

# WEST SUFFOLK: A SINGLE DISTRICT-LEVEL COUNCIL - INDEPENDENT SURVEY OF RESIDENTS

#### **METHODOLOGY NOTE**

ComRes interviewed 1,001 adults aged 18+ living in West Suffolk by telephone between June 30th and July 24th 2017. All respondents lived in and were eligible to vote in elections in either Forest Heath District Council or St Edmundsbury Borough Council areas. Data have been weighted to be representative of all adults across West Suffolk living in Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough Council areas by age, gender, social grade, ward, ethnicity and council area. ComRes set quotas to ensure 400 interviews in Forest Heath District and 600 in St Edmundsbury Borough Council areas. ComRes is a member of the British Polling Council and abides by its rules.

For information about commissioning research please contact andrew.hawkins@comresglobal.com or call +44 (0)20 7871 8670.

#### REPUTATION | COMMUNICATIONS | PUBLIC POLICY

Four Millbank | London | SW1P 3JA | T. +44 (0)20 7871 8660

Rond-Point Schuman / Schumanplein 6 | Box 5 | 1040 Bruxelles | T. +32 (0)2 234 63 82

51/F Raffles City | No.268 Xi Zang Middle Road | HuangPu District Shanghai | 200001 China | T. +86 (0)21 2312 7674

Q1. I'd like to start by talking about your local area. What is it you like most about living in your local area?	ı
Q2. And what is it you like least about living in your local area?	
This survey is about your District council, which is responsible for housing, planning, tourism and leisure, bin collection and local community services. It is not about Suffolk County Council, which is responsible for social care, schools and roads. At present, all of your District council services are delivered jointly by Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury councils. This survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough councils. Q3. Before now, had you ever heard of the proposed creation of a single District Council for West Suffolk?	
Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are currently considering proposals to replace the two councils with a single District-level Council covering both areas. Both councils have been working in partnership for over 10 years, and all of their services are run together on behalf of both councils. Q4. In general, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?	)
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. SUMMARY TABLE	3
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Important summary	
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Not important summary	)
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_1. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Continue the delivery of important services to local people	ì
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_2. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year.  25  Base: All respondents	,
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_3. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	2
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5_4. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	5
As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can	

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June – 24th July 2017 Prepared by ComRes

achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk. Q5 5. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective. Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing Base: All respondents As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils. The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year. Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area. Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can Base: All respondents Currently there are 72 Councillors representing the entire West Suffolk area. A new single District-level Council may lead to some political changes, with a potential reduction in the total number of councillors across the area in line with national trends. Q6. To what extent do you think a reduction in the overall number of councillors would have a positive or negative impact on how your council is run, or make no difference at all?... Base: All respondents Base: All respondents Base: All respondents Base: All respondents Q7 1. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all. Young people, for example children and Base: All respondents Q7\_2. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all. Old people, for example pensioners and those who are retired Rase: All respondents Base: All respondents Base: All respondents Base: All respondents Base: All respondents Q8. I am now going to read out a list of priorities for local government generally. Please select the top three priorities that are most important to you personally. Q9. Based on everything we have discussed so far today and having heard the various benefits and concerns, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents Q9. Based on everything we have discussed so far today and having heard the various benefits and concerns, to what extent are you favourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? ...... by Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are currently considering proposals to replace the two councils with a single District-level Council covering both areas. Both councils have been working in partnership for over 10 years, and all of their services are run together on behalf of both councils. Q4. In general, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents Q10. To what extent, if at all, are you concerned about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents Q11. What concerns, if any, do you have regarding the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? ...... Base: All those who have concerns about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk Q12. What further information, if anything, would you like to see from the two councils about the proposed changes going forward? Rase: All respondents Q13. How, if at all, would you like to hear from Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils about the proposal to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

Ward	92
S0. In order to speak to a representative cross-section of the local population, could I please speak to the youngest male or female aged 18 or above in the household?	104
S1. Can I start by checking whether your main residence is in the Forest Heath District Council area, the St Edmundsbury Borough Council area, or somewhere else?  Base: All respondents	107
S2. Are you eligible to vote in Local Government elections in Forest Heath or St Edmundsbury? You are eligible if you are 18+ and either. A British citizen living in the UK A Commonwealth citizen living in the UK AN EU or Irish citizen living in the UK Registered to vote as a service voter or crown servant. A British citizen living abroad but registered to vote in britain	110
S3. Are you currently a District Councillor serving in West Suffolk?	113
D1. Which of the following age groups do you fall into?  Base: All respondents	116
D2. Gender	119
D3. Which of the following best describes the employment status of the Chief Income Earner in your household?	122
D4. Does the Chief Income Earner have a private pension or allowance?  Base: All retired	125
D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired?	128
DSEG	134
D6. And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong?	137
D6. And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong?	140
D7. Which of the following best describes your working status?	143
DAGE	146
DETH	149
Working status	152
E2. Could we call you back about this survey if we need to clarify or check anything	155

# Q1. I'd like to start by talking about your local area. What is it you like most about living in your local area? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total

Weighted Total

	COUNC	L AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	l i	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%



## Q1. I'd like to start by talking about your local area. What is it you like most about living in your local area? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

			SEC	3	_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%



# Q1. I'd like to start by talking about your local area. What is it you like most about living in your local area? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

		TY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL O	OF NEW SINGLE		OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	Ţ	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%



## Q2. And what is it you like least about living in your local area? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

	COUNC	L AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%



## Q2. And what is it you like least about living in your local area? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

			SEG		_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%



## Q2. And what is it you like least about living in your local area? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

		LITY TOWARDS I			LITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL O	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPACT OF REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF CLLRS			
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%



This survey is about your District council, which is responsible for housing, planning, tourism and leisure, bin collection and local community services. It is not about Suffolk County Council, which is responsible for social care, schools and roads.

At present, all of your District council services are delivered jointly by Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury councils. This survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough councils.

#### Q3. Before now, had you ever heard of the proposed creation of a single District Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	L AREA	GENE	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total	а	b	C	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Heard of and know a lot about it	52 5%	19 5%	33 5%	34 7% d	18 4%	6 5%	4 2%	17 9% fkm	7 4%	6 4%	13 6%	10 4%	24 7% f	19 5%
Heard of and know a little about it	360 36%	124 33%	236 38%	216 43% d	144 29%	33 31%	43 26%	57 31%	53 32%	63 41% fkl	112 49% efghkl	76 28%	110 31%	175 46% efghkl
Heard of but know nothing about it	88 9%	34 9%	54 9%	40 8%	48 10%	1 1%	12 8% e	14 7% e	22 13% ek	15 10% e	24 10% ek	14 5%	35 10% ek	39 10% ek
Never heard of it	500 50%	198 53%	303 48%	213 42%	287 58% c	64 62% ijm	105 64% ghijlm	99 53% jm	83 51% jm	71 46% j	78 35%	169 63% ghijlm	182 52% jm	149 39%
NETS														
Net: Knowledge of	413 41%	144 38%	269 43%	250 50% d	162 33%	38 37%	47 29%	74 40% f	60 36%	69 45% fk	124 55% efghikl	85 32%	134 38% f	193 51% efghkl
Net: Heard of	501 50%	178 47%	323 52%	291 58% d	210 42%	40 38%	59 36%	88 47% fk	82 49% fk	84 54% efk	148 65% efghikl	99 37%	170 48% fk	232 61% efghkl
Net: No knowledge	588 59%	232 62%	356 57%	253 50%	335 67% c	66 63% jm	117 71% gijlm	113 60% jm	105 64% jm	86 55% j	102 45%	183 68% ijm	218 62% jm	188 49%



This survey is about your District council, which is responsible for housing, planning, tourism and leisure, bin collection and local community services. It is not about Suffolk County Council, which is responsible for social care, schools and roads.

At present, all of your District council services are delivered jointly by Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury councils. This survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough councils.

#### Q3. Before now, had you ever heard of the proposed creation of a single District Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Heard of and know a lot about it	52 5%	17 9%	15 4%	13 6%	8 3%	32 6%	21 4%	50 5%	2 3%	32 5%	17 4%	52 13%	52 10%	
Heard of and know a little about it	360	df 81	127	80	71	209	152	339	18	197	157	m 360	m 360	-
	36%	42% df	38% d	34%	30%	40% df	32%	36%	33%	33%	40% i	87% Im	72% m	-
Heard of but know nothing about it	88 9%	13 7%	28 8%	27 11%	20 8%	41 8%	47 10%	87 9%	1 2%	51 9%	36 9%	- -	88 18% km	
Never heard of it	500 50%	83 43%	162 49%	117 49%	139 58% abce	244 46%	256 54% ae	461 49%	33 62%	308 52% j	178 46%	- -	-	500 100% kl
NETS														
Net: Knowledge of	413 41%	98 51% cdf	142 43% d	94 39%	79 33%	241 46% df	172 36%	389 42%	19 36%	228 39%	174 45%	413 100% Im	413 82% m	-
Net: Heard of	501 50%	111 57% df	170 51% d	121 51% d	99 42%	282 54% df	219 46%	476 51%	21 38%	279 48%	210 54% i	413 100% m	501 100% m	
Net: No knowledge	588 59%	96 49%	189 57%	144 61% a	159 67% abe	285 54%	303 64% ae	548 58%	35 64%	359 61%	214 55%	- -	88 18% k	500 100% kl



This survey is about your District council, which is responsible for housing, planning, tourism and leisure, bin collection and local community services. It is not about Suffolk County Council, which is responsible for social care, schools and roads.

At present, all of your District council services are delivered jointly by Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury councils. This survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough councils.

#### Q3. Before now, had you ever heard of the proposed creation of a single District Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

			LITY TOWARDS N		COUNCIL: SECOND Q COUNCIL				F NEW SINGLE	IMPAC1	F OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS	
		Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
	Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%	ļ	а	b	С	d	е	Ť	g	h	'	J	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Heard of and know a lot about it	52	36	14	2	37	16	-	22	29	1	15	19	16	1
	5%	6%	7%	1%	5%	7%	-	5%	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%	2%
		С	С		f	f								
Heard of and know a little about it	360	247	73	41	256	77	27	168	187	5	131	103	110	17
	36%	38%	37%	26%	36%	36%	34%	40%	35%	13%	38%	30%	42%	29%
		С	С					i	i		k		k	
Heard of but know nothing about it	88	47	23	18	60	21	7	37	49	2	32	32	20	4
	9%	7%	12%	12%	9%	10%	8%	9%	9%	5%	9%	9%	8%	6%
Never heard of it	500	317	85	98	353	102	46	197	275	29	167	184	114	36
	50%	49%	44%	62%	50%	47%	58%	46%	51%	79%	48%	54%	44%	62%
				ab						gh		1		1
NETS														
Net: Knowledge of	413	283	87	43	292	93	27	190	216	6	146	122	126	19
_	41%	44%	45%	27%	41%	43%	34%	45%	40%	17%	42%	36%	49%	32%
		С	С					i	i				km	
Net: Heard of	501	330	110	61	353	114	34	228	265	8	178	154	146	22
	50%	51%	56%	38%	50%	53%	42%	54%	49%	21%	52%	46%	56%	38%
		С	С					i	i				km	
Net: No knowledge	588	364	108	117	413	123	52	234	324	30	199	215	134	40
	59%	56%	55%	73%	59%	57%	66%	55%	60%	83%	58%	64%	51%	68%
				ab						gh				I



Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are currently considering proposals to replace the two councils with a single District-level Council covering both areas.

Both councils have been working in partnership for over 10 years, and all of their services are run together on behalf of both councils.

Q4. In general, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

			COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER I					AGE				
				St							-				
		Total	Forest Heath District	Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very favourable	(4)	180 18%	52 14%	127 20%	95 19%	85 17%	16 15%	22 14%	29 16%	26 16%	35 22%	51 23%	38 14%	55 16%	86 23%
		10%	1470	a a	1976	17 76	1376	1470	10%	10%	fk	fkl	1470	10%	fkl
Fairly favourable	(3)	467	171	296	223	244	66	79	87	73	73	89	145	160	162
		47%	46%	47%	44%	49%	63%	48%	47%	44%	47%	39%	54%	46%	42%
							fghijlm						hjlm		
Fairly unfavourable	(2)	105	46	59	58	47	9	23	9	21	16	27	32	30	43
		10%	12%	9%	11%	10%	8%	14% gl	5%	13%	10%	12%	12%	9%	11%
										g		g	g		g
Very unfavourable	(1)	90 9%	45 12%	45 7%	54 11%	36 7%	4 4%	17 10%	17 9%	11 7%	13 9%	27 12%	21 8%	29 8%	40 11%
		9%	b	1%	11%	1%	4%	10%	9%	1%	9%	12% e	8%	0%	11%
Don't know		159	61	99	74	85	9	23	44	33	18	32	32	77	50
		16%	16%	16%	15%	17%	9%	14%	24%	20%	12%	14%	12%	22%	13%
									efijkm	eikm				efijkm	
NETS															
Net: Favourable		647	224	423	318	329	82	101	116	99	108	140	183	216	248
		65%	60%	68% a	63%	66%	79% fghjlm	62%	62%	60%	70%	62%	68%	61%	65%
Net: Unfavourable		195	91	103	111	84	13	40	26	33	29	54	53	59	83
		19%	24%	17%	22%	17%	12%	25%	14%	20%	19%	24%	20%	17%	22%
			b		d			egl				egl			g
Mean score		2.9	2.7	3.0 a	2.8	2.9	3.0 f	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9
Standard deviation		.87	.90	.83	.91	.82	.67	.86	.86	.83	.87	.97	.80	.85	.93
Standard error		.03	.05	.04	.04	.04	.08	.07	.07	.07	.07	.07	.05	.05	.05



Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are currently considering proposals to replace the two councils with a single District-level Council covering both areas.

Both councils have been working in partnership for over 10 years, and all of their services are run together on behalf of both councils.

Q4. In general, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

					SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	j	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very favourable	(4)	180	55	48	37	39	104	76	166	13	95	84	95	106	74
		18%	29% bcdef	15%	15%	16%	20%	16%	18%	24%	16%	22% i	23% m	21% m	15%
Fairly favourable	(3)	467	77	164	118	107	241	226	435	26	289	167	188	224	243
		47%	40%	49% a	50% a	45%	46%	48%	46%	48%	49%	43%	46%	45%	49%
Fairly unfavourable	(2)	105	17	39	29	20	56	49	99	5	63	40	45	60	45
		10%	9%	12%	12%	8%	11%	10%	11%	9%	11%	10%	11%	12%	9%
Very unfavourable	(1)	90	17	21	22	30	38	52	87	2	44	42	42	49	40
		9%	9%	6%	9%	13% be	7%	11% be	9%	3%	8%	11%	10%	10%	8%
Don't know		159	27	60	31	41	87	72	150	8	96	57	43	61	98
		16%	14%	18%	13%	17%	17%	15%	16%	15%	16%	15%	10%	12%	20% kl
NETS															
Net: Favourable		647	133	212	155	146	345	302	601	39	385	250	283	330	317
		65%	68%	64%	65%	62%	66%	64%	64%	72%	66%	64%	69%	66%	63%
Net: Unfavourable		195	34	60	51	50	94	101	186	7	107	82	87	110	85 17%
		19%	18%	18%	21%	21%	18%	21%	20%	13%	18%	21%	21%	22%	
Mean score		2.9	3.0 cdf	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9 df	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9
Standard deviation		.87	.92	.78	.85	.93	.84	.89	.87	.75	.82	.93	.91	.90	.83
Standard error		.03	.07	.05	.06	.06	.04	.04	.03	.14	.04	.05	.05	.04	.04



Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are currently considering proposals to replace the two councils with a single District-level Council covering both areas.

Both councils have been working in partnership for over 10 years, and all of their services are run together on behalf of both councils.

Q4. In general, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

			FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: FIRST Q				ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU		F NEW SINGLE				
					2		UNCIL: SECOND	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very favourable	(4)	180	180	-	-	162	13	5	42	137	1	82	68	26	4
		18%	28% bc	-	-	23% ef	6%	6%	10%	25% gi	2%	24% Im	20% Im	10%	7%
F	(0)	40-							470	_					
Fairly favourable	(3)	467 47%	467 72%	-	-	423 60%	30 14%	14 17%	178 42%	281 52%	8 23%	169 49%	172 51%	99 38%	26 45%
			bc			ef	,.	,-	i	gi		1	1		
Fairly unfavourable	(2)	105	-	105	-	27	73	5	75	27	3	22	30	49	4
		10%	-	54%	-	4%	34%	7%	18%	5%	9%	6%	9%	19%	7%
				ac			df		h					jkm	
Very unfavourable	(1)	90	-	90	-	12	76	1	71 17%	18	1	15	23	50 19%	1 2%
		9%	-	46% ac	-	2%	35% df	2%	hi	3%	2%	4%	7%	jkm	2%
Don't know		159	_	_	159	82	24	54	58	77	23	57	45	35	22
DOTT KNOW		16%	-	-	100%	12%	11%	68%	14%	14%	64%	16%	13%	14%	38%
					ab			de			gh				jkl
NETS															
Net: Favourable		647	647	-	-	585	43	19	220	418	9	251	240	125	31
		65%	100% bc	-	-	83% ef	20%	24%	52%	77% gi	25%	73% Im	71% lm	48%	52%
			DC DC						'	•					
Net: Unfavourable		195 19%	-	195 100%	-	39 6%	149 69%	7 8%	146 34%	45 8%	4 11%	37 11%	53 16%	100 38%	5 9%
		19%	-	ac	-	076	df	076	hi	0%	1176	1170	1076	jkm	976
Mean score		2.9	3.3	1.5	-	3.2	1.9	2.9	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.1	3.0	2.4	2.9
			b			e				g		kl	1		1
Standard deviation Standard error		.87	.45 .02	.50 .04	-	.59 .02	.90 .06	.80 .15	.93 .05	.70 .03	.69 .19	.75 .04	.80 .05	.96 .07	.62 .11
Standard entor		.03	.02	.04		.02	.00	.10	.05	.03	.19	.04	.05	.07	.11



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### **SUMMARY TABLE**

Base: All respondents

	Total	Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Not at all important	Don't know	Net: Important	Net: Not important	Mean
Continue the delivery of important services to	1001	830	141	11	8	10	971	20	3.8
local people	100%	83%	14%	1%	1%	1%	97%	2%	
Allow the Council to better plan for the future,	1001	664	266	31	13	27	930	44	3.6
including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing	100%	66%	27%	3%	1%	3%	93%	4%	
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to	1001	637	267	39	21	37	904	60	3.6
meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	100%	64%	27%	4%	2%	4%	90%	6%	
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in	1001	504	366	71	30	30	871	100	3.4
the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	100%	50%	37%	7%	3%	3%	87%	10%	
Simplify council decision-making while still	1001	433	413	78	37	40	846	115	3.3
keeping offices across both areas	100%	43%	41%	8%	4%	4%	85%	11%	
Deliver further efficiency savings in the	1001	468	339	92	40	62	807	132	3.3
Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year	100%	47%	34%	9%	4%	6%	81%	13%	



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### **Important summary**

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	DER	AGE								
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Continue the delivery of important services to local people	971 97%	360 96%	611 98%	485 96%	486 98%	102 98%	158 96%	179 96%	162 98%	152 98%	219 97%	261 97%	341 97%	370 97%
Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing	930 93%	351 93%	579 93%	460 91%	470 94%	97 93%	161 98% egijlm	174 93%	158 96% jm	142 92%	198 88%	258 96% ijm	332 94% jm	340 89%
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	904 90%	332 88%	572 91%	450 89%	454 91%	99 95% g	150 92%	163 87%	152 92%	142 91%	198 88%	249 93% gj	315 89%	340 89%
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	871 87%	319 85%	552 88%	427 85%	443 89% c	94 90%	148 90% i	158 85%	145 88%	129 83%	197 87%	242 90% i	303 86%	325 85%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### **Important summary**

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas
Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year
None of the above

	COUNC	L AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
846 85%	304 81%	541 87% a	412 82%	434 87% c	96 92% im	138 84%	155 83%	141 86%	125 81%	191 85%	233 87%	296 84%	317 83%
807 81%	292 78%	515 82%	388 77%	419 84% c	87 84%	146 89% ghijlm	142 76%	131 80%	121 78%	180 80%	233 87% ghijlm	273 78%	301 79%
10 1%	5 1%	5 1%	7 1%	4 1%	2 2%	1	3 1%	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	2 1%	5 1%	3 1%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### **Important summary**

Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Continue the delivery of important services to local people	971 97%	187 96%	329 99% acdf	229 96%	226 95%	516 98% df	455 96%	911 97%	51 94%	571 97%	377 97%	399 97%	485 97%	487 97%
Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing	930 93%	182 94%	315 95% df	219 92%	213 90%	498 95% df	432 91%	871 93%	49 91%	552 94%	356 92%	380 92%	461 92%	469 94%
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	904 90%	181 93% df	307 92% df	221 93% df	195 82%	488 93% df	416 88% d	848 91%	46 85%	541 92% j	341 88%	375 91%	455 91%	449 90%
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	871 87%	171 88%	296 89%	202 85%	201 85%	467 89%	404 85%	819 87%	42 78%	509 87%	341 88%	352 85%	433 86%	438 88%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Important summary

Base: All respondents

None of the above

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas
Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year

			SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
846	158	279	211	198	437	409	795	42	493	331	345	420	426
85%	82%	84%	89% ae	83%	83%	86%	85%	78%	84%	85%	83%	84%	85%
807	149	263	206	189	412	395	759	42	474	314	328	399	408
81%	77%	79%	87%	80%	78%	83%	81%	77%	81%	81%	79%	80%	82%
			abde			ae							
10	2	1	2	5	3	8	9	2	7	2	5	6	5
1%	1%	*	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
				е									



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Important summary

Base: All respondents

			FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: FIRST Q			COUNCIL: SECOND Q			UT PROPOSAL ( COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE		T OF REDUCTION	I IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Continue the delivery of important services to local people	971 97%	639 99% bc	182 93%	151 95%	697 99% ef	201 93%	73 92%	409 96%	529 98% i	33 90%	335 97%	329 98%	250 96%	57 97%
Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing	930 93%	623 96% bc	165 85%	142 89%	679 96% ef	182 84%	69 87%	388 92%	511 95% i	30 83%	329 95% I	311 92%	234 90%	56 96%
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	904 90%	609 94% bc	164 84%	131 82%	664 94% ef	180 84%	59 74%	378 89% i	499 92% i	26 72%	320 93%	305 90%	229 88%	50 86%
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	871 87%	593 92% bc	147 75%	131 82%	643 91% ef	164 76%	63 79%	364 86%	480 89% i	27 74%	303 88%	290 86%	224 86%	54 93%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### **Important summary**

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas
Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year
None of the above

	FAVOURABIL	ITY TOWARDS	NEW SINGLE	FAVOURABII	LITY TOWARDS I	IEW SINGLE	CONCERN ABO	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE				
	C	OUNCIL: FIRST (	2	СО	UNCIL: SECOND	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1009
846	584	144	117	635	159	52	350	472	24	296	289	212	48
85%	90%	74%	74%	90%	73%	66%	83%	87%	65%	86%	86%	82%	83
	bc			ef			i	gi					
807	577	127	103	628	130	49	321	465	21	300	277	189	40
81%	89%	65%	65%	89%	60%	62%	76%	86%	58%	87%	82%	73%	69
	bc			ef			i	gi		lm	lm		
10	1	6	4	2	6	3	5	3	2	2	2	5	2
1%	*	3%	2%	*	3%	4%	1%	1%	6%	1%	1%	2%	3
		а	а		d	d			gh				



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Not important summary

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year	132 13%	55 15%	77 12%	86 17% d	46 9%	14 13%	13 8%	32 17% fk	21 13%	23 15%	29 13%	27 10%	52 15% f	52 14%
Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas	115 11%	52 14%	63 10%	74 15% d	40 8%	6 6%	20 12%	21 11%	20 12%	22 14%	25 11%	26 10%	41 12%	48 12%
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	100 10%	43 11%	58 9%	67 13% d	34 7%	7 7%	12 7%	24 13% k	18 11%	19 12%	21 9%	19 7%	41 12%	40 10%
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	60 6%	28 7%	33 5%	36 7%	24 5%	3 3%	11 7%	16 9%	7 4%	8 5%	15 7%	15 6%	23 7%	22 6%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Not important summary

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
			St											
	Total	Forest Heath District	Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total	District	Borougn	iviale C		10-24	20-34 f		40-04 h	55-64 i	65+	16-34	35-54	m m
Significance Level. 95/6		a a	D		a	-	'	g	"	'	J	K	'	""
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Allow the Council to better plan for the future,	44	16	27	28	16	1	2	9	7	7	18	3	16	25
including a long-term plan for improving the	4%	4%	4%	5%	3%	1%	1%	5%	4%	4%	8%	1%	4%	6%
local economy and housing								fk			efk		k	fk
Continue the delivery of important services to	20	11	9	15	5	-	3	6	3	1	6	3	9	7
local people	2%	3%	1%	3%	1%	-	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
				d										
None of the above	710	251	459	323	387	83	123	124	119	104	157	206	242	262
	71%	67%	73%	64%	78%	80%	75%	66%	72%	67%	70%	77%	69%	69%
			а		С	gilm						gilm		



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Not important summary

Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year	132 13%	33 17% cf	48 15%	25 10%	26 11%	81 15% f	51 11%	121 13%	7 13%	81 14%	48 12%	67 16% m	80 16% m	52 10%
Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas	115 11%	28 14%	41 12%	22 9%	24 10%	69 13%	46 10%	109 12%	5 9%	72 12%	41 11%	55 13%	66 13%	49 10%
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	100 10%	19 10%	29 9%	28 12%	24 10%	49 9%	52 11%	95 10%	5 9%	58 10%	39 10%	51 12%	56 11%	45 9%
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	60 6%	10 5%	16 5%	8 4%	25 11% abce	27 5%	34 7%	59 6%	1 3%	31 5%	28 7%	28 7%	34 7%	26 5%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Not important summary

Base: All respondents

				SEC	3	_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Allow the Council to better plan for the future,	44	6	9	13	15	15	28	42	2	24	18	20	26	18
including a long-term plan for improving the	4%	3%	3%	6%	6%	3%	6%	4%	3%	4%	5%	5%	5%	4%
local economy and housing					be		е							
Continue the delivery of important services to	20	4	3	8	6	6	13	18	2	10	8	9	11	8
local people	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
				b										
None of the above	710	130	230	180	171	359	351	665	38	414	278	272	339	371
	71%	67%	69%	76%	72%	68%	74%	71%	71%	70%	72%	66%	68%	74%
				ae										kl



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Not important summary

Base: All respondents

	FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: FIRST Q Favour Unfavour				ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL O	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPAC*	T OF REDUCTION	I IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS	
	Total			Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Deliver further efficiency savings in the	132	48	56	28	56	63	13	72	55	4	32	37	54	8
Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year	13%	7%	29% ac	17% a	8%	29% df	16% d	17% h	10%	11%	9%	11%	21% jk	13%
Simplify council decision-making while still	115	51	39	25	56	45	14	56	57	2	42	36	35	2
keeping offices across both areas	11%	8%	20% a	16% a	8%	21% d	17% d	13%	10%	6%	12% m	11%	13% m	3%
Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the	100	43	40	17	50	42	9	47	52	2	37	31	31	2
region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people	10%	7%	20% ac	11%	7%	19% d	11%	11%	10%	4%	11%	9%	12%	3%
Ensure the new Council is better equipped to	60	25	22	13	28	25	7	30	29	1	20	20	19	1
meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster	6%	4%	11% a	8% a	4%	12% d	8%	7%	5%	4%	6%	6%	7%	1%



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_SUM. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Not important summary

Base: All respondents

			LITY TOWARDS OUNCIL: FIRST			LITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL ( COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	T-1-1	Favour	Unfavour	David Incom	Favour	Unfavour	D!!-!	0	Not	David Inc.	Destition	NI - difference	Namatina	David Income
Significance Level: 95%	Total	able	able	Don't know c	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive :	No difference	Negative	Don't know m
Significance Level. 95%		а	b	C	u	е	ı	9	11	'	J	K	'	""
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Allow the Council to better plan for the future,	44	13	22	9	19	22	3	23	19	2	9	13	21	1
including a long-term plan for improving the	4%	2%	11%	5%	3%	10%	4%	5%	3%	6%	3%	4%	8%	2%
local economy and housing			ac	а		d							jk	
Continue the delivery of important services to	20	7	9	4	8	10	1	11	8	1	7	4	8	-
local people	2%	1%	4%	2%	1%	5%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	-
			а			d								
None of the above	710	508	100	102	554	110	47	286	398	26	252	245	167	46
	71%	78%	51%	64%	78%	51%	59%	67%	74%	72%	73%	73%	64%	79%
		bc		b	ef				g		1	1		1



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_1. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Continue the delivery of important services to local people

Base: All respondents

	1		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
				St											
		Total	Forest Heath District	Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	830	302	528	408	421	91	129	151	137	134	189	220	288	322
		83%	81%	84%	81%	85%	88%	78%	81%	83%	86%	83%	82%	82%	85%
Fairly important	(3)	141	58	84	77	65	11	30	28	25	18	30	41	53	48
		14%	15%	13%	15%	13%	11%	18%	15%	15%	11%	13%	15%	15%	13%
Not very important	(2)	11	7	4	8	3	-	2	3	1	1	4	2	4	5
		1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	*	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Not at all important	(1)	8	4	5	7	1	-	1	4	2	-	1	1	6	1
		1%	1%	1%	1%	*	-	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	*
Don't know		10	5	5	4	6	2	2	1	1	3	2	4	2	4
		1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	*	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
NETS															
Net: Important		971	360	611	485	486	102	158	179	162	152	219	261	341	370
		97%	96%	98%	96%	98%	98%	96%	96%	98%	98%	97%	97%	97%	97%
Net: Not important		20	11	9	15	5	-	3	6	3	1	6	3	9	7
		2%	3%	1%	3% d	1%	-	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
Mean score		3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
						С	f				fg				
Standard deviation		.48	.52	.45	.54	.40	.31	.51	.58	.49	.36	.48	.45	.54	.44
Standard error		.02	.03	.02	.02	.02	.03	.04	.04	.04	.03	.03	.03	.03	.02



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_1. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Continue the delivery of important services to local people

Base: All respondents

		SEG SEG				ETHNIC	HTY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF			
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very important	(4)	830 83%	164 85%	275 83%	199 84%	192 81%	439 84%	391 82%	778 83%	43 80%	492 84%	323 83%	353 85%	425 85%	405 81%
Fairly important	(3)	141 14%	23 12%	54 16%	30 13%	34 14%	77 15%	64 14%	132 14%	7 14%	80 14%	54 14%	46 11%	60 12%	82 16% kl
Not very important	(2)	11 1%	2 1%	1	5 2%	3 1%	4 1%	8 2%	11 1%	- -	4 1%	6 1%	4 1%	6 1%	6 1%
Not at all important	(1)	8 1%	1 1%	1	3 1%	3 1%	3	6 1%	7 1%	2 3%	6 1%	3 1%	5 1%	6 1%	2 *
Don't know		10 1%	3 2% b	<del>-</del> -	1 *	6 2% bce	3 1%	7 1%	8 1%	2 3%	6 1%	3 1%	5 1%	5 1%	5 1%
NETS															
Net: Important		971 97%	187 96%	329 99% acdf	229 96%	226 95%	516 98% df	455 96%	911 97%	51 94%	571 97%	377 97%	399 97%	485 97%	487 97%
Net: Not important		20 2%	4 2%	3 1%	8 3% b	6 2%	6 1%	13 3%	18 2%	2 3%	10 2%	8 2%	9 2%	11 2%	8 2%
Mean score Standard deviation Standard error		3.8 .48 .02	3.8 .45 .03	3.8 .42 .03	3.8 .53 .03	3.8 .51 .03	3.8 .43 .02	3.8 .52 .02	3.8 .47 .02	3.8 .62 .11	3.8 .47 .02	3.8 .48 .02	3.8 .49 .02	3.8 .49 .02	3.8 .46 .02

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

COMRES

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_1. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Continue the delivery of important services to local people

Base: All respondents

				ITY TOWARDS N					CONCERN ABO		F NEW SINGLE				
			C	OUNCIL: FIRST O	Q	CC	DUNCIL: SECOND	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	FOF REDUCTION	I IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
			Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
		Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	830	552	154	124	598	169	63	347	457	26	287	281	217	46
		83%	85%	79%	78%	85%	78%	79%	82%	85%	71%	83%	83%	83%	79%
			bc			е				i					
Fairly important	(3)	141	87	28	26	100	32	10	62	72	7	49	49	34	10
		14%	13%	14%	17%	14%	15%	13%	15%	13%	19%	14%	14%	13%	18%
Not very important	(2)	11	5	3	2	5	5	1	7	3	1	6	2	4	-
		1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	*	2%	-
							d								
Not at all important	(1)	8	2	5	1	2	5	1	4	4	-	2	3	4	-
		1%	*	3%	1%	*	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-
				а			d								
Don't know		10	1	5	5	1	5	5	4	3	3	2	4	2	2
		1%	*	2%	3%	*	2%	6%	1%	1%	8%	1%	1%	1%	3%
				а	а		d	d			gh				
NETS															
Net: Important		971	639	182	151	697	201	73	409	529	33	335	329	250	57
		97%	99%	93%	95%	99%	93%	92%	96%	98%	90%	97%	98%	96%	97%
			bc			ef				i					
Net: Not important		20	7	9	4	8	10	1	11	8	1	7	4	8	-
		2%	1%	4%	2%	1%	5%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	-
				а			d								
Mean score		3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
			b			е									
Standard deviation		.48	.41	.63	.51	.42	.63	.48	.51	.45	.49	.47	.46	.53	.39
Standard error		.02	.02	.05	.04	.02	.04	.06	.02	.02	.08	.02	.03	.03	.05

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_2. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	L AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
			St											
	Total	Forest Heath District	Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very important (4)	468 47%	161 43%	307 49%	223 44%	245 49%	47 46%	84 51%	79 42%	77 46%	66 43%	115 51%	131 49%	155 44%	181 48%
Fairly important (3)	339 34%	131 35%	209 33%	165 33%	175 35%	40 38%	62 38% j	63 34%	55 33%	55 36%	64 29%	102 38% j	118 33%	120 31%
Not very important (2)	92 9%	35 9%	57 9%	58 12% d	34 7%	12 11%	8 5%	22 12% f	15 9%	19 12% f	15 7%	20 7%	37 11% f	35 9%
Not at all important (1)	40 4%	20 5%	19 3%	28 5% d	12 2%	2 2%	5 3%	10 5%	5 3%	4 2%	14 6%	7 3%	15 4%	18 5%
Don't know	62 6%	29 8%	34 5%	30 6%	32 7%	3 3%	5 3%	14 7% fk	13 8% fk	11 7% k	17 7% fk	8 3%	27 8% fk	28 7% fk
NETS														
Net: Important	807 81%	292 78%	515 82%	388 77%	419 84% c	87 84%	146 89% ghijlm	142 76%	131 80%	121 78%	180 80%	233 87% ghijlm	273 78%	301 79%
Net: Not important	132 13%	55 15%	77 12%	86 17% d	46 9%	14 13%	13 8%	32 17% fk	21 13%	23 15%	29 13%	27 10%	52 15% f	52 14%
Mean score	3.3	3.2	3.4 a	3.2	3.4 c	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error	.82 .03	.86 .04	.79 .03	.88 .04	.74 .03	.76 .08	.73 .05	.87 .07	.80 .06	.79 .07	.88 .06	9 .74 .05	.84 .05	.84 .05

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_2. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year

Base: All respondents

															CREATION OF
					SEG	ì			ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		NEW COUNCIL	
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	Ī	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	468	94	135	123	116	229	239	438	28	266	190	200	236	232
		47%	48%	41%	52% be	49%	43%	50% be	47%	51%	45%	49%	48%	47%	46%
Fairly important	(3)	339	56	127	83	73	183	156	321	14	208	124	128	163	176
		34%	29%	38% a	35%	31%	35%	33%	34%	26%	35%	32%	31%	33%	35%
Not very important	(2)	92	22	34	18	18	56	36	82	7	56	33	50	59	33
		9%	11%	10%	8%	7%	11%	8%	9%	13%	10%	9%	12% m	12% m	7%
Not at all important	(1)	40	11	14	7	8	25	15	39	_	25	14	18	21	19
Trot at all important	(.)	4%	5%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%	4%	-	4%	4%	4%	4%	
Don't know		62	12	21	6	23	33	29	57	5	32	27	18	22	41
		6%	6%	6% c	3%	10% c	6% c	6% c	6%	10%	6%	7%	4%	4%	8%   kl
NETS				Ü		Ŭ	Ü	ŭ							N
Net: Important		807	149	263	206	189	412	395	759	42	474	314	328	399	408
,		81%	77%	79%	87% abde	80%	78%	83% ae	81%	77%	81%	81%	79%	80%	
Net: Not important		132	33	48	25	26	81	51	121	7	81	48	67	80	52
'		13%	17%	15%	10%	11%	15%	11%	13%	13%	14%	12%	16%	16%	
			cf				t						m	m	
Mean score		3.3	3.3	3.2	3.4 be	3.4 be	3.2	3.4 be	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.4
Standard deviation		.82	.89	.82	.76	.79	.85	.77	.82	.73	.82	.81	.85	.84	.79
Standard error		.03	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03	.03	.13	.04	.04	.04	.04	.04

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m CATI Fieldwork: 30th June – 24th July 2017

Prepared by ComRes

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_2. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Deliver further efficiency savings in the Councils' budget of around eight-hundred thousand pounds a year Base: All respondents

			CC	ITY TOWARDS N DUNCIL: FIRST C		COL	ITY TOWARDS N JNCIL: SECOND		CONCERN ABOU	COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	FOF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	468	346	59	63	378	66	24	164	292	12	189	157	102	19
		47%	54%	30%	39%	54% ef	30%	30%	39%	54%	33%	55% klm	47%	39%	33%
			bc							gi					
Fairly important	(3)	339 34%	231 36%	68 35%	40 25%	250 35%	64 30%	25 32%	157 37%	173 32%	9 26%	111 32%	120 36%	87 34%	21 37%
		34%	30% C	33% C	25%	33%	30%	3276	3176	3276	20%	32%	30%	34%	3170
Not very important	(2)	92	41	36	15	45	39	8	52	37	3	24	30	32	6
		9%	6%	19% ac	9%	6%	18% d	10%	12% h	7%	7%	7%	9%	12% j	10%
Not at all important	(1)	40	7	20	13	11	24	5	20	18	1	8	8	22	2
,	( )	4%	1%	10%	8%	2%	11%	6%	5%	3%	4%	2%		8%	4%
				а	а		d	d						jk	
Don't know		62	22	12	28	22	23	18	31	20	11	12	23	17	10
		6%	3%	6%	18% ab	3%	11% d	22% de	7% h	4%	30% gh	4%	7%	6%	17% jkl
NETS					ab		ŭ	do			9.1				jiu
Net: Important		807	577	127	103	628	130	49	321	465	21	300	277	189	40
Net. Important		81%	89%	65%	65%	89%	60%	62%	76%	86%	58%	87%		73%	69%
			bc			ef			i	gi		lm	lm		
Net: Not important		132	48	56	28	56	63	13	72	55	4	32	37	54	8
		13%	7%	29% ac	17% a	8%	29% df	16% d	17% h	10%	11%	9%	11%	21% jk	13%
Mean score		3.3	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.2
0			bc	0-	b	ef	4.05			g		lm	1	0=	
Standard deviation Standard error		.82 .03	.67 .03	.97 .07	.98 .09	.69 .03	1.02 .07	.91 .11	.85 .04	.77 .03	.87 .17	.74 .04	.75 .04	.95	.82

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_3. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster

Base: All respondents

			COUNC	IL AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
				St											
		Total	Forest Heath District	Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	637	228	410	317	320	69	111	116	99	104	138	180	215	242
		64%	61%	65%	63%	64%	67%	68%	62%	60%	67%	61%	67%	61%	64%
Fairly important	(3)	267	105	162	133	134	30	39	47	53	38	60	69	100	98
		27%	28%	26%	26%	27%	29%	24%	25%	32%	24%	27%	26%	28%	26%
Not very important	(2)	39	16	23	24	15	2	8	10	3	7	9	10	14	16
		4%	4%	4%	5%	3%	2%	5%	5%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Not at all important	(1)	21	11	10	12	9	1	4	6	3	1	6	5	9	6
		2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Don't know		37	16	21	17	19	2	2	8	6	5	13	4	14	19
		4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	2%	1%	4%	4%	4%	6%	1%	4%	5%
												fk			fk
NETS															
Net: Important		904	332	572	450	454	99	150	163	152	142	198	249	315	340
		90%	88%	91%	89%	91%	95%	92%	87%	92%	91%	88%	93%	89%	89%
							g						gj		
Net: Not important		60	28	33	36	24	3	11	16	7	8	15	15	23	22
		6%	7%	5%	7%	5%	3%	7%	9%	4%	5%	7%	6%	7%	6%
Mean score		3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6
Standard deviation		.68	.73	.64	.71	.64	.59	.70	.76	.65	.60	.70	.65	.71	.66
Standard error		.02	.04	.03	.03	.03	.07	.05	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.04	.03

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

COMRES

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_3. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster

Base: All respondents

		AB C1		SEG		_		ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very important (4)	637 64%	139 72% cdf	216 65%	144 61%	138 58%	355 68% df	282 59%	598 64%	33 61%	388 66%	236 61%	279 68% m	333 66%	305 61%
Fairly important (3)	267 27%	42 22%	91 27%	77 33% ade	57 24%	133 25%	134 28%	250 27%	13 24%	153 26%	104 27%	96 23%	122 24%	144 29%
Not very important (2)	39 4%	8 4%	10 3%	5 2%	17 7% bce	18 3%	22 5%	38 4%	1 3%	21 4%	17 4%	19 4%	23 5%	16 3%
Not at all important (1)	21 2%	2 1%	7 2%	3 1%	9 4%	9 2%	12 3%	21 2%	- -	10 2%	11 3%	10 2%	11 2%	10 2%
Don't know	37 4%	3 1%	9 3%	8 3%	18 7% abce	11 2%	25 5% ae	30 3%	7 13% g	15 3%	19 5%	9 2%	11 2%	25 5% kl
NETS														
Net: Important	904 90%	181 93% df	307 92% df	221 93% df	195 82%	488 93% df	416 88% d	848 91%	46 85%	541 92% j	341 88%	375 91%	455 91%	449 90%
Net: Not important	60 6%	10 5%	16 5%	8 4%	25 11% abce	27 5%	34 7%	59 6%	1 3%	31 5%	28 7%	28 7%	34 7%	26 5%
Mean score	3.6	3.7 df	3.6 d	3.6	3.5	3.6 df	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6
Standard deviation Standard error	.68 .02	.62 .04	.65 .04	.61 .04	.80 .05	.64 .03	.71 .03	.68 .02	.54 .10	.64 .03	.73 .04	.69 .03	.69 .03	.66

COMRES

#### West Suffolk: Creation of a Single Council Public Survey

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_3. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Ensure the new Council is better equipped to meet the future challenges facing local government, such as an ageing population, and a reduction in funding from central government in Westminster

Base: All respondents

			FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE						CONCERN ABO		OF NEW SINGLE				
			C	OUNCIL: FIRST O	Q .	co	UNCIL: SECOND	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
			Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
		Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	637	435	105	96	475	124	38	269	351	17	233	212	161	31
		64%	67%	54%	61%	67%	57%	48%	63%	65%	48%	68%	63%	62%	53%
			b			ef				i		m			
Fairly important	(3)	267	174	58	35	189	57	21	109	149	9	87	93	68	19
		27%	27%	30%	22%	27%	26%	26%	26%	28%	25%	25%	27%	26%	32%
Not very important	(2)	39	20	13	7	19	15	5	20	19	-	15	15	9	-
		4%	3%	7%	4%	3%	7%	6%	5%	4%	-	4%	4%	3%	-
				а			d								
Not at all important	(1)	21	6	9	6	9	10	2	10	10	1	5	5	10	1
		2%	1%	5%	4%	1%	5%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%	4%	1%
				а	а		d							j	
Don't know		37	12	10	15	13	10	14	16	12	9	5	13	11	8
		4%	2%	5%	9%	2%	5%	17%	4%	2%	24%	2%	4%	4%	13%
				а	а		d	de			gh			j	jkl
NETS															
Net: Important		904	609	164	131	664	180	59	378	499	26	320	305	229	50
·		90%	94%	84%	82%	94%	84%	74%	89%	92%	72%	93%	90%	88%	86%
			bc			ef			i	i					
Net: Not important		60	25	22	13	28	25	7	30	29	1	20	20	19	1
		6%	4%	11%	8%	4%	12%	8%	7%	5%	4%	6%	6%	7%	1%
				а	а		d								
Mean score		3.6	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6
Standard deviation		.68	.59	.82	.78	ef .61	.83	.75	.70	.65	.76	.64	.66	.76	
Standard deviation		.02	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06	.09	.03	.03	.14	.03	.04	.05	
Columna Tastada a haa da f	سليات تمايس	.02	.02		.07	.52	.30	.00		.55	.1-7	.55		.55	

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - q,h,i - j,k,l,m

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_4. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very important (4)	504 50%	177 47%	328 52%	247 49%	258 52%	59 57%	81 50%	88 47%	83 50%	75 48%	118 52%	140 52%	171 49%	193 51%
Fairly important (3)	366 37%	142 38%	224 36%	181 36%	186 37%	35 33%	67 41%	70 37%	63 38%	54 35%	78 35%	102 38%	132 38%	132 35%
Not very important (2)	71 7%	28 7%	43 7%	47 9% d	23 5%	7 7%	8 5%	17 9%	14 8%	10 7%	14 6%	15 6%	31 9%	25 7%
Not at all important (1)	30 3%	15 4%	15 2%	19 4%	10 2%	- -	4 2%	7 4%	4 2%	8 5% ek	6 3%	4 1%	11 3%	15 4%
Don't know	30 3%	14 4%	16 3%	10 2%	20 4% c	3 3%	4 2%	5 3%	2 1%	8 5%	8 4%	7 3%	7 2%	16 4%
NETS														
Net: Important	871 87%	319 85%	552 88%	427 85%	443 89% c	94 90%	148 90% i	158 85%	145 88%	129 83%	197 87%	242 90% i	303 86%	325 85%
Net: Not important	100 10%	43 11%	58 9%	67 13% d	34 7%	7 7%	12 7%	24 13% k	18 11%	19 12%	21 9%	19 7%	41 12%	40 10%
Mean score	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4 c	3.5 g	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.4
Standard deviation Standard error	.75 .02	.79 .04	.73 .03	.80 .04	.69 .03	.63 .07	.70 .05	.79 .06	.74 .06	.84 .07	.75 .05	.67 .04	.77 .04	.79 .04

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m CATI Fieldwork: 30th June – 24th July 2017

Prepared by ComRes

Page 35



As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_4. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people

					SEG				ETHNIC	:ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS O	F PROPOSED	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	504 50%	107 55%	158 48%	117 49%	122 52%	265 50%	240 50%	471 50%	28 52%	293 50%	198 51%	210 51%	254 51%	250 50%
Fairly important	(3)	366	64	138	85	79	202	164	348	14	216	143	142	179	188
		37%	33%	42% d	36%	33%	38%	35%	37%	27%	37%	37%	34%	36%	37%
Not very important	(2)	71	15	22	19	15	36	34	66	5	42	26	35	38	32
		7%	8%	6%	8%	6%	7%	7%	7%	9%	7%	7%	8%	8%	6%
Not at all important	(1)	30	5	8	8	9	12	17	29	-	16	13	16	17	12
		3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%	3%	-	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%
Don't know		30	4	7	7	12	10	20	23	7	20	9	10	12	18
		3%	2%	2%	3%	5%	2%	4%	2%	12%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%
						е		е		g					
NETS															
Net: Important		871	171	296	202	201	467	404	819	42	509	341	352	433	438
		87%	88%	89%	85%	85%	89%	85%	87%	78%	87%	88%	85%	86%	88%
Net: Not important		100	19	29	28	24	49	52	95	5	58	39	51	56	45
		10%	10%	9%	12%	10%	9%	11%	10%	9%	10%	10%	12%	11%	9%
Mean score		3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4
Standard deviation		.75	.74	.72	.78	.79	.72	.78	.76	.69	.75	.76	.80	.78	.73
Standard error		.02	.05	.05	.05	.05	.03	.03	.02	.13	.03	.04	.04	.04	.03



COMRES

### West Suffolk: Creation of a Single Council Public Survey

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_4. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Strengthen West Suffolk's political voice in the region and nationally, while remaining small enough to support local people

				ITY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	504	332	93	80	356	103	46	206	282	16	182	148	144	30
		50%	51%	47%	50%	50%	48%	58%	49%	52%	45%	53% k	44%	55% k	51%
Fairly important	(3)	366	262	54	51	288	62	17	157	198	11	121	142	79	24
		37%	40%	28%	32%	41%	29%	21%	37%	37%	29%	35%	42%	31%	42%
			bc			ef							ı		
Not very important	(2)	71	37	22	11	40	24	7	31	38	2	22	24	23	2
		7%	6%	11% a	7%	6%	11% d	9%	7%	7%	4%	6%	7%	9%	3%
Not at all important	(1)	30	6	18	6	10	18	2	16	14	-	15	7	7	-
		3%	1%	9%	4%	1%	8%	2%	4%	3%	-	4%	2%	3%	-
				ac	а		d								
Don't know		30	10	8	12	13	10	8	14	8	8	5	16	6	2
		3%	2%	4% a	7% a	2%	5% d	10% d	3%	2%	22% gh	2%	5%	2%	4%
NETS				a	a		u	ū			gri		J		
Net: Important		871	593	147	131	643	164	63	364	480	27	303	290	224	54
		87%	92% bc	75%	82%	91% ef	76%	79%	86%	89% i	74%	88%	86%	86%	93%
Net: Not important		100	43	40	17	50	42	9	47	52	2	37	31	31	2
		10%	7%	20%	11%	7%	19%	11%	11%	10%	4%	11%	9%	12%	3%
				ac			d								
Mean score		3.4	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5
Standard deviation		.75	.65	.98	b .79	e .67	.96	e .78	.78	.74	.61	.79	.71	78	57
Standard error		.02	.03	.07	.07	.03	.07	.09	.04	.03	.11	.04	.04	.05	08
Columns Tested: a b c - d e f -	ahi-iklm		1						1					Part Control of the	

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m

Prepared by ComRes

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_5. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very important (4)	664 66%	244 65%	420 67%	319 63%	345 69% c	73 70%	117 72% m	124 67%	109 66%	98 63%	142 63%	190 71% m	234 66%	241 63%
Fairly important (3)	266 27%	107 28%	159 25%	141 28%	125 25%	24 23%	44 27%	50 27%	48 29%	44 28%	56 25%	68 25%	98 28%	100 26%
Not very important (2)	31 3%	9 2%	22 4%	18 4%	13 3%	1 1%	1	8 4% fk	5 3%	5 3%	11 5% fk	2 1%	13 4% fk	16 4% fk
Not at all important (1)	13 1%	7 2%	5 1%	10 2%	3 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	7 3% kl	1 1%	3 1%	9 2%
Don't know	27 3%	8 2%	19 3%	16 3%	11 2%	6 6% fhl	1	4 2%	1 *	6 4% fhl	10 4% fhl	6 2%	4 1%	16 4% fhl
NETS														
Net: Important	930 93%	351 93%	579 93%	460 91%	470 94%	97 93%	161 98% egijlm	174 93%	158 96% jm	142 92%	198 88%	258 96% ijm	332 94% jm	340 89%
Net: Not important	44 4%	16 4%	27 4%	28 5%	16 3%	1 1%	2 1%	9 5% fk	7 4%	7 4%	18 8% efk	3 1%	16 4% k	25 6% fk
Mean score	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.7 c	3.7 i	3.7 jm	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.7 jm	3.6	3.6
Standard deviation Standard error	.61 .02	.64 .03	.60 .02	.66 .03	.56 .03	.48 .05	.52 .04	.60 .04	.59 .05	.62 .05	.73 .05	.51 .03	.60 .03	.69 .04

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

Prepared by ComRes

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_5. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing

					SEG				ETHNIC	ITV	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS O	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of		Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	664	137	222	144	161	359	305	626	34	390	260	271	323	341
		66%	71% c	67%	61%	68%	68%	64%	67%	64%	66%	67%	66%	65%	68%
Fairly important	(3)	266	45	94	75	52	139	127	246	15	162	97	109	138	128
		27%	23%	28%	31% d	22%	26%	27%	26%	27%	28%	25%	26%	27%	26%
Not very important	(2)	31	5	8	7	11	13	19	30	2	18	12	14	19	13
		3%	2%	2%	3%	5%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%
Not at all important	(1)	13	1	1	6	4	3	10	13	-	6	6	7	8	5
		1%	1%	*	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%
					е			е							
Don't know		27	5	7	5	9	13	14	24	3	12	14	13	13	14
		3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%	3%	6%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%
NETS															
Net: Important		930	182	315	219	213	498	432	871	49	552	356	380	461	469
		93%	94%	95% df	92%	90%	95% df	91%	93%	91%	94%	92%	92%	92%	94%
Net: Not important		44	6	9	13	15	15	28	42	2	24	18	20	26	18
		4%	3%	3%	6%	6%	3%	6%	4%	3%	4%	5%	5%	5%	4%
						be		е							
Mean score		3.6	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.7
			cf				cf								50
Standard deviation Standard error		.61 .02	.56 .04	.55 .03	.68 .04	.66 .04	.55 .03	.67 .03	.62 .02	.55 .10	.60 .03	.63 .03	.64 .03	.64 .03	.58 .03
Standard error		.02	.04	.03	.04	.04	.03	.03	.02	.10	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

COMRES

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_5. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m

Allow the Council to better plan for the future, including a long-term plan for improving the local economy and housing

	FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: FIRST Q Favour   Unfavour					ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001 1009	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very important	4) 664 669	456 71% b	108 55%	100 63%	497 70% ef	120 56%	47 59%	276 65%	367 68%	21 59%	246 71% Im	224 66% m	163 63%	31 53%
Fairly important	3) 266 279	167 26%	57 29%	42 26%	182 26%	62 29%	22 28%	113 27%	144 27%	9 25%	83 24%	87 26%	71 27%	25 43% jkl
Not very important	2) 31	11 2%	13 7% a	7 4% a	16 2%	13 6% d	2 3%	15 4%	15 3%	1 4%	7 2%	10 3%	13 5% j	1 2%
Not at all important	1) 13	2 *	9 5% ac	2 1%	3 *	9 4% d	1 1%	8 2%	4 1%	1 2%	2 1%	3 1%	8 3% j	-
Don't know	27 39	11 2%	8 4% a	9 5% a	8 1%	12 6% d	7 9% d	13 3%	10 2%	4 11% gh	7 2%	13 4%	5 2%	2 3%
NETS														
Net: Important	930 93%	623 96% bc	165 85%	142 89%	679 96% ef	182 84%	69 87%	388 92%	511 95% i	30 83%	329 95% I	311 92%	234 90%	56 96%
Net: Not important	44 49	13 2%	22 11% ac	9 5% a	19 3%	22 10% d	3 4%	23 5%	19 3%	2 6%	9 3%	13 4%	21 8% jk	1 2%
Mean score	3.6	3.7 b	3.4	3.6 b	3.7 e	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7 Im	3.6	3.5	3.5
Standard deviation Standard error	.61 .02	.52 .02	.82 .06	.63 .05	.53 .02	.80 .06	.61 .07	.66 .03	.57 .02	.70 .12	.54 .03	.59 .03	.73 .05	53

Prepared by ComRes

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_6. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas

Base: All respondents

			COUNC	L AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very important	(4)	433 43%	151 40%	282 45%	203 40%	230 46%	51 49%	68 41%	73 39%	70 43%	63 41%	108 48%	118 44%	144 41%	171 45%
Fairly important	(3)	413 41%	154 41%	259 41%	208 41%	205 41%	45 43%	70 43%	81 44%	71 43%	62 40%	84 37%	115 43%	152 43%	146 38%
Not very important	(2)	78 8%	38 10% b	40 6%	45 9%	33 7%	4 4%	14 8%	14 7%	16 10%	15 10%	16 7%	17 7%	29 8%	31 8%
Not at all important	(1)	37 4%	14 4%	23 4%	30 6% d	7 1%	2 2%	6 4%	7 4%	5 3%	7 5%	9 4%	8 3%	12 3%	17 4%
Don't know		40 4%	19 5%	21 3%	17 3%	23 5%	2 2%	7 4%	11 6%	4 2%	8 5%	9 4%	9 3%	15 4%	17 4%
NETS															
Net: Important		846 85%	304 81%	541 87% a	412 82%	434 87% c	96 92% im	138 84%	155 83%	141 86%	125 81%	191 85%	233 87%	296 84%	317 83%
Net: Not important		115 11%	52 14%	63 10%	74 15% d	40 8%	6 6%	20 12%	21 11%	20 12%	22 14%	25 11%	26 10%	41 12%	48 12%
Mean score		3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.4 c	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error		.77 .02	.79 .04	.76 .03	.85 .04	.68 .03	.67 .08	.78 .06	.77 .06	.76 .06	.82 .07	.79 .05	.74 .05	.77 .04	.81 .04

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

COMRES

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_6. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas

Base: All respondents

									_				AWARENESS O		CREATION OF
					SEG				ETHNIC		WORKING			NEW COUNCIL	
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	433	79	139	105	110	218	215	413	17	249	176	190	227	206
		43%	41%	42%	44%	46%	41%	45%	44%	32%	42%	45%	46%	45%	41%
Fairly important	(3)	413	79	139	106	88	219	194	382	25	244	155	155	194	219
		41%	41%	42%	45%	37%	42%	41%	41%	45%	42%	40%	37%	39%	44%
Not very important	(2)	78	19	32	14	13	51	27	72	5	51	25	34	45	33
		8%	10%	10%	6%	5%	10%	6%	8%	9%	9%	6%	8%	9%	7%
			f	f			df								
Not at all important	(1)	37	9	9	8	11	17	19	37	-	21	16	21	21	16
		4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	3%	4%	4%	-	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%
Don't know		40	8	13	4	16	20	20	33	7	22	16	13	15	26
		4%	4%	4%	2%	7%	4%	4%	4%	13%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%
						С				g					
NETS															
Net: Important		846	158	279	211	198	437	409	795	42	493	331	345	420	426
		85%	82%	84%	89%	83%	83%	86%	85%	78%	84%	85%	83%	84%	85%
					ae										
Net: Not important		115	28	41	22	24	69	46	109	5	72	41	55	66	49
		11%	14%	12%	9%	10%	13%	10%	12%	9%	12%	11%	13%	13%	10%
Mean score		3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Standard deviation		.77	.82	.75	.74	.80	.78	.77	.78	.65	.78	.78	.83	.81	.74
Standard error		.02	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03	.03	.12	.03	.04	.04	.04	.03

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m

COMRES

As I mentioned earlier, this survey is about the proposed creation of a new single District-level Council for West Suffolk, replacing Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils.

The councils are already saving around £4million pounds every year by working in partnership, but now need new approaches to meet future challenges. A new single District-level Council for West Suffolk would deliver further savings of an estimated £800,000 per year.

Some people believe that the new council will be more efficient and that delivery of services to residents will not be affected. However, others say it might lead to less political accountability as there may be fewer councillors covering a bigger area.

Now that I have provided more background, I'm going to read out a list of objectives that the Councils believe they can achieve by creating a single District-level Council for West Suffolk.

Q5\_6. For each one, please say how important, if at all, you feel it is that they achieve this objective.

#### Simplify council decision-making while still keeping offices across both areas

Base: All respondents

				ITY TOWARDS					CONCERN ABO		OF NEW SINGLE				
			C	OUNCIL: FIRST	2	CO	UNCIL: SECONE	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	I IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
			Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
		Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very important	(4)	433	300	77	57	327	81	25	184	240	9	159	135	118	21
		43%	46%	39%	36%	46%	37%	32%	43%	44%	24%	46%	40%	45%	36%
			С			ef			i	i					
Fairly important	(3)	413	285	68	60	308	78	27	166	232	15	137	154	94	27
		41%	44% b	35%	38%	44%	36%	34%	39%	43%	41%	40%	46% I	36%	47%
Not very important	(2)	78	39	23	16	36	31	11	40	36	2	28	26	23	1
		8%	6%	12%	10%	5%	14%	14%	10%	7%	4%	8%	8%	9%	2%
				а			d	d							
Not at all important	(1)	37	11	16	9	20	14	3	15	21	1	14	10	12	1
		4%	2%	8%	6%	3%	7%	3%	4%	4%	2%	4%	3%	5%	1%
				а	а		d								
Don't know		40	12	11	17	15	12	13	18	12	10	7	12	13	8
		4%	2%	6%	11%	2%	6%	17%	4%	2%	28%	2%	4%	5%	14%
				а	а		d	de			gh				jkl
NETS															
Net: Important		846	584	144	117	635	159	52	350	472	24	296	289	212	48
		85%	90%	74%	74%	90%	73%	66%	83%	87%	65%	86%	86%	82%	83%
			bc			ef			i	gi					
Net: Not important		115	51	39	25	56	45	14	56	57	2	42	36	35	2
		11%	8%	20%	16%	8%	21%	17%	13%	10%	6%	12%	11%	13%	3%
				а	а		d	d				m		m	
Mean score		3.3	3.4 bc	3.1	3.2	3.4 ef	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4
Standard deviation		.77	.68	.94	.86	.71	.90	.84	.79	.76	.69	.79	.74	.83	.60
Standard error		.02	.03	.07	.07	.03	.06	.10	.04	.03	.13	.04	.04	.05	.09

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m

Prepared by ComRes

\_

Currently there are 72 Councillors representing the entire West Suffolk area. A new single District-level Council may lead to some political changes, with a potential reduction in the total number of councillors across the area in line with national trends.

# Q6. To what extent do you think a reduction in the overall number of councillors would have a positive or negative impact on how your council is run, or make no difference at all?

Base: All respondents

			COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very positive	(5)	121 12%	41 11%	79 13%	73 14% d	48 10%	3 3%	25 15% e	22 12% e	17 11%	18 12% e	35 15% e	28 10% e	40 11% e	53 14% e
Fairly positive	(4)	225 22%	96 26%	129 21%	120 24%	105 21%	26 25%	35 21%	42 23%	32 20%	36 23%	52 23%	61 23%	75 21%	89 23%
No difference	(3)	338 34%	119 32%	218 35%	162 32%	176 35%	42 40%	56 34%	56 30%	61 37%	55 35%	68 30%	98 37%	117 33%	123 32%
Fairly negative	(2)	165 17%	58 15%	108 17%	71 14%	95 19% c	19 18%	26 16%	29 15%	26 16%	29 18%	37 16%	45 17%	55 16%	66 17%
Very negative	(1)	95 9%	37 10%	58 9%	59 12% d	36 7%	7 7%	13 8%	20 11%	17 10%	12 8%	25 11%	20 8%	37 10%	38 10%
Don't know		58 6%	25 7%	33 5%	20 4%	38 8% c	7 7%	8 5%	18 10% ijm	11 7%	5 3%	9 4%	16 6%	29 8% ijm	13 3%
NETS															
Net: Positive		345 34%	137 37%	208 33%	192 38% d	153 31%	29 28%	60 36%	65 35%	50 30%	55 35%	87 39%	89 33%	114 33%	142 37%
Net: Negative		260 26%	94 25%	166 27%	129 26%	131 26%	25 24%	40 24%	48 26%	43 26%	41 26%	62 28%	65 24%	91 26%	103 27%
Mean score Standard deviation Standard error		3.1 1.15 .04	3.1 1.15 .06	3.1 1.15 .05	3.2 1.21 .05	3.1 1.08 .05	3.0 .94 .11	3.2 1.16 .09	3.1 1.19 .09	3.0 1.13 .09	3.1 1.11 .09	3.2 1.22 .08	3.1 1.08 .07	3.1 1.16 .06	3.1 1.18 .06



Currently there are 72 Councillors representing the entire West Suffolk area. A new single District-level Council may lead to some political changes, with a potential reduction in the total number of councillors across the area in line with national trends.

# Q6. To what extent do you think a reduction in the overall number of councillors would have a positive or negative impact on how your council is run, or make no difference at all?

Base: All respondents

					SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very positive	(5)	121 12%	36 18% bcf	35 11%	17 7%	32 14% c	71 14% c	49 10%	114 12%	6 11%	62 11%	55 14%	55 13%	63 13%	57 11%
Fairly positive	(4)	225 22%	48 25%	68 21%	61 26%	46 20%	117 22%	108 23%	212 23%	10 19%	135 23%	88 23%	91 22%	115 23%	110 22%
No difference	(3)	338 34%	53 27%	116 35%	81 34%	87 37% a	169 32%	168 35% a	323 34%	11 21%	210 36%	118 30%	122 30%	154 31%	184 37% kl
Fairly negative	(2)	165 17%	33 17%	56 17%	40 17%	37 15%	89 17%	76 16%	147 16%	16 30% g	94 16%	69 18%	77 19%	86 17%	80 16%
Very negative	(1)	95 9%	15 8%	33 10%	27 11%	19 8%	48 9%	46 10%	90 10%	4 7%	52 9%	38 10%	49 12% m	61 12% m	34 7%
Don't know		58 6%	8 4%	23 7%	11 4%	16 7%	31 6%	27 6%	50 5%	6 12%	34 6%	21 5%	19 4%	22 4%	36 7%
NETS															
Net: Positive		345 34%	84 43% bcdf	104 31%	79 33%	79 33%	188 36%	157 33%	326 35%	16 30%	197 34%	143 37%	146 35%	178 36%	167 33%
Net: Negative		260 26%	49 25%	89 27%	67 28%	56 23%	138 26%	123 26%	238 25%	20 37%	146 25%	107 27%	126 31% m	146 29% m	114 23%
Mean score		3.1	3.3 bcf	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2
Standard deviation Standard error		1.15 .04	1.21	1.14 .07	1.11 .07	1.13 .07	1.17	1.12 .05	1.15 .04	1.19 .22	1.11 .05	1.19 .06	1.22 .06	1.21 .06	1.08 .05



Currently there are 72 Councillors representing the entire West Suffolk area. A new single District-level Council may lead to some political changes, with a potential reduction in the total number of councillors across the area in line with national trends.

# Q6. To what extent do you think a reduction in the overall number of councillors would have a positive or negative impact on how your council is run, or make no difference at all?

Base: All respondents

				ITY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	F OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	121 12%	84 13% b	13 7%	24 15% b	99 14% e	13 6%	9 11%	33 8%	84 16% g	3 9%	121 35% klm	-	-	
Fairly positive	(4)	225 22%	167 26% b	24 13%	33 21% b	192 27% ef	25 11%	8 10%	81 19%	138 25% g	6 17%	225 65% klm	-	-	-
No difference	(3)	338 34%	240 37% bc	53 27%	45 28%	256 36% e	53 25%	29 37% e	117 28%	208 38% g	13 36%	-	338 100% jlm	-	-
Fairly negative	(2)	165 17%	94 15%	46 23% a	25 16%	99 14%	55 25% d	12 15%	97 23% hi	68 13%	1 4%	-	-	165 64% jkm	
Very negative	(1)	95 9%	31 5%	54 28% ac	10 6%	26 4%	63 29% df	5 6%	76 18% hi	18 3%	1 2%	-	-	95 36% jkm	
Don't know		58 6%	31 5%	5 3%	22 14% ab	34 5%	8 4%	16 21% de	20 5%	26 5%	12 32% gh	-	-	-	58 100% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		345 34%	251 39% b	37 19%	57 36% b	291 41% ef	37 17%	17 21%	114 27%	221 41% g	9 26%	345 100% klm	-	-	-
Net: Negative		260 26%	125 19%	100 51% ac	35 22%	125 18%	118 55% df	17 22%	173 41% hi	85 16%	2 6%	-	-	260 100% jkm	-
Mean score		3.1	3.3 b	2.5	3.3 b	3.4 ef	2.4	3.1 e	2.7	3.4 g	3.4	4.3 I	3.0	1.6	-
Standard deviation Standard error		1.15 .04	1.04 .04	1.22 .09	1.17 .10	1.03 .04	1.20 .08	1.11 .14	1.21 .06	1.02 .04	.91 .18	.48 .03		.48 .03	-

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

#### **SUMMARY TABLE**

Base: All respondents

	Total	Very positive	Fairly positive	No difference	Fairly negative	Very negative	Don't know	Net: Positive	Net: Negative	Mean
Young people, for example children and	1001	134	245	362	100	63	97	379	163	3.3
teenagers	100%	13%	24%	36%	10%	6%	10%	38%	16%	
Disabled people	1001	153	214	327	126	85	97	367	211	3.2
· ·	100%	15%	21%	33%	13%	8%	10%	37%	21%	
Old people, for example pensioners and	1001	149	214	336	138	71	93	363	210	3.3
those who are retired	100%	15%	21%	34%	14%	7%	9%	36%	21%	
People on low incomes	1001	116	205	384	129	69	99	320	198	3.2
	100%	12%	20%	38%	13%	7%	10%	32%	20%	
People living in rural areas	1001	106	203	337	177	77	101	309	253	3.1
	100%	11%	20%	34%	18%	8%	10%	31%	25%	
People from minority religions or ethnic	1001	78	198	474	87	41	123	276	128	3.2
groups	100%	8%	20%	47%	9%	4%	12%	28%	13%	



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Positive summary Base: All respondents

Г		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
			St											
	Total	Forest Heath District	Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	TULAI	a	bolougii	C	d	e e	20-34   f	35-44 g	45-54   h	55-64 i	i 65+	10-34   k	35-54	m
							•	_	•	•	j		•	
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Young people, for example children and	379	143	236	195	184	43	66	67	47	62	95	109	114	156
teenagers	38%	38%	38%	39%	37%	41%	40%	36%	28%	40%	42%	41%	32%	41%
						h	h			h	hl	hl		hl
Disabled people	367	129	237	181	186	45	64	58	45	65	91	108	103	156
	37%	34%	38%	36%	37%	43%	39%	31%	27%	42%	40%	40%	29%	41%
						hl	hl			ghl	hl	ghl		ghl
Old people, for example pensioners and those	363	132	231	185	178	41	62	63	48	61	87	103	111	149
who are retired	36%	35%	37%	37%	36%	40%	38%	34%	29%	39%	39%	39%	31%	39%
											h	h		hl
People on low incomes	320	111	210	163	158	34	58	58	41	47	83	92	99	130
	32%	29%	34%	32%	32%	33%	35%	31%	25%	30%	37%	34%	28%	34%
							h				hl	h		h
People living in rural areas	309	107	202	150	159	36	51	49	36	51	86	87	85	137
	31%	29%	32%	30%	32%	34%	31%	26%	22%	33%	38%	32%	24%	36%
						h				hl	ghl	hl		ghl
People from minority religions or ethnic groups	276	99	177	132	143	35	51	40	37	51	62	86	77	113
	28%	26%	28%	26%	29%	34%	31%	21%	22%	33%	27%	32%	22%	30%
						gl	gl			ghl		ghl		gl
None of the above	453	174	279	226	226	46	74	91	94	63	86	120	184	149
	45%	46%	45%	45%	46%	44%	45%	48%	57%	40%	38%	45%	52%	39%
								jm	fijkm	_			ijm	



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Positive summary Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Young people, for example children and	379	66	119	92	103	185	195	362	16	212	163	153	188	191
teenagers	38%	34%	36%	39%	43% ae	35%	41%	39%	30%	36%	42%	37%	38%	38%
Disabled people	367	67	113	86	100	180	186	343	20	206	158	144	173	194
	37%	35%	34%	36%	42% e	34%	39%	37%	38%	35%	41%	35%	35%	39%
Old people, for example pensioners and those	363	64	114	87	97	179	184	340	20	203	153	133	167	195
who are retired	36%	33%	34%	37%	41%	34%	39%	36%	38%	35%	39%	32%	33%	39% k
People on low incomes	320	59	100	75	87	159	162	301	17	179	137	131	156	165
	32%	30%	30%	32%	37%	30%	34%	32%	32%	30%	35%	32%	31%	33%
People living in rural areas	309	55	79	79	97	134	175	293	16	161	145	121	142	167
	31%	28%	24%	33% be	41% abe	25%	37% abe	31%	29%	27%	37% i	29%	28%	33%
People from minority religions or ethnic groups	276	52	88	65	71	140	136	255	20	159	112	101	123	152
	28%	27%	27%	27%	30%	27%	29%	27%	37%	27%	29%	24%	25%	30% kl
None of the above	453	94	167	102	90	261	192	422	24	288	149	190	225	228
	45%	48% df	50% df	43%	38%	50% df	40%	45%	44%	49% j	38%	46%	45%	46%



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Positive summary Base: All respondents

		С	ITY TOWARDS I		СО	LITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negativa	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%	i otai	able	able	Don't know	able d	able e	DON'T KNOW	Concerned	concerned h	DON'T KNOW	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know m
							•	1		•	,		•	
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Young people, for example children and	379	281	49	50	327	40	13	146	226	7	186	118	62	15
teenagers	38%	43%	25%	31%	46%	18%	16%	34%	42%	18%	54%	35%	24%	25%
		bc			ef			i	gi		klm	I		
Disabled people	367	285	38	43	316	36	14	128	230	8	183	117	56	11
	37%	44%	20%	27%	45%	17%	18%	30%	43%	22%	53%	35%	21%	19%
		bc			ef				gi		klm	lm		
Old people, for example pensioners and those	363	285	36	41	312	34	16	131	227	5	175	116	61	11
who are retired	36%	44%	19%	26%	44%	16%	20%	31%	42%	15%	51%	34%	23%	18%
		bc			ef			i	gi		klm	lm		
People on low incomes	320	243	34	43	271	37	13	121	194	5	164	95	55	7
	32%	38%	17%	27%	38%	17%	16%	28%	36%	15%	47%	28%	21%	12%
		bc		b	ef				gi		klm	m		
People living in rural areas	309	243	33	34	266	34	10	109	195	5	154	97	49	9
	31%	38%	17%	21%	38%	16%	12%	26%	36%	12%	45%		19%	16%
		bc			ef				gi		klm	lm		
People from minority religions or ethnic groups	276	216	32	27	240	27	8	103	168	5	147	72	49	9
	28%	33%	16%	17%	34%	13%	10%	24%	31%	13%	42%	21%	19%	15%
		bc			ef				gi		klm			
None of the above	453	254	111	87	263	138	52	210	221	22	97	167	151	39
	45%	39%	57%	55%	37%	64%	65%	49%	41%	61%	28%	49%	58%	66%
			а	а		d	d	h		h		j_	jk	jk

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Negative summary Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
People living in rural areas	253 25%	104 28%	150 24%	132 26%	121 24%	23 22%	37 22%	48 25%	40 24%	55 35% efghjkl	51 22%	60 22%	88 25%	106 28%
Disabled people	211 21%	93 25% b	118 19%	108 21%	103 21%	21 21%	39 24%	36 19%	36 22%	35 23%	44 20%	60 22%	71 20%	79 21%
Old people, for example pensioners and those who are retired	210 21%	84 22%	125 20%	108 21%	102 21%	22 21%	38 23%	38 20%	31 19%	38 24%	43 19%	60 22%	69 20%	80 21%
People on low incomes	198 20%	84 22%	114 18%	95 19%	103 21%	20 19%	31 19%	34 18%	31 19%	34 22%	48 21%	51 19%	65 18%	82 22%
Young people, for example children and teenagers	163 16%	64 17%	99 16%	84 17%	79 16%	15 14%	27 16%	27 14%	27 16%	29 18%	39 17%	41 15%	54 15%	68 18%
People from minority religions or ethnic groups	128 13%	46 12%	82 13%	69 14%	59 12%	13 12%	22 13%	26 14%	19 12%	22 14%	26 12%	35 13%	45 13%	48 13%
None of the above	630 63%	224 60%	407 65%	312 62%	318 64%	72 69% i	102 62%	121 65%	104 63%	85 55%	147 65% i	174 65% i	225 64% i	232 61%



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Negative summary Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED IEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
People living in rural areas	253	50	90	57	56	140	113	237	13	160	87	119	139	115
	25%	26%	27%	24%	24%	27%	24%	25%	25%	27%	22%	29%	28%	23%
												m		
Disabled people	211	37	83	51	40	121	90	196	14	134	72	97	115	96
	21%	19%	25%	21%	17%	23%	19%	21%	26%	23%	19%	23%	23%	19%
			df			d								
Old people, for example pensioners and those	210	33	82	55	40	115	95	196	12	134	71	93	113	97
who are retired	21%	17%	25%	23%	17%	22%	20%	21%	22%	23%	18%	22%	23%	19%
			ad											
People on low incomes	198	39	72	41	46	111	87	181	15	119	75	87	104	94
	20%	20%	22%	17%	19%	21%	18%	19%	28%	20%	19%	21%	21%	19%
Young people, for example children and	163	23	65	36	39	89	75	151	9	101	59	67	83	80
teenagers	16%	12%	20%	15%	16%	17%	16%	16%	17%	17%	15%	16%	17%	16%
			а											
People from minority religions or ethnic groups	128	22	46	27	33	68	60	124	4	76	48	55	67	61
	13%	11%	14%	12%	14%	13%	13%	13%	7%	13%	12%	13%	13%	12%
None of the above	630	123	204	150	153	327	304	600	26	362	251	249	303	327
	63%	63%	61%	63%	65%	62%	64%	64%	47%	62%	65%	60%	61%	65%
								h						



Q7\_SUM. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Negative summary Base: All respondents

		C	ITY TOWARDS I		co	LITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Consormed	Not	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%	Total	able a	able	C C	able d	able e	DON I KNOW	Concerned	concerned h	i j	i	k	Negative	m Don't know
							•			·	,		•	
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
People living in rural areas	253	123	105	25	116	124	14	172	78	3	49	57	137	11
	25%	19%	54%	16%	16%	57%	17%	40%	14%	9%	14%	17%	53%	18%
			ac			df		hi					jkm	
Disabled people	211	90	94	26	88	111	12	153	53	5	42	43	122	4
	21%	14%	48%	17%	12%	51%	15%	36%	10%	13%	12%	13%	47%	7%
			ac			df		hi					jkm	
Old people, for example pensioners and those	210	89	98	23	82	119	9	149	56	4	40	38	129	2
who are retired	21%	14%	50%	14%	12%	55%	11%	35%	10%	11%	12%	11%	50%	3%
			ac			df		hi					jkm	
People on low incomes	198	93	83	22	88	97	12	131	63	4	40	42	109	7
	20%	14%	42%	14%	12%	45%	16%	31%	12%	11%	12%	12%	42%	12%
			ac			df		hi					jkm	
Young people, for example children and	163	67	75	21	62	91	10	115	44	4	27	34	99	4
teenagers	16%	10%	38%	13%	9%	42%	12%	27%	8%	11%	8%	10%	38%	7%
			ac			df		hi					jkm	
People from minority religions or ethnic groups	128	55	57	16	52	70	6	86	40	2	24	23	78	3
	13%	8%	29%	10%	7%	32%	8%	20%	7%	5%	7%	7%	30%	6%
			ac			df		hi					jkm	
None of the above	630	455	59	117	518	54	58	199	400	31	254	252	79	46
	63%	70%	30%	73%	73%	25%	73%	47%	74%	85%	73%	75%	30%	79%
		b		b	е		е		g	g	I	1		I

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



Q7\_1. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Young people, for example children and teenagers Base: All respondents

	Г		COUNC	IL AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very positive	(5)	134 13%	53 14%	81 13%	67 13%	68 14%	21 20% ghl	23 14%	18 9%	14 8%	21 14%	38 17% ghl	44 16% ghl	32 9%	59 16% ghl
Fairly positive	(4)	245 24%	90 24%	155 25%	128 26%	116 23%	22 21%	43 26%	50 27%	33 20%	40 26%	57 25%	65 24%	83 23%	97 26%
No difference	(3)	362 36%	133 35%	229 37%	183 36%	179 36%	44 42% jm	58 36% j	76 41% jm	74 45% ijm	53 34%	57 25%	102 38% jm	150 43% jm	109 29%
Fairly negative	(2)	100 10%	38 10%	62 10%	48 10%	52 10%	12 11%	19 12%	11 6%	20 12% g	18 12%	20 9%	31 11% g	32 9%	38 10%
Very negative	(1)	63 6%	26 7%	37 6%	35 7%	27 6%	3 3%	7 4%	16 8% k	7 4%	11 7%	19 9% k	10 4%	22 6%	30 8% k
Don't know		97 10%	35 9%	61 10%	42 8%	55 11%	3 3%	13 8%	16 9%	17 10% e	12 8%	35 16% efgikl	16 6%	33 9%	48 12% ek
NETS															
Net: Positive		379 38%	143 38%	236 38%	195 39%	184 37%	43 41% h	66 40% h	67 36%	47 28%	62 40% h	95 42% hl	109 41% hl	114 32%	156 41% hl
Net: Negative		163 16%	64 17%	99 16%	84 17%	79 16%	15 14%	27 16%	27 14%	27 16%	29 18%	39 17%	41 15%	54 15%	68 18%
Mean score		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.5 h	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4 hl	3.2	3.4
Standard deviation Standard error		1.07 .04	1.10 .06	1.06 .05	1.08 .05	1.07 .05	1.04 .12	1.04 .08	1.04 .08	.94 .08	1.11 .09	1.21 .09	1.04 .07	1.00 .06	1.16 .06



Q7\_1. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

# Young people, for example children and teenagers Base: All respondents

					SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very positive	(5)	134 13%	16 8%	47 14%	28 12%	44 19% ace	63 12%	72 15% a	125 13%	9 17%	72 12%	61 16%	52 13%	61 12%	74 15%
Fairly positive	(4)	245 24%	50 26%	72 22%	64 27%	59 25%	122 23%	123 26%	237 25%	7 12%	140 24%	102 26%	101 24%	127 25%	118 24%
No difference	(3)	362 36%	86 44% bdf	111 34%	92 39%	73 31%	197 38%	164 35%	333 36%	22 42%	227 39% j	120 31%	152 37%	183 37%	178 36%
Fairly negative	(2)	100 10%	13 6%	42 13% a	20 8%	25 11%	55 10%	45 9%	91 10%	7 13%	64 11%	35 9%	42 10%	54 11%	46 9%
Very negative	(1)	63 6%	11 5%	23 7%	16 7%	14 6%	33 6%	29 6%	60 6%	2 4%	37 6%	24 6%	25 6%	29 6%	34 7%
Don't know		97 10%	19 10%	37 11%	19 8%	23 10%	55 11%	41 9%	90 10%	6 12%	46 8%	46 12% i	41 10%	47 9%	50 10%
NETS															
Net: Positive		379 38%	66 34%	119 36%	92 39%	103 43% ae	185 35%	195 41%	362 39%	16 30%	212 36%	163 42%	153 37%	188 38%	191 38%
Net: Negative		163 16%	23 12%	65 20% a	36 15%	39 16%	89 17%	75 16%	151 16%	9 17%	101 17%	59 15%	67 16%	83 17%	80 16%
Mean score		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4 e	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error		1.07 .04	.94 .07	1.13 .08	1.04 .07	1.13 .07	1.06 .05	1.09 .05	1.08 .04	1.08 .20	1.06 .05	1.11 .06	1.06 .06	1.05 .05	1.10 .05



Q7\_1. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Young people, for example children and teenagers Base: All respondents

				TY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	T PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	134 13%	97 15% b	13 7%	25 16% b	114 16% e	12 6%	8 11%	52 12%	78 14%	4 12%	68 20% kl	46 14% I	15 6%	5 9%
Fairly positive	(4)	245 24%	184 28% bc	37 19%	24 15%	213 30% ef	28 13%	4 5%	94 22% i	148 27% i	2 7%	117 34% klm	71 21%	47 18%	9 16%
No difference	(3)	362 36%	253 39% b	55 28%	54 34%	265 37%	68 31%	29 37%	122 29%	231 43% gi	8 22%	111 32%	157 47% jlm	77 30%	15 26%
Fairly negative	(2)	100 10%	47 7%	39 20% ac	14 9%	48 7%	46 21% df	6 8%	67 16% hi	31 6%	1 4%	15 4%	21 6%	60 23% jkm	4 7%
Very negative	(1)	63 6%	20 3%	36 18% ac	7 4%	14 2%	46 21% df	4 4%	47 11% h	13 2%	3 7%	12 4%	12 4%	39 15% jkm	-
Don't know		97 10%	46 7%	17 8%	34 22% ab	52 7%	17 8%	28 35% de	41 10%	38 7%	18 49% gh	21 6%	29 9%	22 9%	24 42% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		379 38%	281 43% bc	49 25%	50 31%	327 46% ef	40 18%	13 16%	146 34% i	226 42% gi	7 18%	186 54% klm	118 35% I	62 24%	15 25%
Net: Negative		163 16%	67 10%	75 38% ac	21 13%	62 9%	91 42% df	10 12%	115 27% hi	44 8%	4 11%	27 8%	34 10%	99 38% jkm	4 7%
Mean score		3.3	3.5 b	2.7	3.4 b	3.6 ef	2.6	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.7 kl	3.4	2.7	3.5
Standard deviation Standard error		1.07 .04	.96 .04	1.20 .09	1.10 .10	.93 .04	1.16 .08	e 1.06 .14	1.21 .06	9 .92 .04	1.31 .29	.98 .05	.96 .05	1.13 .08	.91 .16

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



Q7\_2. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

# Old people, for example pensioners and those who are retired Base: All respondents

			COUNC	II ARFA	GENI	DER					AGE				
				St	<u> </u>										
		<b>-</b>	Forest Heath	Edmundsbury			40.04	05.04	05.44	45.54	04	0.5	40.04	05.54	
Significance Level: 95%		Total	District a	Borough b	Male c	Female d	18-24 e	25-34	35-44	45-54 h	55-64	65+	18-34 k	35-54	55+ m
Significance Level. 95%			a	ь	C	u	е	'	g	"	'	J	ĸ	'	""
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very positive	(5)	149	62	86	80	69	19	23	25	18	25	39	42	43	64
		15%	17%	14%	16%	14%	18%	14%	13%	11%	16%	17%	16%	12%	17%
Fairly positive	(4)	214	69	145	105	109	22	39	38	30	37	48	61	68	85
	` ,	21%	18%	23%	21%	22%	21%	24%	20%	18%	24%	21%	23%	19%	22%
No difference	(3)	336	118	217	172	164	35	52	64	67	45	72	87	131	118
	, ,	34%	32%	35%	34%	33%	34%	32%	34%	41%	29%	32%	33%	37%	31%
										im					
Fairly negative	(2)	138	54	84	71	67	18	23	21	20	27	29	41	41	56
		14%	14%	13%	14%	14%	18%	14%	11%	12%	17%	13%	15%	12%	15%
Very negative	(1)	71	30	41	37	35	4	15	17	11	11	14	19	28	25
		7%	8%	7%	7%	7%	4%	9%	9%	7%	7%	6%	7%	8%	6%
Don't know		93	41	52	39	54	5	12	22	19	11	24	17	42	34
		9%	11%	8%	8%	11%	5%	7%	12%	12%	7%	10%	6%	12%	9%
									k					k	
NETS															
Net: Positive		363	132	231	185	178	41	62	63	48	61	87	103	111	149
		36%	35%	37%	37%	36%	40%	38%	34%	29%	39%	39%	39%	31%	39%
												h	h		hl
Net: Negative		210	84	125	108	102	22	38	38	31	38	43	60	69	80
		21%	22%	20%	21%	21%	21%	23%	20%	19%	24%	19%	22%	20%	21%
Mean score		3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3
Standard deviation		1.14	1.19	1.10	1.15	1.13	1.12	1.17	1.16	1.06	1.17	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.15
Standard error		.04	.06	.05	.05	.05	.13	.09	.09	.09	.10	.08	.07	.06	.06



Q7\_2. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

# Old people, for example pensioners and those who are retired Base: All respondents

				SEC				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very positive	(5) 149 15%	19 10%	46 14%	33 14%	51 22% abce	64 12%	84 18% ae	138 15%	10 18%	76 13%	72 18% i	53 13%	64 13%	84 17%
Fairly positive	(4) 214 21%	46 24%	69 21%	54 23%	45 19%	114 22%	99 21%	202 22%	11 20%	128 22%	82 21%	80 19%	103 21%	111 22%
No difference	(3) 336 34%	83 43% bcdef	99 30%	76 32%	78 33%	182 35%	154 32%	315 34%	15 28%	195 33%	130 34%	149 36%	176 35%	159 32%
Fairly negative	(2) 138 14%	22 11%	52 16%	37 16%	27 11%	74 14%	64 14%	126 13%	10 18%	86 15%	51 13%	68 17% m	80 16% m	58 12%
Very negative	(1) 71 7%	11 6%	29 9%	18 7%	13 5%	41 8%	31 6%	69 7%	2 3%	48 8%	20 5%	24 6%	33 7%	39 8%
Don't know	93 9%	14 7%	37 11%	20 8%	23 10%	50 10%	43 9%	86 9%	7 13%	54 9%	34 9%	38 9%	44 9%	49 10%
NETS														
Net: Positive	363 36%	64 33%	114 34%	87 37%	97 41%	179 34%	184 39%	340 36%	20 38%	203 35%	153 39%	133 32%	167 33%	195 39% k
Net: Negative	210 21%	33 17%	82 25% ad	55 23%	40 17%	115 22%	95 20%	196 21%	12 22%	134 23%	71 18%	93 22%	113 23%	97 19%
Mean score	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4 abce	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.4 i	3.2	3.2	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error	1.14	1.00	1.18	1.14	1.16 .07	1.12	1.16	1.14 .04	1.15	1.14	1.13 .06	1.09	1.10	1.17
Standard error	.04	.07	.08	.08	.07	.05	.05	.04	.21	.05	.oo	.06	.05	.05



Q7\_2. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

# Old people, for example pensioners and those who are retired Base: All respondents

				ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	149 15%	115 18% b	12 6%	21 13% b	122 17% e	17 8%	9 12%	54 13%	93 17%	2 6%	74 21% kl	41 12%	27 11%	6 10%
Fairly positive	(4)	214 21%	170 26% bc	24 13%	20 13%	190 27% ef	17 8%	7 8%	77 18%	134 25% gi	3 9%	101 29% klm	75 22% Im	33 13%	5 8%
No difference	(3)	336 34%	230 35% b	47 24%	59 37% b	260 37% e	47 22%	29 36% e	109 26%	220 41% gi	7 18%	103 30% I	162 48% jlm	56 21%	15 26%
Fairly negative	(2)	138 14%	64 10%	61 31% ac	14 8%	61 9%	72 33% df	6 7%	92 22% hi	44 8%	1 4%	26 8%	28 8%	82 32% jkm	2 3%
Very negative	(1)	71 7%	25 4%	37 19% ac	9 6%	21 3%	48 22% df	3 4%	57 13% h	12 2%	3 8% h	14 4%	11 3%	47 18% jkm	-
Don't know		93 9%	44 7%	13 7%	36 23% ab	52 7%	16 7%	26 33% de	36 8%	37 7%	20 56% gh	27 8%	22 6%	14 6%	30 52% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		363 36%	285 44% bc	36 19%	41 26%	312 44% ef	34 16%	16 20%	131 31% i	227 42% gi	5 15%	175 51% klm	116 34% Im	61 23%	11 18%
Net: Negative		210 21%	89 14%	98 50% ac	23 14%	82 12%	119 55% df	9 11%	149 35% hi	56 10%	4 11%	40 12%	38 11%	129 50% jkm	2 3%
Mean score		3.3	3.5 bc	2.5	3.2 b	3.5 e	2.4	3.3 e	2.9	3.5 g	3.0	3.6 kl	3.3	2.6	3.5
Standard deviation Standard error		1.14 .04	1.05 .04	1.15 .08	1.11 .10	1.00 .04	1.19 .08	1.05 .14	1.25 .06	.97 .04	1.27 .31	1.06 .06	.93 .05	1.25 .08	.92 .18

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



Q7\_3. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People from minority religions or ethnic groups Base: All respondents

	[		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very positive	(5)	78 8%	30 8%	48 8%	34 7%	44 9%	8 7%	11 6%	10 5%	15 9%	17 11%	17 8%	18 7%	25 7%	35 9%
Fairly positive	(4)	198 20%	68 18%	130 21%	99 20%	99 20%	27 26% ghl	40 25% ghl	30 16%	22 14%	34 22%	45 20%	68 25% ghl	52 15%	78 21% I
No difference	(3)	474 47%	181 48%	293 47%	247 49%	227 46%	50 48%	77 47%	96 52% jm	89 54% jm	67 43%	95 42%	127 47%	186 53% ijm	162 42%
Fairly negative	(2)	87 9%	32 9%	55 9%	47 9%	41 8%	11 11%	16 10%	15 8%	15 9%	13 8%	18 8%	27 10%	30 9%	31 8%
Very negative	(1)	41 4%	14 4%	27 4%	23 4%	18 4%	1 1%	6 4%	11 6%	4 2%	9 6%	9 4%	8 3%	15 4%	18 5%
Don't know		123 12%	50 13%	74 12%	55 11%	68 14%	6 6%	14 9%	25 13%	20 12%	16 10%	43 19% efikl	21 8%	44 13%	58 15% efk
NETS															
Net: Positive		276 28%	99 26%	177 28%	132 26%	143 29%	35 34% gl	51 31% gl	40 21%	37 22%	51 33% ghl	62 27%	86 32% ghl	77 22%	113 30% gl
Net: Negative		128 13%	46 12%	82 13%	69 14%	59 12%	13 12%	22 13%	26 14%	19 12%	22 14%	26 12%	35 13%	45 13%	48 13%
Mean score		3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3 g	3.1	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error		.91 .03	.90 .05	.91 .04	.90 .04	.92 .04	.83 .09	.88 .07	.89 .07	.86 .07	1.01 .09	.93 .07	.86 .06	.88 .05	.96 .05



Q7\_3. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People from minority religions or ethnic groups Base: All respondents

					SEG	i			ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very positive	(5)	78 8%	9 5%	27 8%	19 8%	23 10% a	36 7%	42 9%	68 7%	9 18% g	38 7%	37 10%	23 5%	25 5%	53 11% kl
Fairly positive	(4)	198 20%	42 22%	61 18%	46 19%	48 20%	104 20%	94 20%	187 20%	11 20%	121 21%	75 19%	78 19%	99 20%	99 20%
No difference	(3)	474 47%	106 55% df	152 46%	119 50% d	96 40%	259 49% d	215 45%	438 47%	27 50%	291 50%	172 44%	216 52% m	260 52% m	214 43%
Fairly negative	(2)	87 9%	14 7%	34 10%	17 7%	22 9%	48 9%	39 8%	83 9%	4 7%	52 9%	34 9%	42 10%	50 10%	37 7%
Very negative	(1)	41 4%	7 4%	12 4%	10 4%	11 5%	20 4%	21 4%	41 4%	- -	23 4%	14 4%	13 3%	17 3%	24 5%
Don't know		123 12%	14 7%	45 14% a	26 11%	38 16% a	60 11%	64 13% a	120 13%	3 6%	62 10%	56 14%	42 10%	50 10%	73 15% kl
NETS															
Net: Positive		276 28%	52 27%	88 27%	65 27%	71 30%	140 27%	136 29%	255 27%	20 37%	159 27%	112 29%	101 24%	123 25%	152 30% kl
Net: Negative		128 13%	22 11%	46 14%	27 12%	33 14%	68 13%	60 13%	124 13%	4 7%	76 13%	48 12%	55 13%	67 13%	61 12%
Mean score		3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.3 kl
Standard deviation Standard error		.91 .03	.81 .06	.92 .06	.90 .06	.98 .06	.88 .04	.94 .04	.91 .03	.88 .16	.87 .04	.94 .05	.83 .04	.83 .04	.98 .05



Q7\_3. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People from minority religions or ethnic groups Base: All respondents

				TY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	IT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		Total	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	78 8%	60 9%	11 5%	7 4%	65 9% f	11 5%	1 2%	31 7%	44 8%	2 7%	45 13% kl	19 6%	11 4%	3 6%
Fairly positive	(4)	198 20%	156 24% bc	21 11%	20 13%	175 25% ef	16 8%	6 8%	72 17%	124 23% gi	2 6%	102 30% klm	53 16%	37 14%	5 9%
No difference	(3)	474 47%	314 49%	86 44%	74 46%	342 49%	99 46%	32 41%	185 44% i	279 52% gi	9 26%	139 40%	206 61% jlm	110 42%	18 31%
Fairly negative	(2)	87 9%	41 6%	35 18% ac	11 7%	44 6%	41 19% df	3 4%	56 13% hi	31 6%	-	15 4%	16 5%	53 20% jkm	3 6%
Very negative	(1)	41 4%	14 2%	22 11% ac	5 3%	8 1%	29 13% df	4 5% d	30 7% h	9 2%	2 5%	9 2%	7 2%	25 10% jkm	
Don't know		123 12%	62 10%	20 10%	42 26% ab	71 10%	20 9%	33 41% de	51 12%	52 10%	20 56% gh	36 10%	36 11%	23 9%	28 48% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		276 28%	216 33% bc	32 16%	27 17%	240 34% ef	27 13%	8 10%	103 24%	168 31% gi	5 13%	147 42% klm	72 21%	49 19%	9 15%
Net: Negative		128 13%	55 8%	57 29% ac	16 10%	52 7%	70 32% df	6 8%	86 20% hi	40 7%	2 5%	24 7%	23 7%	78 30% jkm	3 6%
Mean score		3.2	3.4 bc	2.8	3.1 b	3.4 ef	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.3 g	3.2	3.5 kl	3.2	2.8	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error		.91 .03	.85 .04	1.02 .08	.82 .08	.81 .03	1.01 .07	.80 .11	1.00 .05	.80 .04	1.13 .28	.90 .05	.73 .04	.98 .07	.81 .15

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



Q7\_4. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Disabled people Base: All respondents

	1		COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	ER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very positive	(5)	153 15%	60 16%	93 15%	80 16%	73 15%	18 18%	26 16%	23 13%	17 10%	24 15%	45 20% ghl	44 16%	41 12%	69 18% hl
Fairly positive	(4)	214 21%	70 19%	144 23%	101 20%	113 23%	26 25%	38 23%	35 18%	27 17%	42 27% hl	46 20%	64 24% I	62 18%	87 23%
No difference	(3)	327 33%	114 30%	212 34%	176 35%	151 30%	32 31%	50 31%	70 38% jm	69 42% fijkm	44 29%	61 27%	82 31%	139 40% fijkm	105 28%
Fairly negative	(2)	126 13%	57 15%	69 11%	64 13%	62 12%	17 16%	25 15%	18 10%	23 14%	16 10%	27 12%	42 16%	42 12%	43 11%
Very negative	(1)	85 8%	36 10%	49 8%	44 9%	41 8%	4 4%	14 8%	17 9%	12 8%	19 13% ek	17 8%	18 7%	30 8%	37 10%
Don't know		97 10%	39 10%	58 9%	39 8%	58 12% c	6 6%	12 7%	23 12% k	16 9%	11 7%	30 13% fik	18 7%	39 11%	40 11%
NETS															
Net: Positive		367 37%	129 34%	237 38%	181 36%	186 37%	45 43% hl	64 39% hl	58 31%	45 27%	65 42% ghl	91 40% hl	108 40% ghl	103 29%	156 41% ghl
Net: Negative		211 21%	93 25% b	118 19%	108 21%	103 21%	21 21%	39 24%	36 19%	36 22%	35 23%	44 20%	60 22%	71 20%	79 21%
Mean score		3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.4 hl	3.3	3.1	3.3
Standard deviation Standard error		1.17 .04	1.22 .06	1.14 .05	1.17 .05	1.17 .06	1.11 .13	1.18 .09	1.14 .09	1.06 .09	1.24 .10	1.23 .09	1.16 .07	1.10 .06	1.23



Q7\_4. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Disabled people Base: All respondents

					SEG				ETHNIC		WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very positive	(5)	153	15	41	41	55	56	97	145	8	80	70	52	62	91
		15%	8%	12%	17%	23%	11%	20%	15%	14%	14%	18%	13%	12%	1
					ae	abe		abe							kl
Fairly positive	(4)	214	52	72	45	45	124	90	199	13	125	87	92	111	103
		21%	27% cdf	22%	19%	19%	24%	19%	21%	23%	21%	22%	22%	22%	21%
No difference	(3)	327	79	95	81	72	174	152	307	13	194	122	141	177	150
	(-)	33%	41%	29%	34%	30%	33%	32%	33%	24%	33%	31%	34%	35%	
			bdf												
Fairly negative	(2)	126	25	52	29	20	77	49	116	9	86	40	55	66	60
		13%	13%	16%	12%	9%	15%	10%	12%	17%	15%	10%	13%	13%	12%
				df			df								
Very negative	(1)	85	12	32	22	19	44	41	80	5	49	32	41	49	36
		8%	6%	10%	9%	8%	8%	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%	10%	10%	7%
Don't know		97	11	40	20	26	51	46	90	7	54	37	32	36	61
		10%	6%	12% a	8%	11% a	10%	10%	10%	12%	9%	9%	8%	7%	12% kl
NETS				_		_									
Net: Positive		367	67	113	86	100	180	186	343	20	206	158	144	173	194
		37%	35%	34%	36%	42%	34%	39%	37%	38%	35%	41%	35%	35%	
						е									
Net: Negative		211	37	83	51	40	121	90	196	14	134	72	97	115	96
		21%	19%	25% df	21%	17%	23% d	19%	21%	26%	23%	19%	23%	23%	19%
Mean score		3.2	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.3
MICAN SCUIC		3.2	3.∠	5.1	5.5	abe	3.2	5.4 be	3.3	٥.٤	3.2	3.4 i	3.2	3.2	s.s kl
Standard deviation		1.17	.99	1.19	1.20	1.23	1.12	1.22	1.17	1.23	1.15	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.19
Standard error		.04	.07	.08	.08	.08	.05	.06	.04	.23	.05	.06	.06	.05	.06



Q7\_4. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## Disabled people Base: All respondents

				TY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		10101	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	153 15%	117 18% b	16 8%	20 13%	130 18% ef	16 8%	7 9%	60 14%	88 16%	5 14%	75 22% kl	45 13%	27 10%	6 10%
Fairly positive	(4)	214 21%	168 26% bc	22 12%	23 15%	187 26% ef	20 9%	7 9%	68 16%	143 26% gi	3 8%	108 31% klm	72 21% Im	29 11%	5 9%
No difference	(3)	327 33%	221 34%	52 27%	53 34%	248 35% e	53 24%	26 33%	106 25%	214 40% gi	6 16%	98 28%	151 45% jlm	65 25%	14 23%
Fairly negative	(2)	126 13%	61 9%	51 26% ac	14 9%	64 9%	56 26% df	6 8%	86 20% hi	38 7%	1 4%	20 6%	31 9%	73 28% jkm	3 5%
Very negative	(1)	85 8%	30 5%	43 22% ac	12 8%	24 3%	55 25% df	6 7%	67 16% h	14 3%	4 10% h	21 6%	12 4%	50 19% jkm	2 3%
Don't know		97 10%	50 8%	10 5%	36 23% ab	53 8%	16 8%	27 34% de	36 9%	43 8%	18 49% gh	23 7%	27 8%	17 7%	29 50% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		367 37%	285 44% bc	38 20%	43 27%	316 45% ef	36 17%	14 18%	128 30%	230 43% gi	8 22%	183 53% klm	117 35% Im	56 21%	11 19%
Net: Negative		211 21%	90 14%	94 48% ac	26 17%	88 12%	111 51% df	12 15%	153 36% hi	53 10%	5 13%	42 12%	43 13%	122 47% jkm	4 7%
Mean score		3.2	3.5 bc	2.5	3.2 b	3.5 ef	2.4	3.1	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.6 kl	3.3	2.6	3.4
Standard deviation Standard error		1.17 .04	1.07 .04	1.22 .09	1.15 .10	1.03 .04	1.22 .09	e 1.12 .15	1.31 .07	g .97 .04	1.45 .33	1.11 .06	.98 .06	1.24 .08	1.10 .21

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

Q7\_5. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People living in rural areas Base: All respondents

			COUNC	IL AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very positive	(5)	106 11%	40 11%	67 11%	56 11%	50 10%	8 8%	19 11%	16 9%	11 7%	20 13%	32 14% hl	27 10%	27 8%	52 14% hl
Fairly positive	(4)	203 20%	67 18%	135 22%	94 19%	109 22%	28 27% hl	33 20%	33 18%	25 15%	31 20%	54 24% hl	60 22%	58 16%	85 22% I
No difference	(3)	337 34%	123 33%	214 34%	183 36%	154 31%	41 39% ijm	59 36% ijm	71 38% ijm	70 42% ijm	39 25%	58 26%	99 37% ijm	141 40% ijm	97 25%
Fairly negative	(2)	177 18%	70 19%	107 17%	89 18%	88 18%	16 15%	25 16%	35 19%	33 20%	35 22%	33 15%	41 15%	67 19%	68 18%
Very negative	(1)	77 8%	34 9%	43 7%	43 9%	34 7%	7 7%	11 7%	13 7%	8 5%	20 13% hkl	17 8%	19 7%	21 6%	37 10% hl
Don't know		101 10%	42 11%	59 10%	38 8%	63 13% c	5 4%	18 11%	20 11%	18 11%	10 7%	31 14% ei	22 8%	38 11%	41 11%
NETS															
Net: Positive		309 31%	107 29%	202 32%	150 30%	159 32%	36 34% h	51 31%	49 26%	36 22%	51 33% hl	86 38% ghl	87 32% hl	85 24%	137 36% ghl
Net: Negative		253 25%	104 28%	150 24%	132 26%	121 24%	23 22%	37 22%	48 25%	40 24%	55 35% efghjkl	51 22%	60 22%	88 25%	106 28%
Mean score		3.1	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3 ghil	3.1	3.0	3.1
Standard deviation Standard error		1.11 .04	1.14 .06	1.09 .05	1.12 .05	1.10 .05	1.03 .12	1.09 .08	1.05 .08	.96 .08	1.26 .10	1.18 .08	1.06 .07	1.01 .06	1.22 .07



Q7\_5. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People living in rural areas Base: All respondents

				SEG	ì			ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very positive (5)	106 11%	11 6%	26 8%	31 13%	38 16%	37 7%	69 15%	98 10%	8 14%	50 9%	54 14%	39 9%	45 9%	62 12%
	11%	6%	8%	ae	abe	1%	abe	10%	14%	9%	14% i	9%	9%	12%
Fairly positive (4)	203	44	53	47	59	97	106	195	8	111	91	82	98	105
	20%	22%	16%	20%	25%	18%	22%	21%	15%	19%	23%	20%	19%	21%
					be		b							
No difference (3)	337 34%	77 40%	122 37%	84 36%	53 22%	200 38%	137 29%	313 33%	18 34%	214 36%	112 29%	142 34%	180 36%	157 31%
		df	df	d		df	d		21,75	j				
Fairly negative (2)		35	64	38	40	99	78	165	10	109	65	79	95	82
	18%	18%	19%	16%	17%	19%	16%	18%	18%	19%	17%	19%	19%	16%
Very negative (1)	77 8%	15 8%	26 8%	19 8%	16 7%	41 8%	35 7%	72 8%	4 7%	51 9%	22 6%	39 10%	44 9%	33 7%
Don't know	101 10%	12 6%	40 12%	17 7%	32 13%	52 10%	49 10%	94 10%	7 13%	52 9%	44 11%	31 8%	40 8%	61 12%
			а		ac									kl
NETS														
Net: Positive	309	55	79	79	97	134	175	293	16	161	145	121	142	167
	31%	28%	24%	33% be	41% abe	25%	37% abe	31%	29%	27%	37%	29%	28%	33%
	050					4.40		007		400	, 		100	
Net: Negative	253 25%	50 26%	90 27%	57 24%	56 24%	140 27%	113 24%	237 25%	13 25%	160 27%	87 22%	119 29%	139 28%	115 23%
												m		
Mean score	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.2
Standard deviation	1.11	1.01	1.06	1.14	abe 1.20	1.04	abe 1.17	1.11	1.17	1.08	i 1.13	1.12	1.09	kl 1.12
Standard deviation	.04	.07	.07	.08	.07	.05	.05	.04	.22	.05	.06	.06	.05	.05



Q7\_5. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People living in rural areas Base: All respondents

				TY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	106 11%	84 13% b	8 4%	14 9%	92 13% e	9 4%	5 7%	36 8%	69 13% g	2 4%	56 16% kl	29 9%	17 7%	5 8%
Fairly positive	(4)	203 20%	158 24% bc	25 13%	20 13%	173 25% ef	25 12%	4 5%	74 17%	126 23% gi	3 8%	98 28% klm	68 20% Im	32 12%	5 8%
No difference	(3)	337 34%	235 36% b	45 23%	57 36% b	263 37% e	46 21%	28 36% e	110 26%	219 41% gi	8 22%	114 33% Im	154 46% jlm	57 22%	11 20%
Fairly negative	(2)	177 18%	101 16%	59 30% ac	17 11%	98 14%	70 32% df	9 11%	112 26% hi	64 12%	1 2%	33 10%	46 14%	87 33% jkm	11 18%
Very negative	(1)	77 8%	23 3%	45 23% ac	9 5%	17 2%	54 25% df	5 6%	60 14% h	14 3%	3 7%	16 5%	10 3%	50 19% jkm	
Don't know		101 10%	46 7%	13 7%	43 27% ab	61 9%	13 6%	28 35% de	33 8%	47 9%	21 57% gh	28 8%	30 9%	17 6%	27 46% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		309 31%	243 38% bc	33 17%	34 21%	266 38% ef	34 16%	10 12%	109 26%	195 36% gi	5 12%	154 45% klm	97 29% Im	49 19%	9 16%
Net: Negative		253 25%	123 19%	105 54% ac	25 16%	116 16%	124 57% df	14 17%	172 40% hi	78 14%	3 9%	49 14%	57 17%	137 53% jkm	11 18%
Mean score		3.1	3.3 b	2.4	3.1 b	3.3 ef	2.3	2.9 e	2.8	3.3	3.0	3.5 kl	3.2	2.5	3.1
Standard deviation Standard error		1.11 .04	1.03 .04	1.13 .08	1.04 .10	.99 .04	1.13 .08	1.03 .14	1.19 .06	g .97 .04	1.17 .28	1.06 .06	.92 .05	1.16 .08	1.04

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m



CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017

Q7\_6. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People on low incomes Base: All respondents

	ſ		COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	DER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very positive	(5)	116 12%	45 12%	71 11%	67 13%	49 10%	13 12%	19 11%	20 11%	14 8%	19 13%	31 14%	31 12%	34 10%	51 13%
Fairly positive	(4)	205 20%	66 17%	139 22%	95 19%	109 22%	22 21%	39 24%	38 20%	27 16%	28 18%	51 23%	61 23%	65 18%	79 21%
No difference	(3)	384 38%	139 37%	245 39%	203 40%	181 36%	46 45% jm	64 39% j	77 41% jm	74 45% jm	57 37%	66 29%	111 41% jm	150 43% jm	123 32%
Fairly negative	(2)	129 13%	57 15%	72 12%	67 13%	63 13%	12 12%	25 15%	22 12%	25 15%	16 10%	29 13%	38 14%	47 13%	45 12%
Very negative	(1)	69 7%	27 7%	42 7%	28 6%	40 8%	7 7%	6 4%	12 7%	6 3%	19 12% fhkl	19 8% h	13 5%	18 5%	38 10% fhkl
Don't know		99 10%	42 11%	57 9%	43 9%	56 11%	4 4%	11 7%	18 10%	20 12% ek	17 11% k	29 13% efk	15 5%	38 11% k	46 12% efk
NETS															
Net: Positive		320 32%	111 29%	210 34%	163 32%	158 32%	34 33%	58 35% h	58 31%	41 25%	47 30%	83 37% hl	92 34% h	99 28%	130 34% h
Net: Negative		198 20%	84 22%	114 18%	95 19%	103 21%	20 19%	31 19%	34 18%	31 19%	34 22%	48 21%	51 19%	65 18%	82 22%
Mean score Standard deviation Standard error		3.2 1.07 .04	3.1 1.10 .06	3.2 1.06 .05	3.2 1.06 .05	3.1 1.09 .05	3.2 1.05 .12	3.3 1.00 .08	3.2 1.04 .08	3.1 .94 .08	3.1 1.19 .10	3.2 1.18 .08	3.2 1.02 .06	3.2 1.00 .06	3.2 1.18 .06



Q7\_6. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People on low incomes Base: All respondents

					SEG	ì			ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very positive	(5)	116 12%	17 9%	32 10%	28 12%	39 17% abe	49 9%	67 14% ae	108 11%	8 14%	61 10%	54 14%	42 10%	47 9%	69 14% I
Fairly positive	(4)	205 20%	42 22%	68 20%	48 20%	47 20%	110 21%	95 20%	194 21%	10 18%	118 20%	84 22%	90 22%	109 22%	96 19%
No difference	(3)	384 38%	82 42% d	128 39%	97 41% d	76 32%	210 40% d	174 37%	361 38%	17 31%	234 40%	138 35%	159 39%	200 40%	184 37%
Fairly negative	(2)	129 13%	31 16%	44 13%	29 12%	25 11%	74 14%	55 12%	117 13%	10 19%	82 14%	45 12%	62 15%	73 15%	56 11%
Very negative	(1)	69 7%	9 4%	28 9%	11 5%	20 9%	37 7%	32 7%	64 7%	5 9%	37 6%	30 8%	26 6%	31 6%	38 8%
Don't know		99 10%	14 7%	32 10%	25 10%	28 12%	46 9%	53 11%	94 10%	5 9%	55 9%	38 10%	35 9%	41 8%	58 12%
NETS															
Net: Positive		320 32%	59 30%	100 30%	75 32%	87 37%	159 30%	162 34%	301 32%	17 32%	179 30%	137 35%	131 32%	156 31%	165 33%
Net: Negative		198 20%	39 20%	72 22%	41 17%	46 19%	111 21%	87 18%	181 19%	15 28%	119 20%	75 19%	87 21%	104 21%	94 19%
Mean score Standard deviation Standard error		3.2 1.07 .04	3.2 .98 .07	3.1 1.08 .07	3.2 1.02 .07	3.3 1.19 .07	3.1 1.04 .05	3.3 1.11 .05	3.2 1.07 .04	3.1 1.21 .22	3.2 1.04 .05	3.2 1.13 .06	3.2 1.04 .05	3.1 1.03 .05	3.2 1.12 .05



Q7\_6. For each of the following groups of people, please say if you think the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk will have a positive or negative impact on that group, or make no difference at all.

## People on low incomes Base: All respondents

				TY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very positive	(5)	116 12%	84 13% b	13 6%	19 12%	92 13%	19 9%	5 6%	46 11%	67 12%	2 7%	58 17% kl	34 10%	19 7%	5 9%
Fairly positive	(4)	205 20%	160 25% bc	21 11%	24 15%	178 25% ef	18 8%	8 10%	74 18%	127 24% gi	3 8%	106 31% klm	61 18% m	36 14% m	2 4%
No difference	(3)	384 38%	262 40% b	64 33%	58 37%	292 41% e	67 31%	25 31%	138 32%	237 44% gi	9 25%	114 33%	175 52% jlm	74 29%	21 36%
Fairly negative	(2)	129 13%	72 11%	45 23% ac	12 7%	67 9%	57 26% df	6 7%	74 17% hi	56 10% i	-	30 9%	31 9%	62 24% jk	7 12%
Very negative	(1)	69 7%	21 3%	37 19% ac	10 7%	21 3%	41 19% df	7 8% d	58 14% h	7 1%	4 11% h	10 3%	11 3%	47 18% jkm	-
Don't know		99 10%	49 8%	15 8%	35 22% ab	54 8%	15 7%	30 37% de	34 8%	47 9%	18 49% gh	28 8%	27 8%	22 8%	23 39% jkl
NETS															
Net: Positive		320 32%	243 38% bc	34 17%	43 27% b	271 38% ef	37 17%	13 16%	121 28%	194 36% gi	5 15%	164 47% klm	95 28% m	55 21%	7 12%
Net: Negative		198 20%	93 14%	83 42% ac	22 14%	88 12%	97 45% df	12 16%	131 31% hi	63 12%	4 11%	40 12%	42 12%	109 42% jkm	7 12%
Mean score		3.2	3.4 b	2.6	3.2 b	3.4 ef	2.6	3.0 e	2.9	3.4	3.0	3.5 klm	3.2	2.7	3.2
Standard deviation Standard error		1.07 .04	.98 .04	1.15 .08	1.10 .10	.96 .04	1.18 .08	1.10 .15	1.20 .06	g .91 .04	1.28 .29	1.00	.90 .05	1.19 .08	.91 .16



Q8. I am now going to read out a list of priorities for local government generally. Please select the top three priorities that are most important to you personally.

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	L AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Support for the vulnerable, for example children and disabled people	561 56%	216 57%	345 55%	268 53%	292 59%	62 59%	97 59% g	90 48%	96 58%	90 58%	126 56%	159 59% g	186 53%	216 57%
Keeping council tax rates as low as possible	430 43%	172 46%	259 41%	199 40%	231 46% c	31 30%	73 45% e	80 43% e	75 46% e	58 37%	114 50% eik	104 39%	155 44% e	171 45% e
Efficient and consistent delivery of services	392 39%	147 39%	245 39%	190 38%	202 41%	45 43%	56 34%	70 37%	74 45%	61 39%	87 38%	101 38%	144 41%	147 39%
Engaging with and listening to residents	335 33%	133 35%	201 32%	162 32%	173 35%	28 27%	52 32%	52 28%	56 34%	61 39% gk	86 38% g	80 30%	108 31%	147 38% egkl
Improving local places, for example parks and community centres	333 33%	121 32%	212 34%	181 36%	152 31%	37 36% j	61 37% jm	77 41% jm	58 35% jm	50 32% j	50 22%	98 37% jm	135 38% jm	100 26%
Driving growth in employment	301 30%	111 30%	190 30%	159 32%	142 29%	38 36% jm	51 31% j	70 38% jm	49 29%	46 30%	48 21%	88 33% jm	119 34% jm	94 25%
Driving growth in housing	256 26%	90 24%	166 27%	144 29% d	112 23%	30 29%	46 28%	47 25%	42 26%	39 25%	52 23%	76 28%	90 25%	91 24%
Strong and accountable local leadership	193 19%	76 20%	117 19%	106 21%	87 17%	21 20%	30 19%	28 15%	27 17%	33 21%	54 24% gl	51 19%	55 16%	87 23% gl
Don't know	27 3%	9 2%	18 3%	11 2%	17 3%	3 3% h	3 2%	6 3% h	-	4 2% h	11 5% hl	6 2%	6 2%	15 4% h
None of the above	6 1%	2 1%	4 1%	6 1% d	1 *	-	1	4 2% km	-	-	2 1%	1	4 1%	2

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June – 24th July 2017



Q8. I am now going to read out a list of priorities for local government generally. Please select the top three priorities that are most important to you personally.

Base: All respondents

			·	SEG		·		ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS O	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Support for the vulnerable, for example children and disabled people	561 56%	112 58%	181 55%	130 55%	138 58%	293 56%	268 56%	527 56%	28 52%	319 54%	228 59%	213 52%	268 54%	293 58% k
Keeping council tax rates as low as possible	430 43%	57 29%	138 42% a	113 48% ae	122 51% abe	195 37% a	235 50% abe	405 43%	24 44%	252 43%	164 42%	148 36%	189 38%	241 48% kl
Efficient and consistent delivery of services	392 39%	87 45% cdf	142 43% cf	78 33%	85 36%	228 43% cdf	164 34%	375 40%	13 24%	237 40%	148 38%	188 46% m	216 43% m	176 35%
Engaging with and listening to residents	335 33%	61 31%	105 32%	94 40% de	75 31%	166 32%	169 36%	314 34%	17 32%	188 32%	143 37%	157 38% m	186 37% m	148 30%
Improving local places, for example parks and community centres	333 33%	60 31%	135 41% acdf	65 28%	72 30%	195 37% cf	138 29%	301 32%	28 51% g	218 37% j	109 28%	130 32%	151 30%	182 36% I
Driving growth in employment	301 30%	69 36% df	108 33% d	72 31% d	51 22%	177 34% df	124 26%	289 31%	10 19%	198 34% j	96 25%	132 32%	156 31%	145 29%
Driving growth in housing	256 26%	57 29% d	76 23%	72 30% d	51 22%	133 25%	123 26%	245 26%	9 16%	155 26%	99 25%	111 27%	135 27%	121 24%
Strong and accountable local leadership	193 19%	54 28% bdef	52 16%	49 20%	39 16%	106 20%	87 18%	179 19%	12 23%	97 16%	92 24% i	93 22% m	107 21%	86 17%
Don't know	27 3%	2 1%	8 2%	2 1%	15 6% abce	11 2%	17 4% c	21 2%	5 9% g	11 2%	14 4%	6 1%	12 2%	15 3%



# Q8. I am now going to read out a list of priorities for local government generally. Please select the top three priorities that are most important to you personally. Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total None of the above

			SE	:G			ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
6 1%	1 *	1	3 1%	1 1%	2	4 1%	6 1%	-	3 1%	1	1 *	1	5 1%



# Q8. I am now going to read out a list of priorities for local government generally. Please select the top three priorities that are most important to you personally. Base: All respondents

			LITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPAC1	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Support for the vulnerable, for example	561	360	117	85	393	130	38	251	295	15	180	193	162	26
children and disabled people	56%	56%	60%	53%	56%	60%	48%	59% i	55%	40%	52%	57%	62% jm	46%
Keeping council tax rates as low as possible	430	283	76	71	334	70	27	174	240	15	157	147	108	19
	43%	44%	39%	45%	47% ef	32%	34%	41%	44%	42%	45%	43%	41%	33%
Efficient and consistent delivery of services	392	265	65	62	281	75	36	164	217	11	133	137	94	28
	39%	41%	34%	39%	40%	35%	46%	39%	40%	31%	39%	41%	36%	47%
Engaging with and listening to residents	335	201	78	56	213	90	31	144	174	16	119	108	86	22
	33%	31%	40% a	35%	30%	42% d	40%	34%	32%	43%	35%	32%	33%	38%
Improving local places, for example parks and	333	208	74	51	239	72	22	146	176	10	118	101	97	16
community centres	33%	32%	38%	32%	34%	33%	27%	34%	33%	28%	34%	30%	37%	28%
Driving growth in employment	301	210	43	48	233	55	13	111	185	5	111	95	72	23
	30%	32% b	22%	30%	33% ef	26%	17%	26%	34% gi	14%	32%	28%	28%	39%
Driving growth in housing	256	186	44	26	181	60	15	104	146	6	91	96	63	8
Driving growar in riodoling	26%	29%	22%	17%	26%	28%	19%	24%	27%	18%	26%	28%	24%	13%
		С									m	m		
Strong and accountable local leadership	193	123	45	25	129	51	13	91	96	6	73	56	56	8
	19%	19%	23%	15%	18%	23%	16%	22%	18%	15%	21%	17%	21%	14%
Don't know	27	15	4	8	13	6	8	12	10	6	6	14	2	6
	3%	2%	2%	5%	2%	3%	10% de	3%	2%	16% gh	2%	4% I	1%	10% il
None of the share		_	•	,	-	•			•	ŭ			_	, ,
None of the above	6 1%	1	2 1%	4 2%	2	2 1%	2 3%	1 *	3 1%	2 6%	1	2 1%	2 1%	1 3%
			.,,	a		.,,	d		.,,	gh		.,,	.,,	j



Q9. Based on everything we have discussed so far today and having heard the various benefits and concerns, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

		COL	NCIL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Tot	Forest Hea	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			a b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	l l	m
Unweighted Total	100	40	1 600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	100		6 625 0% 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very favourable	(4) 20		8 149 5% 24% a	115 23%	93 19%	26 25%	33 20%	44 24% h	25 15%	32 20%	49 21%	58 22%	69 20%	80 21%
Fairly favourable	(3) 49		5 313 9% 50%	235 47%	263 53% c	55 53%	77 47%	93 50%	92 56% j	78 50%	103 46%	132 49%	185 53%	181 48%
Fairly unfavourable	(2)		8 59 3% 9%	52 10%	55 11%	11 11%	25 15% m	19 10%	17 10%	15 10%	21 9%	36 13%	36 10%	36 9%
Very unfavourable	(1) 10		1 58 4% 9% b	69 14% d	40 8%	6 6%	21 13%	18 10%	12 7%	21 13%	31 14% hl	27 10%	30 9%	52 14% ehl
Don't know	7		4 46 9% 7%	33 6%	47 9%	7 6%	8 5%	13 7%	20 12% fk	10 6%	22 10%	15 6%	32 9%	32 8%
NETS														
Net: Favourable	70		3 463 5% 74% a	350 69%	356 72%	80 77%	110 67%	137 74%	117 71%	110 71%	152 67%	190 71%	254 72%	262 69%
Net: Unfavourable	2′	2%	9 117 6% 19% b	121 24%	95 19%	17 17%	46 28% ehl	37 20%	29 17%	36 23%	52 23%	63 24%	66 19%	87 23%
Mean score	2	2	7 3.0 a	2.8	2.9	3.0 f	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8
Standard deviation Standard error	3. ).		1 .87	.96 .04	.82 .04	.79 .09	.93 .07	.88 .07	.77 .06	.93 .08	.96 .07	.89 .06	.83 .05	.95 .05



Q9. Based on everything we have discussed so far today and having heard the various benefits and concerns, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

					SEG		_		ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very favourable	(4)	207	49	60	50	48	109	98	194	13	114	89	101	111	97
		21%	25%	18%	21%	20%	21%	21%	21%	24%	19%	23%	24%	22%	19%
Fairly favourable	(3)	498	89	171	121	117	260	238	466	28	306	184	192	242	256
		50%	46%	52%	51%	49%	50%	50%	50%	51%	52%	47%	46%	48%	51%
Fairly unfavourable	(2)	107	23	44	22	19	67	41	99	5	70	35	44	51	56
		11%	12%	13%	9%	8%	13%	9%	11%	9%	12%	9%	11%	10%	11%
				df			df								
Very unfavourable	(1)	109	22	30	32	24	52	57	104	5	57	48	50	63	46
		11%	12%	9%	14%	10%	10%	12%	11%	10%	10%	12%	12%	13%	9%
Don't know		79	11	26	13	29	38	42	75	3	41	32	27	34	46
		8%	6%	8%	5%	12% ace	7%	9%	8%	6%	7%	8%	7%	7%	9%
						ace									
NETS															
Net: Favourable		706	138	232	171	165	370	336	660	41	419	273	292	353	353
		70%	71%	70%	72%	70%	70%	71%	70%	75%	71%	70%	71%	70%	71%
Net: Unfavourable		216	45	74	54	43	119	97	203	10	127	83	93	114	102
		22%	23%	22%	23%	18%	23%	20%	22%	19%	22%	21%	23%	23%	20%
Mean score		2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9
Standard deviation		.89	.94	.84	.93	.89	.88	.91	.90	.88	.86	.94	.94	.93	.85
Standard error		.03	.07	.06	.06	.05	.04	.04	.03	.16	.04	.05	.05	.04	.04



Q9. Based on everything we have discussed so far today and having heard the various benefits and concerns, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

Base: All respondents

			FAVOURABILI CO	TY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		. otal	a	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Very favourable	(4)	207 21%	190 29% bc	5 3%	12 7% b	207 29% ef			45 11%	161 30% gi	2 5%	108 31% klm	82 24% Im	18 7%	1 1%
Fairly favourable	(3)	498 50%	395 61% bc	34 17%	70 44% b	498 71% ef	-	-	191 45% i	298 55% gi	9 25%	183 53% I	174 52% I	107 41%	33 57% I
Fairly unfavourable	(2)	107 11%	29 4%	61 31% ac	18 11% a	-	107 50% df	-	76 18% hi	29 5%	1 4%	19 6%	30 9%	51 20% jk	6 11%
Very unfavourable	(1)	109 11%	15 2%	88 45% ac	6 4%	-	109 50% df	-	91 21% hi	17 3%	1 4%	18 5%	23 7%	66 26% jkm	1 2%
Don't know		79 8%	19 3%	7 3%	54 34% ab	-	-	79 100% de	21 5%	35 6%	23 63% gh	17 5%	29 9% j	17 7%	16 28% jkl
NETS															
Net: Favourable		706 70%	585 90% bc	39 20%	82 51% b	706 100% ef	-	-	236 56% i	459 85% gi	11 30%	291 84% klm	256 76% Im	125 48%	34 58%
Net: Unfavourable		216 22%	43 7%	149 77% ac	24 15% a	-	216 100% df	-	167 39% hi	46 9%	3 8%	37 11%	53 16%	118 45% jkm	8 13%
Mean score		2.9	3.2 bc	1.8	2.8 b	3.3 e	1.5	-	2.5	3.2 g	2.8	3.2 klm	3.0	2.3	2.8
Standard deviation Standard error		.89 .03	.63 .03	.84 .06	.70 .07	.46 .02	.50 .03	-	.96 .05	.69 .03	.81 .21	.76 .04	.81 .05	.95 .06	.52 .08



Q9. Based on everything we have discussed so far today and having heard the various benefits and concerns, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

by Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are currently considering proposals to replace the two councils with a single District-level Council covering both areas.

Both councils have been working in partnership for over 10 years, and all of their services are run together on behalf of both councils.

Q4. In general, to what extent are you favourable or unfavourable towards the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

				FAVOURA	BILITY TOWARDS PROPOSAI	_S Q4		
	Total	Very favourable	Fairly favourable	Fairly unfavourable	Very unfavourable	Don't know	Net: Favourable	Net: Unfavourable
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g
Unweighted Total	1001	180	463	102	97	159	643	199
Weighted Total	1001	180	467	105	90	159	647	195
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very favourable (4)	207	111	79	2	3	12	190	5
	21%	62%	17%	2%	3%	7%	29%	3%
		bcdefg	cdeg			g	bcdeg	
Fairly favourable (3)	498	51	344	24	9	70	395	34
	50%	28%	74%	23%	10%	44%	61%	17%
		dg	acdefg	d		acdg	acdeg	
Fairly unfavourable (2)	107	5	24	47	14	18	29	61
	11%	3%	5%	45%	15%	11%	4%	31%
				abdefg	abf	abf		abdef
Very unfavourable (1)	109	8	7	26	63	6	15	88
	11%	4%	1%	24%	70%	4%	2%	45%
		b		abef	abcefg			abcef
Don't know	79	5	14	5	1	54	19	7
	8%	3%	3%	5%	2%	34%	3%	3%
						abcdfg		
NETS								
Net: Favourable	706	162	423	27	12	82	585	39
	70%	90%	91%	25%	14%	51%	90%	20%
		cdeg	cdeg	d		cdg	cdeg	
Net: Unfavourable	216	13	30	73	76	24	43	149
	22%	7%	7%	69%	85%	15%	7%	77%
				abef	abcef	abf		abef
Mean score	2.9	3.5	3.1	2.0	1.5	2.8	3.2	1.8
		bcdefg	cdeg	dg		cdg	bcdeg	d
Standard deviation	.89	.76	.53	.78	.81	.70	.63	.84
Standard error	.03	.06	.02	.08	.08	.07	.03	.06

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f,g



# Q10. To what extent, if at all, are you concerned about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

			COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	DER					AGE				
		Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total		1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Very concerned	(4)	115 11%	39 10%	75 12%	72 14% d	43 9%	8 8%	17 11%	26 14% h	9 6%	22 14% h	32 14% h	25 10%	35 10%	54 14% h
Fairly concerned	(3)	310 31%	129 34%	180 29%	147 29%	162 33%	26 25%	54 33%	50 27%	50 30%	48 31%	81 36% g	80 30%	100 28%	130 34%
Not very concerned	(2)	308 31%	108 29%	201 32%	149 30%	160 32%	41 39% gjm	59 36% gjm	48 26%	64 39% gijm	43 27%	53 24%	100 37% gijm	112 32% jm	96 25%
Not at all concerned	(1)	232 23%	82 22%	150 24%	123 24%	109 22%	24 23%	28 17%	55 29% fk	39 23%	37 24%	49 22%	52 19%	93 26% fk	86 23%
Don't know		37 4%	17 5%	19 3%	13 3%	24 5%	4 4%	5 3%	8 4%	3 2%	5 3%	10 4%	10 4%	11 3%	15 4%
NETS															
Net: Concerned		424 42%	169 45%	256 41%	219 44%	205 41%	34 33%	71 43%	76 41%	59 36%	70 45%	113 50% ehkl	106 39%	135 38%	183 48% ehkl
Net: Not concerned		540 54%	190 51%	350 56%	271 54%	269 54%	65 63% jm	87 53%	103 55%	103 62% jm	80 51%	103 45%	152 57% jm	205 58% jm	182 48%
Mean score		2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.4 h	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.4 ehl	2.3	2.2	2.4 hl
Standard deviation Standard error		.97 .03	.95 .05	.98 .04	1.01 .05	.92 .04	.90 .10	.90 .07	1.05 .08	.86 .07	1.01 .08	1.00	.90 .06	.97 .05	1.01 .05



# Q10. To what extent, if at all, are you concerned about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

					SEG				ETHNIC	ITV	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
		Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%			a	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total		1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total		1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Very concerned	(4)	115 11%	19 10%	40 12%	25 10%	31 13%	59 11%	56 12%	100 11%	13 23% g	58 10%	55 14% i	59 14% m	69 14% m	46 9%
Fairly concerned	(3)	310 31%	62 32%	104 31%	73 31%	71 30%	166 32%	144 30%	291 31%	16 30%	182 31%	122 32%	132 32%	159 32%	151 30%
Not very concerned	(2)	308 31%	62 32%	104 31%	67 28%	76 32%	166 32%	142 30%	296 32%	10 18%	195 33%	106 27%	121 29%	151 30%	157 31%
Not at all concerned	(1)	232 23%	47 24%	70 21%	70 29% bde	45 19%	117 22%	115 24%	218 23%	12 22%	138 23%	90 23%	95 23%	114 23%	118 24%
Don't know		37 4%	4 2%	14 4%	3 1%	15 6% ac	18 3%	19 4%	32 3%	3 6%	14 2%	15 4%	6 1%	8 2%	29 6% kl
NETS															
Net: Concerned		424 42%	81 42%	144 43%	98 41%	102 43%	225 43%	200 42%	391 42%	29 54%	240 41%	177 46%	190 46% m	228 45% m	197 39%
Net: Not concerned		540 54%	109 56%	174 53%	136 57%	120 51%	283 54%	257 54%	514 55%	22 40%	333 57%	196 51%	216 52%	265 53%	275 55%
Mean score		2.3	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.4 c	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3
Standard deviation Standard error		.97 .03	.95 .07	.96 .06	.99 .06	.96 .06	.96 .05	.98 .04	.96 .03	1.11 .20	.94 .04	1.01 .05	1.00 .05	.99 .04	.94 .04



# Q10. To what extent, if at all, are you concerned about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk?

				ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE	IMBACI	T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLIBS
			Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour	· ·		Not		IIVIFAC	I OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLKS
		Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%			а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total		1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total		1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Very concerned	(4)	115	33	63	18	37	71	7	115	-	-	22	25	61	7
		11%	5%	33%	11%	5%	33%	9%	27%	-	-	6%	7%	24%	12%
				ac	а		df		hi					jk	
Fairly concerned	(3)	310	187	82	41	199	96	15	310	-	-	93	92	112	13
		31%	29%	42%	25%	28%	45%	18%	73%	-	-	27%	27%	43%	23%
				ac			df		hi					jkm	
Not very concerned	(2)	308	242	29	37	263	29	16	-	308	-	124	112	56	17
		31%	37%	15%	23%	37%	13%	20%	-	57%	-	36%	33%	21%	29%
			bc			ef				gi		1	ı		
Not at all concerned	(1)	232	175	16	41	196	17	19	-	232	-	98	95	29	9
		23%	27% b	8%	26%	28%	8%	24%	-	43%	-	28%	28%	11%	16%
			D		b	е		е		gi		'	1		
Don't know		37	9	4	23	11	3	23	-	-	37	9	13	2	12
		4%	1%	2%	15% ab	2%	1%	29% de	-	-	100% gh	3%	4%	1%	20% jkl
					ab			ue			gri				jki
NETS															
Net: Concerned		424	220	146	58	236	167	21	424	-	-	114	117	173	20
		42%	34%	75%	37%	33%	77%	27%	100%	-	-	33%	35%	67%	35%
				ac			df		hi					jkm	
Net: Not concerned		540	418	45	77	459	46	35	-	540	-	221	208	85	26
		54%	65%	23%	49%	65%	21%	44%	-	100%	-	64%		33%	45%
			bc		b	ef		е		gi		lm	lm		
Mean score		2.3	2.1	3.0	2.3	2.1	3.0	2.2	3.3	1.6	-	2.1	2.1	2.8	2.4
Oten dead decidation		0.7	0=	ac	4.00	00	df	4.00	h	50		60	00	jkm	00
Standard deviation Standard error		.97 .03	.87 .03	.91 .06	1.03 .09	.88 .03	.89 .06	1.03 .13	.44 .02	.50 .02	-	.90 .05	.93 .05	.93 .06	.98 .15
Stanualu EIIUI		.03	.03	.00	.08	.03	.∪0	.13	.02	.02	-	.05	.05	.00	.10



# Q11. What concerns, if any, do you have regarding the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All those who have concerns about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

	COUNC	IL AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
731	296	435	365	366	61	147	126	122	111	164	208	248	275
733 100%	276 100%	457 100%	368 100%	365 100%	76 100%	131 100%	124 100%	123 100%	113 100%	166 100%	206 100%	247 100%	279 100%



# Q11. What concerns, if any, do you have regarding the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All those who have concerns about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

			SE	:G	_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	*h	i	j	k	1	m
731	151	188	169	223	339	392	699	24	423	292	298	369	362
733 100%	143 100%	248 100%	164 100%	178 100%	391 100%	342 100%	687 100%	39 100%	435 100%	283 100%	311 100%	379 100%	354 100%



# Q11. What concerns, if any, do you have regarding the proposed creation of a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All those who have concerns about the proposals to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

		ITY TOWARDS DUNCIL: FIRST			LITY TOWARDS		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL ( COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE		F OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	a b c		С	d	е	f	g	h	*i	j	k	I	m
731	459	179	93 497		195	39	420	311	-	247	228	219	37
733 100%	462 100%	175 100%	95 100%	499 100%	196 100%	38 100%	424 100%	308 100%	-	238 100%	229 100%	229 100%	37 100%



# Q12. What further information, if anything, would you like to see from the two councils about the proposed changes going forward? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

	COUNCI	L AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
		St											
	Forest Heath	Edmundsbury			40.04	05.04	05.44	45.54	55.04	0.5	40.04	05.54	
Total	District	Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



# Q12. What further information, if anything, would you like to see from the two councils about the proposed changes going forward? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

			SEC	3	_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%



# Q12. What further information, if anything, would you like to see from the two councils about the proposed changes going forward? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total

		ITY TOWARDS DUNCIL: FIRST			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL O	OF NEW SINGLE		OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour Unfavour able Don't kno			Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	a b c		С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



## Q13. How, if at all, would you like to hear from Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils about the proposal to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	ER					AGE				
	Tatal	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury	Male	Familia	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	05.	18-34	05.54	55.
Significance Level: 95%	Total	District	Borough b	Male c	Female d	18-24 e	25-34 f	35-44 g	45-54   h	55-64 i	65+ i	18-34   k	35-54	55+ m
										•	,		•	
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Leaflet or flyer	569	213	356	273	296	60	93	117	92	94	113	153	209	207
	57%	57%	57%	54%	60%	58%	57%	63%	56%	60%	50%	57%	59%	54%
								j		j			j	
Local newspaper	512	191	321	268	244	65	73	93	73	73	135	138	166	209
	51%	51%	51%	53%	49%	62%	45%	50%	44%	47%	60%	51%	47%	55%
						fhil					fghil			fhl
Email	290	104	186	156	134	38	45	56	53	47	52	82	109	99
	29%	28%	30%	31%	27%	36%	27%	30%	32%	30%	23%	31%	31%	26%
						j			j				j	
Social media	266	111	155	120	146	45	47	57	47	43	27	93	104	69
	27%	30%	25%	24%	29%	44%	29%	30%	28%	28%	12%	35%	29%	18%
					С	fghijlm	jm	jm	jm	jm		jm	jm	j
Public event	260	107	154	129	131	27	42	49	49	41	53	70	97	94
	26%	28%	25%	26%	26%	26%	26%	26%	29%	26%	23%	26%	28%	25%
Telephone	80	28	53	40	41	12	15	15	6	12	20	27	22	31
	8%	7%	8%	8%	8%	12%	9%	8%	4%	7%	9%	10%	6%	8%
						h	h					h		
Don't know	7	3	5	3	4	-	2	2	-	1	2	2	2	3
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
None of the above	43	15	28	21	22	3	10	5	11	4	9	13	16	14
	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	6%	3%	7%	3%	4%	5%	5%	4%



## Q13. How, if at all, would you like to hear from Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils about the proposal to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	EITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of		Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	Ţ	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Leaflet or flyer	569 57%	104 54%	215 65% acdf	129 54%	121 51%	319 61% df	250 53%	538 57%	27 50%	351 60%	208 54%	227 55%	280 56%	290 58%
Local newspaper	512 51%	90 46%	172 52%	121 51%	130 55%	262 50%	250 53%	483 52%	23 42%	288 49%	212 55%	227 55% m	281 56% m	231 46%
Email	290 29%	72 37% cdf	105 32% df	65 27% d	47 20%	177 34% df	112 24%	272 29%	14 25%	184 31%	103 26%	136 33% m	155 31%	135 27%
Social media	266 27%	42 22%	108 33% adf	64 27%	51 22%	151 29% d	115 24%	250 27%	12 23%	192 33% j	72 19%	114 28%	133 27%	133 27%
Public event	260 26%	54 28% c	102 31% cf	44 19%	61 26%	155 30% cf	105 22%	251 27%	8 15%	158 27%	100 26%	113 27%	136 27%	124 25%
Telephone	80 8%	10 5%	30 9%	17 7%	23 10%	40 8%	40 8%	77 8%	3 6%	44 7%	34 9%	32 8%	38 8%	43 9%
Don't know	7 1%	-	1 *	3 1%	4 2% e	1 *	6 1%	6 1%	2 3%	4 1%	2 1%	2 *	3 1%	5 1%
None of the above	43 4%	4 2%	9 3%	15 6% ae	16 7% abe	13 2%	30 6% abe	36 4%	7 14% g	24 4%	13 3%	10 2%	14 3%	29 6% kl



## Q13. How, if at all, would you like to hear from Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils about the proposal to create a single District-level Council for West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
		Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
Significance Level: 95%	Total	able	able b	Don't know	able d	able e	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference k	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	D	С	ū	е	1	g	n	'	J	К	Į.	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Leaflet or flyer	569	366	115	88	404	123	42	253	303	13	183	193	159	34
	57%	57%	59%	55%	57%	57%	53%	60%	56%	36%	53%	57%	61%	59%
								i	i				j	
Local newspaper	512	351	85	76	379	100	33	216	280	16	183	176	130	23
	51%	54%	44%	48%	54%	46%	42%	51%	52%	42%	53%	52%	50%	40%
		b			f									
Email	290	204	45	40	224	52	14	123	162	4	113	95	73	9
	29%	32%	23%	25%	32%	24%	18%	29%	30%	12%	33%	28%	28%	16%
		b			ef			i	i		m			
Social media	266	186	49	31	193	54	19	112	146	7	86	100	66	14
	27%	29%	25%	20%	27%	25%	24%	26%	27%	20%	25%	30%	25%	25%
		С												
Public event	260	170	55	35	178	69	13	137	119	4	84	84	81	12
	26%	26%	28%	22%	25%	32%	16%	32%	22%	11%	24%	25%	31%	21%
						df		hi						
Telephone	80	57	14	9	58	19	4	38	39	3	27	34	15	4
	8%	9%	7%	6%	8%	9%	5%	9%	7%	9%	8%	10%	6%	7%
Don't know	7	3	3	2	4	2	2	1	4	2	1	4	3	-
	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%	5%	*	1%	1%	-
										gh				
None of the above	43	14	18	11	16	18	9	12	24	7	7	17	10	9
	4%	2%	9%	7%	2%	8%	12%	3%	4%	19%	2%	5%	4%	15%
			a	а		d	d			gh		j_		jkl



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

		COUNCI		GENE	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
All Saints	24 2%	24 6% b	-	12 2%	11 2%	- -	6 3%	2 1%	5 3%	4 2%	7 3%	6 2%	7 2%	11 3%
Brandon East	39 4%	39 10% b		16 3%	23 5%	5 4%	5 3%	6 3%	7 4%	6 4%	10 4%	9 3%	14 4%	16 4%
Brandon West	26 3%	26 7% b		17 3%	9 2%	1 1%	3 2%	5 3%	2 1%	5 3%	10 5% h	4 2%	6 2%	15 4%
Eriswell and The Rows	34 3%	34 9% b	-	20 4%	14 3%	1 1%	4 3%	7 3%	6 4%	10 7% jk	5 2%	6 2%	13 4%	15 4%
Exning	14 1%	14 4% b		8 2%	6 1%	1 1%	3 2%	3 1%	4 3%	1 1%	2 1%	5 2%	7 2%	3 1%
Great Heath	27 3%	27 7% b	-	16 3%	11 2%	1 1%	5 3%	4 2%	3 2%	6 4%	8 3%	7 2%	7 2%	14 4%
Iceni	13 1%	13 3% b	-	7 1%	6 1%	1 1%	1 *	3 1%	4 3%	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	7 2%	4 1%
Lakenheath	31 3%	31 8% b		11 2%	19 4%	1 1%	3 2%	7 4%	1 1%	4 3%	14 6% fhkl	5 2%	8 2%	18 5% hk
Manor	13 1%	13 3% b		6 1%	7 1%	1 1%	1 *	3 2%	1	2 1%	5 2%	1 1%	4 1%	7 2%
Market	27 3%	27 7% b	-	12 2%	15 3%	2 2%	4 2%	6 3%	7 4%	7 4% j	2 1%	6 2%	12 3%	9 2%
Red Lodge	30 3%	30 8% b	-	17 3%	14 3%	4 4%	4 2%	8 4%	3 2%	5 3%	7 3%	7 3%	11 3%	12 3%
Severals	45 4%	45 12% b	-	16 3%	29 6% c	2 1%	8 5%	9 5%	10 6%	5 3%	11 5%	10 4%	19 5%	16 4%

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	L AREA	GENE	ER					AGE				
		Forest Heath	St Edmundsbury											
0::#	Total	District	Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34 f	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	•	g	h	1	J	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
South	15 1%	15 4% b	-	7 1%	7 1%	- -	1 *	2 1%	5 3% k	3 2%	4 2%	1	6 2%	8 2%
St Mary's	38 4%	38 10% b	-	20 4%	18 4%	4 3%	6 4%	10 5%	8 5%	4 3%	5 2%	10 4%	18 5%	10 3%
Abbeygate	27 3%	- -	27 4% a	15 3%	12 2%	4 4% g	3 2%	1 *	7 4% g	6 4% g	6 3%	7 3%	8 2%	12 3% g
Bardwell	16 2%	- -	16 2% a	14 3% d	2	4 4% him	3 2%	5 2% h		1	3 1%	7 3% h	5 1%	4 1%
Barningham	17 2%	- -	17 3% a	8 2%	9 2%	6 6% ghijlm	4 2%	2 1%	1	1 1%	3 1%	10 4% hlm	3 1%	4 1%
Barrow	15 2%	- -	15 2% a	6 1%	9 2%	1 1%	4 3% i	4 2%	3 2%	-	3 1%	5 2%	7 2%	3 1%
Cavendish	13 1%	- -	13 2% a	6 1%	6 1%	- -	1 *	3 2%	4 2%	3 2%	2 1%	1	7 2%	5 1%
Chedburgh	13 1%	- -	13 2% a	6 1%	7 1%	2 2%	2 1%	1 1%	3 2%	3 2%	3 1%	4 1%	4 1%	5 1%
Clare	13 1%	- -	13 2% a	7 1%	7 1%	- -	2 1%	3 2%	4 2%	1 1%	3 1%	2 1%	7 2%	5 1%
Eastgate	14 1%	- -	14 2% a	4 1%	10 2%	2 2%	3 2%	3 2%	- -	3 2%	2 1%	5 2%	3 1%	6 1%
Fornham	12 1%	- -	12 2% a	7 1%	6 1%	2 2%	2 2%	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	5 2%	3 1%	4 1%
Great Barton	14 1%	- -	14 2% a	8 2%	6 1%	- -	-	3 2% k	2 1% k	1 1%	7 3% fk	-	6 2% k	8 2% fk

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

		COUNCI	L AREA	GENE	ER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total	а	b	C	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Haverhill East	41 4%	- -	41 7% a	25 5%	17 3%	5 5%	16 9% ghijlm	5 3%	3 2%	4 2%	10 4%	20 8% ghilm	8 2%	13 3%
Haverhill North	43 4%	- -	43 7% a	22 4%	21 4%	3 2%	11 7%	7 4%	6 4%	8 5%	7 3%	13 5%	13 4%	16 4%
Haverhill South	30 3%	- -	30 5% a	15 3%	15 3%	4 4%	6 3%	6 3%	8 5% im	1 1%	5 2%	9 3%	15 4% m	6 2%
Haverhill West	30 3%	- -	30 5% a	20 4%	10 2%	2 2%	6 4%	10 5% jm	4 2%	5 3%	3 1%	8 3%	14 4%	8 2%
Horringer and Whelnetham	13 1%	- -	13 2% a	7 1%	7 1%	3 3%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	3 2%	2 1%	5 2%	4 1%	4 1%
Hundon	14 1%	- -	14 2% a	7 1%	7 1%	2 1%	2 1%	1 *	4 2%	2 1%	4 2%	4 1%	4 1%	5 1%
Ixworth	13 1%	- -	13 2% a	5 1%	8 2%	2 2%	2 1%	5 3%	1 1%	3 2%	1	4 1%	6 2%	4 1%
Kedington	13 1%	- -	13 2% a	6 1%	7 1%	3 3% h	2 1%	3 2%	-	4 2% h	1	5 2%	3 1%	5 1%
Minden	27 3%	- -	27 4% a	14 3%	13 3%	2 2%	3 2%	8 4%	4 2%	5 3%	5 2%	5 2%	12 3%	10 3%
Moreton Hall	42 4%	- -	42 7% a	22 4%	20 4%	3 2%	8 5%	6 3%	3 2%	8 5%	15 7% hl	10 4%	9 3%	23 6% I
Northgate	14 1%	- -	14 2% a	3 1%	12 2% c	2 2%	3 2%	2 1%	3 2%	3 2%	2 1%	5 2%	5 1%	5 1%
Pakenham	15 1%	- -	15 2% a	9 2%	6 1%	3 3% i	4 2%	2 1%	1 1%	- -	6 3% i	6 2%	3 1%	6 2%

Columns Tested: a,b - c,d - e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
Risby	15 1%	-	15 2% a	10 2%	5 1%	2 2%	4 2%	2 1%	2 1%	-	4 2%	5 2%	5 1%	4 1%
Risbygate	26 3%	-	26 4% a	12 2%	15 3%	7 7% fghlm	1 1%	4 2%	3 2%	4 2%	7 3%	9 3%	7 2%	10 3%
Rougham	14 1%	-	14 2% a	8 2%	6 1%	4 3%	1 1%	3 2%	1	2 2%	4 2%	5 2%	4 1%	6 2%
Southgate	26 3%	-	26 4% a	14 3%	12 2%	3 3%	3 2%	2 1%	5 3%	7 5%	5 2%	7 2%	7 2%	12 3%
St Olaves	26 3%	-	26 4% a	6 1%	19 4% c	4 4%	4 2%	2 1%	4 3%	4 3%	7 3%	8 3%	7 2%	11 3%
Stanton	17 2%	-	17 3% a	10 2%	7 1%	- -	1	6 3% fjkm	7 5% fjkm	2 1%	-	1	14 4% fjkm	2 1%
Westgate	26 3%	-	26 4% a	10 2%	15 3%	1 1%	4 2%	6 3%	4 3%	2 1%	8 4%	5 2%	10 3%	10 3%
Wichambrook	14 1%		14 2% a	7 1%	7 1%	2 2%	3 2%	3 2%	4 2%	-	2 1%	5 2%	7 2%	2 *
Withersfield	14 1%		14 2% a	7 1%	7 1%	3 3% gl	2 1%	-	2 1%	2 1%	5 2%	5 2%	2 *	7 2%



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

				SEG		_		ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Saints	24	4	10	4	6	13	10	19	5	16	7	11	12	12
	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	8% g	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%
Brandon East	39	6	13	5	16	18	21	35	5	24	13	13	14	25
	4%	3%	4%	2%	7%	3%	4%	4%	9%	4%	3%	3%	3%	
					ce									
Brandon West	26	1	10	6	9	11	15	25	-	12	14	13	16	10
	3%	1%	3%	2%	4% a	2%	3% a	3%	-	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%
5: " IT 5			40			40				0.5	_			40
Eriswell and The Rows	34 3%	8 4%	10 3%	8 3%	8 3%	18 3%	16 3%	34 4%	-	25 4%	7 2%	18 4%	21 4%	13 3%
	078	470	070	070	070	070	0,0	470		j	270	470	470	070
Exning	14	3	5	3	4	8	6	13	2	10	3	6	6	8
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
Great Heath	27	4	6	7	10	10	17	23	4	14	12	12	17	11
	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%	2%	7%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%
Iceni	13	3	5	3	2	8	5	13	-	9	4	5	8	5
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Lakenheath	31	4	12	7	8	16	15	29	2	10	20	14	15	15
	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	5% i	3%	3%	3%
Manor	13	3	3	5	2	6	7	13	_	6	7	6	7	6
	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Market	27	5	10	6	7	15	13	23	3	18	8	9	14	13
	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	5%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Red Lodge	30	2	11	8	9	13	17	28	2	20	9	7	9	21
	3%	1%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4% kl
Severals	45	4	15	9	17	19	26	43	2	28	17	8	12	33
<del>-</del>	4%	2%	4%	4%	7%	4%	5%	5%	3%	5%	4%	2%	2%	7%
					ae									kl
South	15	6	5	-	3	11	3	15	-	9	6	8	8	7
	1%	3% cf	1%	-	1%	2% c	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June – 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 6 100%
St Mary's	38 4%	7 4%	13 4%	7 3%	10 4%	20 4%	17 4%	33 3%	5 9%	26 4%	12 3%	14 3%	20 4%	18 6 4%
Abbeygate	27 3%	5 3%	7 2%	8 3%	6 3%	13 2%	14 3%	27 3%	-	17 3%	10 3%	13 3%	14 3%	13 6 3%
Bardwell	16 2%	5 3%	5 2%	4 1%	1 1%	11 2%	5 1%	15 2%	-	10 2%	4 1%	7 2%	8 2%	8 6 2%
Barningham	17 2%	4 2%	4 1%	4 2%	4 2%	9 2%	8 2%	13 1%	2 3%	10 2%	7 2%	6 1%	6 19	11 % 2%
Barrow	15 2%	3 1%	10 3% df	2 1%	1	13 2% df	3 1%	15 2%	-	10 2%	5 1%	4 1%	6 19	9 % 2%
Cavendish	13 1%	5 3% f	4 1%	2 1%	2 1%	9 2%	3 1%	13 1%	-	6 1%	6 1%	5 1%	6 19	7 % 1%
Chedburgh	13 1%	1	5 1%	7 3% ade	1	5 1%	8 2%	13 1%	-	7 1%	5 1%	5 1%	5 1%	8 % 2%
Clare	13 1%	2 1%	5 2%	3 1%	4 2%	7 1%	6 1%	12 1%	2 3%	7 1%	6 2%	10 2% m	12 2% m	1 *
Eastgate	14 1%	4 2%	3 1%	5 2%	2 1%	7 1%	7 2%	12 1%	2 3%	9 2%	5 1%	4 1%	5 1%	9 % 2%
Fornham	12 1%	2 1%	-	8 3% be	3 1%	2 *	10 2% be	12 1%	-	5 1%	7 2%	2 *	2 *	10 2% kl
Great Barton	14 1%	4 2%	3 1%	2 1%	5 2%	7 1%	7 1%	12 1%	2 3%	4 1%	9 2% i	6 2%	8 2%	5 6 1%
Haverhill East	41 4%	5 3%	9 3%	19 8% abde	8 4%	14 3%	27 6% e	36 4%	4 7%	24 4%	17 4%	17 4%	21 49	20 6 4%
Haverhill North	43 4%	8 4%	19 6%	9 4%	7 3%	27 5%	16 3%	39 4%	3 6%	22 4%	20 5%	17 4%	21 49	22 6 4%
Haverhill South	30 3%	3 2%	10 3%	9 4%	8 3%	13 3%	17 3%	27 3%	3 5%	19 3%	11 3%	8 2%	12 29	18 6 4%

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June – 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

				SEG	<u> </u>			ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500
Haverhill West	30 3%	4 2%	10 3%	12 5% d	3 1%	14 3%	15 3%	26 3%	3 6%	24 4% j	6 2%	15 4%	16 3%	14 3%
Horringer and Whelnetham	13 1%	2 1%	8 2% cf	1	2 1%	10 2%	3 1%	13 1%	-	9 2%	4 1%	7 2%	8 2%	5 5 1%
Hundon	14 1%	4 2% d	6 2% d	4 1% d	- -	10 2% d	4 1%	14 1%	- -	9 2%	5 1%	4 1%	6 1%	8 2%
lxworth	13 1%	2 1%	7 2%	1 *	2 1%	10 2%	4 1%	13 1%	- -	7 1%	5 1%	1 *	2	12 2% kl
Kedington	13 1%	1	6 2%	5 2%	2 1%	7 1%	6 1%	13 1%	-	7 1%	5 1%	6 1%	6 1%	7 5 1%
Minden	27 3%	5 2%	12 4%	4 1%	6 3%	17 3%	10 2%	24 3%	1 3%	18 3%	9 2%	13 3%	14 3%	13
Moreton Hall	42 4%	21 11% bcdef	11 3%	7 3%	3 1%	33 6% cdf	9 2%	42 4%	-	24 4%	18 5%	28 7% m	31 6% m	11 2%
Northgate	14 1%	-	-	5 2% abe	9 4% abe	-	14 3% abe	14 2%	-	8 1%	6 2%	3 1%	5 1%	10 2%
Pakenham	15 1%	6 3%	3 1%	4 2%	2 1%	9 2%	6 1%	15 2%	-	7 1%	7 2%	6 2%	7 1%	8 2%
Risby	15 1%	3 2%	2 1%	6 2%	4 2%	5 1%	10 2%	15 2%	-	6 1%	9 2%	9 2%	10 2%	5 1%
Risbygate	26 3%	9 5%	6 2%	4 2%	8 3%	15 3%	11 2%	26 3%	-	12 2%	13 3%	12 3%	14 3%	13 3%
Rougham	14 1%	4 2%	4 1%	3 1%	4 2%	7 1%	7 1%	13 1%	-	7 1%	7 2%	6 1%	6 1%	8 2%
Southgate	26 3%	5 2%	5 2%	9 4%	8 3%	10 2%	16 3%	25 3%	1 3%	16 3%	9 2%	11 3%	16 3%	10 2%
St Olaves	26 3%	1 1%	10 3%	6 3%	8 3%	11 2%	15 3%	24 3%	2 3%	14 2%	11 3%	8 2%	12 2%	14

Columns Tested: a,b,c,d,e,f - g,h - i,j - k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

				SEC	3			ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
•	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Stanton	17	1	12	1	3	12	4	15	2	13	2	11	12	5
	2%	*	4%	*	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%
			acf							j				
Westgate	26	6	11	4	5	17	9	26	-	15	11	16	21	5
	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	-	3%	3%	4%	4%	1%
												m	m	
Wichambrook	14	5	2	3	3	7	7	14	-	7	5	5	7	7
	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Withersfield	14	4	5	2	2	10	4	14	-	7	7	5	7	7
	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS N			LITY TOWARDS		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL O COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
All Saints	24 2%	16 3%	3 2%	4 2%	19 3%	4 2%	1 1%	12 3%	11 2%	1 2%	13 4% k	5 1%	6 2%	-
Brandon East	39 4%	23 4%	9 5%	7 5%	24 3%	11 5%	4 5%	15 3%	23 4%	2 5%	10 3%	17 5%	8 3%	5 8%
Brandon West	26 3%	15 2%	7 3%	5 3%	15 2%	8 4%	2 3%	15 4%	10 2%	1 2%	8 2%	7 2%	9 3%	2 3%
Eriswell and The Rows	34 3%	18 3%	11 5%	5 3%	18 3%	12 6% d	3 4%	19 5%	13 2%	2 4%	12 3%	12 4%	10 4%	-
Exning	14 1%	8 1%	2 1%	4 3%	12 2%	2 1%	1 1%	6 1%	8 1%	1 2%	4 1%	5 2%	4 2%	1 1%
Great Heath	27 3%	14 2%	9 5%	4 3%	14 2%	8 4%	5 6% d	11 3%	16 3%	1 2%	12 3%	9 3%	5 2%	2 3%
Iceni	13 1%	9 1%	3 1%	1 1%	10 1%	2 1%	1 1%	4 1%	9 2%	-	5 1%	5 1%	3 1%	1 1%
Lakenheath	31 3%	17 3%	7 4%	7 4%	22 3%	6 3%	3 4%	13 3%	17 3%	2 4%	14 4%	11 3%	5 2%	-
Manor	13 1%	9 1%	4 2%	-	8 1%	5 2%	-	8 2%	5 1%	-	5 1%	2 1%	6 2%	-
Market	27 3%	12 2%	8 4%	7 4%	17 2%	9 4%	1 1%	13 3%	15 3%	-	11 3%	5 1%	7 3%	4 8% k
Red Lodge	30 3%	22 3%	6 3%	3 2%	21 3%	6 3%	3 3%	12 3%	16 3%	3 7%	11 3%	8 2%	8 3%	3 4%
Severals	45 4%	30 5%	7 4%	8 5%	35 5%	4 2%	5 7% e	15 4%	26 5%	4 11% g	9 3%	20 6% j	11 4%	5 8% j
South	15 1%	8 1%	4 2%	3 2%	7 1%	4 2%	3 4% d	5 1%	8 1%	2 4%	10 3% k	1	2 1%	2 3% k
St Mary's	38 4%	23 4%	12 6% c	3 2%	21 3%	15 7% d	3 3%	21 5%	16 3%	1 2%	13 4%	12 4%	10 4%	2 4%

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%	Total	а	b	C	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
Weighted Foldi	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%
Abbeygate	27	12	9	6	14	12	2	15	9	2	5	9	9	4
	3%	2%	4% a	4%	2%	5% d	2%	4%	2%	7% h	2%	3%	3%	7% i
Bardwell	16	11	1	3	14	2	-	5	11	-	6	7	2	-
	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	-	2%		1%	-
Barningham	17	13	1	3	12	5	-	8	8	-	5	6	3	2
	2%	2%	*	2%	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	4%
Barrow	15 2%	11 2%	4 2%	1	13 2%	2 1%	-	5 1%	10 2%	-	6 2%	6 2%	2 1%	1 2%
										-				
Cavendish	13 1%	7 1%	3 2%	2 1%	8 1%	2 1%	2 3%	4 1%	8 2%	-	6 2%	2 1%	4 2%	1 2%
Chedburgh	13	13	_	_	13	1	-	3	9	1	4	7	3	_
	1%	2% b	-	-	2%	*	-	1%	2%	4%	1%		1%	-
Clare	13	8	1	5	10	2	2	6	6	1	3	1	8	1
	1%	1%	*	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	*	3% jk	1%
Eastgate	14	9	2	3	11	3	1	8	6	-	5	3	7	-
·	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	3%	-
Fornham	12	6	4	2	6	5	1	5	7	-	6	3	3	-
	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	2%		1%	-
Great Barton	14 1%	10 2%	1	3 2%	11 2%	1	2 3%	3 1%	10 2%	1 2%	7 2%	. 1	4 2%	2 3%
	170	270		270	270		070	170	270	270	k	,	270	k
Haverhill East	41	19	13	8	23	15	3	23	15	3	10	17	13	1
	4%	3%	7% a	5%	3%	7% d	4%	5% h	3%	8%	3%	5%	5%	2%
Haverhill North	43	23	12	8	30	10	3	21	22	-	12	12	17	1
	4%	4%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	-	4%	4%	6%	2%
Haverhill South	30	18	4	8	22	4	4	11	17	1	14	10	6	-
	3%	3%	2%	5%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	-
Haverhill West	30	16	8	5	18	9	3	15	14	-	5	13	9	2
	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	3%	-	1%	4% j	4%	4%

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

		CC	ITY TOWARDS I		COL	ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1009
Horringer and Whelnetham	13	11	-	2	10	2	1	4	8	1	4	5	4	-
	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	4%	1%	1%	2%	-
Hundon	14 1%	10 2%	3 2%	-	11 2%	1 1%	2 2%	9 2%	5 1%		4 1%	8 2%	2 1%	-
						1%								
Ixworth	13 1%	11 2%	1 1%	1 1%	12 2%	-	1 2%	4 1%	7 1%	2 6%	5 1%	2	3 1%	4 79
	1 76	270	170	1 70	276	-	2 76 e	176	170	gh	170		176	jkl
Kedington	13	11	1	1	9	4	1	4	8	1	3	4	5	1
	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	19
Minden	27	19	3	4	23	3	1	14	13	-	9	7	8	2
	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	-	3%	2%	3%	49
Moreton Hall	42	31	5	5	32	8	2	25	17	-	16	14	11	2
	4%	5%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	6% h	3%	-	5%	4%	4%	3%
Northgate	14	13	2	-	11	3	-	5	10	-	1	7	5	2
	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	-	*	2% j	2%	39
Pakenham	15	11	3	1	8	4	2	4	11	-	3	7	5	-
	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	-	1%	2%	2%	-
Risby	15	9	4	2	12	2	1	3	12	-	2	9	2	1
	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	3% j	1%	2%
Risbygate	26	23	1	2	24	1	2	5	20	1	14	9	3	-
	3%	4%	*	2%	3%	*	2%	1%	4%	2%	4%	3%	1%	-
		b			е				g					
Rougham	14 1%	11 2%	2 1%	1	11 2%	-	3 4%	6 2%	7 1%	1 4%	7 2%	4 1%	2 1%	2 49
	1 78	270	1 /6		270		e e	2 /0	1 /6	470	2/0	1 76	1 70	4,
Southgate	26	16	7	3	19	7	-	12	14	-	9	8	7	1
	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	-	3%	3%	-	3%	2%	3%	29
St Olaves	26	20	1	5	21	2	2	9	15	2	12	10	3	-
	3%	3%	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	-
Stanton	17	13	3	1	15	1	1	4	12	-	6	8	3	-
	2%	2%	2%	*	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	-

Columns Tested: a,b,c - d,e,f - g,h,i - j,k,l,m

CATI Fieldwork: 30th June - 24th July 2017



#### Ward

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Westgate
Wichambrook
Withersfield

	FAVOURABILIT COL	TY TOWARDS I UNCIL: FIRST (			ITY TOWARDS N JNCIL: SECOND		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION I	N NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
26	20	2	3	22	2	1	3	21	2	13	7	5	1
3%	3%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	4%	4%	4%	2%	2%	1%
								g					
14	7	2	5	10	2	2	2	12	-	2	9	3	-
1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	*	2%	-	*	3%	1%	-
			а					g			j		
14	10	1	3	9	4	1	8	6	-	3	5	5	1
1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	1%



# S0. In order to speak to a representative cross-section of the local population, could I please speak to the youngest male or female aged 18 or above in the household?

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Yes - speaking
Not on phone at present (PLEASE ASK TO BE TRANSFERRED/MAKE A CALLBACK)

	COUNCIL AREA		GENDER		AGE								
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### S0. In order to speak to a representative cross-section of the local population, could I please speak to the youngest male or female aged 18 or above in the household? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Yes - speaking Not on phone at present (PLEASE ASK TO BE TRANSFERRED/MAKE A CALLBACK)

			SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS O	F PROPOSED IEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### S0. In order to speak to a representative cross-section of the local population, could I please speak to the youngest male or female aged 18 or above in the household? Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS N DUNCIL: FIRST G			ITY TOWARDS N JNCIL: SECOND		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL C COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT OF REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF CLLRS			
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Yes - speaking	1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
Not on phone at present (PLEASE ASK TO BE TRANSFERRED/MAKE A CALLBACK)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### S1. Can I start by checking whether your main residence is in the Forest Heath District Council area, the St Edmundsbury Borough Council area, or somewhere else? Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total	a	b	C	d	е	f	g g	h	i	i	k	33-34   	m
								_			•			
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Forest Heath District council area	376	376	-	185	190	24	53	74	67	65	92	78	141	157
	38%	100%	-	37%	38%	23%	33%	40%	41%	42%	41%	29%	40%	41%
		b						ek	ek	ek	ek		ek	ek
St Edmundsbury Borough council area	625	_	625	318	307	80	110	113	98	91	134	190	211	224
	62%	-	100%	63%	62%	77%	67%	60%	59%	58%	59%	71%	60%	59%
			а			ghijlm						ghijlm		
Somewhere else	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### S1. Can I start by checking whether your main residence is in the Forest Heath District Council area, the St Edmundsbury Borough Council area, or somewhere else? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Forest Heath District council area
St Edmundsbury Borough council area
Somewhere else

			SE	G			ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS OF PROPOSED CREATION OF NEW COUNCIL		
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
376	60	126	78	111	186	190	345	28	227	137	144	178	198
38%	31%	38%	33%	47% abce	35%	40% a	37%	51%	39%	35%	35%	36%	40%
625	134	206	159	126	340	286	592	26	360	252	269	323	303
62%	69%	62%	67%	53%	65%	60%	63%	49%	61%	65%	65%	64%	60%
	df	d	d		d								
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### S1. Can I start by checking whether your main residence is in the Forest Heath District Council area, the St Edmundsbury Borough Council area, or somewhere else? Base: All respondents

			LITY TOWARDS OUNCIL: FIRST			LITY TOWARDS		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL ( COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPACT OF REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF CLLRS			
	T-4-1	Favour	Unfavour	David Incom	Favour	Unfavour	David Incom	0	Not	Danis Inc.	Diti	No difference	Nametica	David Income
	Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		a	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%
Forest Heath District council area	376	224	91	61	243	99	34	169	190	17	137	119	94	25
	38%	35%	47%		34%	46%	43%	40%	35%	47%	40%		36%	43%
			а			d								
St Edmundsbury Borough council area	625	423	103	99	463	117	46	256	350	19	208	218	166	33
	62%	65%	53%	62%	66%	54%	57%	60%	65%	53%	60%	65%	64%	57%
		b			е									
Somewhere else	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



S2. Are you eligible to vote in Local Government elections in Forest Heath or St Edmundsbury?

You are eligible if you are 18+ and either...

A British citizen living in the UK
A Commonwealth citizen living in the UK
AN EU or Irish citizen living in the UK
Registered to vote as a service voter or crown servant
A British citizen living abroad but registered to vote in britain

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Yes
No
Don't know

	COUNC	L AREA	GENE	ER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
-	-	-	-	-	- -	-	-	- -	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Never heard of

AWARENESS OF PROPOSED CREATION OF

NEW COUNCIL

Heard of

**WORKING STATUS** 

Not working

Knowledge of

Working

#### West Suffolk: Creation of a Single Council Public Survey

S2. Are you eligible to vote in Local Government elections in Forest Heath or St Edmundsbury?

You are eligible if you are 18+ and either...

A British citizen living in the UK
A Commonwealth citizen living in the UK
AN EU or Irish citizen living in the UK
Registered to vote as a service voter or crown servant
A British citizen living abroad but registered to vote in britain

Base: All respondents

				SEG		
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1
Significance Level: 95%		a	b	С	d	
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	45
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	52
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	10
Yes	1001	194	332	238	238	52
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	10
No	-	-	-	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	-	
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	-	

1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**ETHNICITY** 

BAME

White



S2. Are you eligible to vote in Local Government elections in Forest Heath or St Edmundsbury?

You are eligible if you are 18+ and either...

A British citizen living in the UK
A Commonwealth citizen living in the UK
AN EU or Irish citizen living in the UK
Registered to vote as a service voter or crown servant
A British citizen living abroad but registered to vote in britain

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Yes
No
Don't know

		_											
		ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU		F NEW SINGLE				
	C	DUNCIL: FIRST (	ב	COL	JNCIL: SECOND	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Favour	Unfavour		Favour	Unfavour			Not					
Total	able	able	Don't know	able	able	Don't know	Concerned	concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



### S3. Are you currently a District Councillor serving in West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Yes No

	COUNC	L AREA	GEN	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



# S3. Are you currently a District Councillor serving in West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Yes
No

			SEG		_		ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS O	F PROPOSED IEW COUNCIL	
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



# S3. Are you currently a District Councillor serving in West Suffolk? Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Yes
No

		ITY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE		OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



# D1. Which of the following age groups do you fall into? Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total		borougn		remale d	10-24 e	20-34		45-54   h	55-64	100+	16-34   k	35-54	
Significance Level: 95%		а	ь	С	u	е	1	g	n	1	J	К	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Under 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18 - 24	104	24	80	55	49	104	-	-	-	-	-	104	-	-
	10%	6%	13%	11%	10%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	39%	-	-
			а			fghijklm						fghijlm		
25 - 34	164	53	110	89	74	-	164	-	-	-	-	164	-	-
	16%	14%	18%	18%	15%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	61%	-	-
							eghijklm					eghijlm		
35 - 44	187	74	113	108	79	-	-	187	-	-	-	-	187	-
	19%	20%	18%	21%	16%	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	53%	-
				d				efhijklm					efhijkm	
45 - 54	164	67	97	63	101	-	-	-	164	-	-	-	164	-
	16%	18%	16%	12%	20%	-	-	-	99%	-	-	-	47%	-
					С				efgijklm				efgijkm	
55 - 64	155	65	91	73	82	-	-	-	-	155	-	-	-	155
	16%	17%	14%	14%	17%	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	41%
										efghjklm				efghjkl
65+	226	92	134	114	111	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	226
	23%	25%	21%	23%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	59%
											efghiklm			efghikl
Refused	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	*	-



# D1. Which of the following age groups do you fall into? Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	:ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard o
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Under 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18 - 24	104	17	43	28	15	60	44	97	5	72	29	38	40	64
	10%	9%	13%	12%	7%	12%	9%	10%	10%	12%	7%	9%	8%	13%
			d	d		d				j				I
25 - 34	164	26	61	42	35	87	77	148	14	112	45	47	59	105
	16%	14%	18%	18%	15%	17%	16%	16%	26%	19%	12%	11%	12%	
										j				kl
35 - 44	187	44	70	36	37	115	72	170	15	139	41	74	88	99
	19%	23%	21%	15%	15%	22%	15%	18%	27%	24%	11%	18%	18%	20%
		cdf	Ţ			cdf				J				
45 - 54	164	37	66	35	27	103	61	154	8	144	17	60	82	82
	16%	19% df	20% df	15%	11%	20% df	13%	16%	15%	24%	4%	15%	16%	16%
										J				
55 - 64	155	28	49	42	37	77	79	147	7	105	50	69	84	71
	16%	14%	15%	18%	16%	15%	17%	16%	13%	18% j	13%	17%	17%	14%
65+	226	42	42	55	87	84	142	220	5	16	205	124	148	78
	23%	21%	13%	23%	37%	16%	30%	24%	10%	3%	53%	30%	29%	16%
		b		be	abcef		abce				i	m	m	
Refused	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
	*	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	*



### D1. Which of the following age groups do you fall into? Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%	TOTAL	able a	able b	C	d d	able e	f	g	h	i	i	k	Negative	m
							•			-	,		•	
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Under 18	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-	-	-	_
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18 - 24	104	82	13	9	80	17	7	34	65	4	29	42	25	7
	10%	13%	7%	6%	11%	8%	8%	8%	12%	12%	8%	12%	10%	13%
		bc							g					
25 - 34	164	101	40	23	110	46	8	71	87	5	60	56	40	8
	16%	16%	21%	14%	16%	21%	11%	17%	16%	15%	17%	17%	15%	14%
						f								
35 - 44	187	116	26	44	137	37	13	76	103	8	65	56	48	18
	19%	18%	13%	28%	19%	17%	16%	18%	19%	23%	19%	17%	19%	31%
				ab										jkl
45 - 54	164	98	33	33	116	29	20	59	102	3	49	61	43	11
	16%	15%	17%	21%	16%	13%	25%	14%	19%	8%	14%	18%	17%	20%
							е		g					
55 - 64	155	108	29	18	110	36	10	70	80	5	55	55	41	5
	16%	17%	15%	11%	16%	16%	12%	17%	15%	14%	16%	16%	16%	8%
65+	226	140	54	32	152	52	22	113	103	10	87	68	62	9
	23%	22%	28%	20%	21%	24%	28%	27%	19%	28%	25%	20%	24%	15%
								h						
Refused	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	-



#### D2. Gender

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Male
Female

	COUNCI	L AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I .	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
504	185	318	504	-	55	89	108	64	73	114	145	171	187
50%	49%	51%	100%	-	53%	55%	58%	39%	47%	51%	54%	49%	49%
			d		h	h	hil			h	h	h	h
497	190	307	-	497	49	74	79	101	82	111	123	181	194
50%	51%	49%	-	100%	47%	45%	42%	61%	53%	49%	46%	51%	51%
				С				efgjklm	g			g	



#### D2. Gender

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Male
Female

	SEG           AB         C1         C2         DE         ABC1           a         b         c         d         e           205         252         244         300         457           194         332         238         238         526           100%         100%         100%         100%         100%           118         167         122         97         285           61%         50%         51%         41%         54%           bcdf         d         d         d         df						ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED IEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001 100%						475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
504 50%						218 46%	482 51%	17 31%	294 50%	192 49%	250 61%	291 58%	213 43%
30 %				4170		4076	h	31/0	30%	4970	m	m	43/6
497	76	164	116	141	241	257	455	37	293	196	162	210	287
50%	39%	50%	49%	59%	46%	54%	49%	69%	50%	51%	39%	42%	57% kl
		а	а	abce		ae		g					



### D2. Gender Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Male Female

		ITY TOWARDS OUNCIL: FIRST			ITY TOWARDS N JNCIL: SECOND		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL C COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPAC1	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
504	318	111	74	350	121	33	219	271	13	192	162	129	20
50%	49%	57%	47%	50%	56%	41%	52%	50%	35%	56%	48%	50%	34%
					f					km		m	
497	329	84	85	356	95	47	205	269	24	153	176	131	38
50%	51%	43%	53%	50%	44%	59%	48%	50%	65%	44%	52%	50%	66%
						е					j		jl



# D3. Which of the following best describes the employment status of the Chief Income Earner in your household? Base: All respondents

		COUNC	L AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total	a	borougn b	rviale c	remale d	18-24 e	25-34   f	35-44 g	45-54   h	55-64   i	i +co	16-34   k	35-54	55+ M
							·			•	,		·	
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Working full time	567	204	363	295	272	83	113	132	134	91	13	197	266	104
	57%	54%	58%	59%	55%	80%	69%	71%	81%	59%	6%	73%	76%	27%
						ijm	ijm	ijm	fgijm	jm		ijm	ijm	j
Working part time	94	41	53	30	64	11	14	17	20	17	15	24	37	32
	9%	11%	8%	6%	13% c	10%	8%	9%	12%	11%	7%	9%	10%	8%
Retired	271	101	169	150	121	-	10	28	2	37	192	10	31	230
	27%	27%	27%	30%	24%	-	6%	15%	1%	24%	85%	4%	9%	60%
							eh	efhkl		efghkl	efghiklm		ehk	efghikl
Student	7	2	4	3	4	3	1	1	1	-	-	4	3	-
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	-
						ijm						m		
Not working/Sick/Disabled/Working less than	33	16	17	9	24	3	9	7	6	8	1	12	13	9
eight hours a week	3%	4%	3%	2%	5%	3%	5%	4%	4%	5%	*	4%	4%	2%
					С	j	j	j	j	j		j	j	
None of these	8	3	5	4	3	3	2	1	-	1	1	5	1	1
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3% hlm	1%	1%	-	*	*	2%	*	*
Refused	21	8	14	13	9	1	15	-	1	1	3	16	1	4
1	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	9%	-	1%	1%	2%	6%	*	1%
							eghijlm					ghijlm		



# D3. Which of the following best describes the employment status of the Chief Income Earner in your household? Base: All respondents

		·	·	SEG		·		ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard o
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Working full time	567	125	233	154	55	358	209	523	37	503	56	214	260	308
-	57%	65%	70%	65%	23%	68%	44%	56%	68%	86%	14%	52%	52%	62%
		df	df	df		df	d			j				kl
Working part time	94	12	42	15	25	54	40	89	5	72	19	35	45	48
• .	9%	6%	13%	6%	10%	10%	8%	9%	9%	12%	5%	9%	9%	109
			ac							j				
Retired	271	55	44	60	111	99	171	264	5	9	258	141	169	102
	27%	28%	13%	25%	47%	19%	36%	28%	10%	1%	66%	34%	34%	20%
		be		be	abcef		abce	h			i	m	m	
Student	7	-	7	-	-	7	-	5	-	-	7	2	2	4
	1%	-	2%	-	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%	*	19
			acdf			df					i			
Not working/Sick/Disabled/Working less than	33	-	-	-	33	-	33	28	6	1	29	4	7	26
eight hours a week	3%	-	-	-	14%	-	7%	3%	10%	*	8%	1%	1%	5%
					abcef		abce		g		i			kl
None of these	8	-	-	-	8	-	8	8	-	1	6	3	4	3
	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	2%	1%	-	*	1%	1%	1%	19
					abce		bce				i			
Refused	21	2	6	9	5	8	14	19	2	2	14	13	13	8
	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	*	4%	3%	3%	2%
Calumna Tastada a bada fi abi ii lalar	2%			4%		2%	3%			*	4% i			



# D3. Which of the following best describes the employment status of the Chief Income Earner in your household? Base: All respondents

	FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: FIRST Q				TY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE		T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS	
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	l l	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Working full time	567	371	102	94	409	126	32	220	331	17	187	209	146	25
	57%	57%	53%	59%	58%	58%	41%	52%	61%	46%	54%		56%	43%
					Ť	Ť			g			jm		
Working part time	94	62	17	14	65	18	11	46	46	2	33	25	25	10
	9%	10%	9%	9%	9%	8%	14%	11%	8%	6%	10%	7%	10%	18% k
Retired	271 27%	171 26%	63 32%	37 23%	185 26%	57 26%	28 36%	127 30%	132 24%	12 33%	100 29%	84 25%	72 28%	14 25%
	21%	26%	32%	23%	26%	26%	36%	30%	24%	33%	29%	25%	28%	25%
Student	7	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	4	-	1
	1%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	*	1%	-	2%
										gh				'
Not working/Sick/Disabled/Working less than	33	23	4	7	23	8	2	19	14	1	11	8	8	6
eight hours a week	3%	4%	2%	4%	3%	4%	3%	5%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	10% jkl
														JKI
None of these	8	1	3	3	4	2	1	3	4	1	4	1	2	-
	1%	*	2% a	2% a	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	1%	-
			а	a										
Refused	21	15	4	3	15	4	2	8	12	2	8	6	7	1
	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	6%	2%	2%	3%	2%



# **D4.** Does the Chief Income Earner have a private pension or allowance? Base: All retired

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Yes No Prefer not to say

	COUNCI	L AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	*e	*f	g	*h	i	j	*k	I	m
285	115	170	157	128	-	12	35	3	40	195	12	38	235
271	101	169	150	121	-	10	28	2	37	192	10	31	230
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
189	63	126	113	76	-	7	22	2	25	134	7	23	159
70%	62%	74% a	75% d	63%	-	66%	76%	71%	66%	70%	66%	76%	69%
64	30	34	25	39	-	3	4	1	11	45	3	5	56
24%	30%	20%	17%	32%	-	27%	14%	29%	29%	24%	27%	15%	25%
				С									
18	8	10	12	6	-	1	3	-	2	13	1	3	15
7%	8%	6%	8%	5%	-	6%	9%	-	4%	7%	6%	9%	6%



# **D4.** Does the Chief Income Earner have a private pension or allowance? Base: All retired

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Yes No Prefer not to say

			SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS O	F PROPOSED IEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	*h	*i	j	k	I	m
285	56	31	59	139	87	198	281	3	9	271	146	176	109
271	55	44	60	111	99	171	264	5	9	258	141	169	102
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
189	53	38	59	38	91	98	186	2	5	181	104	122	67
70%	97%	86%	99%	34%	92%	57%	70%	34%	58%	70%	74%	72%	66%
	df	df	bdf		df	d							
64	-	2	-	62	2	62	60	4	4	58	28	35	28
24%	-	4%	-	56%	2%	36%	23%	66%	42%	23%	20%	21%	28%
				abcef		abce							
18	2	4	1	11	6	12	18	-	-	18	9	11	6
7%	3%	10%	1%	10%	6%	7%	7%	-	-	7%	6%	7%	6%
				С									



# **D4.** Does the Chief Income Earner have a private pension or allowance? Base: All retired

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Yes
No
Prefer not to say

		ITY TOWARDS I DUNCIL: FIRST (			ITY TOWARDS N JNCIL: SECOND		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL O COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	*i	j	k	I	*m
285	180	66	39	197	58	30	128	144	13	107	90	74	14
271	171	63	37	185	57	28	127	132	12	100	84	72	14
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100
189	120	41	27	128	40	21	89	93	7	74	54	50	11
70%	70%	66%	74%	69%	71%	73%	70%	70%	60%	74%	65%	69%	75
64	43	12	9	47	9	8	28	33	3	20	25	18	2
24%	25%	19%	24%	25%	16%	27%	22%	25%	27%	20%	29%	24%	11
18	8	9	1	10	7	-	9	7	2	6	5	5	2
7%	4%	15%	2%	6%	13%	-	7%	5%	13%	6%	6%	7%	1-



# D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired? Base: All in employment or retired with a private pension

		COUNC	L AREA	GENE	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	827	319	508	428	399	73	149	170	152	128	155	222	322	283
Weighted Total	850 100%	308 100%	542 100%	437 100%	412 100%	94 100%	134 100%	171 100%	155 100%	133 100%	163 100%	228 100%	326 100%	296 100%
Higher managerial / professional / administrative	46 5%	11 4%	35 6%	34 8% d	12 3%	2 3%	6 5%	13 8%	8 5%	8 6%	8 5%	9 4%	21 6%	16 6%
Intermediate managerial / professional / administrative	140 16%	48 15%	92 17%	76 17%	64 15%	15 16%	18 13%	29 17%	29 19%	19 14%	31 19%	32 14%	58 18%	49 17%
Supervisory or clerical / junior managerial / professional / administrative	306 36%	113 37%	193 36%	155 35%	151 37%	40 43% jm	54 40% jm	65 38% jm	65 42% jm	49 37% j	33 20%	94 41% jm	130 40% jm	82 28%
Student	- -		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	
Skilled manual worker	223 26%	72 23%	151 28%	111 25%	112 27%	28 30%	36 27%	36 21%	34 22%	38 28%	52 32% gl	64 28%	69 21%	89 30% gl
Semi or unskilled manual work	91 11%	44 14% b	47 9%	43 10%	47 12%	5 6%	15 11%	17 10%	15 10%	14 11%	25 15% e	20 9%	32 10%	39 13%
Casual worker – not in permanent employment	14 2%	6 2%	8 1%	3 1%	11 3% c	-	1 1%	6 3% k	1 1%	1 1%	5 3% k	1 *	7 2%	7 2%
Housewife / Homemaker	2	1 *	1 *	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1	1 1%	-	1 *
Retired and living on state pension	- -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Unemployed or not working due to long-term sickness	1 *	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 *



# D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired? Base: All in employment or retired with a private pension

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I .	m
Unweighted Total	827	319	508	428	399	73	149	170	152	128	155	222	322	283
Weighted Total	850 100%	308 100%	542 100%	437 100%	412 100%	94 100%	134 100%	171 100%	155 100%	133 100%	163 100%	228 100%	326 100%	296 100%
Full-time carer or other household member	6 1%	3 1%	3 1%	1	5 1%	2 2%	1 1%	1	1	2 1%	-	3 1%	1	2 1%
Refused	20 2%	9 3%	11 2%	12 3%	8 2%	2 2%	1 1%	5 3%	3 2%	2 2%	7 5%	3 1%	8 2%	10 3%



### D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired? Base: All in employment or retired with a private pension

				SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	*h	i	j	k	Ţ	m
Unweighted Total	827	200	238	235	154	438	389	792	26	560	254	336	408	419
Neighted Total	850	190	313	228	119	503	347	799	43	580	257	353	427	423
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Higher managerial / professional /	46	46	-	-	-	46	-	44	2	34	12	23	29	17
dministrative	5%	24%	-	-	-	9%	-	6%	4%	6%	5%	6%	7%	49
		bcdef				bcdf								
ntermediate managerial / professional /	140	140	-	-	-	140	-	130	8	84	55	70	76	64
dministrative	16%	74%	-	-	-	28%	-	16%	19%	14%	21%	20%	18%	159
		bcdef				bcdf					i			
Supervisory or clerical / junior managerial /	306	-	306	-	-	306	-	295	9	244	56	129	157	149
rofessional / administrative	36%	-	98%	-	-	61%	-	37%	22%	42%	22%	37%	37%	359
			acdef			acdf				j				
udent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
killed manual worker	223	-	-	223	-	-	223	210	10	145	76	87	113	110
	26%	-	-	98%	-	-	64%	26%	24%	25%	30%	25%	27%	26
				abdef			abde							
Semi or unskilled manual work	91	-	-	-	91	-	91	82	9	53	35	26	32	59
	11%	-	-	-	77%	-	26%	10%	21%	9%	13%	7%	7%	
					abcef		abce							kl
asual worker – not in permanent employment	14	-	-	-	14	-	14	13	1	7	8	3	4	10
	2%	-	-	-	12%	-	4%	2%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2
					abcef		abce							
ousewife / Homemaker	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	1	-	2	1	2	-
	*	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	*	3%	-	1%	*	*	
					bce						i			
etired and living on state pension	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	•
Unemployed or not working due to long-term	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-
ickness	*	_	-	_	1%	_	*	*	- 1	_	*	*	*	_



# D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired? Base: All in employment or retired with a private pension

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
Full-time carer or other household member
Refused

			SE	G	_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	*h	i	j	k	I	m
827	200	238	235	154	438	389	792	26	560	254	336	408	419
850	190	313	228	119	503	347	799	43	580	257	353	427	423
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
6	-	-	-	6	-	6	6	-	6	-	1	1	5
1%	-	-	-	5% abcef	-	2% bce	1%	-	1%	-	*	*	1%
20	4	7	5	4	11	9	17	2	8	12	12	12	9
2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%	4%	1%	5% i	3%	3%	2%



# D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired? Base: All in employment or retired with a private pension

	COUNCIL: FIRST Q				ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	IMPAC*	r of reduction	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS	
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	*i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	827	535	161	131	584	179	64	342	460	25	294	281	209	43
Weighted Total	850 100%	554 100%	161 100%	135 100%	602 100%	184 100%	64 100%	354 100%	469 100%	26 100%	295 100%	288 100%	220 100%	46 100%
Higher managerial / professional / administrative	46 5%	34 6%	9 5%	4 3%	30 5%	14 7%	2 3%	14 4%	32 7%	1 3%	22 7%	13 5%	9 4%	2 4%
Intermediate managerial / professional / administrative	140 16%	93 17%	25 15%	22 16%	100 17%	31 17%	9 15%	65 18%	72 15%	3 10%	57 19% k	38 13%	38 17%	6 14%
Supervisory or clerical / junior managerial / professional / administrative	306 36%	199 36%	50 31%	57 42%	218 36%	64 35%	24 37%	130 37%	165 35%	11 41%	99 34%	107 37%	85 38%	15 33%
Student	- -	-	-	-	-	-	- -		-	-	-		- -	-
Skilled manual worker	223 26%	145 26%	49 30%	29 22%	161 27%	51 28%	11 17%	92 26%	129 27%	3 10%	74 25%	78 27%	60 27%	10 21%
Semi or unskilled manual work	91 11%	53 10%	23 14%	15 11%	60 10%	19 10%	12 18% d	40 11%	45 10%	6 22%	25 9%	38 13%	21 10%	6 14%
Casual worker – not in permanent employment	14 2%	9 2%	2 1%	3 2%	12 2%	1	2 3%	4 1%	9 2%	2 6%	6 2%	5 2%	3 1%	1 2%
Housewife / Homemaker	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	1 *	1	-	1	-	1	-
Retired and living on state pension	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	- -	-	-
Unemployed or not working due to long-term sickness	1	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1% d	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	-
Full-time carer or other household member	6 1%	5 1%	1	1	4 1%	1	1 1%	1 *	4 1%	1 4%	2 1%	3 1%	-	1 1%



# D5. What is / was the profession of the Chief Income Earner in your household before they retired? Base: All in employment or retired with a private pension

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Refused

		LITY TOWARDS OUNCIL: FIRST			LITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL C COUNCIL	OF NEW SINGLE		IMPACT OF REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF CLLRS			
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know	
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	*i	j	k	I	m	
827	535	161	131	584	179	64	342	460	25	294	281	209	43	
850 100%	554 100%	161 100%	135 100%	602 100%	184 100%	64 100%	354 100%	469 100%	26 100%	295 100%	288 100%	220 100%	46 100%	
20 2%	14 2%	3 2%	4 3%	14 2%	4 2%	3 5%	7 2%	12 3%	1 5%	7 2%	5 2%	4 2%	5 11% jkl	



55+

381

381

100%

69

18%

24%

96

124

161

220

efghkl

42%

33% efghikl

25%

18-34

266

268

100%

43

16%

39%

70

26%

50

148

120

45%

55%

19%

35-54

354

352

100%

81

136

39%

jm

71

20%

63

218

134

38%

62%

18%

23%

### West Suffolk: Creation of a Single Council Public Survey

#### **DSEG**

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENE	ER					AGE		
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	
AB	194 19%	60 16%	134 21% a	118 23% d	76 15%	17 16%	26 16%	44 24% k	37 22%	28 18%	42 18%	
C1	332 33%	126 34%	206 33%	167 33%	164 33%	43 42% jm	61 37% jm	70 38% jm	66 40% jm	49 31% j	42 19%	
C2	238 24%	78 21%	159 25%	122 24%	116 23%	28 27%	42 26%	36 19%	36 22%	42 27%	55 24%	
DE	238 24%	111 30% b	126 20%	97 19%	141 28% c	15 15%	35 21%	37 20%	27 16%	37 24%	87 39% efghikl	
NETS												
Net: ABC1	526 53%	186 50%	340 54%	285 57% d	241 48%	60 58% jm	87 53% jm	115 61% ijm	103 62% ijm	77 49% j	84 37%	
Net: C2DE	475 47%	190 50%	286 46%	218 43%	257 52% c	44 42%	77 47%	72 39%	62 38%	79 51% ghl	142 63% efghikl	



#### **DSEG**

Base: All respondents

			SEG		_		ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
194	194	-	-	-	194	-	180	12	117	74	98	111	83
19%	100%	-	-	-	37%	-	19%	22%	20%	19%	24%	22%	17%
	bcdef				bcdf						m	m	
332	-	332	-	-	332	-	317	11	247	78	142	170	162
33%	-	100%	-	-	63%	-	34%	21%	42%	20%	34%	34%	32%
		acdef			acdf				j				
238	-	-	238	-	-	238	223	12	149	84	94	121	117
24%	-	-	100%	-	-	50%	24%	22%	25%	22%	23%	24%	23%
			abdef			abde							
238	-	-	-	238	-	238	217	19	74	151	79	99	139
24%	-	-	-	100%	-	50%	23%	35%	13%	39%	19%	20%	28%
				abcef		abce				i			kl
526	194	332	-	-	526	-	496	23	364	153	241	282	244
53%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	-	53%	43%	62%	39%	58%	56%	
	cdf	cdf			cdf				j		m	m	
475	-	-	238	238	-	475	440	31	223	236	172	219	256
47%	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	47%	57%	38%	61%	42%	44%	51%
			abe	abe		abe				i			kl



#### **DSEG**

Base: All respondents

		FAVOURABIL	ITY TOWARDS I	NEW SINGLE	FAVOURABIL	ITY TOWARDS N	NEW SINGLE	CONCERN ABO	UT PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE						
		C	OUNCIL: FIRST (	Q		JNCIL: SECOND	Q		COUNCIL		IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS		
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know		
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m		
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55		
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58		
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
AB	194	133	34	27	138	45	11	81	109	4	84	53	49	8		
	19%	21%	18%	17%	20%	21%	14%	19%	20%	12%	24%	16%	19%	14%		
											k					
C1	332	212	60	60	232	74	26	144	174	14	104	116	89	23		
	33%	33%	31%	37%	33%	34%	33%	34%	32%	37%	30%	34%	34%	40%		
C2	238	155	51	31	171	54	13	98	136	3	79	81	67	11		
	24%	24%	26%	20%	24%	25%	16%	23%	25%	10%	23%	24%	26%	18%		
									i							
DE	238	146	50	41	165	43	29	102	120	15	79	87	56	16		
	24%	23%	26%	26%	23%	20%	37%	24%	22%	41%	23%	26%	21%	28%		
							de			gh						
NETS																
Net: ABC1	526	345	94	87	370	119	38	225	283	18	188	169	138	31		
	53%	53%	48%	55%	52%	55%	47%	53%	52%	49%	54%	50%	53%	54%		
Net: C2DE	475	302	101	72	336	97	42	200	257	19	157	168	123	27		
	47%	47%	52%	45%	48%	45%	53%	47%	48%	51%	46%	50%	47%	46%		



# D6. And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong? Base: All respondents

		COUNCIL AREA			ER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	į.	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
White	937 94%	345 92%	592 95%	482 96% d	455 91%	97 93%	148 90%	170 91%	155 94%	147 95%	220 98% efgkl	245 91%	325 92%	368 96% fgkl
Mixed	25 3%	12 3%	13 2%	7 1%	19 4% c	3 3%	6 3% m	8 4% jm	5 3%	2 1%	2 1%	9 3% m	13 4% jm	3 1%
Asian	13 1%	7 2%	7 1%	5 1%	8 2%	2 2% j	5 3% hjm	5 3% hjm	- -	2 1%	- -	7 3% hjm	5 1%	2 1%
Black	8 1%	3 1%	5 1%	2	7 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	3 2% g	2 1%	2 1%	1 *	5 1%
Chinese	2	-	2	2	-	-	2 1%	-	- -	-	-	2 1%	-	
Other ethnic group	5 1%	5 1% b	-	2	4 1%	-	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	3 1%	2 1%
Refused	10 1%	4 1%	7 1%	4 1%	6 1%	2 2% j	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	-	4 1%	5 1%	1 *
NETS														
Net: Non white	54 5%	28 7% b	26 4%	17 3%	37 7% c	5 5%	14 9% jm	15 8% jm	8 5%	7 4%	5 2%	19 7% jm	23 6% jm	12 3%



# D6. And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong? Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS OF PROPOSED CREATION OF NEW COUNCIL				
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of		
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m		
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508		
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%		
White	937 94%	180 93%	317 95%	223 94%	217 91%	496 94%	440 93%	937 100% h	-	544 93%	369 95%	389 94%	476 95%	461 92%		
Mixed	25 3%	7 4%	4 1%	3 1%	11 5% bce	11 2%	15 3%	-	25 47% g	18 3%	6 2%	7 2%	8 2%	17 3%		
Asian	13 1%	2 1%	4 1%	3 1%	5 2%	5 1%	8 2%	- -	13 25% g	9 2%	5 1%	3 1%	3 1%	10 2%		
Black	8 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%	4 1%	5 1%	-	8 16% g	5 1%	3 1%	5 1%	5 1%	3 1%		
Chinese	2 *	-	-	2 1%	-	-	2 *	-	2 3% g	2	-		-	2 *		
Other ethnic group	5 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	-	4 1%	2 *	-	5 10% g	3 1%	2 1%	4 1%	4 1%	2 *		
Refused	10 1%	3 1%	4 1%	2 1%	1 1%	6 1%	4 1%	-	-	6 1%	4 1%	4 1%	4 1%	6 1%		
NETS																
Net: Non white	54 5%	12 6%	11 3%	12 5%	19 8% be	23 4%	31 6%	-	54 100% g	37 6%	16 4%	19 5%	21 4%	33 7%		



# **D6.** And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong? Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE	.E IMPACT OF REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF CLLRS					
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know		
Significance Level: 95%	Total	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m		
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55		
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58		
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
White	937 94%	601 93%	186 96%	150 94%	660 93%	203 94%	75 94%	391 92%	514 95%	32 87%	326 95%	323 96%	238 91%	50 86%		
									gi		m	lm				
Mixed	25	15	4	6	20	3	2	14	8	3	13	5	6	2		
	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	9% h	4%	1%	2%	3%		
Asian	13	12	1	-	10	3	-	8	5	-	2	3	5	3		
	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	6% jk		
Black	8	7	-	2	5	2	2	5	3	-	-	3	5	-		
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	2% j	-		
Chinese	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2		
	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	3% jkl		
Other ethnic group	5	3	2	-	3	2	-	2	3	-	2	-	4	-		
	1%	1%	1%	-	*	1%	-	*	1%	-	1%	-	1% k	-		
Refused	10	7	1	1	5	3	1	4	4	1	3	3	2	1		
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	2%		
NETS																
Net: Non white	54 5%	39 6%	7 4%	8 5%	41 6%	10 5%	3 4%	29 7%	22 4%	3 9%	16 5%	11 3%	20 8%	6 11%		
	376	0%	470	376	076	3%	470	1 76	470	370	3%	3%	k	k		



# **D6.** And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong? Base: All excluding refused

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER	AGE									
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+	
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m	
Unweighted Total	990	397	593	499	491	80	182	186	162	154	226	262	348	380	
Weighted Total	991 100%	372 100%	619 100%	499 100%	492 100%	102 100%	162 100%	184 100%	163 100%	154 100%	226 100%	264 100%	347 100%	380 100%	
White	937 95%	345 93%	592 96% a	482 97% d	455 92%	97 95%	148 91%	170 92%	155 95%	147 96%	220 98% fgkl	245 93%	325 93%	368 97% fgkl	
Mixed	25 3%	12 3%	13 2%	7 1%	19 4% c	3 3%	6 3% m	8 4% jm	5 3%	2 1%	2 1%	9 3% m	13 4% jm	3 1%	
Asian	13 1%	7 2%	7 1%	5 1%	8 2%	2 2% j	5 3% hjm	5 3% hjm	-	2 1%	-	7 3% hjm	5 1%	2 1%	
Black	8 1%	3 1%	5 1%	2	7 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	3 2% g	2 1%	2 1%	1 *	5 1%	
Chinese	2	-	2	2	-	-	2 1%				-	2 1%			
Other ethnic group	5 1%	5 1% b	-	2 *	4 1%	-	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	3 1%	2 1%	
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
NETS															
Net: Non white	54 5%	28 7% b	26 4%	17 3%	37 8% c	5 5%	14 9% jm	15 8% jm	8 5%	7 4%	5 2%	19 7% jm	23 7% jm	12 3%	



# **D6.** And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong? Base: All excluding refused

				SEG				ETHNIC	CITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS (	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	990	202	249	241	298	451	539	957	33	562	401	397	488	502
Weighted Total	991 100%	192 100%	328 100%	235 100%	236 100%	520 100%	471 100%	937 100%	54 100%	581 100%	385 100%	408 100%	496 100%	495 100%
White	937 95%	180 94%	317 97% d	223 95%	217 92%	496 96% d	440 93%	937 100% h	-	544 94%	369 96%	389 95%	476 96%	461 93%
Mixed	25 3%	7 4%	4 1%	3 1%	11 5% bce	11 2%	15 3%	- -	25 47% g	18 3%	6 2%	7 2%	8 2%	17 3%
Asian	13 1%	2 1%	4 1%	3 1%	5 2%	5 1%	8 2%	-	13 25% g	9 2%	5 1%	3 1%	3 1%	10 2%
Black	8 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	3 1%	4 1%	5 1%	-	8 16% g	5 1%	3 1%	5 1%	5 1%	3 1%
Chinese	2 *	-	-	2 1%	-	-	2	-	2 3% g	2	-		-	2
Other ethnic group	5 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	-	4 1%	2	-	5 10% g	3 1%	2 1%	4 1%	4 1%	2 *
Refused	-	<del>-</del> -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
NETS														
Net: Non white	54 5%	12 6%	11 3%	12 5%	19 8% be	23 4%	31 7%	-	54 100% g	37 6%	16 4%	19 5%	21 4%	33 7%



# D6. And to which of the following ethnic groups do you consider you belong? Base: All excluding refused

			ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C	F NEW SINGLE		T OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	990	636	197	157	699	210	81	415	539	36	354	335	247	54
Weighted Total	991	640	193	158	700	213	78	420	536	35	343	334	258	57
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
White	937	601	186	150	660	203	75	391	514	32	326	323	238	50
	95%	94%	96%	95%	94%	95%	96%	93%	96%	90%	95% m	97% Im	92%	89%
Mixed	25	15	4	6	20	3	2	14	8	3	13	5	6	2
Window (	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	10%	4%		2%	3%
										h				
Asian	13	12	1	-	10	3	-	8	5	-	2	3	5	3
	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	-	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	6% jk
Black	8	7	_	2	5	2	2	5	3	-	_	3	5	-
	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	2%	-
													J	
Chinese	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2 3%
			-	-		-	-	_		-	-	-	-	jkl
Other ethnic group	5	3	2	-	3	2	-	2	3	-	2	-	4	-
	1%	1%	1%	-	*	1%	-	*	1%	-	1%	-	1% k	-
Refused	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_
Notused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NETS														
Net: Non white	54	39	7	8	41	10	3	29	22	3	16	11	20	6
	5%	6%	4%	5%	6%	5%	4%	7%	4%	10%	5%	3%	8% k	11% jk



# **D7. Which of the following best describes your working status?**Base: All respondents

		COUNC	L AREA	GEND	ER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%	Total	а	b	C	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Working full time (30+ hrs a week)	427	160	267	244	183	47	89	102	107	76	7	136	208	83
	43%	43%	43%	49%	37%	45%	54%	54%	65%	49%	3%	51%	59%	22%
				d		jm	jm	jm	efijkm	jm		jm	eijkm	j
Working part time (8-29 hrs a week)	160	67	93	50	110	25	23	38	37	28	9	48	75	37
	16%	18%	15%	10%	22%	24%	14%	20%	22%	18%	4%	18%	21%	10%
					С	fjm	j	jm	fjm	jm		jm	fjm	j
Not working but seeking work or temporarily	28	12	16	10	18	3	7	8	4	6	-	10	12	6
unemployed/sick	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%	-	4%	3%	2%
						j	jm	j	j	j		j	j	
Not working / not seeking work	41	12	29	16	25	12	10	4	7	6	2	22	11	8
	4%	3%	5%	3%	5%	12%	6%	2%	4%	4%	1%	8%	3%	2%
						ghijlm	gjm		j	j		gjlm		
Retired	247	92	155	121	126	-	-	-	6	38	203	-	6	241
	25%	25%	25%	24%	25%	-	-	-	4%	24%	90%	-	2%	63%
									fgk	efghkl	efghiklm		k	efghikl
Student	72	20	52	45	27	13	28	30	1	-	-	41	31	-
	7%	5%	8%	9%	5%	13%	17%	16%	1%	-	-	15%	9%	-
				d		hijm	hijlm	hijlm				hijlm	hijm	
None of these	11	6	5	8	4	1	1	5	1	1	2	3	6	2
	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	*	1%	1%	2%	1%
								m						
Refused	14	5	9	9	5	2	6	1	1	-	3	7	3	3
	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	-	2%	3%	1%	1%
							ilm					i		



# **D7. Which of the following best describes your working status?**Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	F PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	j	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
Working full time (30+ hrs a week)	427 43%	90 46% df	189 57% acdf	107 45% df	41 17%	279 53% cdf	148 31% d	396 42%	27 51%	427 73% j		171 42%	206 41%	222 44%
Working part time (8-29 hrs a week)	160 16%	27 14%	58 17%	42 18%	33 14%	85 16%	75 16%	149 16%	10 18%	160 27% j		57 14%	74 15%	86 17%
Not working but seeking work or temporarily unemployed/sick	28 3%	3 2%	5 1%	7 3%	13 5% abe	8 2%	20 4% be	25 3%	3 6%	-	28 7% i	3 1%	5 1%	23 5% kl
Not working / not seeking work	41 4%	3 2%	4 1%	10 4% be	24 10% abce	7 1%	34 7% abe	38 4%	3 5%	-	41 11% i	10 2%	16 3%	26 5% k
Retired	247 25%	50 26% be	46 14%	59 25% be	92 39% abcef	96 18%	151 32% bce	238 25%	7 13%	-	247 64% i	130 31% m	155 31% m	92 18%
Student	72 7%	18 9% c	24 7%	9 4%	22 9% c	42 8% c	31 6%	67 7%	3 5%	-	72 19% i	31 8%	35 7%	37 7%
None of these	11 1%	2 1%	3 1%	1	6 3% ce	4 1%	7 2%	10 1%	1 2%	- -	-	3 1%	4 1%	7 1%
Refused	14 1%	1	4 1%	3 1%	6 2%	5 1%	9 2%	13 1%	-	-	-	7 2%	7 1%	7 1%



# **D7. Which of the following best describes your working status?**Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS NOUNCIL: FIRST O			LITY TOWARDS IN		CONCERN ABOU	UT PROPOSAL C	OF NEW SINGLE	IMPAC	F OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%	Total	able	b	C	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Working full time (30+ hrs a week)	427	280	77	71	306	96	25	168	246	13	150	156	100	21
	43%	43%	39%	45%	43% f	45% f	32%	40%	46%	35%	43%	46%	39%	36%
Working part time (8-29 hrs a week)	160	105	30	25	114	31	16	72	87	2	47	54	46	13
	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	14%	20%	17% i	16%	4%	14%	16%	18%	22%
Not working but seeking work or temporarily	28	14	6	8	21	7	-	18	10	-	6	10	10	2
unemployed/sick	3%	2%	3%	5%	3%	3%	-	4% h	2%	-	2%	3%	4%	3%
Not working / not seeking work	41	26	9	7	29	10	2	14	26	1	15	9	13	5
	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%	2%	4%	3%	5%	9% k
Retired	247	162	52	33	174	49	24	116	121	10	98	76	65	7
	25%	25%	27%	21%	25%	23%	30%	27%	22%	26%	29% m	23%	25%	13%
Student	72	48	15	9	48	18	6	28	39	5	24	22	20	7
	7%	7%	8%	6%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%	13%	7%	7%	8%	12%
None of these	11	8	3	1	9	3	-	6	5	1	3	5	3	-
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-
Refused	14	4	4	6	5	3	6	2	6	6	2	4	4	3
	1%	1%	2%	4% a	1%	1%	8% de	*	1%	17% gh	1%	1%	2%	6% ik



#### **DAGE**

Base: All respondents

		COUNC	IL AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
	Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m
Unweighted Total	1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
Weighted Total	1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
18 - 24	104 10%	24 6%	80 13% a	55 11%	49 10%	104 100% fghijklm	-	-	-	-	-	104 39% fghijlm	-	-
25 - 34	164 16%	53 14%	110 18%	89 18%	74 15%	<del>-</del> -	164 100% eghijklm	- -	- -	-		164 61% eghijlm	-	-
35 - 44	187 19%	74 20%	113 18%	108 21% d	79 16%	-	- -	187 100% efhijklm	- -			-	187 53% efhijkm	-
45 - 54	165 16%	67 18%	98 16%	64 13%	101 20% c	- -	-	-	165 100% efgijklm	-	-	-	165 47% efgijkm	-
55 - 64	155 16%	65 17%	91 14%	73 14%	82 17%	<del>-</del> -	-	- -	- -	155 100% efghjklm		-	-	155 41% efghjkl
65+	226 23%	92 25%	134 21%	114 23%	111 22%	<del>-</del> -	-	- -	- -	-	226 100% efghiklm	-	-	226 59% efghikl
NETS														
Net: 18-34	268 27%	78 21%	190 30% a	145 29%	123 25%	104 100% ghijlm	164 100% ghijlm	-	-	-	-	268 100% ghijlm	-	-
Net: 35-54	352 35%	141 38%	211 34%	171 34%	181 36%	-	-	187 100% efijkm	165 100% efijkm	-	-	-	352 100% efijkm	-
Net: 55+	381 38%	157 42%	224 36%	187 37%	194 39%	-	-	-	-	155 100% efghkl	226 100% efghkl	-	-	381 100% efghkl



#### **DAGE**

Base: All respondents

				SEG				ETHNIC	ITY	WORKING	STATUS	AWARENESS C	OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
	Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
Unweighted Total	1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
Weighted Total	1001 100%	194 100%	332 100%	238 100%	238 100%	526 100%	475 100%	937 100%	54 100%	587 100%	388 100%	413 100%	501 100%	500 100%
18 - 24	104 10%	17 9%	43 13% d	28 12% d	15 7%	60 12% d	44 9%	97 10%	5 10%	72 12%	29 7%	38 9%	40 8%	64 13%
25 - 34	164 16%	26 14%	61 18%	42 18%	35 15%	87 17%	77 16%	148 16%	14 26%	112 19%	45 12%	47 11%	59 12%	105 21% kl
35 - 44	187 19%	44 23% cdf	70 21% f	36 15%	37 15%	115 22% cdf	72 15%	170 18%	15 27%	139 24% i	41 11%	74 18%	88 18%	99
45 - 54	165 16%	37 19% df	66 20% df	36 15%	27 11%	103 20% df	62 13%	155 17%	8 15%	144 24% i	19 5%	60 15%	82 16%	83 17%
55 - 64	155 16%	28 14%	49 15%	42 18%	37 16%	77 15%	79 17%	147 16%	7 13%	105 18%	50 13%	69 17%	84 17%	71 14%
65+	226 23%	42 21% b	42 13%	55 23% be	87 37% abcef	84 16%	142 30% abce	220 24%	5 10%	16 3%	205 53% i	124 30% m	148 29% m	78 16%
NETS														
Net: 18-34	268 27%	43 22%	104 31% ad	70 30% d	50 21%	148 28% d	120 25%	245 26%	19 35%	184 31%	74 19%	85 21%	99 20%	169 34% kl
Net: 35-54	352 35%	81 42% cdf	136 41% cdf	71 30%	63 27%	218 41% cdf	134 28%	325 35%	23 42%	283 48%	60 15%	134 33%	170 34%	182
Net: 55+	381 38%	69 36%	91 28%	96 40% be	124 52% abce	161 31%	220 46% abe	368 39%	12 23%	120 21%	255 66%	193 47% m	232 46% m	149 30%



#### **DAGE**

Base: All respondents

			ITY TOWARDS N			ITY TOWARDS N		CONCERN ABOU	T PROPOSAL O	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
	Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
Significance Level: 95%		а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
Unweighted Total	1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
Weighted Total	1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
18 - 24	104	82	13	9	80	17	7	34	65	4	29	42	25	7
	10%	13% bc	7%	6%	11%	8%	8%	8%	12% g	12%	8%	12%	10%	13%
25 - 34	164	101	40	23	110	46	8	71	87	5	60	56	40	8
	16%	16%	21%	14%	16%	21% f	11%	17%	16%	15%	17%	17%	15%	14%
35 - 44	187	116	26	44	137	37	13	76	103	8	65	56	48	18
	19%	18%	13%	28% ab	19%	17%	16%	18%	19%	23%	19%		19%	31% jkl
45 - 54	165	99	33	33	117	29	20	59	103	3	50	61	43	11
40 - 54	16%	15%	17%	21%	17%	13%	25%	14%	19%	8%	14%		17%	20%
							е		g					
55 - 64	155	108	29	18	110	36	10	70	80	5	55	55	41	5
	16%	17%	15%	11%	16%	16%	12%	17%	15%	14%	16%	16%	16%	8%
65+	226	140	54	32	152	52	22	113	103	10	87	68	62	9
	23%	22%	28%	20%	21%	24%	28%	27% h	19%	28%	25%	20%	24%	15%
NETS														
Net: 18-34	268	183	53	32	190	63	15	106	152	10	89	98	65	16
	27%	28% c	27%	20%	27%	29%	19%	25%	28%	27%	26%	29%	25%	27%
Net: 35-54	352	216	59	77	254	66	32	135	205	11	114	117	91	29
	35%	33%	30%	49% ab	36%	30%	41%	32%	38% g	31%	33%	35%	35%	50% jkl
N . 55		0.45	0.5				9.5	40-	_		4.4=	405	405	•
Net: 55+	381 38%	248 38%	83 42%	50 32%	262 37%	87 40%	32 40%	183 43%	182 34%	15 42%	142 41%	123 36%	103 40%	13 23%
	5570	3070	C	02/0	J1 70	-1070	-1070	h	3470	72/0	m	3370	m	25/0



#### **DETH**

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
White
Non-white
No response

	COUNCI	L AREA	GENI	DER					AGE				
Total	Forest Heath District	St Edmundsbury Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ı	m
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381
1001 100%	376 100%	625 100%	504 100%	497 100%	104 100%	164 100%	187 100%	165 100%	155 100%	226 100%	268 100%	352 100%	381 100%
937 94%	345 92%	592 95%	482 96% d	455 91%	97 93%	148 90%	170 91%	155 94%	147 95%	220 98% efgkl	245 91%	325 92%	368 96% fgkl
54 5%	28 7% b	26 4%	17 3%	37 7% c	5 5%	14 9% jm	15 8% jm	8 5%	7 4%	5 2%	19 7% jm	23 6% jm	12 3%
10 1%	4 1%	7 1%	4 1%	6 1%	2 2%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	-	4 1%	5 1%	1 *



#### **DETH**

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
White
Non-white
No response

			SEC	G	_		ETHNI	CITY	WORKING	3 STATUS		OF PROPOSED NEW COUNCIL	CREATION OF
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
937	180	317	223	217	496	440	937	-	544	369	389	476	461
94%	93%	95%	94%	91%	94%	93%	100%	-	93%	95%	94%	95%	92%
							h						
54	12	11	12	19	23	31	-	54	37	16	19	21	33
5%	6%	3%	5%	8%	4%	6%	-	100%	6%	4%	5%	4%	7%
				be				g					
10	3	4	2	1	6	4	-	-	6	4	4	4	6
1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%



#### **DETH**

Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95%
Unweighted Total
Weighted Total
White
Non-white
No response

		ITY TOWARDS I			ITY TOWARDS I		CONCERN ABOU	JT PROPOSAL C COUNCIL	F NEW SINGLE	IMPACT	OF REDUCTION	IN NUMBER OF	CLLRS
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001 100%	647 100%	195 100%	159 100%	706 100%	216 100%	79 100%	424 100%	540 100%	37 100%	345 100%	338 100%	260 100%	58 100%
937	601	186	150	660	203	75	391	514	32	326	323	238	50
94%	93%	96%	94%	93%	94%	94%	92%	95% gi	87%	95% m	96% Im	91%	86%
54	39	7	8	41	10	3	29	22	3	16	11	20	6
5%	6%	4%	5%	6%	5%	4%	7%	4%	9%	5%	3%	8% k	11% k
10	7	1	1	5	3	1	4	4	1	3	3	2	1
1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	2%



## Working status Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Economically active Economically inactive

	COUNCIL AREA		GENDER		AGE									
	COUNC	St	OLIVI	DER					AGE T					
	Forest Heath	Edmundsbury												
Total	District	Borough	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	18-34	35-54	55+	
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	Ι.	m	
1001	401	600	504	497	82	184	189	165	155	226	266	354	381	
1001	376	625	504	497	104	164	187	165	155	226	268	352	381	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
587	227	360	294	293	72	112	139	144	105	16	184	283	120	
59%	60%	58%	58%	59%	69%	68%	75%	87%	67%	7%	69%	80%	32%	
					jm	jm	jm	efgijkm	jm		jm	efijkm	j	
414	149	265	209	205	32	52	47	21	51	210	84	69	261	
41%	40%	42%	42%	41%	31%	32%	25%	13%	33%	93%	31%	20%	68%	
					hl	hl	h		hl	efghiklm	hl		efghikl	



## Working status Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Economically active Economically inactive

	SEG							ETHNICITY		WORKING STATUS		AWARENESS OF PROPOSED CREATION OF NEW COUNCIL		
Total	AB	C1	C2	DE	ABC1	C2DE	White	BAME	Working	Not working	Knowledge of	Heard of	Never heard of	
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	1	m	
1001	205	252	244	300	457	544	957	33	569	404	402	493	508	
1001	194	332	238	238	526	475	937	54	587	388	413	501	500	
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
587	117	247	149	74	364	223	544	37	587	-	228	279	308	
59%	60%	74%	63%	31%	69%	47%	58%	68%	100%	-	55%	56%	62%	
	df	acdf	df		adf	d			j					
414	77	85	88	164	162	252	393	17	-	388	184	222	192	
41%	40%	26%	37%	69%	31%	53%	42%	32%	-	100%	45%	44%	38%	
	be		b	abcef		abce				i				



## Working status Base: All respondents

Significance Level: 95% Unweighted Total Weighted Total Economically active Economically inactive

	FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: FIRST Q			FAVOURABILITY TOWARDS NEW SINGLE COUNCIL: SECOND Q			CONCERN ABOUT PROPOSAL OF NEW SINGLE COUNCIL			IMPACT OF REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF CLLRS			
Total	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Favour able	Unfavour able	Don't know	Concerned	Not concerned	Don't know	Positive	No difference	Negative	Don't know
	а	b	С	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	ļ	m
1001	643	199	159	705	214	82	420	544	37	357	339	250	55
1001	647	195	159	706	216	79	424	540	37	345	338	260	58
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
587	385	107	96	419	127	41	240	333	14	197	210	146	34
59%	59%	55%	60%	59%	59%	51%	57% i	62% i	39%	57%	62%	56%	58%
414	262	88	64	286	89	39	184	207	22	148	127	114	24
41%	41%	45%	40%	41%	41%	49%	43%	38%	61% gh	43%	38%	44%	42%

