



**RESEARCH FOR TODAY**  
LIMITED

77 Gunnersbury Avenue, London W5 4LP

Telephone: 020 8992 4877

Fax: 020 8993 5818

E-mail [simalto@researchfortoday.com](mailto:simalto@researchfortoday.com)

# **Tunbridge Wells Borough Council**

## **2007 Budget Input Consultation Using SIMALTO Modelling**

**November 2006**

# Contents

---

	Page Number
Background	3
Objectives	3
Method	4
Sample	5
Summary	6
Recommendations	7
SIMALTO grid summary information	8
Attribute Improvement Priorities	9
Satisfaction and Willingness to Pay for Alternative Scenarios	10
Modelling Information	12
Optimum Best Value Total Budgets	13
Value Hierarchy of Individual Improvements	14
Predicting Satisfaction for Consensus Budgets	16
Predicting Preferences Between Alternative Budgets	17
Appendix 1 Detailed Summary of Service Priorities	20
Appendix 2 Questionnaire and SIMALTO Grid	28

## **Background**

---

- ❑ Tunbridge Wells Borough Council desired resident input to their 2007 Budget Allocation decision making process
- ❑ In order that this should be as relevant and accurate possible, the SIMALTO Modelling approach was adopted
- ❑ This method asks respondents to make their priorities from a choice of defined alternative levels of each service
- ❑ In effect they are informing the council where services should expand/contract to better meet their needs
- ❑ Their choices are 'realistic' since the relative savings/extra costs of each different service level are shown to residents, and they only have fixed, constrained budgets to allocate across the competing service levels
- ❑ This recognises some changes save/cost more than others, and residents (councils) cannot spend the same money twice

## **Main Objectives**

---

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council wanted to know resident feelings about the allocation of council tax between various services in 2007 and beyond.

- ❑ Which current service levels could be reduced in order to cause least 'distress' among residents?
- ❑ Which improvements, if any, on other services should take priority?
- ❑ Would residents be willing to pay more council tax, beyond an expected annual inflation increase, to minimise net reductions in service benefits?

## Method

---

Tunbridge Wells Council had prepared a matrix with 26 attributes showing different services on which the council might change its service level from 2006 to 2007 (See SIMALTO Grid in Appendix 2). Individual alternative levels of service are described, each with the relative cost of their change from other levels of the same attribute, e.g. extending to 4 additional older person communities (2 units, (3-1) on attribute 19) costs twice as much as providing 5 extra playground refurbishments (1 unit, (2-1) on attribute 24).

Very approximately, 1 point on the grid represents £40,000 of council budget, and the current service 'costs' 55 units on the grid. Respondents were invited to carefully read the whole sheet, and then carry out the following tasks. (The full questionnaire is given in the appendix.)

### ***Task 1***

Cross out any options they thought were unacceptable, i.e. would cause them to complain or seriously consider doing so if this level of service was provided.

### ***Task 2***

Indicate the 5 or 6 services they thought were most important.

### ***Task 3***

Read the options in the first option box on each row, and indicate how 'pleased' they would be if that level of service were to be provided by the council.

### ***Task 4***

Allocate between 24 and 26 points on improving the overall service from this basic first option box position (first priorities)

### ***Task 5***

Allocate a further 10 points – second priority improvements

### ***Task 6***

Allocate a further 10 points – third priority improvements

### ***Task 7***

Allocate a final 10 points of improvements – fourth priorities

An illustration of a completed part grid is shown below.

→ (32 - 16) 16 + (4 - 1) 3 + 1 = 20 points

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS SIMALTO GRID**

	Service	Level of Service Options			
1	<del>Recycling (doorstep collection)</del>	Remove green box (paper and cardboard)	Maintain existing fortnightly level of recycling (paper, cardboard, garden and kitchen waste)	PLUS Introduce a doorstep collection of plastic bottles and tins	PLUS introduce a weekly collection of residual waste using a smaller bin
		0	2	16	32
2	<del>Recycling ('bring sites')</del>	Remove banks for recycling of plastic bottles from 10 sites	As now (35 sites)	Increase 5 new 'bring' sites	Increase 10 new 'bring' sites
		0	2	3	4
3	Street furniture (bins, benches, lights etc)	Reduce street furniture maintenance to responsive repairs only	Retain current planned maintenance programme for street furniture	Increase maintenance cycle to ensure that all Borough Council street furniture is repaired in reasonable condition	Provide a dedicated maintenance team to achieved a high standard of maintenance and fast response
		0	1	3	4
4	Assembly Hall	Remove Council investment and close Assembly Hall	Reduce Council investment and scale down programme (150 events per year)	As now (200 events per year)	Increase Council investment allow a broader programme with fewer commercial productions
		0	10	12	14
5	<del>Event Programme</del>	<del>Remove Council investment and provide events</del>	Reduce number of events to 10	As now, 15 events	Increase to 25 events
		0	1	2	3
6	<del>Keeping you informed, Borough magazine</del>	Do not produce Borough magazine or annual A-Z directory of services	Produce Borough magazine twice a year with separate annual A-Z directory of services	As now - produce Borough magazine four times a year with a separate A-Z directory of services	Monthly magazine with A-Z directory of service included in one magazine edition
		0	1	2	6
7	<del>Tourism</del>	Close Tourism Information Centre	Operate Tourist Information Centre six days a week	As now (TIC open seven days a week)	Extend opening hours to evenings
		0	4	5	6
8	<del>Grants to prevent decay/demolition of historic buildings</del>	No grants to protect historic buildings	Reduce grants to improve 3 buildings at risk	As now improve 7 buildings at risk	Increase grants to improve 10 buildings at risk
		0	2	4	7
9	<del>Environmental grants to protect the countryside</del>	Remove funding and education programme for countryside issues	Reduce funding to work with 5 schools on countryside issues	As now work with six schools to raise awareness of countryside issues	Increase funding to work with 9 schools
		0	1	2	4
10	<del>Public Toilets</del>	Close six toilets with low usage (100 people per week)	Close three toilets with low usage (100 people per week)	As now maintain existing number of public toilets	Add three new toilets into the town centre
		0	1	2	3
11	<del>Home improvements</del>	Reduce homes receiving grants by 10% (60 fewer)	Reduce homes receiving grants by 5% (30 fewer)	As now, grants to 585 homes	30 more homes
		0	2	4	6
12	<del>Parking</del>	Increase car park charges 20p per hour and significant increase maintenance and cleaning standards to achieve Park Mark status	Increase car park charges by 10 per cent (10p per hour) increase in cleaning and maintenance standards	Retain current car park charges	Decrease car park charges by 10p per hour and reduce the level of maintenance and cleaning
		0	16	28	40
13	Community Safety	Reduce funding for police community support officers (lose 1 PCSO)	As now, 2 police community support officers funded	Provide 1 additional support officer	Provide 2 additional support officers
		0	1	2	3

After each of Tasks 4 to 7, respondents indicated how ‘pleased’ they would be if this improved level of service were to be provided (with no associated change in council tax being implied).

### Task 8

Finally respondents were told that each of their improvement scenarios would result in different levels of council tax being applied. The council tax would need to rise by about £10 above inflation to maintain the existing level of these services – 55 points on the grid. The different scenarios would cause this ‘increase above inflation’ to vary as follows for a Band D house:

+25 point priorities	£16 decrease	30p per week less
+35 point priorities	£8 decrease	16p per week less
+45 point priorities	No change, inflation only	
+55 point priorities	£10 increase	20p per week increase

Respondents were asked which of their alternative improvement scenarios, with associated tax rates, they would choose.

### Sample

Tunbridge Wells Council provided detailed ward maps and their populations. Interviews were conducted in every ward, and the number of interviews conducted was proportional to that wards population. This number was approximately equally spread across each of the following six categories, unless age demographics dictated otherwise.

Male	18 – 40	Female	18 – 40
Male	41 - 59	Female	41 - 59
Male	60+	Female	60+

Once an interview has been completed (in respondents’ homes) the next attempt at interview was made, missing out the next three homes, to ensure a random representative sample was drawn. Interviews were face to face and generally lasted 40-50 minutes.

A target of 300 interviews was set and 304 completed.

Area	Tunbridge Wells	West	East	Total
Interviewed	133	103	68	304
Sex	Male	50%	Female	50%

Age	18-40	33%	41-59	36%	60+	31%
-----	-------	-----	-------	-----	-----	-----

Ethnicity	White British	98%	Other	2%
-----------	---------------	-----	-------	----

## Summary

---

### *Information*

- ❑ To maintain the current levels of service on these attributes, council tax might need to rise by about £10 above the rate of inflation %.
- ❑ 49% of residents opted for tax rises of £10 above inflation, to achieve their personal budget allocations of net zero change current budget.
- ❑ 9% chose to pay £16 less tax by accepting significant net savings in some services.
- ❑ Elderly and 'Eastern' residents were marginally less keen on paying more to maintain current net services.

### **Predictions**

---

The majority of residents had a different view of how the current budget should be allocated, from that of the council. In fact it was different on 9 of the 26 services.

- ❑ When a range of alternative 'optimal' allocations at different costs, including a 'no-tax-change' budget option were simulated for choice, 52% were predicted to pay a £10 or more tax increase for no net change in service benefits..
- ❑ 31% were predicted to be very or slightly unhappy with the optimum consensus 'no tax change' or £450k budget saving allocation. This reduces to 17% being 'unhappy' with the optimum '£10 increased tax' + inflation scenario allocation.

## **Service Level Recommendations**

---

On balance the research suggests the optimal council tax on these services, from the residents perspective, should increase by about £5, plus inflation.

### **Possible Service Benefit Level Changes**

#### **1. Reductions Causing Least Displeasure**

Magazine – None

Tourism – TIC open for 6 days (from 7)

Home improvements – 30 fewer homes

Car parking charges – 10% increase

Assembly Hall – Reduce investment

Planning complaints – 40% response in 21 days (from 80%)

Christmas lights – Halve number

Events program – Reduce from 15 to 10

Historic buildings – Reduce from 7 to 3

Countryside – Reduce from 6 to 3 assisted schools

#### **2. Enhancements Causing Most Satisfaction**

Doorstep recycling – Plastic + tins

Community safety – 1 extra PCSO

Young people – 2 additional projects

Parks / open spaces – Improve

Street cleaning – 1 extra team

#### **3. Services which should not be reduced**

Doorstep recycling

Bring sites

Street furniture

Toilets

Community safety

CCTV

Young people activities

Affordable homes

Healthy living

Older persons 'gardening'

Parks / open spaces

Play areas

Street cleaning

Noise complaints

## SIMALTO Grid Summary Information

---

A summary of the service option priorities given by respondents is shown below, illustrated by the Community Safety attribute. This data for all attributes is given in Appendix 1.

---

<b>14. Community Safety</b>				
	1 fewer PCSO 0	As now, 2 PCSOs 1	1 extra PCSO 2	2 extra PCSOs 3
<b>Bonus 55</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Bonus 45</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Bonus 35</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Bonus 25</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

The interpretation of this data is as follows.

Faced with the four service options, 67% of respondents thought the first option of 1 fewer PCSO was ‘unacceptable’, i.e. they would complain..

When they were given 25 points to allocate 21% chose to spend 3 of them on improving the worst-case scenario to option 4. 19% chose to allocate 1 point to retaining the status quo, and another 19% allocated 2 points to get 1 extra PCSO. 41% did not allocate any of their first 25 points to improving this service from the worst-case scenario.

When they were given another 10 points (35 in total), an extra 7% (28%-21%) decided to achieve service option 4, either by investing 1 point to improve from option 3, or by investing 2 points to improve from option 2, or 3 points from option 1. (Obviously the 21% already at option 4 did not have to ‘spend’ any more budget). The relative priorities to achieve better services on the different attributes can be deduced by comparing such tabulations in appendix 1, and is summarised on the next chart.

## Attribute Improvement Priorities

Chart 1	After 1 <sup>st</sup> Priority	After 2 <sup>nd</sup> Priority	After 3 <sup>rd</sup> Priority	After 4 <sup>th</sup> Priority
1 Doorstep recycling	77	85	91	94
14 Community safety	59	74	82	87
25 Noise complaints	54	70	81	89
16 Young people	54	67	77	84
20 Parks open spaces	52	67	78	84
10 Toilets	47	59	69	79
2 Bring sites	44	58	71	81
15 CCTV	39	57	70	76
17 Affordable homes	39	50	62	72
24 Play areas	38	60	72	80
8 Historic buildings	38	55	73	79
9 Countryside	37	53	71	80
19 Older persons	35	51	67	78
18 Healthy living	34	52	64	77
22 Christmas lights	28	41	53	65
26 Noise complaints	28	42	59	69
4 Assembly hall	26	36	52	67
3 Street furniture	25	43	58	70
5 Events program	20	39	58	68
7 Tourism	20	40	56	66
12 Car park charges	20	31	39	49
13 Car park maintenance	19	34	48	61
21 Planning complaints	17	25	39	55
23 Town centre improves	15	25	34	49
11 Home improvements	15	30	46	57
6 Magazine	8	18	30	39

Chart 1 shows the % of respondents spending at least some of their points improving each of the services. This is interesting data as far as it goes, but it should *not* be interpreted as relative importance of the different services, since some improvement options start from the current 2006 service level and others start some way below this. So improving on some of them indicates improving the current position, whilst on others it means improving to merely REINSTATE the status quo. Also, we do not know from this table how far the respondents improvement 'reached' and for the priority 2/3/4 columns, where the improvement 'started'. The detailed level improvements are given in Appendix 1.

## Satisfaction and Willingness to Pay For Alternative Scenarios

After respondents had designed their own personal budget allocation for each of the bonus priority scenarios, they were asked how pleased they would be if the council delivered this specification. Chart 2 shows 96% to be ‘unhappy’ with the basic “first option on each attribute” scenario. This percentage reduces to 4% after respondents had received the services they prioritised after “spending” 45 points.

Note: residents were obviously more pleased with their OWN PERSONAL priority allocation of 55 points than with the current overall council service (of a similar 55 points cost equivalent). No information was given on possible tax impacts when asking for this reaction to the specification they designed.

**Chart 2**

Scenario	Very Unhappy	Slightly Unhappy	Un-Certain	Quite Pleased	Very Pleased	Extremely Pleased
Base	85%	11%	3%	1%	0%	0%
Bonus 25	10%	27%	18%	37%	7%	0%
Bonus 35	2%	15%	13%	52%	15%	3%
Bonus 45	1%	3%	14%	51%	25%	5%
Bonus 55	1%	1%	7%	39%	39%	13%
Current	6%	9%	22%	53%	10%	0%

After all four stages of prioritisation had taken place, respondents were reminded of what they had chosen by reviewing the SIMALTO grid, and then told the impact on their council tax, in terms of both pence per week and pounds per year, that each scenario would cause, (Task 8). See Chart 3. 49% chose to spend £10 on their fourth bonus priority scenario. Elderly residents were slightly less keen and ‘Easter’ residents noticeably less keen on paying for the most expensive budget. Note that these scenarios were for their own individual budget allocations.

Scenario:	Bonus 25	Bonus 35	Bonus 45	Bonus 55
Budget equivalent:	-£1.25m	-£850	-£450k	As now
Tax Impact:	£16 Decrease	£8 Decrease	No change	£10 Increase
<b>Total</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>49%</b>
Under 40	11%	10%	31%	47%
40-60	8%	9%	25%	58%
Over 60	7%	17%	35%	40%
Tunbridge Wells	5%	9%	31%	55%
West	3%	10%	39%	48%
East	26%	21%	15%	38%

**Chart 3: Scenarios Chosen When Informed of its Council Tax Impact**

## Modelling Information

---

The SIMALTO data summarised above and in the Appendix 1 is useful in its own right, and gives some fairly clear messages about most popular (e.g. Recycling, Community Safety) and least popular (Magazine, Tourism) service improvements. However, it is not easy to assimilate this information for all the levels of the 26 services, e.g. Is a reduced number of numbers more important than 4 more historic buildings at risk (Both save £40,000, 1 grid improvement point on these services)?

An influencer on this “importance” is the willingness to pay for an improvement, and what other items each respondent also wants improved. Fortunately, mathematical models can be built with this data to predict which changes to any given overall service specification would be preferred to other changes of similar cost.

These models can also predict the optimum “best value” specification at any given budget level, and how ‘pleased’ citizens would be with any given specification. These models use all the data from the SIMALTO grid. In essence the models assume that each individual resident would choose the budget allocation that offered him/her the best bargain, or best value. I.e. including as many of the options he/she valued highly, and excluding as many of the options he/she did not value highly, within any given fixed budget constraint. All the models work at the individual respondent level – there is no averaging of desires/priorities across respondents.

As part of the interview, respondents were shown six alternative ‘part’ services on Card Y. A, B, C and D ‘cost’ similar amounts to each other and were approximately £4 per year cheaper in council tax than each of E and F. Respondents were asked to indicate their relative preferences between A to F. The result of this preference choice between the 6 budgets was as follows. Shown below this is the SIMALTO Model simulation of the preference between these same 6 budgets

<b>Card Y Budget allocations</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
Questionnaire Preference %	13	18	8	15	22	24
Model Simulation Preference %	18	15	8	15	20	24

The relative superiority of the 2 ‘more expensive’ budgets, E and F, was correctly simulated, as was that between the 4 ‘cheaper’ ones. The above similarity between the ‘true’ preferences from the questionnaire, and the simulated ones from the SIMALTO sheet data, gives confidence that the model will correctly pick winners from losers in any alternative budget comparisons the user may desire to make.

## Optimum Best Value Total Budgets

SIMALTO Modelling can be used to predict the optimum ‘consensus’ budget allocation from the residents’ point of view, for any given total budget cost ‘constraint’

**Chart 4: Alternative Investment Scenarios: Resident Consensus Optimum Budget Allocations**

The yellow shaded options indicate where the current service level has been ‘improved’, and the grey shading indicates savings in service level.

Investment Scenario SIMALTO Points	-£850k 35	-£650k 40	-£450k 45	-£220k 50	As now 55
<b>Predicted Council Tax (ex. Inflation)</b>	<b>-£8</b>	<b>-£4</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>+£5</b>	<b>+£10</b>
1 Doorstep recycling	<b>Plastic / tins</b>	<b>Plastic / tins</b>	<b>Plastic / tins</b>	<b>Plastic / tins</b>	<b>Plastic / tins</b>
2 Bring sites	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
3 Street furniture	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
4 Assembly Hall	150	150	150	150	As now
5 Events program	10	10	10	As now	As now
6 Magazine	None	None	None	None	None
7 Tourism	6 days	close	6 days	6 days	6 days
8 Historic buildings	Improve 3	Improve 3	Improve 3	As now	As now
9 Countryside	3 schools	3 schools	3 schools	As now	As now
10 Toilets	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
11 Home improvements	30 fewer	As now	30 fewer	30 fewer	30 fewer
12 Car parking charges	20% more	10% more	10% more	10% more	10% more
13 Car park maintenance	Reduce	Reduce	As now	As now	As now
14 Community safety	<b>1 extra</b>	<b>1 extra</b>	<b>1 extra</b>	<b>1 extra</b>	<b>1 extra</b>
15 CCTV	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
16 Young people projects	As now	As now	As now	<b>2 extra</b>	<b>2 extra</b>
17 Affordable homes	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
18 Healthy living	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
19 Older people	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
20 Parks open spaces	As now	As now	As now	<b>Improve</b>	<b>Improve</b>
21 Planning complaints	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	As now
22 Christmas lights	Halve	None	Halve	Halve	As now
23 Town centre improves	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
24 Play areas	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now
25 Street cleaning	As now	As now	As now	As now	<b>Extra team</b>
26 Noise complaints	As now	As now	As now	As now	As now

## Chart 5. Best Value Hierarchy Index

Chart 5 below shows the complete hierarchy of residents 'value preference' index for the right hand member of each pair of adjacent options on the SIMALTO grid, all other options being fixed.

Attribute	Change	Index	Cost
1 Doorstep recycling	Remove → as now	89	1
25 Street cleaning	1 team → as now, 2	83	1
14 Community safety	1 fewer PCSO → as now	82	1
20 Parks / open spaces	Reduce cutting → As now	80	1
16 Young people	Remove support → As now	79	1
2 Bring sites	10 fewer → As now	75	1
10 Toilets	Close 6 → close 3	74	1
8 Historic buildings	No grant → improve 3	74	1
24 Play areas	Cease support → as now	73	1
15 CCTV	10 fewer → as now	72	1
9 Countryside	No education → 3 schools	72	1
19 Older persons	Stop projects → as now	72	1
10 Toilets	Close 3 → as now	69	1
18 Healthy living	Remove → as now	69	1
1 Doorstep recycling	As now → +plastic tins	65	7
3 Street furniture	Only damaged → as now	63	1
14 Community safety	As now → 1 extra PCSO	63	1
17 Affordable homes	Reduce → as now	63	1
5 Events program	None → 10	62	1
26 Noise complaints	Reduce → as now	61	1
4 Assembly Hall	Close → reduce	61	5
9 Countryside	3 schools → as now, 6 schools	60	1
7 Tourism	Close TIC → 6 days	60	2
16 Young people	As now → 2extra projects	60	1
8 Historic buildings	Improve 3 → as now, 7	59	1
22 Christmas lights	None → halve	58	1
13 Car park maintenance	Reduce → as now	56	1
20 Parks / open spaces	As now → improve	55	1
5 Events program	10 → as now, 15	54	1
25 Street cleaning	As now, 2 → 3 teams	52	1
4 Assembly Hall	Reduce → as now	52	1
11 Home improvements	60 fewer → 30 fewer	51	1
22 Christmas lights	Half → as now	50	1
2 Bring sites	As now → 5 more	48	1
21 Planning complaints	Minimum → as now	47	2

Attribute	Change	Index	Cost
11 Home improvements	30 fewer → as now	46	1
12 Car park charges	20% more → 10% more	43	9
15 CCTV	As now → 1 more	43	1
19 Older persons	As now → 2 more	42	1
14 Community safety	1 more PCSO → 2 more PCSO	42	1
23 Town centre improves	As now → improve 1	41	2
18 Healthy living	As now → Double GPs	41	1
24 Play areas	As now → improve 5	41	1
3 Street furniture	As now → improve	40	1
17 Affordable homes	As now → 5 more	38	5
7 Tourism	6 days → as now, 7	38	1
6 Magazine	None → twice	34	1
26 Noise complaints	As now → 3 nights	32	1
16 Young people	2 extra projects → + 4	30	1
9 Countryside	6 schools → 9	27	1
1 Doorstep recycling	+plastic tins → +weekly	26	8
25 Street cleaning	3 teams → 4 teams	23	1
15 CCTV	1 more → 2 more	23	1
23 Town centre improves	improve 1 → improve 2	22	1
10 Toilets	As now → 3 new	21	1
13 Car park maintenance	As now → improve	20	1
12 Car park charges	10% more → as now	19	7
2 Bring sites	5 new → 10 new	19	1
21 Planning complaints	As now → 90%	19	1
18 Healthy living	Double GPs → Triple GPs	18	1
20 Parks / open spaces	Improve → + 2 officers	17	2
6 Magazine	Twice → quarterly	16	1
24 Play areas	5 more → 10 more	16	1
3 Street furniture	Increase → dedicated team	16	1
11 Home improvements	As now → 30 more	14	2
19 Older persons	2 more → 4 more communities	14	1
26 Noise complaints	3 nights → 7 nights	14	1
17 Affordable homes	5 more → 10 more	13	5
8 Historic buildings	Improve 7 → improve 10	12	3
5 Events program	As now 15 → 25	10	1
4 Assembly Hall	As now → increase	9	1
22 Christmas lights	As now → increase	9	1
23 Town centre improves	improve 2 → improve 3	9	1
21 Planning complaints	90% → 100%	8	1
13 Car park maintenance	Improve → significant	6	1
7 Tourism	as now, 7 → + evenings	3	1
12 Car park charges	As now → 10% less	3	7
6 Magazine	Quarterly → monthly	1	2

Clearly if council wishes to amend the optimal resident consensus budget allocations shown in chart 4, changes which appear nearer the top of this list are likely to be much more popular in combination with other options, than changes at the bottom of this list.

### **Chart 6: Satisfaction Predictions For Respondent Optimum Budgets**

Residents indicated how pleased they would be to receive each of their own personal allocation of budgets across the attributes. The SIMALTO Modelling can be used to predict, on the same scale, what resident satisfaction would be for any other allocation within the range of budget points spent. Chart 6 below shows this % prediction for the five consensus optimal allocations shown in Chart 4

<b>Tax Scenario</b>	<b>Very Unhappy</b>	<b>Slightly Unhappy</b>	<b>Uncertain</b>	<b>Quite Pleased</b>	<b>Very Pleased</b>	<b>Extremely Pleased</b>
<b>-£8</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>-£4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>As now</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>+£5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>+£10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>

Potential dissatisfaction declines rapidly as these services improve.

Another forecast available from the SIMALTO Modelling simulation programs is to find the relative popularity between the alternative optimal allocations above. If all 5 were available for choice, Chart 7 shows the % choosing each option.

**Chart 7: % Preference between Optimal Consensus Budgets**

Optimal Scenario Cost:	-£850k	-£650k	-£450k	-£220k	As now
Predicted Tax	-£8	-£4	As now	+£5	+£10
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>52</b>
Under 40	10	10	11	21	49
40 – 59	11	6	12	15	55
Over 60	11	9	11	16	53
Tunbridge Wells	10	8	13	17	53
West	9	7	11	18	54
East	14	11	10	18	46

Consensus preference is around the ‘£5 increase’ tax level. (This is the level where about half residents would prefer to pay below it, and half would prefer to pay above it, for the associated service levels proposed).

## Preference between Alternative Budgets

The SIMALTO model can be used to predict preferences between alternative combinations of options. As an example, the consensus optimum budget of 55 points was compared with the current 2006 budget. The optimum had 9 changes to the current allocation on the 26 attributes considered. The results were as follows:

	Current allocation	Residents consensus
Preference	19%	81%

## Satisfaction Prediction

Pleased	56%	62%
---------	-----	-----

The consensus current budget reallocation would generate 6% more residents in the pleased section of the dissatisfied - pleased scale.

# Appendices

# **Appendix 1**

## **Summary Data**

# APPENDIX 1

## Detailed Summary of Priorities

The following tables summarise the information from the SIMALTO grid tasks for the total sample. The numbers refer to the **percentages** choosing the service levels indicated at each priority scenario.

1. Recycling (doorstep collection)				
	Remove green box (paper and cardboard) 0	Maintain existing fortnightly level of recycling (paper, cardboard, garden and kitchen waste) 1	PLUS Introduce a doorstep collection of plastic bottles and tins 8	PLUS introduce a weekly collection of non-recyclable waste 16
Bonus 55	6	25	41	28
Bonus 45	9	27	41	22
Bonus 35	15	27	39	19
Bonus 25	23	25	39	13
Unacceptable	74	2	0	0

2. Recycling ('bring sites')				
	Remove banks for recycling of plastic bottles from 10 sites 0	As now (35 sites) 1	Increase 5 new 'bring' sites 2	Increase 10 new 'bring' sites 3
Bonus 55	19	27	31	23
Bonus 45	29	25	30	16
Bonus 35	42	25	22	11
Bonus 25	56	21	16	7
Unacceptable	62	0	0	0

3. Street furniture (bins, benches, lights etc)				
	Only repair damaged furniture 0	Retain current planned maintenance programme for street furniture 1	Increase maintenance cycle to ensure that all Borough Council street furniture is repaired is in reasonable condition 2	Provide a dedicated maintenance team to achieved a high standard of maintenance and fast response 3
Bonus 55	30	25	26	18
Bonus 45	42	25	22	11
Bonus 35	57	20	16	6
Bonus 25	75	12	10	4
Unacceptable	35	1	0	0

4. Assembly Hall				
	Remove Council investment and close Assembly Hall 0	Reduce Council investment and scale down programme (150 events per year) 5	As now (200 events per year) 6	Increase Council investment allow a broader programme with fewer commercial productions 7
Bonus 55	32	12	45	11
Bonus 45	48	10	37	5
Bonus 35	64	7	26	4
Bonus 25	74	5	19	2
Unacceptable	52	0	0	0

5. Events Programme – non assembly hall (e.g. cricket, pantiles, ice skating etc.)				
	Remove Council investment and provide no events 0	Reduce number of events to 10 1	As now, 15 events 2	Increase to 25 events 3
Bonus 55	32	10	47	11
Bonus 45	42	9	43	7
Bonus 35	61	7	28	4
Bonus 25	80	5	14	2
Unacceptable	47	1	0	0

6. Keeping you informed, Borough magazine				
	Do not produce Borough magazine or annual A-Z directory of services 0	Produce magazine twice a year with separate annual A-Z directory of services 1	As now – produce Borough magazine four times a year with a separate A-Z directory of services 2	Monthly magazine with A-Z directory of service included in one magazine edition 4
Bonus 55	61	20	17	2
Bonus 45	70	16	13	0
Bonus 35	82	10	9	0
Bonus 25	92	5	3	0
Unacceptable	17	1	0	0

7. Tourism				
	Close Tourism Information Centre 0	Operate Tourist Information Centre six days a week 4	As now (TIC open seven days a week) 5	Extend opening hours to evenings 6
Bonus 55	34	25	37	4
Bonus 45	44	22	33	2
Bonus 35	60	18	21	1
Bonus 25	80	10	10	1
Unacceptable	44	0	0	0

8. Grants to prevent decay/demolition of historic buildings				
	No grants to protect historic buildings 0	Improve 3 buildings at risk 1	As now improve 7 buildings at risk 2	Improve 10 buildings at risk 5
Bonus 55	21	15	48	15
Bonus 45	27	16	48	9
Bonus 35	45	14	37	4
Bonus 25	63	8	25	4
Unacceptable	57	2	0	0

9. Environmental grants to protect the countryside				
	Remove funding and education programme for countryside issues 0	Work with 3 schools on countryside issues 1	As now work with 6 schools to raise awareness of countryside issues 2	Work with 9 schools 3
Bonus 55	20	11	38	31
Bonus 45	29	15	33	23
Bonus 35	47	13	25	15
Bonus 25	63	9	18	10
Unacceptable	54	1	0	0

10. Public Toilets				
	Close 6 toilets with lowest usage 0	Close 3 toilets with lowest usage 1	As now maintain existing number of public toilets 2	Add 3 new toilets into the town centre 3
Bonus 55	20	7	49	24
Bonus 45	31	7	42	20
Bonus 35	41	4	39	15
Bonus 25	53	4	31	12
Unacceptable	55	2	0	0

11. Home improvements (e.g. for insulation). Means tested				
	60 fewer homes 0	30 fewer homes 1	As now, grants to 585 homes 2	30 more homes 4
Bonus 55	43	7	33	17
Bonus 45	54	7	26	13
Bonus 35	70	4	17	9
Bonus 25	85	2	8	5
Unacceptable	30	1	0	0

12. Parking charges				
	Increase car park charges 20p per hour 0	Increase car park charges by 10 per cent (10p per hour) 9	As now 16	Decrease car park charges by 10p per hour 23
Bonus 55	50	27	19	4
Bonus 45	61	23	14	2
Bonus 35	69	20	10	2
Bonus 25	80	12	6	2
Unacceptable	38	1	0	0

13. Car park maintenance				
	Reduce maintenance / cleaning 0	As now 1	Improve maintenance 2	Significantly improve 3
Bonus 55	39	39	14	8
Bonus 45	52	33	12	3
Bonus 35	66	24	7	3
Bonus 25	81	13	4	2
Unacceptable	37	0	0	0

14. Community Safety				
	1 fewer Police Community Support officer 0	As now, 2 police community support officers funded 1	Provide 1 additional support officer 2	Provide 2 additional support officers 3
Bonus 55	13	19	23	45
Bonus 45	18	20	25	37
Bonus 35	26	22	24	28
Bonus 25	41	19	19	21
Unacceptable	67	0	0	0

15. CCTV				
	10 fewer fixed cameras in the Town Centre. 0	As now (38 cameras operating in the Town Centre only) 1	Add 1 mobile camera to provide some coverage in rural areas 2	Add 2 mobile cameras for increased coverage in rural areas 3
Bonus 55	23	29	20	27
Bonus 45	30	29	20	21
Bonus 35	43	28	14	15
Bonus 25	61	21	9	10
Unacceptable	47	0	0	0

<b>16. Young People</b>				
	Remove support for youth activities 0	As now, projects for young people 1	2 additional projects for young people 2	4 additional projects 3
Bonus 55	16	17	33	34
Bonus 45	23	20	31	26
Bonus 35	33	19	29	19
Bonus 25	46	17	24	12
Unacceptable	65	0	0	0

<b>17. Affordable Homes – working with housing associations</b>				
	Reduce investment in promoting new affordable homes 0	As now activities to promote new affordable homes 1	Build 5 additional affordable homes 6	Build 10 additional affordable homes 11
Bonus 55	28	29	28	15
Bonus 45	38	25	24	13
Bonus 35	50	21	19	10
Bonus 25	62	15	16	7
Unacceptable	48	0	0	0

<b>18. Healthy Living – council support for physiotherapy etc. for GP Referrals</b>				
	Remove support for the GP Referral Project to Leisure Centres 0	Maintain current number of GPs and referral rates 1	Double the number of GPs who refer people across the district 2	Triple the number of GPs who refer people across the district 3
Bonus 55	23	30	25	21
Bonus 45	36	25	24	16
Bonus 35	48	19	22	11
Bonus 25	66	13	14	7
Unacceptable	42	0	0	0

<b>19. Older People – encouraging ‘socialising’ by ‘light work’ on community property</b>				
	Close our community ‘gardening projects’ working with elderly people 0	As now, current gardening projects in two villages 1	Extend the scheme to 2 additional communities 2	Extend to 4 additional communities 3
Bonus 55	21	29	30	19
Bonus 45	33	31	24	13
Bonus 35	49	24	19	8
Bonus 25	65	17	13	5
Unacceptable	47	0	0	0

<b>20. Parks and Open Spaces including play areas</b>				
	Reduce maintenance and grass cutting in parks and play areas by 50% 0	As now maintenance and grass cutting in parks and play areas 1	Improve cleanliness, maintenance and security of parks through increased frequency of inspection by employing 1 additional officer 2	Employ 2 additional officers 4
Bonus 55	16	25	40	19
Bonus 45	22	26	39	13
Bonus 35	33	24	34	9
Bonus 25	48	20	26	5
Unacceptable	56	0	0	0

<b>21. Speed of dealing with planning complaints / challenges</b>				
	Minimum service re-acting to complaints (an initial response within 21 days for 40 % of complaints). 0	As now (an initial response within 21 days for 80 % of complaints) 2	90 % response within 21 days 3	100 % response within 21 days 4
Bonus 55	44	33	13	9
Bonus 45	61	24	9	6
Bonus 35	75	14	6	4
Bonus 25	82	9	6	2
Unacceptable	30	0	0	0

22. Christmas Lights				
	No Christmas Lights 0	Halve the number of lights in main shopping areas 1	As now 2	Increase coverage to whole town centre and main routes 4
Bonus 55	34	9	46	10
Bonus 45	47	8	39	6
Bonus 35	59	7	30	4
Bonus 25	72	5	21	2
Unacceptable	43	1	0	0

23. Town Centre Improvements				
	As now, no plans 0	Create a plan for improving 1 town 4	Create plans for improving 2 towns 6	Create plans for improving 3 towns 8
Bonus 55	51	22	16	11
Bonus 45	66	18	10	6
Bonus 35	75	15	7	3
Bonus 25	85	9	5	1
Unacceptable	11	0	0	0

24. Upgrading and refurbishing play areas				
	Remove grants for playground maintenance 0	As now (grants to improve up to 5 play areas in rural areas) 1	5 extra playground refurbishments 2	10 extra playground refurbishments 3
Bonus 55	20	35	26	19
Bonus 45	28	33	26	13
Bonus 35	40	29	20	10
Bonus 25	62	18	14	5
Unacceptable	61	0	0	0

25. Street Cleaning – litter, fly tipping, graffiti removal, shopping trolleys				
	Reduce to 1 special team 0	As now – 2 special teams to tackle rubbish, graffiti and litter 1	3 special teams 2	4 special teams 3
Bonus 55	11	30	33	26
Bonus 45	19	31	32	18
Bonus 35	30	30	28	12
Bonus 25	46	26	21	7
Unacceptable	60	0	0	0

26. Noise Complaints				
	Reduce the Environmental Health out of hours call out service to only deal with emergencies with noise complaints investigated the following working day 0	As now – existing call out service to deal with large scale noise disturbances and environmental health emergencies 1	Provide a noise patrol of 2 officers to gather evidence of disturbances from commercial and domestic properties on Thur/Friday/Saturday night 2	2 officers for 7 nights a week 3
Bonus 55	31	31	23	15
Bonus 45	41	28	19	12
Bonus 35	58	22	13	8
Bonus 25	72	14	9	6
Unacceptable	41	1	0	0

# **Appendix 2**

## **Questionnaire, Card Y and SIMALTO Grid**

Research For Today 77 Gunnersbury Avenue, London W5 4LP  
Telephone: 020 8992 4877 Fax: 020 8993 5818  
E-mail:simalto@researchfortoday.com

**Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Consultation**

**October 2006**

**Interviewer** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Respondent Name:**

**Mr/Mrs/Ms/Miss** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Postcode** \_\_\_\_\_

**Telephone Number** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Quota Sheet Number</b>	
---------------------------	--

---

Introduction

---

Hello. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ from Research For Today Ltd, an independent market research company.

We are conducting research to find out your opinions about the way you would prefer Tunbridge Wells Council should allocate elements of their budget.

All the opinions you express and information you give will be treated confidentially.

The Council is considering options to balance Council Tax changes with standards of service at levels that are acceptable to local people. To do this, they need to obtain local people's views about the best way of spending the Council budget that is available. The Council may chose to make savings in some services to fund improvements in other services, or to make savings on its total budget, or to increase its investment in services. They want local people to have an input into these decisions.

**S1a** Before we begin collecting your views on different services, thinking of the overall service Tunbridge Wells Council **currently** provides, how pleased are you with their service? **SHOW CARD X**

Extremely pleased.....	6
Very pleased.....	5
Quite pleased.....	4
Uncertain.....	3
Slightly unhappy.....	2
Very unhappy.....	1

I am now going to ask you some questions that will require the use of some special answer sheets. These sheets will help us collect your views and priorities.

**HAND RESPONDENT SIMALTO SHEET AND A RED PEN**

Down the left hand side of the sheet is a list of services that are provided (**POINT TO THE LEFT HAND COLUMN**). To the right are the different levels and options that could be provided of each service. First of all please take a couple of minutes or so to read through the sheet and make sure you understand all the options. If there are any you are not clear about please tell me. The shaded box indicates the level of service Tunbridge Wells council currently provides.

We are going to ask you to carry out a number of tasks on this grid. We would like you to tell us:

1. Any performance levels you would consider unacceptable
2. What you think the most important services are
3. What you think of a basic package of services that we will show you
4. How you would like to improve that basic service to better meet your needs.  
We will do this in stages so you can show your priorities

**S1.** For the moment, please ignore the numbers in the right hand corner of the option boxes. First of all, using the red pen, please cross out any option on any row that would make you want to complain if this level of service was provided. We do not want you to cross out those options you do not like, just those that are totally unacceptable – **those that, if provided by the council, would actually cause you to complain to the council or a councilor, or seriously consider doing so.**

Some rows will have no crosses. Some rows may have 2 or more crosses. Any crosses are **generally to the left of the shaded boxes**. It's up to you to say which options, if any, might cause you to complain to the council.

IF NECESSARY KEEP REMINDING RESPONDENT THESE ARE **TOTALLY** UNACCEPTABLE OPTIONS. **NOTE**: GENERALLY CROSSES ARE ONLY TO THE LEFT OF SHADED BOXES. **CONTINUE WITH RED PEN**

**S2.** Now I would like you to place a tick against the 5 or 6 services that you think are most important, **for both yourself and the local community**. Please make your ticks in the column to the left of the attribute description.

**S3.** The black circles on this sheet show a very basic level of service that a council might provide. This level is the lowest level on each of the services on the grid – it is often poorer than the level of service being provided by the council now. The level of service Tunbridge Wells currently provides is also indicated for each service as the shaded box.

**SHOW CARD X**

Please read again the service shown by the black circles. If this showed the level that might be provided by Tunbridge Wells next year - how pleased would you be?

- Extremely pleased..... 6
- Very pleased..... 5
- Quite pleased..... 4
- Uncertain..... 3
- Slightly unhappy ..... 2
- Very unhappy..... 1

**NOTE, RESPONSE TO S3 MAY (SHOULD) BE LOWER THAN S1**

**CONTINUE WITH RED PEN**

**S4.** The sheet has allocations of points for each level of each attribute. These small figures in the bottom right hand corner of each box on the grid represent the relative cost of that option compared with other options on that row. As service performance improves from the left to the right on each attribute, costs and so the points for each level increase.

Using the points in each box, please tell me how you would most like to improve the very basic black-circled package of benefits to make it more appropriate to your priorities. Imagine that Tunbridge Wells wanted to improve their services from this basic black circle level and allocated ***approximately 25*** points for this purpose. Please use red arrows to show how you would improve the basic circled package by a total of **between 24 and 26 points**. You may make as many or as few improvements as you like by drawing a red arrow from the circled package to those levels you would like to improve to.

Please use these 25 points to show your top priority improvements. We will later be giving you extra points to spend, but first we need to know your top priorities, for **yourself and the local community**. Note that if you do not improve beyond any unacceptable level you may have indicated, these

unimproved unacceptable levels will still be part of the overall service delivered.

**INTERVIEWER: RESPONDENTS SHOULD IMPROVE BEYOND ALL CROSSED OUT LEVELS OF SERVICES IF POSSIBLE. IF THEY HAVE NOT THEN SAY TO THEM**

I notice you have not improved services you have crossed out. This means that those crossed out services are part of your package. Do you wish to change any of the improvements you have made so you can use points to improve these “unacceptable” levels of services?

**KEEP A TALLY OF ALL IMPROVEMENTS MADE**

= 25 ±1

**S5.** If Tunbridge Wells provided this improved level of service (the black pre-circled level except where improved by your red arrows), how pleased would you be?

**SHOW CARD X**

- Extremely pleased..... 6
- Very pleased..... 5
- Quite pleased..... 4
- Uncertain..... 3
- Slightly unhappy ..... 2
- Very unhappy..... 1

**INT: ANSWER MUST BE THE SAME OR BETTER THAN S3.  
HAND RESPONDENT BLACK PEN**

**S6.** Now I would like you to spend **another 10 points** assuming you already have the first red arrow improvements you have made to services. What other improvements would you like? Please now use black arrows to show how you would prefer Tunbridge Wells to allocate these *extra* 10 points. You can decide to improve new attributes or further improve the level of service of some choices you have made already. If you move from a box marked ‘2 points’ to a box marked ‘3 points’, this will only cost you the difference of ‘1 point’ (3 minus 2 points).

**INTERVIEWER: CHECK ALL BLACK ARROWS START FROM THE END OF A RED ARROW (IF THERE IS A RED ARROW ON THAT ROW) OR A BLACK PRE-CIRCLE. CHECK RESPONDENT HAS SPENT BETWEEN 9 AND 11 MORE POINTS. KEEP A TALLY OF ALL IMPROVEMENTS MADE AT S6**

= 10 ± 1

**CHECK TOTAL OF S4 + S6 = 35 +/- 1 POINTS**

**INTERVIEWER: RESPONDENTS SHOULD IMPROVE BEYOND ALL CROSSED OUT LEVELS OF SERVICES BY THIS STAGE. IF THEY HAVE**

**NOT THEN SAY TO THEM:-** I notice you have not improved services you have crossed out. This means that those crossed out services are part of your package. Do you wish to change any of the improvements you have made to use points to improve these “unacceptable” levels of services?

**S7.** If Tunbridge Wells provided this level of service (the black pre-circles except where improved by both your red and black arrows), how pleased would you be? **SHOW CARD X**

- Extremely pleased..... 6
- Very pleased..... 5
- Quite pleased..... 4
- Uncertain..... 3
- Slightly unhappy ..... 2
- Very unhappy..... 1

**INTERVIEWER: ANSWER MUST BE THE SAME OR BETTER THAN S5**

**HAND RESPONDENT GREEN PEN**

**S8.** Imagine that Tunbridge Wells could improve their services still further and allocated **another 10 points** for this purpose. Please use green arrows to show how you would prefer them to improve your already improved package by a further 10 points. Just to remind you, you must start from the end of a black arrow if there is one on the row, or a red arrow, or a black pre-circled box, if you have not already improved that service. Assume you already have the improvements you have already selected, and that becomes the starting point for this next set of improvements.

Also please remember that the costs in these boxes are cumulative. So moving to the right from a box costing 2 points to a box costing 6 points contributes the difference of 4 points to your overall target of another 10 points.

***KEEP TALLY OF COST OF IMPROVEMENTS MADE***

	<b>= 10 ± 1</b>
--	-----------------

**S9.** If Tunbridge Wells provided this new level of service (the basic pre-circled level plus all your red, black and green arrowed improvements), how pleased would you be? **SHOW CARD X**

- Extremely pleased..... 6
- Very pleased..... 5
- Quite pleased..... 4
- Uncertain..... 3
- Slightly unhappy ..... 2
- Very unhappy..... 1

**INTERVIEWER: ANSWER MUST BE THE SAME OR BETTER THAN S7**

**HAND RESPONDENT BLUE PEN**

**S10.** Imagine **finally** that Tunbridge Wells could improve their services still further and allocated **another 10 points** for this purpose. Please use blue arrows to show how you would prefer them to improve your already improved package by a further 10 points. Just to remind you, you must start from the end of a green arrow if there is one on the row or a black or a red arrow - or a black pre-circled box, if you have not already improved that service. Assume you already have the improvements you have already selected and that is the starting point for these final improvements.

Also please remember that the costs in these boxes are cumulative. So moving to the right from a box costing 2 points to a box costing 6 points contributes the difference of 4 points to your overall target of 10 points.

**S11.** If Tunbridge Wells provided this level of service (the basic pre-circled level **plus** all your red, black, green and blue arrowed improvements), how pleased would you be? **SHOW CARD X**

- Extremely pleased..... 6
- Very pleased..... 5
- Quite pleased..... 4
- Uncertain..... 3
- Slightly unhappy ..... 2
- Very unhappy..... 1

**INTERVIEWER: ANSWER MUST BE THE SAME OR BETTER THAN S9**

**S12. SHOW RESPONDENT COMPLETED SIMALTO SHEET**

Please take another look at your completed sheet. The government calculates how much it thinks councils need to spend to meet the needs of their communities. It gives them Revenue Support Grant to cover part of this spending, but it doesn't give them all the money they need. So they have to increase Council Tax to meet their obligations to provide better and more costly services, the increasing costs of caring for the growing numbers of elderly people, and so on. In order to provide the same level of services as today, Tunbridge Wells council tax will have to increase next year by a little bit more than the inflation %. So in the context of today's council tax amount, the different budget allocations you described would actually cost as follows in 2007, ignoring any inflation effects. Which of the following scenarios is most appealing to you?

**SHOW RESPONDENT COMPLETED SIMALTO SHEET AND SHOW CARD  
Z – CIRCLE ONE OPTION**

The black circled package PLUS the first round of improvements (red arrows) with a <b>30 pence a week decrease</b> in council tax for typical Band D housing. (Approx. £16 a year less)	<b>1</b>
The package after 2 rounds of improvements (black circles PLUS red and black arrows) with a <b>15 pence a week decrease</b> in council tax for typical Band D housing. (Approx. £8 a year less)	<b>2</b>
The package after 3 rounds of improvements (red, black and green arrows) with no change in tax (except inflation)	<b>3</b>
The package after all 4 rounds of improvements (red, black, green and blue arrows) with a <b>20 pence a week increase</b> in council tax for typical Band D housing. (Approx. £10 a year more).	<b>4</b>

**HAND RESPONDENT SHEET Y**

**S13** Please read through the 6 alternative packages. Assume they all have the same existing services as are in place today in Tunbridge Wells, apart from those detailed here. Also assume that each package would cost the same to provide. Looking at

all the combinations A to F, which one has the balance of services you most prefer? Please give that package 10 points. Now select the package with the balance of services you least like. Give that package 1 point. Please show how much you like each other of the combinations by awarding them a score between 1 and 10. 10 is the highest score you can give and 1 is the lowest.

**INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT GIVES THE SAME SCORE TO EACH REMAINING PACKAGE TRY TO ENCOURAGE SOME VARIATION BY ASKING IF HE/SHE REALLY THINKS THEY ARE ALL THE SAME. BUT DO NOT FORCE DIFFERENT SCORES AFTER THIS PROMPT IF RESPONDENT REFUSES TO CHANGE. INTERVIEWER – TAKE SHEET Y AND WRITE IN “£4 per year more than A to D” FOR CONCEPTS E AND F IN COST ROW. HAND SHEET Y BACK TO RESPONDENT.**

**S14.** Please rate the packages of services shown *again*, on a scale of 1-10 to show how enthusiastic you would be for each of these 6 alternatives. This time please note that service combinations E and F would cost an extra 8 pence per week, or approximately £4 a year, more in council tax to deliver than the other 4 services combinations A to D. Once again 9 or 10 marks indicates your most preferred packages and 1 or 2 marks indicates your least preferred.

**S15** Please tell me if this household pays full council tax, a reduced rate (for single occupancy etc) or is exempt from paying council tax?

- Full..... 1
- Reduced ..... 2
- Exempt (Pays no council tax)..... 3
- Don't know ..... 4

## DEMOGRAPHICS

<p><b>Sex</b></p> <p>Male.....1</p> <p>Female .....2</p> <p><b>Age: Respondent</b></p> <p>18-40 .....1</p> <p>41-60 .....2</p> <p>61+ .....3</p> <p><b>WRITE IN ACTUAL AGE</b></p> <p><b>Number Adults Over 18 in Household (including respondent)</b></p> <p><i>WRITE IN Number</i></p> <p>TOTAL _____</p> <p><b>Age &amp; Number of Children in Household</b></p> <p><i>WRITE IN Number</i></p> <p>0-4 _____</p> <p>5-11 _____</p> <p>12-17 _____</p> <p>TOTAL _____</p> <p><b>Working Status (Main Income Earner)</b></p> <p>Full Time .....1</p> <p>_____</p> <p><b>Housing Tenure of Main Income Earner</b></p> <p>Own home .....1</p> <p>Rent privately .....2</p> <p>Rent from council.....3</p> <p>Rent from housing association ....4</p> <p>Other (specify) .....5</p>	<p><b>Ethnic Origin of Household (MULTI CODE IF APPROPRIATE)</b></p> <p><b>WHITE OR WHITE BRITISH</b></p> <p>British .....1</p> <p>Greek Cypriot .....2</p> <p>Turkish Cypriot .....3</p> <p>Irish.....4</p> <p>Other White (please specify) _____5</p> <p><b>ASIAN OR ASIAN BRITISH</b></p> <p>Bangladeshi .....6</p> <p>Chinese .....7</p> <p>Indian .....8</p> <p>Pakistani .....9</p> <p>Other Asian (please specify) _____10</p> <p><b>BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH</b></p> <p>African .....11</p> <p>Caribbean.....12</p> <p>Other Black (please specify) _____13</p> <p><b>MIXED BACKGROUND</b></p> <p>Asian and White .....14</p> <p>Black African and White .....15</p> <p>Black Caribbean and White.....16</p> <p>Other Mixed (please specify) _____17</p> <p><b>OTHER ETHNIC GROUP</b></p> <p>Other Ethnic Group (please specify) _____18</p> <p><b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC (Main Income Earner)</b></p> <p>AB.....1</p> <p>C1 .....2</p> <p>C2 .....3</p> <p>DE.....4</p> <p>OCCUPATION (write in) _____</p>
--	---

**INTERVIEW DECLARATION**  
minutes

**Duration of Interview** \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby declare that I have asked all the questions correctly.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Interviewer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

## TUNBRIDGE WELLS SIMALTO GRID

	Service	Level of Service Options			
1	Recycling (doorstep collection)	Remove green box (paper and cardboard) 0	Maintain existing fortnightly level of recycling (paper, cardboard, garden and kitchen waste) 1	PLUS Introduce a doorstep collection of plastic bottles and tins 8	PLUS introduce a weekly collection of non-recyclable waste 16
2	Recycling ('bring sites')	Remove banks for recycling of plastic bottles from 10 sites 0	As now (35 sites) 1	Increase 5 new 'bring' sites 2	Increase 10 new 'bring' sites 3
3	Street furniture (bins, benches, lights etc)	Only repair damaged furniture 0	Retain current planned maintenance programme for street furniture 1	Increase maintenance cycle to ensure that all Borough Council street furniture is repaired is in reasonable condition 2	Provide a dedicated maintenance team to achieved a high standard of maintenance and fast response 3
4	Assembly Hall	Remove Council investment and close Assembly Hall 0	Reduce Council investment and scale down programme (150 events per year) 5	As now (200 events per year) 6	Increase Council investment allow a broader programme with fewer commercial productions 7
5	Events Programme – non assembly hall (eg cricket, pantiles, ice skating etc.)	Remove Council investment and provide no events 0	Reduce number of events to 10 1	As now, 15 events 2	Increase to 25 events 3
6	Keeping you informed, Borough magazine	Do not produce Borough magazine or annual A-Z directory of services 0	Produce magazine twice a year with separate annual A-Z directory of services 1	As now – produce Borough magazine four times a year with a separate A-Z directory of services 2	Monthly magazine with A-Z directory of service included in one magazine edition 4
7	Tourism	Close Tourism Information Centre 0	Operate Tourist Information Centre six days a week 2	As now (TIC open seven days a week) 3	Extend opening hours to evenings 4
8	Grants to prevent decay/demolition of historic buildings	No grants to protect historic buildings 0	Improve 3 buildings at risk 1	As now improve 7 buildings at risk 2	Improve 10 buildings at risk 5
9	Environmental grants to protect the countryside	Remove funding and education programme for countryside issues 0	Work with 3 schools on countryside issues 1	As now work with 6 schools to raise awareness of countryside issues 2	Work with 9 schools 3
10	Public Toilets	Close 6 toilets with lowest usage 0	Close 3 toilets with lowest usage 1	As now maintain existing number of public toilets 2	Add 3 new toilets into the town centre 3
11	Home improvements (e.g. for insulation). Means tested	60 fewer homes 0	30 fewer homes 1	As now, grants to 585 homes 2	30 more homes 4
12	Parking charges	Increase car park charges 20p per hour 0	Increase car park charges by 10 per cent (10p per hour) 9	As now 16	Decrease car park charges by 10p per hour 23
13	Car park maintenance	Reduce maintenance / cleaning 0	As now 1	Improve maintenance 2	Significantly improve 3
14	Community Safety	1 fewer Police Community Support officer 0	As now, 2 police community support officers funded 1	Provide 1 additional support officer 2	Provide 2 additional support officers 3
15	CCTV	10 fewer fixed cameras in the Town Centre. 0	As now (38 cameras operating in the Town Centre only) 1	Add 1 mobile camera to provide some coverage in rural areas 2	Add 2 mobile cameras for increased coverage in rural areas 3

16	Young People	Remove support for youth activities 0	As now, projects for young people 1	2 additional projects for young people 2	4 additional projects 3
17	Affordable Homes – working with housing associations	Reduce investment in promoting new affordable homes 0	As now activities to promote new affordable homes 1	Build 5 additional affordable homes 6	Build 10 additional affordable homes 11
18	Healthy Living – council support for physiotherapy etc. for GP Referrals	Remove support for the GP Referral Project to Leisure Centres 0	Maintain current number of GPs and referral rates 1	Double the number of GPs who refer people across the district 2	Triple the number of GPs who refer people across the district 3
19	Older People – encouraging 'socialising' by 'light work' on community property	Close our community 'gardening projects' working with elderly people 0	As now, current gardening projects in two villages 1	Extend the scheme to 2 additional communities 2	Extend to 4 additional communities 3
20	Parks and Open Spaces including play areas	Reduce maintenance and grass cutting in parks and play areas by 50% 0	As now maintenance and grass cutting in parks and play areas 1	Improve cleanliness, maintenance and security of parks through increased frequency of inspection by employing 1 additional officer 2	Employ 2 additional officers 4
21	Speed of dealing with planning complaints / challenges	Minimum service re-acting to complaints (an initial response within 21 days for 40 % of complaints. 0	As now (an initial response within 21 days for 80 % of complaints) 2	90 % response within 21 days 3	100 % response within 21 days 4
22	Christmas Lights	No Christmas Lights 0	Halve the number of lights in main shopping areas 1	As now 2	Increase coverage to whole town centre and main routes 3
23	Town Centre Improvements	As now, no plans 0	Create a plan for improving 1 town 2	Create plans for improving 2 towns 3	Create plans for improving 3 towns 4
24	Upgrading and refurbishing play areas	Remove grants for playground maintenance 0	As now (grants to improve up to 5 play areas in rural areas) 1	5 extra playground refurbishments 2	10 extra playground refurbishments 3
25	Street Cleaning – litter, fly tipping, graffiti removal, shopping trolleys	Reduce to 1 special team 0	As now – 2 special teams to tackle rubbish, graffiti and litter 1	3 special teams 2	4 special teams 3
26	Noise Complaints	Reduce the Environmental Health out of hours call out service to only deal with emergencies with noise complaints investigated the following working day 0	As now – existing call out service to deal with large scale noise disturbances and environmental health emergencies 1	Provide a noise patrol of 2 officers to gather evidence of disturbances from commercial and domestic properties on Thur/Friday/Saturday night 2	2 officers for 7 nights a week 3

## Tunbridge Wells Card Y

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>Borough magazine</b>	As now 4 times/year	Do not produce	Monthly	Twice a year	Monthly	As now 4 times/year
<b>Grants to prevent decay of historic buildings</b>	As now, 7 improved	10 improved	3 improved	As now, 7 improved	3 improved	10 improved
<b>Public toilets</b>	Close 3	As Now	Add 3	Close 3	As Now	Add 3
<b>CCTV cameras</b>	As now, 38	As now, 38	10 fewer	As now +2 mobile	As now +2 mobile	As now +1 mobile
<b>Young people activities</b>	2 additional projects	As now	Remove support	2 additional projects	4 additional projects	2 additional projects
<b>Marks Out Of 10</b>						
<b>Cost</b>						
<b>Marks Out Of 10</b>						