. A general feeling was that health services should have

been higher up the list. In terms of the areas most in need of improvement, the perception was that road safety and broadband were higher priorities than job prospects, affordable decent housing, wage levels and the local cost of living.

- **Weobley:** There was a general consensus that the QOL results were reflective of priorities for this locality, although people were unsure about access to nature coming above affordable decent housing. In terms of the areas most in need of improvement, the perception was that people in Weobley village felt that public transport was satisfactory and that road and pavement repairs, job prospects and broadband should form part of this priorities list.

Although youth services did not come out as a priority in the Quality of Life survey and was not identified as an area in need of improvement, the need for provision for young people, particularly access to youth facilities, was commonly highlighted during the group discussions as a priority across both rural and urban localities.

Participants expressed a real concern about the diminishing resources for youth provision and the closure of youth clubs across the county. In many areas, this concern was strongly linked with fears that levels of anti-social behaviour and low level crime would increase, if young people were not engaged in some kind of focused activity.

While this was an area that some people felt could be organised and run by community volunteers, there was a strong consensus that volunteers would require a comprehensive level of training and support, which would need to be centrally coordinated and delivered. Significantly, views relating to youth services drawn out of other parts of the consultation are more polarised, see section 4.6c on page 26.

4.5) Comparisons and variations between urban and rural localities

There was a strong feeling in the more rural localities that there was a need for greater parity between the availability and accessibility of services in rural areas and those in Hereford. Participants frequently referred to issues around services being 'Hereford centric', a feeling of being marginalised and requiring a greater level of self-sufficiency than their urban counterparts.

Rural participants also reflected that services often cost more to deliver in rural areas and raised concerns that this would further disadvantage rural areas in the light of public sector cuts. It was strongly felt that the increased cost of delivering services in rural areas should not be passed on to the service user.

The low visibility and lack of presence of police and Community Support Officers (CSOs) was more commonly raised as an issue by those living in rural areas or the market towns than city based residents.

There were also variations to the relative importance of street lighting and this was clearly linked to whether residents lived in rural or urban areas of the county, with rural residents placing significantly less priority on the need for street lighting than their urban counterparts. There was a general consensus that street lighting could be 'turned off or significantly reduced' during the early hours of the morning, however for those living in towns it was felt that sensor controlled lighting may be a more appropriate solution.

The need for action to reduce speeding and traffic calming measures were seen as a much higher priority in rural localities than in more urban areas. This was most commonly seen as a problem in villages which are based either side of a busy main road, such as Fownhope and Shobdon.

4.6) Overview of participants priorities

One of the aims of the consultation was to identify those areas which residents felt were 'less important' or that they 'could do without'. The majority of consultation participants struggled to

identify services that they felt they 'could do without' or that were 'less of a priority', with many comments being made around the importance of all services to a 'well-functioning society'. Some participants were also reluctant to respond, because they felt that a service that isn't important to one person may be very important to someone else. They were also asked to consider how things could be 'done differently' in the future either to improve a service or deliver it more efficiently.

The following information provides an overview of the priorities emerging from the events, as well as areas which were seen as less important from other consultation groups.

a) Findings from the events

As part of the consultation events, participants were encouraged to think about the comparative value they placed on different services and to consider which services they saw as essential and which ones they considered being less of a priority. This was achieved through group exercises and by residents recording their personal views privately. The findings of these exercises are discussed in each of the locality reports, which are available on the council website at: www.herefordshire.gov.uk/yourcommunityyoursay. The following is a summary of the overview of these exercises.

While the services people deemed to be 'must haves' were very broad, ranging from health services to refuse collection, after analysing the priorities from across the consultation, it shows that direct health services, including hospitals, GPs, dentists and ambulance services are consistently recorded as being the most commonly listed priority service areas. However, preventative health services appear to be much less of a priority, with this coming in as the third most commonly recorded service people felt they could do without.

Education was the second most commonly recorded priority service area, closely followed by public transport. It is worth noting in relation to public transport, that a significant number of residents specifically highlighted community transport as a priority. Social care, affordable decent housing and road and pavement maintenance were afforded similar priority with policing following closely behind.

YCYS event participants identified public toilets as the lowest priority, followed by street lighting, public health, parks and open spaces, access to nature and activities for young people respectively. In addition, libraries, cultural services, licensing and trading standards were all frequently seen as lower priorities.

b) Findings from group discussions and cascading

The following is an overview of high and low priorities for individuals or groups that have been identified through group discussions or one to one interviews with young and community researchers or cascading organisations.

Amongst young people, public transport was by far the most common service identified as a priority followed by health services and policing. In terms of areas needing improvement, young people most commonly mentioned public transport and public toilets.

Disabled participants agreed with the Quality of Life findings which stated that policing, health services and affordable decent housing were all priorities. In addition, public transport, public toilets, the wheelchair service, social care and car parking were also identified as both priorities and areas for improvement.

Amongst minority ethnic groups, there was general consensus that most of the priorities and areas for improvement highlighted in the Quality of Life survey were reflective of the priorities for the county. The exception to this was road and pavement repairs which people did not feel merited its place above affordable decent housing, as the most important area for improvement. They also felt that translation services and access to public transport in rural areas were priorities.

Interestingly, older people's priorities mirrored those of young people with public transport most commonly recorded as a high priority followed by health services and policing. Road and pavement repairs closely followed behind policing. In terms of areas needing improvement, older people most commonly mentioned road and pavement repairs and public toilets.

The priorities for the 25 to 64 age group followed a similar pattern with health services being replaced as the most commonly recorded high priority followed by public transport and policing. This age group identified public transport, health services and road and pavement repairs as the services in most need of improvement.

Despite the fact that people acknowledged the need to make savings and that this would inevitably result in services being reduced or cut many people were unable to identify areas that were less of a priority and either chose not to respond to the question or gave none or all important as their response. A few of the specific comments included:

“There should be no cuts, raise cash instead of cutting things.”

“None, the council have cut enough already.”

“None, the council spend money on unimportant things which we believe wastes money.”

For those who did respond, the most popular responses for young people were public toilets, planting schemes, street lighting, libraries and youth clubs. The replacement of road signs was also mentioned by several respondents.

“Changing perfectly good road signs for new ones when the old ones were perfectly serviceable is pointless and not needed and a complete and utter waste of time and money.”

For disabled people, there was some agreement that cultural facilities and services were less essential in comparison to many of the other services.

There were no specific services mentioned by minority ethnic groups as being less important, although those who attended International School workshop broadly agreed with the areas identified as less important from the Quality of Life survey.

When asked what services those over 65 felt were less of a priority, of the minority that responded, the most popular responses were public toilets and street lighting. The same response, with the addition of libraries was recorded for the 25 to 64 age group.

c) Polarised views of the importance of services

Unsurprisingly across such a broad consultation exercise, there will be polarised views in relation to some service areas. These opinions will be informed by a range of factors including someone's age, where they live and their own personal circumstances and experiences. As one participant commented: “for every ten people who think something is not important, there will be ten people who think it is very important.”

The following service areas are those for which opinions expressed were **most** polarised:

- **Public toilets:** The biggest issue in relation to public toilets was that people do not like using them because they are considered to be dirty and unpleasant. For this reason, they were most often cited as being something which people ‘could do without’ if public spending needs to be reduced. However, public toilets were seen as very important for disabled people, who may not be able to access toilets in pubs or shops and they were also considered to be important in relation to supporting the tourist economy.

- **Street lighting:** This was often seen as an area where savings could be made, for example by limiting the hours when street lighting is on. However, for some, particularly those living in towns, it was not a preferred option especially in areas where people feel unsafe after dark. There was also a concern that reduced street lighting would lead to increased levels of crime.
- **Weekly refuse collection:** While it was felt by some that a weekly black bin collection is not needed, due to the high levels of recycling and therefore reduction in waste, others felt that it was very important. Those that felt it was important were mostly people living in towns, who were either concerned that a build up of refuse would lead to rat infestations or who had to store their bin bags close to their house.
- **Youth services:** While youth services, specifically the provision of youth facilities, was commonly raised as a priority by participants at the locality events and was even identified as being relatively important by young people themselves, youth clubs and activities for young people both feature as services that people felt they 'could do without'.

d) Suggestions for how things can be done differently

The most common suggestion for how things could be done differently centred around devolving power, responsibility and resources to parish and town councils, to enable them to deliver local services more efficiently. The range of services that it was felt could be delivered in this way were public toilets, car parks, hedge cutting, parks maintenance, road repairs and ditch clearing through an extension to the lengthsman service, street cleaning, dog wardens, libraries and in some cases the provision of affordable decent housing. It was also felt that parish and town councils could work with local bus operators to improve public transport provision, such as is already in place in Fownhope. There were also services that it was felt could be carried out by volunteers in the future, such as the organisation of activities for young people and litter picks.

However, it was strongly felt that either devolving services or using volunteers to run services should not be considered as a 'free' option. For example, volunteers need to be supported to acquire the right level of training to enable them to carry out their role, while parish and town councils need additional resources if they are to have additional responsibilities. Although there was a willingness by some, although by no means all, parish and town councils to increase their responsibilities, it was felt that the precept was inadequate in terms of financing additional activity and most local councils would not wish to raise the precept.

Improved communication between Herefordshire Council and local councils is seen as being essential to the future delivery of services. Importantly, improved communication between communities and parish and town councils was also seen as essential, if they are to have more involvement in future service delivery.

There were other suggestions for how things may be done differently and more efficiently, which are highlighted in more detail in the individual locality reports, but the common suggestions were:

- Reduce black bin collections to once a fortnight.
- Reduce the hours for street lighting.
- Introduce a fee for using public toilets but also make them cleaner.
- Make internal savings, for example by capping high salaries and not producing Herefordshire Matters, although some people suggested that this could be available online only.
- Introduce means testing in certain areas, particularly where blanket provision of a service currently exists, such as the provision of bus passes for over 65s.

- The use of local contractors for road and pavement repairs, which was linked to a high level of dissatisfaction with Amey and the feeling that they waste resources by, for example, doing too many temporary repairs.
- More joined up working by service providers and more co-production of services

4.7) Perceptions about Herefordshire Council

Despite a willingness to participate in the YCYS consultation and high levels of positive engagement, there was an underlying feeling of cynicism amongst some people about the extent to which the outcomes of YCYS would result in positive change. These negative feelings were associated with previous experiences of Herefordshire Council led consultations.

There was specific reference made to:

- Previous negative experiences of Herefordshire Council led consultations, with examples given of poorly managed events, aggressive challenging from council staff and people being talked at.
- A lack of feedback from previous consultations, despite being promised it.
- The perception that decisions in relation to some service areas had already been made.
- The perception that public opinion is not listened to and is undervalued by Herefordshire Council.
- Previous negative experiences of trying to influence change or address issues of concern relating to their locality.

In addition, there was a strong consensus that delivering transparent, effective and good value public services could be helped by more effective communication between the council and members of the public. This was raised in relation to accessing financial information, making complaints, requesting information and getting things actioned, such as drains being cleared, road signs being replaced and contacting organisations providing outsourced services.

Many participants expressed their frustration at the difficulties in raising issues with council staff and the problem of queries or complaints either 'disappearing into a black hole' or taking too long to get a response or any action. In conjunction with this, several people suggested that this problem could be resolved simply by having named contacts or by adopting a customer query or complaint tracking system, similar to the one used to track courier parcel deliveries.

Associated with this, there was also a request for better internal communication within the council and across the NHS, which it was felt would aid a more joined up approach to service delivery.

It was also felt that internal inefficiencies need to be prioritised ahead of further service cuts. The capping of excessive council salaries was repeatedly mentioned, as was funding associated with internal restructuring and rebranding resulting in 'unnecessary' expenditure, such as the new Herefordshire signs. The Edgar Street Grid development was also perceived to be another 'waste of expenditure' and was seen by many participants as potentially adding to financial difficulties, diverting money away from essential services and being potentially detrimental in terms of the impact it will have on Hereford city centre.

It was also requested that the increased cost of delivering services in rural areas should not be passed on to the end user.

5) Conclusion

Your community – your say has been successful in engaging with a wide range of communities and individuals, 81% of whom have never been involved in a previous consultation, in meaningful dialogue about the future of public services in the county. It has provided residents with an opportunity to talk about the things that are important to them in their own towns and villages and has demonstrated that they value the opportunity to influence and contribute to decisions that affect them. They are also willing to play a greater role in ensuring that local services are retained or reintroduced.

The findings from the YCYS process confirm that there are many different views about the relative importance of public services. However, despite this, it is still possible to draw the following conclusions in relation to priorities, common suggestions and comments on the way that decisions about services should be made:

a) Priorities

- Health services, public transport and policing are unsurprisingly all seen as high priority.
- In the context of reducing budgets, it was felt that public toilets, street lighting, cultural facilities and services and planting schemes are less important to residents. There were also mixed views about the importance of maintaining public rights of way or street cleaning, but general consensus was that these services may be better delivered at a local level.
- The areas which were identified as most in need of improvement were road and pavement repairs and public transport.
- The need for Herefordshire Council to make internal efficiencies and to demonstrate how this has been done was also felt to be a priority.

b) Common suggestions

- It was felt that means testing across more service areas could be applied. This was particularly the case where there is blanket provision of a service, such as free bus passes for over 65s. It was felt that people may be prepared to pay for some services, if they could see an improvement to that service as a result.
- It is essential to maximise existing resources and facilities. For example, increased access to school facilities including mini buses, bringing empty properties back into use and increasing car sharing.
- As a general principle, it was also felt that there should be better integration of services both physically, for example moving the one stop shop into the library and operationally, for example having a single point of contact within social services. It was felt that there needed to be a much more joined up approach to service delivery.
- A culture of collective responsibility and community self-help needs to be engendered. Collectively as a society, we need to encourage people to take more responsibility for their local environment. The examples given in relation to this included farmers being responsible for clearing ditches and mud from roads, shopkeepers keeping the area around their premises tidy, local people carrying out litter picks and introducing voluntary dog warden schemes.
- Devolving service delivery to a local level was also seen as way of improving service delivery and giving local people more control over how services are delivered. The

services which were most often mentioned in relation to this were car parking, maintenance of public areas, street cleaning and public toilets. There was also strong support for using local contractors wherever possible.

- It was strongly felt that Herefordshire Council and other service providers should explore whether services can be delivered differently and more efficiently, before a decision to withdraw a service is made.

c) Suggestions for how decisions relating to services should be made

Participants largely understood the need to make savings when the scale of budget reductions was outlined. Throughout the consultation there was also a strong recognition that decisions relating to changes in services are difficult to make. This is reflected in the fact that those services which the majority of people felt could be done differently, for example street lighting and public toilets were often the areas for which opinions were most polarised.

This demonstrates the importance of taking into account the views of the vulnerable minority, for example disabled people, people living with mental health problems and those on a low income. For these residents, the loss of a service will have a disproportionate effect on their quality of life and the impact of this, needs to be fully understood before any decisions are made.

The following suggestions were made in relation to decision making and it is recommended that these are developed into criteria, which underpin any decisions around changes to public service spending:

- More statistical and financial information relating to service delivery should be provided to the public, to enable more informed decision making. For example, the level of spending on non-statutory services or the cost and take up of services.
- Short term solutions and reductionist thinking should be avoided in the decision making process.
- The loss of a service should be the last option and looking at how things can be done differently should be a priority.
- An impact analysis should be taken for every service which is under threat.
- Those who will be affected by policies or service cuts should play a greater role in decision making processes.

Finally, this consultation process has re-affirmed the importance of involving people in decision making. Herefordshire Council must aim to inform, engage and involve residents to prevent a one way dialogue from taking precedence.

This consultation has highlighted a number of ways in which the dialogue, which has now been started, can be continued:

- A multi-pronged approach to consultation is essential. Residents want to be able to engage in different ways and this is the only way to maximise participation.
- Cascading techniques are most effective in reaching those who don't traditionally engage. The third sector, along with community researchers offer a potential route to hard to reach communities and groups. However, this approach must be adequately resourced.

- Events can be effective but in the future they must be used to report on the progress that has happened since the last event. The use of a participative style of event, such as the YCYS World Café, is also strongly recommended.
- Improved engagement and communication with local councils is essential to understand the priorities and impact on communities if services are changed, but also to support local councils to take on a more enhanced service delivery role.

In order to capitalise on the momentum created by YCYS and to encourage wider public buy-in and trust the following recommendations are proposed.

6) Next steps

Impact Consultancy Services would advise that the council use this report to consider their next steps in three distinct categories:

- How to use the findings to contribute to the current Root and Branch Reviews and budget setting process.
- How to further develop its overall decision making process.
- How to take the YCYS process forward to continue an ongoing dialogue at a local level.

a) Root and Branch Reviews and budget setting

Together with the results from the Quality of Life survey, we would propose that:

- 1) The results are fed back to service providers and Root and Branch Review (R&B) leads, highlighting relevant service issues. Service providers and R&B Review leads need to demonstrate how they are using the information to inform future service provision, although it is recognised that further consultation may be required to test a change of approach in specific areas.
- 2) The council's Cabinet and chief finance officer need to consider the results as part of the budget setting for 2013 / 2014 and demonstrate how this information has been used within budget recommendations.
- 3) The council considers how to take forward locality specific issues through its lead locality officers. Locality officers should be asked to identify 'priorities for action' and work with key partners, including service providers and local community leaders, to inform their locality work programme and report their progress.
- 4) The information gathered should also feed into 'understanding Herefordshire', to provide additional context which will inform corporate planning for Herefordshire Council and other organisations delivering services across the county.

b) The decision making process

We would propose that the suggestions outlined in section 5c on page 30 are developed into criteria that underpin decision making in relation to public service spending. The following also need to be considered:

- 1) Local residents should have a greater role in deciding which services are delivered and how they are delivered within their community. Whichever mechanism is used to develop a more local approach to service delivery, commissioners and providers should be required to demonstrate how local people have been and will continue to be, more involved in design, delivery and feedback. There needs to be greater emphasis on the co-

commissioning and co-production of local services, with community representatives involved in all aspects of the commissioning cycle.

- 2) There needs to be a closer working relationship and greater involvement in local decision making between Herefordshire Council and its partner organisations, especially those operating at a local level such as town and parish councils.

c) How to take the YCYS process forward

- 1) The Your community – your say branding could be developed into a credible branding for all council consultations. However, this would require a clear policy framework and corporate sign up to a set of standards. The Your community - your say branding should include the continued use of online channels, such as Facebook, Twitter and the discussion forum with identified resources to ensure effective management.
- 2) Any prescheduled two-way discussions involving partner organisations should be held in each locality area and used as a focus for current consultations, to update people on activity and progress and as an opportunity to canvass opinions from residents on a regular basis.
- 3) There should be an ongoing commitment to a multi-pronged approach to consultations to ensure the widest possible engagement, particularly using methods which engage with those who normally don't participate through traditional consultation methods. Any engagement should be rotated across different villages and venues to encourage participation from different communities.
- 4) Local ward members and town and parish councils should be supported to engage with their communities. An example of this would be working with parish councils to run local consultations in their own communities and ensuring that the results are fed back and considered by Herefordshire Council and other service delivery partners.
- 5) A contact database of those residents who participated in the YCYS process needs to be developed and used to encourage ongoing dialogue with these individuals, such as sending personal invitations to attend other consultation events or initiatives and approaching them to act as YCYS champions to encourage other community members to participate.
- 6) An ongoing commitment needs to be made to provide feedback around the findings and outcomes of council consultations. This needs to be as widely available as possible including providing written feedback summaries to participants, information on the council website and in the local media and the use of the YCYS Facebook and Twitter accounts and online discussion forum.
- 7) A database of local communication channels for each locality needs to be developed, including community websites, parish newsletters, local shops and community libraries, to ensure more effective communication with localities.

Appendix A

Please find a list of YCYS events and workshops below:

Locality events

Location	Venue	Date
Ross-on-Wye	Larruperz Community Centre	20 September
Ledbury	St Katherine's Hall	24 September
Ewyas Harold	Ewyas Harold Memorial Hall	25 September
Leintwardine	Leintwardine Village Hall	26 September
Dorstone	Dorstone Village Hall	27 September
Weobley	Weobley Village Hall	1 October
Hereford	Belmont Community Centre	2 October
Shobdon	Shobdon Village Hall	8 October
Bromyard	The Falcon Hotel	9 October
Kington	The Burton Hotel	10 October
Leominster	Bridge Street Sports Centre	15 October
Hereford	St Barnabas Church Centre	17 October
Fownhope	Fownhope Memorial Hall	24 October
Cleghonger	Cleghonger Primary School	8 November

Additional YCYS events and workshops

Activity	Date
Herefordshire Community Development Partnership meeting	18 September
Herefordshire Community Development Workers Forum meeting	20 September
St Peters Centre open day in Peterchurch	22 September
YCYS event at International Saturday School	16 October
YCYS event at Herefordshire Disability United	17 October
Leominster Area Regeneration Company (LARC) meeting	22 October
Discussion with Ocle Pychard Parish Council at Burley Gate Village Hall	23 October

Young Peoples Shadow Board meeting	23 October
Ledbury Children's Centre Parents Forum	31 October
Herefordshire Carers Support Group in Ross-on-Wye	7 November
Kington Children's Centre	21 November
Leominster Children's Centre Young Parent Group	21 November

The below topic guide was used at the Your community – your say locality events:

Your community - your say

Your community – your say event programme.....Bromyard

By the end of these discussions we should:

- Better understand people’s priorities and have identified specific services they would prioritise.
- Know to what extent they are satisfied with how these services are currently run and what it is specifically they would want to improve.
- Have explored and identified alternative ways of delivering and resourcing services.
- Know what services are less of a priority and which services people may be willing to give up in order to retain the services they value.

Time	Activity	Lead / Notes
6:00pm – 6:45pm	Venue set up Display sign in maps and postcode sheet Arrange tablecloths (write the name of the locality on top of each cloth) Arrange the comments box / parking lot	Facilitators <i>Set of 3 tablecloths / pens / sweets / signing in sheets / sticky labels / post-it notes</i>
6:45pm – 7:10pm	Registration (at tables) Geographical monitoring information using the maps	Facilitators <i>Give people pins and a table number</i>
7:10pm – 7:20pm (10 mins)	Event welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show YCYS DVD with Cllr Jarvis • Context setting • Lead into facilitated discussions 	Nominated councillor DVD Lead Locality Officer Impact
7:20pm – 7:45pm (25 mins)	Table discussions Q1) Which public services do you feel are priorities for the county and your local area Supplementary questions and prompts: The QOL survey highlighted health services, the level of	Facilitators & Scribes Before you start your discussions..... <i>Make sure everyone has completed the monitoring sheet – it is particularly important that they give us a means of contacting</i>

	<p>crime and education provision as the top three priorities for people in Bromyard (written on the tablecloth)</p> <p>County results for this question were the level of crime, health services and affordable decent housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do you agree with these? Are there others you would want to add? <p>(write them on the tablecloth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there <u>specific</u> services that you would prioritise? <p>If it has not already been raised, ask people what their priorities are in relation to transport, roads and travel. We are asking this because the Local Transport Plan is currently out for consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is it you value about these services? (accessibility, frequency, reliability, nature of service....) Are there services you think are particularly good? What makes them stand out? <p>Encourage people to give real examples, including ones from other areas.</p>	<p><i>them so we can send them findings from the event. Please check the contact information is legible</i></p> <p><i>Make sure everyone has stuck their pin on the map</i></p> <p><i>Get people to write their first names and where they are from on their sticky labels. Facilitators to write first name and facilitator on their label</i></p> <p><i>Remind people that we are talking about all public services not only those delivered by or on behalf of Herefordshire Council (including: fire service, police, NHS) and give people a sense of the range of public services – see sheet provided</i></p> <p><i>Tell people what the three key questions are and when the break will be</i></p>
<p>7:45pm – 8:10pm (25 mins)</p>	<p>Table discussions (new tablecloth)</p> <p>Q2) What do we need to improve and how can we do things differently to improve services? (alternative service delivery options)</p> <p>Supplementary questions and prompts:</p> <p>The QOL survey highlighted that in the Bromyard area public transport, affordable decent housing and job prospects are the areas that most need improving and are the highest priorities.</p> <p>These three issues will already be written on the tablecloth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do you agree with these? Are there others you would want to add? 	<p>Facilitators & Scribes</p> <p><i>Please spend equal time on both parts of this question (areas for improvement and doing things differently)</i></p> <p><i>Provide examples of alternative service delivery from the list provided or others you are familiar with</i></p> <p><i>County results for this question were road and pavement repairs, affordable decent housing and job prospects</i></p> <p><i>Encourage people to give real examples including ones from</i></p>

	<p>(write them on the tablecloth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there <u>specific</u> services that you particularly think need improving? • In what ways do they need improving? • Would you like a greater say in how services are run? How would you do this? • How effectively are these services able to respond to local needs? • How could we change this? <p>(prompt: Services being delivered at a more local level?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could services be delivered differently? (prompts: Run by the local community / private companies / jointly run?) • What do you think about communities taking over the running of some services? • What sort of services do you think communities could run for themselves? <p>(reference information from the QOL survey)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What might prevent this? <p>(lack of skill / experience / resources...)</p>	<p><i>other areas</i></p> <p><i>Closure of mobile library service (still demand for service) solution was enhanced home delivery service and establishment of local volunteer run community libraries. Result being service users increased and service able to respond better to local needs</i></p> <p><i>458 bus service Fownhope – Dormington - Mordiford to Ross-on-Wye a twice weekly shopper bus service subsidised by parish councils (£3.70)</i></p>
<p>8:10pm – 8:25pm (15 mins)</p>	<p>Refreshment break</p> <p>Encourage people to look at what other people have said (the tablecloths will be displayed for comment) and talk to officers / councillors all sitting at table 1.</p> <p>This is also an opportunity for people to move tables</p>	<p><i>First two tablecloths to be clearly displayed for viewing and comment</i></p>
<p>8:25pm – 8:50pm (25 mins)</p>	<p>Table discussions</p> <p>Q3) What public services are less important to you?</p> <p>Exercise - Get the group to allocate different services (written on cards) under the headings of:</p> <p>Must have / Nice to have / Could do without</p> <p>Blank cards will also be provided for services not included to be written on</p> <p>If group can't reach consensus, put it on a separate pile and ask the scribe to record differing opinions</p>	<p>Facilitators & Scribes</p> <p><i>The QOL survey highlighted that race relations, cultural facilities (e.g. libraries, museums and sports and leisure facilities) were the least important things for people in Bromyard</i></p> <p><i>County results for this question were race relations, levels of pollution, help for people with disabilities and cultural facilities (e.g. libraries, museums)</i></p>

	<p>If you have time, once sorted go through each pile and prioritise</p> <p>Use this exercise as a way of getting people to think about the reality of having to lose or reduce some services in order to retain the services they most value</p> <p>Task - Get people to write on the tablecloth the top three services that they would want retained and the three services they would be happy to forego</p> <p>Evaluation - Give people evaluation sheets to complete before they leave</p>	<p><i>Refer back to earlier examples provided</i></p> <p><i>This should be done from a personal perspective</i></p> <p><i>Ask people to complete and hand in the evaluation before they leave</i></p>
<p>8:50pm – 9:00pm (10 mins)</p>	<p>Thank you, how we will provide feedback and evaluation</p> <p>Remind people about the online consultation methods available</p> <p>Close</p>	<p>Lead Locality Officer</p>
<p>9:15pm – 9:30pm</p>	<p>Facilitator debriefing session</p>	<p>Facilitators</p>

Appendix C

The following is a list of participating stakeholders:

Annie Gamble	Age UK
Sarah Jenkins	Age UK
Liz Stavey	Age UK
Julie Milsom	Barton Hill Centre
Jo Pewsey	Here for the City and Herefordshire Voluntary Organisations' Support Services (HVOSS)
Lynda Wilcox	Herefordshire Association of Local Councils (HALC) chief executive
Nina Bridges	Herefordshire Council sustainable communities manager
Alex Cottrell	Herefordshire Council sustainable communities officer
Alex Fitzpatrick	Herefordshire Council third sector liaison officer
Mariell Biggar	Herefordshire LINK
Chris Gooding	Herefordshire Partnership community led planning co-ordinating and commissioning officer
Richard Betterton	Herefordshire Voluntary Organisations' Support Services (HVOSS)
Angela Dunning	Herefordshire Voluntary Organisations' Support Services (HVOSS)
Diane Gibson	Home Start Herefordshire
Elizabeth Riley	Home Start Herefordshire
Cal Edwards	Mansell Lacey Community Association
Dawn Killeen	Newton Farm Community Association

Event evaluation

All participants who attended a YCYS event were asked to provide feedback on the event itself and what they would like to see happen as a result of the consultation. A significant majority of the comments received in relation to the format of the event were very positive with people particularly welcoming the opportunity to take part in small group discussions, the openness of those discussions and the feeling that their views were valued.

The high quality and approachable nature of the facilitators was also frequently commented upon, with comments including:

“It was a good event, well listened to by the facilitator.”

“Lively discussion well facilitated.”

“The informal method of listening and recording views and comments.”

“Good format around tables in small groups.”

“I enjoyed people considering my views and ideas, I also liked the diversity and depth taken when looking through the issues.”

“I liked that I could put my opinions across with people listening to what I have to say.”

“Use this format again.”

When we asked what people didn't like about the event, the most common response was a fear that nothing would come as a result of consultation. Participants also recorded their disappointment that more people hadn't attended events in some areas and there was a perception that the publicity for the events had been insufficient.

Some of these comments included:

“Will any of our ideas be listened to?”

“Give us more power to get on and do it for ourselves.”

“Too much focus on front line services, little mention of overheads and management back office.”

The actions that participants most frequently said they wanted to see happen next were: feedback on what had come out of the consultation, devolution of budgets and responsibility at a local level to parish and town councils and evidence of the consultation findings being used to positively influence decision making.

A few comments included:

“Give local people a budget, so they can allocate resources to services.”

“Need to take a different approach, if we need to do without things, should start with the executive and re-branding.”

“Would like feedback and to know that Herefordshire Council are prepared to take on board some if not all suggestions and take a radical approach as necessary.”

“We would like some signals that our council leadership really is taking on board the views of the public.”

Young researcher’s evaluation

The young researchers participated in a group discussion to evaluate the consultation process. They highlighted the following elements during this discussion:

What they liked:

- The fact that they were given the opportunity to be part of the consultation.
- The training received in interview techniques and the purpose of the consultation.
- The way the consultation was organised.
- The skills that they had acquired as a result of the process.
- Getting to know each other and talking to other people about the consultation.
- The fact that they were paid for their participation.

What they felt could be improved:

- The questions that were asked, as it sometimes felt as though they were repetitive.
- Better identification badges would be needed in the future.
- The recording of information, as it was difficult to write fast enough to capture what people were saying.

Appendix E

The following tables highlight the monitoring information collected during the Your community – your say process:

Age and ethnicity:

YCYS events	Total numbers	0 - 15	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 - 74	75 +	White	White other	Other
Leintwardine	12	0	2	1	12	1	1	11	1	0
Bromyard	43	0	0	4	18	15	3	30	0	0
Hereford (Belmont)	14	0	0	1	8	2	3	12	0	0
Hereford (St Barnabas)	16	0	0	0	8	7	1	16	0	0
Leominster	9	0	0	1	3	4	1	9	0	0
Ross-on-Wye	24	0	0	1	12	7	4	22	1	1
Shobdon	8	0	0	2	2	4	0	8	0	0
Ledbury	44	0	0	5	16	17	6	40	0	0
Eywas Harold	10	0	0	1	5	4	1	10	1	0
Kington	35	0	0	1	15	16	3	20	0	0
Weobley	20	0	0	0	8	12	0	17	0	0
Dorstone	18	0	1	0	10	6	1	18	0	0
Clehonger	11	0	0	1	3	4	3	11	0	0
Fownhope	31	0	1	1	6	11	12	28	0	0

Where participants heard about the YCYS events:

YCYS events	Councillor	Facebook	Flyer	Invitation	Twitter	Word of mouth	Newspaper	Poster	Banner	Other
Leintwardine	3	0	1	1	0	4	0	1	2	Leintwardine Life parish newsletter
Bromyard	6	1	0	6	0	5	4	3	5	Local website: www.bromyard.info , parish clerk, e-mail to school head teachers and chairs and Herefordshire Council's website
Hereford (Belmont)	1	0	2	1	1	2	1	2	4	Herefordshire Partnership Executive Group, Herefordshire Council's website, cluster meeting and through working for the council
Hereford (St Barnabas)	2	0	4	2	0	3	3	2	4	Via employer and the parish clerk
Leominster	1	0	5	0	0	2	3	1	0	Herefordshire Community Development Partnership
Ross-on-Wye	7	1	3	6	1	4	6	0	0	Parish clerk and e-mail
Shobdon	4	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	Community First, Ecohere e-mail and hall booking
Ledbury	19	1	1	7	0	4	2	0	6	Parish council and church
Eywas Harold	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	0	2	Longtown School Governors and Herefordshire Council's website

Kington	1	0	4	4	0	3	2	7	4	Herefordshire Disability United and e-mail
Weobley	1	0	0	3	0	3	0	6	3	Village magazine, Weobley website and parish clerk
Dorstone	3	0	2	1	0	2	0	4	2	Parish council and The Link newsletter
Clehonger	5	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	N/A	Parish council and a leaflet from the school
Fownhope	6	0	0	1	0	6	0	1	N/A	Parish clerk and via table tennis club

Participants who have previously been involved in a Herefordshire Council consultation:

YCYS events	Yes	No
Leintwardine	9	3
Bromyard	19	11
Hereford (Belmont)	8	6
Hereford (St Barnabas)	7	10
Leominster	5	4
Ross-on-Wye	13	11
Shobdon	3	5
Ledbury	20	24
Eywas Harold	6	5
Kington	11	9
Weobley	10	6
Dorstone	8	9
Clehonger	8	3
Fownhope	7	8

Age and ethnicity (other events and workshops):

Other events and workshops	Total number	0 - 15	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 - 74	75 +	White	White other	Other
Burley Gate Village Hall	7	0	0	4	3	0	0	6	0	0
Herefordshire Carers Support	14	0	0	0	3	3	18	12	0	0
International Saturday School	12	0	0	9	3	0	0	0	12	0
Herefordshire Disability United	14	0	0	2	6	4	2	11	2	0
Young Peoples Shadow Board	14	12	2	0	0	0	0	14	0	0
South Wye Lunch Club	10	0	0	0	1	6	3	10	0	0
Ledbury Children's Centre Parents Forum	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	0	0
Leominster Children's Centre Young Parent Group	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	0	0
Kington Children's Centre	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	0	0
Community Development Workers Forum	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0
Community Development Partnership	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0
Leominster Area Regeneration Company (LARC)	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	0	0
St Peters Centre in Peterchurch	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	0	0
Total	715	12	6	34	141	117	59	335	17	0

Where participants heard about the YCYS events (other events and workshops):

Other events and workshops	Councillor	Facebook	Flyer	Invitation	Twitter	Word of mouth	Newspaper	Poster	Banner
Burley Gate Village Hall	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	N/A
Herefordshire Carers Support	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

International Saturday School	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Herefordshire Disability United	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	0	0
Young Peoples Shadow Board	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
South Wye Lunch Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ledbury Children's Centre Parents Forum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leominster Children's Centre Young Parent Group	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kington Children's Centre	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Development Workers Forum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Development Partnership	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leominster Area Regeneration Company (LARC)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
St Peters Centre in Peterchurch	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	66	4	24	46	2	46	26	29	32

Participants who have previously been involved in a Herefordshire Council consultation (other events and workshops):

Other events and workshops	Yes	No
Burley Gate Village Hall	2	5
Herefordshire Carers Support	1	11
International Saturday School	0	12
Herefordshire Disability United	12	2
Young Peoples Shadow Board	11	2
South Wye Lunch Club	9	1
Ledbury Children's Centre Parents Forum	0	6
Leominster Children's Centre Young Parent Group	0	3
Kington Children's Centre	6	0
Community Development Workers Forum	N/A	N/A
Community Development Partnership	N/A	N/A
Leominster Area Regeneration Company (LARC)	12	0

St Peters Centre in Peterchurch	0	3
---------------------------------	---	---

Information gathered through cascading and young and community researchers:

Cascading, young and community researchers	Total number	0 - 15	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 - 74	75 +	Involved in previous consultations: Yes	Involved in previous consultations: No
Young researchers	570	219	146	81	83	25	16	8	580
Community researchers	49	0	13	25	0	7	4	0	49
Age UK	12	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	12
Deaf Direct	28	0	0	0	8	10	10	2	26
West Mercia Women's Aid	21	0	1	15	5	0	0	0	
Herefordshire Housing	63	0	5	31	25	0	2	3	60
Total	743	219	165	152	121	44	42	13	727