

Our Frogmore & Sherford Community NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Evidence Base

February 2020

Submitted by the qualifying body:

Frogmore and Sherford Parish Council

<https://frogmoreandsherford.co.uk/>

for:

Frogmore and Sherford Neighbourhood Plan

<https://frogmoreandsherford.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan>

HOUSING NEEDS

The last full Parish Housing Needs Survey was produced by the Community Council of Devon on behalf of the Devon Rural Housing Partnership in March 2007. At that stage 25% of Frogmore’s housing provided social rented accommodation, comprising a total of 43 homes at Winslade Close and Appletree Close. The report recommended that *‘in Frogmore and Sherford additional affordable properties are built to meet the identified need for 24 new homes. The overwhelming need is for social rented accommodation.’*

The parish has 52 homes managed by registered providers of social housing, all of which are in Frogmore village. They comprise three estate developments as follows:

- **Appletree Close, Frogmore TQ7 2UT**, comprises 22 one, two and three bedroom homes built and managed by Guinness Housing Association Limited. These houses were constructed in the 1980s. 21 are under social rent tenure and one was sold in 2006 under shared ownership.
- **Winslade Close, Frogmore TQ7 2NX** comprises 21 one and two bedroom bungalows for older residents, built and managed by Guinness Housing Association Limited. Constructed in the 1960s, all are let on social rent tenure with qualifying principal occupiers being over 50 years of age.
- **Creek Close, Frogmore TQ7 2FG** comprises 9 one, two, three and four bedroom homes built and managed by Hastoe Housing Association Limited. Completed in 2017, all are under social rent tenure.

Analysis

Dwelling numbers and tenure:

Parish wide

Dwellings	Private	Social tenure
243	191	52
	21%	79%

Frogmore village

Dwellings	Private	Social tenure
175	52	123
	30%	70%

Sherford and countryside

Dwellings	Private	Social tenure
68	68	0
	100%	0%

The 9 Creek Close social rent houses were let in accordance with Devon Home Choices selection criteria. Applications are placed into 1 of 5 housing need bands based on an assessment of housing need, and whether applicants have a local connection to Devon. 2 successful applicants were assessed in Band C (Medium need), 2 were in Band D (Low need) and the remaining 5 were assessed as Band E (No need).

The Creek Close post code is TQ7 2FG. The next table includes the ‘band of successful applicant’ information in the 11th column from the left.

Frogmore and Sherford Neighbourhood Plan: Evidence Base - February 2020

AFFORDABLE HOUSING -FROGMORE AND SHERFORD PARISH

Table below provided by:

Cassandra Harrison | Housing Specialist | BA (Hons) MCIH

South Hams District Council | West Devon Borough Council

'Report containing all the affordable rent properties let in the area requested'

20th May 2019

All addresses: Frogmore, Kingsbridge, Devon

advert_number	postcode	area_description	subAreaDescription	number_bedrooms	property_type_desc	aa_category_code	total_number_bids	let_bid_position	Band of successful applicant	landlord_name	affordable_total_rent	BID_STATUS_MODIFIED_DATE
3529645	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	1	House	5-General I	31	13	BandD	Hastoe	421.1	02-Feb-17
3529645	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	1	House	5-General I	31	13	BandD	Hastoe	421.1	02-Feb-17
3529647	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	3	House	5-General I	34	24	BandE	Hastoe	601.64	28-Oct-16
3529648	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	4	House	5-General I	45	9	BandC	Hastoe	701.93	28-Oct-16
3529646	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	2	House	5-General I	39	36	BandE	Hastoe	521.43	28-Oct-16
3529646	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	2	House	5-General I	39	36	BandE	Hastoe	521.43	28-Oct-16
3529646	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	2	House	5-General I	39	36	BandE	Hastoe	521.43	28-Oct-16
3529646	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	2	House	5-General I	39	36	BandE	Hastoe	521.43	02-Feb-17
3530579	Frogmore, TQ7 2FG	South Hams	SH_Frogmc	2	House	5-General I	46	7	BandC	Hastoe	521.43	02-Feb-17
3530555	Frogmore, TQ7 2UT	South Hams	SH_Sherfoi	2	House	5-General I	14	6	BandD	The Guinne	85.33	13-Oct-16

South Hams District Council Housing Office advised in May 2019 that Devon Home Choice registered interest in the parish was as follows:

Frogmore

Band	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E
No of Beds	Emergency	High Need	Med. Need	Low Need	No Need
1 bed	0	2	0	2	1
2 bed	0	0	1	0	1
3 bed	0	0	1	0	0
4 bed	0	0	1	0	0
Total	0	2	3	2	2

Sherford

Band	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E
No of Beds	Emergency	High Need	Med. Need	Low Need	No Need
1 bed	0	0	0	0	0
2 bed	0	0	0	1	0
3 bed	0	0	0	0	1
4 bed	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	1	1

There are occasional re-lettings within the existing affordable housing stock. Two of the families moved to Creek Close vacating houses in Guinness Housing Association Limited's Appletree Close, Frogmore. Winslade Close tenants occasionally relocate to Kingsbridge and Chillington to be closer to health care and other services.

In response to a request for guidance on whether or not a further Housing Needs survey was required for the parish, Cassandra Harrison, Housing Specialist, South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council advised 23rd May 2019: '*I can confirm that a Housing Needs survey will not be necessary. There is enough evidence available already.*'

To be economically viable new affordable housing developments need to meet funding 'critical mass' and the Registered Provider's management criteria. The provision of 9 affordable houses proved to be sufficient at Creek Close as a Rural Housing Exception site. A smaller number may be feasible, particularly if built as an extension to an existing affordable housing scheme.

THE PARISH CONTEXT

The parish consists of two village communities and [5] outlying hamlets and farmsteads. Frogmore is comparatively well serviced, being located on the main A379 road, whereas Sherford is more remote from services. As referenced above approximately 30% of Frogmore's dwellings are managed by two registered social landlords providing affordable homes for rent. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group elected to analyse parish views via its engagement and questionnaire programme separately for Frogmore and Sherford and outlying parish areas. They are also presented in combined form.

PARISH QUESTIONNAIRE

The neighbourhood Plan Steering Group invited all parishioners and stakeholders to express their views and identify priorities including housing, infrastructure, employment, community facilities, the environment and access to service. Drop in meetings were held as follows:

- Sherford Village Hall: Saturday 9th September, 2017, 10 am - 2 pm and Monday 11th September 2017, 3 pm - 8 pm.
- Frogmore Village Hall: Thursday 14th September 2017, 3 pm - 8pm, Saturday 16th September 2017, 10 am – 2 pm and Saturday 23rd September 2017, 10 am - 2 pm.

A comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire was hand delivered to all parish addresses in December 2017. This included all individuals assessed as probably registered on the electoral role and thus to be entitled to vote in the referendum (having been instructed via our MP that the Department for Communities and Local Government did not sanction the use of the Electoral Role for our purpose under the provisions of the 2001 Representation of the Peoples' Act, which would incur us in an 'unlimited fine' had we used it).

186 completed questionnaires were received in sealed boxes, representing 45% of the total delivered. Some respondents indicated that they were replying on behalf of themselves and other family members. Many respondents added additional views and comments as invited, and these have been accounted in drafting the Plan. The summaries are divided into those received from (1) Frogmore and those from (2) Sherford and hamlets and businesses in the north of the parish and (3) the composite parish summary.

FROGMORE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1 A DRAFT VISION

The questionnaire is about key issues and different options to address them. We begin, however, with a suggested draft 'Vision' statement:

'We would like Frogmore & Sherford to grow as a sustainable community meeting the needs of local people, to be an ever better place to live and work, retaining the historic character of the two villages, its rural setting and the community spirit. We want to achieve improvements in local infrastructure and enhanced facilities. Our ambition is also to protect and celebrate the rich landscapes and waterscapes within our parish.'

1.0	DRAFT VISION	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
1.01	My response to the draft vision (above)	3	4	9	53	56	6%	7%	87

2 PARISH LIFE

Our community

2.0	COMMUNITY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.01	We have a friendly, active community	2	4	17	80	26	5%	13%	82%
2.02	More village events should be encouraged	0	6	40	66	16	5%	31%	64%
2.03	Parish community buildings should continue to be improved	0	6	22	63	34	5%	18%	77%
2.04	More amenities are needed for young people	2	17	51	33	23	15%	41%	44%
2.05	We need more community amenity open spaces	7	43	44	18	12	40%	36%	24%

The built environment

2.2	BUILT ENVIRONMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.21	We need to safeguard our villages' heritage	0	0	8	42	82	0%	6%	94%
2.22	We should retain the rural character of the parish	0	0	5	33	93	0%	4%	96%
2.23	We need to retain/protect our beautiful countryside	0	0	6	26	99	0%	5%	95%
2.24	Development should be restricted in designated areas of outstanding beauty	1	8	2	17	103	7%	1%	92%

Other community considerations.

2.4	COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.41	We need more footpath/cycle/bridle ways	7	19	31	44	28	20%	24%	56%
2.42	Improved broadband services are needed	1	8	25	54	39	7%	20%	73%
2.43	We need to plan for more businesses and employment opportunities	17	26	32	37	14	34%	25%	41%
2.44	We have traffic safety problems on our roads	6	12	17	35	61	14%	13%	73%
2.45	Public access to Frogmore Creek should be improved	4	31	23	44	27	27%	18%	55%
2.46	Improved access to health care facilities is needed	1	23	41	44	20	19%	32%	49%
2.47	More local shops and services are needed	9	38	35	35	11	37%	27%	36%
2.48	Better visitor parking provision is required	7	25	36	39	18	26%	29%	45%

3 NEW HOUSING

3.0	HOUSING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.01	A need for more housing in the parish?	38	23	19	30	13	50%	15%	35%

Type of housing needed

3.1	HOUSING contd.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.11	New homes should be restricted to satisfying local need	7	6	7	36	43	13%	7%	80%
3.12	Priority should be given to 'affordable' tenure homes	9	15	20	32	22	25%	20%	55%
3.13	New homes should be sited within existing village boundaries	13	7	16	30	31	21%	16%	63%
3.14	New homes may be sited anywhere suitable within the parish	28	17	12	30	5	49%	13%	38%
3.15	Areas of outstanding natural beauty are not suitable new homes locations	13	5	7	19	58	18%	7%	75%
3.16	The development of second or holiday homes should be restricted	6	3	5	27	62	9%	5%	86%
3.17	Sheltered housing accommodation is needed within the parish	13	20	30	29	8	33%	30%	37%

Large, medium or small development?

3.2	HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SIZE	Agree	% total
3.21	Development of single homes only	20	17%
3.22	Developments typical of 1-3 homes	35	29%
3.23	Developments typical of 4-9 homes	24	20%
3.24	Developments typical of 10-15 homes	5	4%
3.25	Developments typical of 16-20 homes	4	3%
3.26	Developments typical of more than 20 homes	3	3%
3.27	No additional home developments	28	24%

Your housing needs

Do you, or a close family member have, or contemplating having, a need for additional housing in the parish over the next five years?

3.3	YES	NO
3.31	20	121

If YES, what type of housing would be sought?

3.4	HOUSING NEED	No of dwellings	Ave. no. occupants	Ave. no. bedrooms	Year in which required	Dwelling type %
3.41	Affordable house to rent	4	2	2	Within 3 years	20%
3.42	Affordable housing to buy outright or via shared ownership	5	4	4	Within 3 years	25%
3.43	Private rented	0	0	0	-	0%
3.44	Private ownership	2	3	4	Within 3 years	10%
3.45	Sheltered housing with resident care	0	0	0	-	0%
3.46	Building plot for self build	6	4	3	Within 3 years	30%
3.47	Live and work accommodation	3	5	3	Within 3 years	15%

Other housing considerations

3.7	HOUSING contd.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.71	Design should generally be in a traditional style	1	8	23	46	33	8%	21%	71%
3.72	Design should generally be in a contemporary style	13	40	40	6	0	54%	40%	6%
3.73	Houses should have off street parking or a garage	1	0	7	57	48	1%	6%	93%
3.74	Maximum building height should be two storeys above ground	1	4	6	44	56	5%	5%	90%
3.75	Design should respect heritage and conservation in materials selection	1	3	10	43	51	4%	9%	87%
3.76	Private gardens are important considerations	1	1	16	53	39	2%	15%	83%
3.77	Include green spaces around developments	2	4	18	44	40	5%	17%	78%

4 PARISH ECONOMY

Employment

4.0	IN EMPLOYMENT	Full Time	Part Time	% Full time	% part time
4.01	I am in employment (not at my home) in the parish	7	3	15%	7%
4.02	I am in employment outside the parish	10	7	22%	15%
4.03	I work from my home in the parish	9	10	20%	22%

4.1	NOT IN EMPLOYMENT	Seeking work	Not seeking work	Retired	Seeking work %	Not seeking work %	Retired %
4.11	I am not in employment	1	6	79	1%	7%	92%

Education & training

4.2	EDUCATION OR TRAINING	Full Time	Part Time
4.21	I am receiving education or training	2	1

About employment opportunities

4.4	PARISH BUSINESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.41	Support agricultural business expansion and diversification	10	18	24	59	15	22%	19%	59%
4.42	Support marine business expansion and diversification	6	15	28	65	11	17%	22%	61%
4.43	Support growth in hospitality business (catering, accommodation etc.)	4	14	41	59	5	15%	33%	52%
4.44	Support growth in craft workshop-based business	3	8	20	80	16	9%	16%	75%
4.45	Support visitor services and facilities, e.g. for heritage visitors, walkers, boat users	6	9	29	69	13	12%	23%	65%

New parish businesses?

4.6	PARISH BUSINESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.61	Make provision for the development of factory and warehouse premises	67	31	19	7	2	78%	15%	7%
4.62	Make provision for more service industry premises	47	26	32	15	4	59%	26%	15%
4.63	Make provision for small workshop and craft business premises	13	11	23	65	16	19%	18%	63%

Issues to be addressed

4.8	PARISH ECONOMY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.81	Better IT communication capacity	1	8	14	68	29	7%	12%	81%
4.82	Improved A379 road infrastructure	3	10	22	38	48	11%	18%	71%
4.83	Off-street car parking on premises	2	7	10	57	45	8%	8%	84%
4.84	Adequate service road capacity for vehicular movement /manoeuvring	3	7	18	48	46	8%	15%	77%

5 TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Public transport

5.0	USE OF TRANSPORT	Never	Occasionally	About once a Week	About once a month	More than once a week	% Never	% Occasional	% Regular
5.01	Public buses	21	23	2	3	0	43%	47%	10%
5.02	Community (Coleridge) bus	43	3	0	2	0	90%	6%	4%
5.03	Taxis	23	23	1	1	0	48%	48%	4%
5.04	Car sharing	26	14	4	1	4	53%	29%	18%

How many vehicles and bicycles does your household regularly use?

5.1	VEHICLES AND BICYCLES	None	1	2	3	4 or more	None	1	2 or more
5.11	Car	0	18	33	1	0	0%	35%	65%
5.12	Commercial van	51	0	0	0	1	98%	0%	2%
5.13	Motorbike/ scooter/moped	51	1	0	0	0	98%	2%	0%
5.14	Bicycle	36	4	8	1	3	69%	8%	23%
5.15	Mobility vehicle	52	0	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%
5.16	Camper van / caravan	48	4	0	0	0	92%	8%	0%

Roads

5.2	ROADS AND PARKING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.21	A lower speed limit is needed on the A379 through Frogmore village	3	12	11	13	13	29%	21%	50%
5.22	Physical traffic calming measures are needed on the A379	11	16	9	9	6	53%	18%	29%
5.23	Off-street parking provision should be required for all new development	1	0	4	20	27	2%	8%	90%
5.24	More car parking capacity is required in our village centres	3	4	16	23	5	14%	31%	55%
5.25	A strategic highways review focused on reducing A379 traffic is needed	2	4	16	16	11	12%	33%	55%

Pedestrians

5.4	PEDESTRIANS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.41	I am satisfied that pedestrians are safe using our roads and available pavements	19	19	8	4	1	74%	16%	10%
5.42	I would like improvements to the network of pavements / parish paths	1	2	10	20	18	6%	20%	74%
5.43	I would support proposals for new 'green' (off road) footpaths linking villages	1	2	4	21	23	6%	8%	86%
5.44	I would support proposals for a safe A379 pedestrian crossing near Frogmore bridge	1	4	9	23	14	10%	18%	72%
5.45	I would support proposals for more access to the countryside footpaths	1	3	8	20	19	8%	16%	76%
5.46	I would support proposals for improved Frogmore Creek public access	0	2	15	21	13	4%	29%	67%

Cyclists

5.6	CYCLE ROUTES	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.61	I am in favour of improving conditions to promote more cycling in the parish	2	8	12	15	14	20%	23%	57%
5.62	I favour, in principle, segregated cycle ways covering main routes	5	10	7	20	9	29%	14%	57%
5.63	I favour promoting parish wide recreational cycle ways	3	9	10	18	11	23%	20%	57%

Bridle paths

5.8	BRIDLEWAYS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.81	I am in favour of increasing the number of bridleways across the parish	3	3	9	25	13	11%	17%	72%

6 RENEWABLE ENERGY

Renewable energy sources

6.0	RENEWABLE ENERGY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
6.01	I am in favour of the installation of non-domestic solar panel farms in the parish	27	11	3	8	5	70%	6%	24%
6.02	I am in favour of the installation of non-domestic wind turbines in the parish	31	6	6	6	5	69%	11%	20%
6.03	I am in favour of the installation of anaerobic digesters for renewable energy	10	2	15	19	7	23%	28%	49%

7 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

Communications

7.0	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
7.01	I have a good telephone landline service	6	5	9	27	7	20%	17%	63%
7.02	I am able to receive a high capacity and high speed broadband service	28	17	5	4	0	84%	9%	7%
7.03	I have a good mobile phone service signal coverage	39	11	2	2	0	92%	4%	4%
7.04	I am able to access 3G services	36	6	8	2	0	81%	15%	4%

8 FINALLY

8.0	FINALLY	I agree	I disagree	Agree %	Disagree %
8.01	'This completed questionnaire including my comments reflects my local concerns and covers the issues I would like taken into account in preparing the parish Neighbourhood Plan'.	46	1	98%	2%

Optional, what is your gender?

8.2	Gender	Male	Female	Male %	Female %	Unspecified %
8.21	I am:	27	27	49%	49%	2%

Optional, what is your age group?

8.3	Age group	Under 17 years	17- 25 years	26- 35 years	36- 45 years	46- 55 years	56- 70 years	71- 85 years	86 years or over
8.31	I am in the age group:	0	0	0	8	7	23	15	0
%	% of all respondents	0%	0%	0%	15%	13%	43%	28%	0%

SHERFORD

1 A DRAFT VISION

The questionnaire is about key issues and different options to address them. We begin, however, with a suggested draft 'Vision' statement:

'We would like Frogmore & Sherford to grow as a sustainable community meeting the needs of local people, to be an ever better place to live and work, retaining the historic character of the two villages, its rural setting and the community spirit. We want to achieve improvements in local infrastructure and enhanced facilities. Our ambition is also to protect and celebrate the rich landscapes and waterscapes within our parish.'

1.0	DRAFT VISION	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
1.01	My response to the draft vision (above)	1	1	1	26	23	4%	2%	94%

2 PARISH LIFE

Our community

2.0	COMMUNITY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.01	We have a friendly, active community	1	0	8	22	22	2%	15%	83%
2.02	More village events should be encouraged	2	3	18	27	3	9%	34%	57%
2.03	Parish community buildings should continue to be improved	0	1	9	29	14	2%	17%	81%
2.04	More amenities are needed for young people	0	3	19	19	12	6%	36%	58%
2.05	We need more community amenity open spaces	1	11	18	16	7	23%	34%	43%

The built environment

2.2	BUILT ENVIRONMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.21	We need to safeguard our villages' heritage	1	0	2	16	33	2%	4%	94%
2.22	We should retain the rural character of the parish	1	0	1	16	34	2%	2%	96%
2.23	We need to retain/protect our beautiful countryside	1	0	2	11	38	2%	4%	94%
2.24	Development should be restricted in designated areas of outstanding beauty	1	2	3	12	34	6%	6%	88%

Other community considerations.

2.4	COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.41	We need more footpath/cycle/bridle ways	0	6	12	16	18	12%	23%	65%
2.42	Improved broadband services are needed	0	0	3	13	36	0%	6%	94%
2.43	We need to plan for more businesses and employment opportunities	0	10	18	16	8	19%	35%	46%
2.44	We have traffic safety problems on our roads	0	3	11	20	17	6%	22%	72%
2.45	Public access to Frogmore Creek should be improved	0	3	15	22	11	6%	29%	65%
2.46	Improved access to health care facilities is needed	3	5	22	15	6	16%	43%	41%
2.47	More local shops and services are needed	2	13	22	10	4	29%	43%	28%
2.48	Better visitor parking provision is required	4	12	16	16	3	31%	32%	37%

3 NEW HOUSING

3.0	HOUSING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.01	There is a need for more housing in the parish?	5	20	12	17	1	45%	22%	33%

Type of housing needed

3.1	HOUSING contd.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.11	New homes should be restricted to satisfying local need	2	6	3	20	18	16%	6%	78%
3.12	Priority should be given to 'affordable' tenure homes	2	6	8	15	18	16%	17%	67%
3.13	New homes should be sited within existing village boundaries	1	6	8	21	13	14%	16%	70%
3.14	New homes may be sited anywhere suitable within the parish	13	13	7	14	2	53%	14%	33%
3.15	Areas of outstanding natural beauty are not suitable new homes locations	0	4	7	13	26	8%	14%	78%
3.16	The development of second or holiday homes should be restricted	0	6	2	11	30	12%	4%	84%
3.17	Sheltered housing accommodation is needed within the parish	2	5	20	15	6	14%	42%	44%

Large, medium or small development?

3.2	HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SIZE	Agree	% total
3.21	Development of single homes only	13	25 %
3.22	Developments typical of 1-3 homes	17	33%
3.23	Developments typical of 4-9 homes	12	23%
3.24	Developments typical of 10-15 homes	2	4%
3.25	Developments typical of 16-20 homes	0	0%
3.26	Developments typical of more than 20 homes	0	0%
3.27	No additional home developments	8	15%

Your housing needs

Do you, or a close family member have, or contemplating having, a need for additional housing in the parish over the next five years?

3.3	YES	NO
3.31	10	45

If YES, what type of housing would be sought?

3.4	HOUSING NEED	No of dwellings	Ave. no. occupants	Ave. no. bedrooms	Year in which required	Dwelling type %
3.41	Affordable house to rent	3	3	2	Within 3 years	30%
3.42	Affordable housing to buy outright or via shared ownership	2	3	2	Within 3 years	20%
3.43	Private rented	1	3	3	Within 3 years	10%
3.44	Private ownership	4	2	3	Within 3 years	40%
3.45	Sheltered housing with resident care	0	0	0	-	-
3.46	Building plot for self build	0	0	0	-	-
3.47	Live and work accommodation	0	0	0	-	-

Other housing considerations

3.7	HOUSING contd.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.71	Design should generally be in a traditional style	0	2	18	15	14	4%	37%	59%
3.72	Design should generally be in a contemporary style	11	10	23	3	0	45%	49%	6%
3.73	Houses should have off street parking or a garage	0	0	7	24	30	0%	11%	89%
3.74	Maximum building height should be two storeys above ground	0	0	3	30	18	0%	6%	94%
3.75	Design should respect heritage and conservation in materials selection	0	2	8	22	19	4%	16%	80%
3.76	Private gardens are important considerations	0	0	14	19	17	0%	28%	72%
3.77	Include green spaces around developments	0	4	5	25	16	8%	10%	82%

4 PARISH ECONOMY

Employment

4.0	IN EMPLOYMENT	Full Time	Part Time	% Full time	% part time
4.01	I am in employment (not at my home) in the parish	2	0	9%	0%
4.02	I am in employment outside the parish	3	3	13%	13%
4.03	I work from my home in the parish	10	5	43%	22%

4.1	NOT IN EMPLOYMENT	Seeking work	Not seeking work	Retired	Seeking work %	Not seeking work %	Retired %
4.11	I am not in employment	0	3	28	0%	10%	90%

Education & training

4.2	EDUCATION OR TRAINING	Full Time	Part Time
4.21	I am receiving education or training	0	0

About employment opportunities

4.4	PARISH BUSINESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.41	Support agricultural business expansion and diversification	0	6	7	28	11	12%	13%	75%
4.42	Support marine business expansion and diversification	0	3	17	20	10	6%	34%	60%
4.43	Support growth in hospitality business (catering, accommodation etc.)	0	2	16	25	9	4%	31%	65%
4.44	Support growth in craft workshop-based business	0	2	9	25	14	4%	18%	78%
4.45	Support visitor services and facilities, e.g. for heritage visitors, walkers, boat users	0	2	16	24	10	4%	31%	65%

New parish businesses?

4.6	PARISH BUSINESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.61	Make provision for the development of factory and warehouse premises	20	19	10	3	0	75%	19%	6%
4.62	Make provision for more service industry premises	11	10	15	16	0	40%	29%	31%
4.63	Make provision for small workshop and craft business premises	1	0	9	35	7	2%	17%	81%

Issues to be addressed

4.8	PARISH ECONOMY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.81	Better IT communication capacity	0	0	2	15	32	0%	4%	96%
4.82	Improved A379 road infrastructure	0	5	13	15	17	10%	26%	64%
4.83	Off-street car parking on premises	0	1	6	22	21	2%	12%	86%
4.84	Adequate service road capacity for vehicular movement /manoeuvring	0	3	10	17	20	6%	20%	74%

5 TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Public transport

5.0	USE OF TRANSPORT	Never	Occasionally	About once a Week	About once a month	More than once a week	% Never	% Occasional	% Regular
5.01	Public buses	21	23	2	3	0	43%	47%	10%
5.02	Community (Coleridge) bus	43	3	0	2	0	90%	6%	4%
5.03	Taxis	23	23	1	1	0	48%	48%	4%
5.04	Car sharing	26	14	4	1	4	53%	29%	18%

How many vehicles and bicycles does your household regularly use?

5.1	VEHICLES AND BICYCLES	None	1	2	3	4 or more	None	1	2 or more
5.11	Car	0	18	33	1	0	0%	35%	65%
5.12	Commercial van	51	0	0	0	1	98%	0%	2%
5.13	Motorbike/ scooter/moped	51	1	0	0	0	98%	2%	0%
5.14	Bicycle	36	4	8	1	3	69%	8%	23%
5.15	Mobility vehicle	52	0	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%
5.16	Camper van / caravan	48	4	0	0	0	92%	8%	0%

Roads

5.2	ROADS AND PARKING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.21	A lower speed limit is needed on the A379 through Frogmore village	3	12	11	13	13	29%	21%	50%
5.22	Physical traffic calming measures are needed on the A379	11	16	9	9	6	53%	18%	29%
5.23	Off-street parking provision should be required for all new development	1	0	4	20	27	2%	8%	90%
5.24	More car parking capacity is required in our village centres	3	4	16	23	5	14%	31%	55%
5.25	A strategic highways review focused on reducing A379 traffic is needed	2	4	16	16	11	12%	33%	55%

Pedestrians

5.4	PEDESTRIANS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.41	I am satisfied that pedestrians are safe using our roads and available pavements	19	19	8	4	1	74%	16%	10%
5.42	I would like improvements to the network of pavements / parish paths	1	2	10	20	18	6%	20%	74%
5.43	I would support proposals for new 'green' (off road) footpaths linking villages	1	2	4	21	23	6%	8%	86%
5.44	I would support proposals for a safe A379 pedestrian crossing near Frogmore bridge	1	4	9	23	14	10%	18%	72%
5.45	I would support proposals for more access to the countryside footpaths	1	3	8	20	19	8%	16%	76%
5.46	I would support proposals for improved Frogmore Creek public access	0	2	15	21	13	4%	29%	67%

Cyclists

5.6	CYCLE ROUTES	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.61	I am in favour of improving conditions to promote more cycling in the parish	2	8	12	15	14	20%	23%	57%
5.62	I favour, in principle, segregated cycle ways covering main routes	5	10	7	20	9	29%	14%	57%
5.63	I favour promoting parish wide recreational cycle ways	3	9	10	18	11	23%	20%	57%

Bridle paths

95.8	BRIDLEWAYS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.81	I am in favour of increasing the number of bridleways across the parish	3	3	9	25	13	11%	17%	72%

6 RENEWABLE ENERGY

Renewable energy sources

6.0	RENEWABLE ENERGY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
6.01	I am in favour of the installation of non-domestic solar panel farms in the parish	27	11	3	8	5	70%	6%	24%
6.02	I am in favour of the installation of non-domestic wind turbines in the parish	31	6	6	6	5	69%	11%	20%
6.03	I am in favour of the installation of anaerobic digesters for renewable energy	10	2	15	19	7	23%	28%	49%

7 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

Communications

7.0	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
7.01	I have a good telephone landline service	6	5	9	27	7	20%	17%	63%
7.02	I am able to receive a high capacity and high speed broadband service	28	17	5	4	0	84%	9%	7%
7.03	I have a good mobile phone service signal coverage	39	11	2	2	0	92%	4%	4%
7.04	I am able to access 3G services	36	6	8	2	0	81%	15%	4%

8 FINALLY

8.0	FINALLY	I agree	I disagree	Agree %	Disagree %
8.01	'This completed questionnaire including my comments reflects my local concerns and covers the issues I would like taken into account in preparing the parish Neighbourhood Plan'.	46	1	98%	2%

Optional, what is your gender?

8.2	Gender	Male	Female	Male %	Female %	Unspecified %
8.21	I am:	27	27	49%	49%	2%

Optional, what is your age group?

8.3	Age group	Under 17 years	17- 25 years	26- 35 years	36- 45 years	46- 55 years	56- 70 years	71- 85 years	86 years or over
8.31	I am in the age group:	0	0	0	8	7	23	15	0
%	% of all respondents	0%	0%	0%	15%	13%	43%	28%	0%

COMBINED PARISH RESULTS

1 A DRAFT VISION

The questionnaire is about key issues and different options to address them. We begin, however, with a suggested draft 'Vision' statement:

'We would like Frogmore & Sherford to grow as a sustainable community meeting the needs of local people, to be an ever better place to live and work, retaining the historic character of the two villages, its rural setting and the community spirit. We want to achieve improvements in local infrastructure and enhanced facilities. Our ambition is also to protect and celebrate the rich landscapes and waterscapes within our parish.'

1.0	DRAFT VISION	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
1.01	My response to the draft vision (above)	4	5	10	79	79	5%	6%	89%

2 PARISH LIFE

Our community

2.0	COMMUNITY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.01	We have a friendly, active community	3	4	25	102	48	4%	14%	82%
2.02	More village events should be encouraged	2	9	58	93	19	6%	32%	62%
2.03	Parish community buildings should continue to be improved	0	7	31	92	48	4%	17%	79%
2.04	More amenities are needed for young people	2	20	70	52	35	12%	39%	49%
2.05	We need more community amenity open spaces	8	54	62	34	19	35%	35%	30%

The built environment

2.2	BUILT ENVIRONMENT	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.21	We need to safeguard our villages' heritage	1	0	10	58	115	1%	5%	94%
2.22	We should retain the rural character of the parish	1	0	6	49	127	1%	3%	96%
2.23	We need to retain/protect our beautiful countryside	1	0	8	37	137	1%	4%	95%
2.24	Development should be restricted in designated areas of outstanding beauty	2	10	5	29	137	6%	3%	91%

Other community considerations.

2.4	COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
2.41	We need more footpath/cycle/bridle ways	7	25	43	60	46	18%	24%	58%
2.42	Improved broadband services are needed	1	8	28	67	75	5%	16%	79%
2.43	We need to plan for more businesses and employment opportunities	17	36	50	53	22	30%	28%	42%
2.44	We have traffic safety problems on our roads	6	15	28	55	78	12%	15%	73%
2.45	Public access to Frogmore Creek should be improved	4	34	38	66	38	21%	21%	58%
2.46	Improved access to health care facilities is needed	4	28	63	59	26	18%	35%	47%
2.47	More local shops and services are needed	11	51	57	45	15	35%	32%	33%
2.48	Better visitor parking provision is required	11	37	52	55	21	27%	30%	43%

3 NEW HOUSING

3.0	HOUSING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.01	There is a need for more housing in the parish?	43	43	31	47	14	48%	18%	34%

Type of housing needed

3.1	HOUSING contd.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.11	New homes should be restricted to satisfying local need	9	12	10	56	61	14%	7%	79%
3.12	Priority should be given to 'affordable' tenure homes	11	21	28	47	40	22%	19%	59%
3.13	New homes should be sited within existing village boundaries	14	13	24	51	44	19%	16%	65%
3.14	New homes may be sited anywhere suitable within the parish	41	30	19	44	7	50%	14%	36%
3.15	Areas of outstanding natural beauty are not suitable new homes locations	13	9	14	32	84	15%	9%	76%
3.16	The development of second or holiday homes should be restricted	6	9	7	38	92	10%	5%	85%
3.17	Sheltered housing accommodation is needed within the parish	15	25	50	44	14	27%	34%	39%

Large, medium or small development?

3.2	HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SIZE	Agree	% total
3.21	Development of single homes only	33	19%
3.22	Developments typical of 1-3 homes	52	31%
3.23	Developments typical of 4-9 homes	36	21%
3.24	Developments typical of 10-15 homes	7	4%
3.25	Developments typical of 16-20 homes	4	2%
3.26	Developments typical of more than 20 homes	3	2%
3.27	No additional home developments	36	21%

Your housing needs

Do you, or a close family member have, or contemplating having, a need for additional housing in the parish over the next five years?

3.3	YES	NO
3.31	30	166

If YES, what type of housing would be sought?

3.4	HOUSING NEED	No of dwellings	Ave. no. occupants	Ave. no. bedrooms	Year in which required	Dwelling type %
3.41	Affordable house to rent	7	3	2	Within 3 years	23%
3.42	Affordable housing to buy outright or via shared ownership	7	4	3	Within 3 years	24%
3.43	Private rented	1	3	3	Within 3 years	3%
3.44	Private ownership	6	3	4	Within 3 years	20%
3.45	Sheltered housing with resident care	0	0	0	-	0%
3.46	Building plot for self-build	6	4	3	-	20%
3.47	Live and work accommodation	3	5	3		10%

Other housing considerations

3.7	HOUSING contd.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
3.71	Design should generally be in a traditional style	1	10	41	61	47	7%	26%	67%
3.72	Design should generally be in a contemporary style	24	50	63	9	0	51%	43%	6%
3.73	Houses should have off street parking or a garage	1	0	14	81	78	1%	8%	91%
3.74	Maximum building height should be two storeys above ground	1	4	9	74	74	3%	6%	91%
3.75	Design should respect heritage and conservation in materials selection	1	5	18	65	70	4%	11%	85%
3.76	Private gardens are important considerations	1	1	30	72	56	1%	19%	80%
3.77	Include green spaces around developments	2	8	29	69	56	6%	15%	79%

4 PARISH ECONOMY

Employment

4.0	IN EMPLOYMENT	Full Time	Part Time	% Full time	% part time
4.01	I am in employment (not at my home) in the parish	9	3	13%	4%
4.02	I am in employment outside the parish	13	10	19%	14%
4.03	I work from my home in the parish	19	15	28%	22%

4.1	NOT IN EMPLOYMENT	Seeking work	Not seeking work	Retired	Seeking work %	Not seeking work %	Retired %
4.11	I am not in employment	1	9	107	1%	9%	90%

Education & training

4.2	EDUCATION OR TRAINING	Full Time	Part Time
4.21	I am receiving education or training	2	1

About employment opportunities

4.4	PARISH BUSINESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.41	Support agricultural business expansion and diversification	10	24	7	87	26	22%	5%	73%
4.42	Support marine business expansion and diversification	6	18	45	85	21	14%	26%	60%
4.43	Support growth in hospitality business (catering, accommodation etc.)	4	16	57	84	14	11%	33%	56%
4.44	Support growth in craft workshop-based business	3	10	29	105	30	7%	17%	76%
4.45	Support visitor services and facilities, e.g. for heritage visitors, walkers, boat users	6	11	45	93	23	10%	25%	65%

New parish businesses?

4.6	PARISH BUSINESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.61	Make provision for the development of factory and warehouse premises	87	50	29	10	2	77%	16%	7%
4.62	Make provision for more service industry premises	58	36	47	31	4	53%	27%	20%
4.63	Make provision for small workshop and craft business premises	14	11	32	100	23	14%	18%	68%

Issues to be addressed

4.8	PARISH ECONOMY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
4.81	Better IT communication capacity	1	8	16	83	61	5%	10%	85%
4.82	Improved A379 road infrastructure	3	15	35	53	65	10%	21%	69%
4.83	Off-street car parking on premises	2	8	16	79	66	6%	9%	84%
4.84	Adequate service road capacity for vehicular movement /manoeuvring	3	10	28	65	66	8%	16%	76%

5 TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Public transport

5.0	USE OF TRANSPORT	Never	Occasionally	About once a Week	About once a month	More than once a week	% Never	% Occasional	% Regular
5.01	Public buses	53	84	11	11	14	31%	48%	21%
5.02	Community (Coleridge) bus	137	25	2	2	4	80%	15%	5%
5.03	Taxis	83	68	2	4	4	48%	46%	6%
5.04	Car sharing	98	47	13	4	10	57%	27%	16%

How many vehicles and bicycles does your household regularly use?

5.1	VEHICLES AND BICYCLES	None	1	2	3	4 or more	None	1	2 or more
5.11	Car	9	75	79	11	3	5%	42%	53%
5.12	Commercial van	160	15	1	0	2	90%	8%	2%
5.13	Motorbike/ scooter/moped	166	4	3	1	0	96%	2%	2%
5.14	Bicycle	138	15	14	3	5	79%	9%	12%
5.15	Mobility vehicle	173	1	1	0	0	98%	1%	1%
5.16	Camper van / caravan	162	14	0	1	0	91%	8%	1%

Roads

5.2	ROADS AND PARKING	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.21	A lower speed limit is needed on the A379 through Frogmore village	15	33	30	37	63	27%	17%	56%
5.22	Physical traffic calming measures are needed on the A379	23	50	28	29	46	41%	16%	43%
5.23	Off-street parking provision should be required for all new development	3	3	9	61	100	3%	5%	92%
5.24	More car parking capacity is required in our village centres	7	16	52	73	28	13%	30%	57%
5.25	A strategic highways review focused on reducing A379 traffic is needed	5	20	40	43	67	14%	23%	63%

Pedestrians

5.4	PEDESTRIANS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.41	I am satisfied that pedestrians are safe using our roads and available pavements	75	58	25	17	3	75%	14%	11%
5.42	I would like improvements to the network of pavements / parish paths	4	8	36	67	62	7%	20%	73%
5.43	I would support proposals for new 'green' (off road) footpaths linking villages	1	6	17	75	81	4%	9%	87%
5.44	I would support proposals for a safe A379 pedestrian crossing near Frogmore bridge	7	18	34	63	58	14%	19%	67%
5.45	I would support proposals for more access to the countryside footpaths	3	14	25	77	61	9%	14%	77%
5.46	I would support proposals for improved Frogmore Creek public access	4	16	44	77	38	11%	25%	64%

Cyclists

5.6	CYCLE ROUTES	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.61	I am in favour of improving conditions to promote more cycling in the parish	11	36	58	40	28	27%	34%	39%
5.62	I favour, in principle, segregated cycle ways covering main routes	13	32	43	56	25	27%	25%	48%
5.63	I favour promoting parish wide recreational cycle ways	11	27	53	56	23	22%	31%	47%

Bridle paths

95.8	BRIDLEWAYS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
5.81	I am in favour of increasing the number of bridleways across the parish	5	22	47	68	35	15%	27%	58%

6 RENEWABLE ENERGY

Renewable energy sources

6.0	RENEWABLE ENERGY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
6.01	I am in favour of the installation of non-domestic solar panel farms in the parish	78	47	20	22	13	70%	11%	19%
6.02	I am in favour of the installation of non-domestic wind turbines in the parish	88	32	19	25	18	66%	10%	24%
6.03	I am in favour of the installation of anaerobic digesters for renewable energy	31	11	55	62	19	24%	31%	45%

7 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

Communications

7.0	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Agree %
7.01	I have a good telephone landline service	8	8	21	106	38	9%	11%	80%
7.02	I am able to receive a high capacity and high-speed broadband service	41	42	38	46	11	47%	21%	32%
7.03	I have a good mobile phone service signal coverage	80	43	15	35	6	69%	8%	23%
7.04	I am able to access 3G services	62	21	37	36	6	51%	23%	26%

8 FINALLY

8.0	FINALLY	I agree	I disagree	Agree %	Disagree %
8.01	'This completed questionnaire including my comments reflects my local concerns and covers the issues I would like taken into account in preparing the parish Neighbourhood Plan'.	165	3	98%	2%

Optional, what is your gender?

8.2	Gender	Male	Female	Male %	Female %	Unspecified %
8.21	I am:	83	96	45%	53%	2%

Optional, what is your age group?

8.3	Age group	Under 17 years	17- 25 years	26- 35 years	36- 45 years	46- 55 years	56- 70 years	71- 85 years	86 years or over
8.31	I am in the age group:	0	3	7	19	16	73	55	5
%	% of all respondents	0%	2%	4%	10%	9%	41%	31%	3%