

Newton Poppleford & Harpford Housing Styles Survey Analysis

Principles:

This survey was designed to permit a degree of quantitative analysis, in addition to qualitative analysis of free text comments. In asking participants to rate their top three options and any that they find unacceptable, responses could be analysed for their overall acceptability to the community, with a design that is broadly found to be acceptable potentially obtaining a higher score than one that polarises opinion.

Q1a – Materials to use for walls

Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1; unacceptable option = -1 point. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

The highest scoring option overall was reclaimed brick (75.8 points) followed by new brick (66.3). Some support for stone (38.8) and cob effect (36.5)

Unpopular options were plastic/uPVC cladding (-21) and modern/glass & metal materials (-11).

The most commonly-selected first choice material (outright) was brick (n=13 and n=11 for new and reclaimed brick respectively)

The most commonly-selected material as one of the top three preferences was new brick (n=28) followed by reclaimed brick (n=26) and stone (n=21)

The most unacceptable materials were plastic/uPVC cladding and modern/glass & metal (n=20 each)

Q1b – Materials to use for roof

Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1; unacceptable option = -1 point. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

The highest-scoring option by some distance was slate tiles (97 points), with the next most popular options being clay tiles (58.5) then thatch (43.7)

Slate was the first choice option for 15 respondents (and one of top three choices for 45 respondents), followed by clay (n=10) then solar tiles (n=9)

The least popular option was metal (-15.5), followed by plastic tiles (-14.2).

18 respondents found a metal roof to be unacceptable, with 16 deeming plastic tiles unacceptable. Some opposition to grass/living roof (n=8) and solar tiles (n=6)

Q2a – Materials to use for hardstanding

Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1; unacceptable option = -1 point. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

Greencore (69.5 points), brick (66.5) and gravel (61.2) were all similarly popular options for hardstanding areas.

However, six respondents found gravel to be unacceptable, a more polarising option than either brick (n=3) or greencore (n=2)

Although greencore was the first choice option of the highest number of respondents (n=15), brick (n= 36) and gravel (n=34) were both in the top three options of a higher number of respondents than greencore (n=31).

The least popular option by some distance was concrete (8.5 points) with the highest number of people considering it unacceptable (n=11), although this was the first choice of a small number of respondents (n=3), i.e. a slightly polarising option.

Q2b – Type of car parking

Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1; unacceptable option = -1 point. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

The most popular option by some distance was for provision of driveways (95.5 points), followed by garages (73.3) and car ports (54.3)

On-street parking was considered unacceptable by the largest number of respondents (n=17) and was the first choice option of no respondents

If parking for a group of properties is to be clustered, respondents would prefer this to take the form of allocated parking spaces (25 points; 5 unacceptable) than a shared car park (2.8 points; 10 unacceptable)

Q3 – Number of parking spaces

Analysis of responses – mode, median and mean values, plus ranges, were determined for each house size.

Both the most common (mode) and middle (median) responses were for provision of a minimum of 1, 2 and 2 car parking spaces for 1-bed, 2-bed and 3-bed houses respectively. For 4+-bed houses, the most common response was 2 spaces, but the middle value was 3 spaces.

Responses ranged from 1-3 spaces for 1-bed and 2-bed houses, from 2-4 spaces for 3-bed houses and from 2-5 spaces for 4+-bed houses.

Average (mean) values were as follows: 1-bed = 1.35; 2-bed = 1.81; 3-bed = 2.45; 4+-bed = 2.81.

Q4 – House frontage

Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1; unacceptable option = -1 point. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

Open lawns (49.6 points), stone walls (49.1) and brick walls (46.9) were all considered approximately equally acceptable for house frontages. The most common first-choice options were brick wall (n=10) and open lawns (n=9), but stone walls were one of the favourite three options more often (n=28) than either open lawns (n=27) or brick walls (n=23). No respondents found brick or stone walls unacceptable, whereas 3 considered open lawns to be unacceptable.

Privet hedging (n=18), wooden fencing (n=15) and car parking (n=11) also were one of the top three options for a significant number of respondents, but were considered unacceptable by others (5 people, 2 people and 7 people respectively).

Other frontages suggested by respondents were: railings/shrubs; wild hedgerows; mixed hedge.

Several options obtained net negative scores: gabions (-10.4); conifer hedging (-1.6) and rendered walls (-1.1). Metal fencing received a score of 1.1.

Q5 – Street aspect

Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1; unacceptable option = -1 point. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.