



Funded by
UK Government

Wedi ei ariannu gan
Llywodraeth y DU



Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations
Cymdeithas Mudiadau Gwirfoddol Powys

"Ariennir y prosiect hwn gan Lywodraeth y DU drwy Gronfa Flynniant Gyffredin y DU, a gefnogir gan Gyngor Sir Powys".



"This project is funded by the UK Government through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund, supported by Powys County Council".

What Matters to People in Powys

An Analysis of the Community Conversations Survey

Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations (PAVO)

This project is funded by the UK Government through the
UK Shared Prosperity Fund,
supported by Powys County Council

February 2026

What Matters to People in Powys

An Analysis of the Community Conversations Survey

Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations (PAVO)

Analysis and Report:

Barry M. Farrell (Independent Analyst)

February 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Executive Summary.....	1
How People Experience Community Life in Powys.....	1
Key Challenges Identified Across the Survey.....	1
Differences by Age, Gender, and Place.....	2
Overall Interpretation.....	3
Section 2: Background and Purpose.....	4
Organisational and Policy Context.....	4
PAVO's Role.....	4
Community Conversations Project.....	4
Survey Purpose and Objectives.....	5
Overall Purpose.....	5
Primary Objectives.....	5
Use of Survey Findings.....	6
Section 3: Methodology.....	7
Overview of Methodological Approach.....	7
Survey Design and Development.....	7
Data Collection and Fieldwork.....	8
Analysis of Closed-Ended Questions.....	9
Overview.....	9
Frequency Analysis.....	9
Analysis of Gaps Between Importance, Use, and Experience.....	9
Analysis of Ordinal Variables.....	10
Demographic Group Comparisons.....	10
Integration with Qualitative Findings.....	11
Interpretation and Limitations.....	11
Analysis of Open-Ended Responses.....	11
Overview.....	11

Background and Rationale.....	11
Purpose of the Content Analysis.....	12
Data Analysed.....	12
Analytical Approach.....	13
Analytical Framework Development.....	14
Coding Procedure.....	16
Application of Framework and Coding Rules.....	17
Demographic Analysis of Coded Open-Ended Responses.....	17
Use of Illustrative Quotes.....	17
Micro-Level Descriptive Analysis.....	18
Utility and Robustness of the Content Analysis.....	18
Methodological Limitations.....	18
Section 4: Results for Close-Ended Survey Items.....	20
Introduction.....	20
Sample Description and Response Profile.....	20
Language Used.....	20
Gender.....	20
Age.....	21
Nationality.....	21
Place of Residence.....	21
Length of Residency.....	21
Sample Size and Interpreting Results.....	22
Demographic Profile and Representativeness.....	22
Purpose and Analytic Approach.....	22
Demographic Variables and Recoding Process.....	23
Gender Composition of the Survey Sample.....	23
Age Composition of the Survey Sample.....	24
Geographic Composition of the Survey Sample.....	24
Overall Assessment and Implications for Interpretation.....	25
Analysis of Closed-Ended Questions.....	25
Frequency Distributions.....	25

Analysis of Unmet Community Needs.....	30
Importance–Use Gaps.....	30
Like–Dislike Gaps.....	31
Differences in Happiness and Future Outlook Across Groups.....	32
Analysis of Current Level of Happiness.....	33
Analysis of Feelings About the Community’s Future.....	33
Summary of Happiness and Future Outlook Findings.....	34
Analysis of Demographic Group Differences.....	35
Analysis of Gender Differences.....	35
Analysis of Age Group Differences.....	36
Analysis of Geographic Area Differences.....	37
Analysis of Length of Residency Differences.....	39
Summary of Demographic Group Differences.....	40
Section 5: Results for Open-Ended Survey Items.....	42
Introduction.....	42
Reporting Frequencies and Valid Responses.....	42
Interpreting Category Frequencies.....	43
Visual Highlighting of Category Prominence.....	43
Results for Open-Ended Questions.....	43
Analysis of Missing Services in the Community.....	43
Analysis of Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing.....	45
Analysis of Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk.....	47
Analysis of Current Challenges Facing the Community.....	49
Analysis of Future Challenges Facing the Community.....	50
Synthesis of Responses Across All Questions.....	56
Everyday Access to Essential Services.....	56
Community Assets and Social Fabric.....	56
Economic and Housing Pressures.....	57
Governance, Children and Young People, and Long-Term Viability.....	57
Key Patterns Across Open-Ended Questions.....	58
Summary of Demographic Group Differences.....	62

Section 6: Interpretation and Conclusions.....	64
Purpose.....	64
Key Considerations and Limitations.....	64
Major Conclusions.....	65
Overall Interpretation.....	70
Section 7: Recommendations.....	71
Purpose and Approach.....	71
Recommendations.....	71
Concluding Observations.....	76

Appendices

Appendix A — Frequency Tables

Appendix B — Crosstabulations

Appendix C — Significant Crosstabs Per Demographic Variable

Appendix D — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Gender

Appendix E — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Age Group

Appendix F — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Geographic Area

Appendix G — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Length of Residency

Appendix H — Demographic Differences in Responses to Open-Ended Survey Questions

Appendix I — Representative Quotes from Responses to Open-Ended Survey Questions

Section 1: Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a county-wide survey exploring how people in Powys experience community life, what they value most, and what concerns them about the future. Drawing on both closed-ended and open-ended responses, the analysis provides a detailed picture of community issues, challenges, and priorities across different demographic groups, including gender, age, geographic area, and length of residency.

Overall, the findings show that people in Powys care deeply about their communities and generally feel positive about where they live now. However, there is widespread uncertainty about whether communities can maintain what matters most to people as economic pressures, service challenges, and ongoing change continue to unfold.

How People Experience Community Life in Powys

Responses to the closed-ended survey questions indicate relatively high levels of satisfaction with day-to-day life and personal well-being. Many respondents report feeling happy in their communities and value the social and environmental qualities of where they live. Views about what matters most to people are consistent across the county, with strong emphasis placed on healthcare services, local shops and amenities, green spaces, and places that support social interaction.

When respondents are asked to look ahead, however, perspectives become more cautious. Concerns about the future are more prominent than dissatisfaction with the present, suggesting that people's anxieties are less about current conditions and more about whether essential services, facilities, and opportunities can be sustained over time.

Key Challenges Identified Across the Survey

Across both closed-ended and open-ended responses, several interconnected challenges consistently emerge.

Transport and connectivity stand out as the most persistent and far-reaching concern. Problems with transport are repeatedly associated with access to healthcare, employment, education, shops, and social activities. For many respondents, transport is not experienced as a minor inconvenience but as a condition that shapes independence, participation, and quality of life.

Social connection and community cohesion are central to how people judge the health of their community. Concerns about isolation, loss of shared spaces, and weakening community ties appear in responses to multiple questions, particularly when respondents reflect on services at risk, buildings or spaces under threat, and anticipated future challenges. Community facilities and local services are valued not only for what they provide directly, but also for the role they play in enabling everyday interaction, informal support, and a sense of belonging.

Economic pressures and affordability, including housing costs and the cost of living, are widely seen as determining who can remain in a community and whether services and amenities remain viable. These pressures are rarely described in isolation; instead, they are viewed as intensifying other challenges and increasing vulnerability over time, particularly for younger individuals and those on lower incomes.

Services for children and young people are consistently raised as indicators of long-term community viability. Concerns about schools, youth services, and opportunities for younger people reflect wider anxieties about whether communities can support successive generations and retain families over time.

Governance, funding, and decision-making issues are most apparent when respondents consider future risks and desired change. These concerns are often framed in terms of the how responsive decision-makers are and how much influence communities believe they have: whether local needs are understood, whether decisions address community priorities, and whether action is timely and meaningful.

Differences by Age, Gender, and Place

While people across Powys tend to highlight the same core issues, the survey shows important differences in emphasis depending on gender, age, and location.

Gender differences appear mainly in how concerns are prioritised and expressed, rather than in fundamentally different priorities. Women are more likely to mention a wider range of services and community assets and to frame risks in terms of social, care-related, and intergenerational consequences, while men focus more often on specific services or infrastructure. Despite these differences, social connection emerges as a shared priority across genders.

Age is the strongest differentiating factor. Younger respondents place greater emphasis on participation, belonging, education, and services for children and young people. Middle-aged respondents raise a broad range of concerns about current pressures and future sustainability. Older respondents focus more on health, care, social connection, and vulnerability, while also expressing concern for the future of their communities beyond their own immediate needs.

Across locations, people tend to emphasise the same issues, but describe and experience those issues differently. Transport, health and well-being services, social connection, and economic pressures are highlighted across all geographic areas, but their relative prominence varies depending on local assets, service access, and local circumstances.

Overall Interpretation

Overall, the findings show that community life in Powys is experienced as interconnected. Services, facilities, social connection, economic conditions, and decision-making processes

are seen as mutually reinforcing rather than as separate issues. Difficulties in one area often spill into others, shaping everyday life and views of the future.

People evaluate services not only in terms of convenience, but also in terms of what these services make possible: access, participation, connection, and continuity across generations. Therefore, the strength of communities is closely tied to how well services, infrastructure, and decision-making processes work together to support daily life.

The recommendations in this report build on this evidence-based interpretation of the findings, emphasising coordination across sectors and governance levels, sensitivity to place and life stage, and approaches that address how people actually experience their communities. By aligning policy, planning, and investment with community involvement, stakeholders can better support resilient, inclusive, and sustainable communities across Powys.

Section 2: Background and Purpose

Organisational and Policy Context

PAVO's Role

Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations (PAVO) is the organisation designated to act as the County Voluntary Council (CVC) for Powys. As the recognised umbrella body for the voluntary and community sector across the county, PAVO plays a central role in assisting third sector organisations, strengthening Powys communities, and improving people's lives.

PAVO fulfils this role by serving as a:

- Catalyst for voluntary and community action
- Voice for communities and the third sector in Powys
- Hub of information, advice, and support to connect people, communities, voluntary organisations, and statutory partners

In this capacity, PAVO acts as a bridge between local communities, the voluntary sector, and public services to help ensure that community perspectives shape planning, service design, and policy development.

Community Conversations Project

The survey forms part of the first phase of the Community Conversations Project, which is funded by the UK Government's Shared Prosperity Fund (SPF) and commissioned by Powys County Council (PCC). Delivered by PAVO, the project is designed to strengthen community involvement by building on established community-based networks and groups across Powys.

The Community Conversations Project brings together grassroots organisations and local residents to:

- Identify gaps and unmet needs
- Recognise existing good practice
- Develop local services and activities that respond to community needs

As part of the wider programme, 18 locality-based focus groups were convened across Powys. These focus groups provided a structured forum for communities to:

- Identify key local priorities
- Explore new and innovative approaches
- Plan pilot activities aimed at strengthening community resilience and sustainability

The project aligns with PCC's "Sustainable Powys" plan by strengthening collaboration between communities, the voluntary sector, and statutory bodies, and by ensuring that local perspectives are reflected in planning and decision-making.

Survey Purpose and Objectives

Overall Purpose

The main purpose of the survey was to gather information to better understand what matters most to people living in Powys, based on their own experiences and perspectives. The survey included both closed-ended and open-ended questions to capture how people experience life in their communities and to identify their priorities, concerns, and challenges.

Primary Objectives

The survey was designed to meet the following objectives:

- Assess how people experience life in their communities
- Determine what people value most about where they live
- Explore immediate and long-term concerns that may affect well-being
- Identify community needs at the local level and how these vary by geographic area

These objectives emphasise people's perspectives and local knowledge, rather than service usage or predefined policy categories.

Use of Survey Findings

Within this broader programme, PAVO administered the survey to gather views from individuals living in Powys, including people involved in community and voluntary activity and those whose voices are less often heard.

The survey was conducted to capture perspectives from Powys residents and to enable systematic analysis of responses by demographic group and geographic area.

The expected outcomes of this work are:

- A stronger community and voluntary sector in Powys
- More balanced and effective working relationships between voluntary organisations and statutory partners
- Services that reflect local community needs

The findings from the survey are planned to be used in the following ways:

- Provide a county-wide overview of residents' views and priorities for Powys County Council (PCC), Powys Teaching Health Board (PTHB), and other statutory partners
- Contribute to county-level assessments and planning, including population needs, well-being, market stability, and health and care planning
- Shape local policy development
- Strengthen priorities identified through the focus groups
- Guide the development of community-led and voluntary-based activities
- Support future funding applications by community and voluntary organisations in Powys
- Make findings available to participants, local communities, and sector networks
- Contribute to wider Welsh Government policy discussions via Third Sector Support Wales (TSSW)

Section 3: Methodology

Overview of Methodological Approach

The methodology combined quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a structured account of what survey respondents indicated and to examine how patterns of response varied across different groups. The survey design, data collection, and analytical methods were chosen to allow respondents to express their views clearly and to support systematic analysis for policy and planning purposes.

Closed-ended survey questions were analysed to summarise patterns of response and to explore differences across demographic groups. Open-ended responses were analysed using a structured content analysis in which written comments were organised into a consistent set of thematic categories. When appropriate, findings from these two types of analysis were examined together to help interpret the results and to show how numerical patterns related to what respondents described in their own words.

Throughout the analysis, emphasis was placed on transparency, proportionality, and practical interpretation. Results are presented as descriptive and comparative evidence, with appropriate caution regarding inference and generalisation.

Percentages reported throughout this report have been rounded to the nearest whole number to aid readability. Exact percentages and corresponding counts are provided in the appendices.

Survey Design and Development

The survey was developed by PAVO to address the specific requirements and desired outcomes of the project. It was designed to provide Powys residents with a formal opportunity to share their experiences, priorities, and concerns. Its structure allowed respondents to comment on issues relevant to them, whether these related to specific services or to broader community matters.

The survey was initially conceived as an open-ended exercise that would enable respondents to describe issues and challenges in their own words. This approach avoided reliance on predefined categories and allowed a broad range of issues to be raised. During survey development, however, it became apparent that open-ended questions alone were not sufficient to elicit responses that were consistently grounded in respondents' own circumstances or their use of local services and activities.

To address this, a small number of closed-ended questions were included at the beginning of the survey to capture information about respondents' activities and use of services. These questions provided contextual framing prior to asking open-ended questions.

The open-ended questions invited respondents to describe what matters most to them, aspects of their communities they value, and areas where improvement was needed. These questions allowed respondents to raise issues in their own words, without restriction.

Data Collection and Fieldwork

The survey was open to anyone living in Powys, with individuals living outside Powys not eligible to take part. Participation was encouraged across all ages and backgrounds, and steps were taken to support accessibility, including the availability of alternative formats on request. Residents with hearing loss were able to participate using SignLive.

The survey was made available from 16th August through 31st October 2025 in both English and Welsh and was primarily hosted online via the "Have Your Say Powys" website. Paper copies were also available for individuals who preferred not to complete the survey online or who had limited digital access. The survey was promoted through multiple channels, including the PAVO website, e-bulletins, social media, the local press, and events and community groups across Powys.

To maximise reach and inclusivity, PAVO's project team attended 38 events and community groups, where participants were invited to complete paper versions of the survey. These surveys were later entered into the survey database by PAVO staff. Of the 1,232 surveys completed, 620 were submitted in hard-copy form, accounting for approximately half of all surveys. QR codes were also provided, enabling participants to complete the survey online if preferred.

This approach reduced barriers to participation and promoted engagement with groups who were less likely to respond to online-only consultations. Engagement efforts focused on reaching a wide range of communities, including Welsh speakers, carers, members of the LGBTQ+ community, armed forces personnel and veterans, farming communities, members of the Traveller community, and people who access health, care, or support services. In addition, a request was made for information about the survey to be shared with parents and children via school channels.

No formal demographic quotas or participation targets were applied. Instead, efforts focused on encouraging broad participation across age groups, backgrounds, and localities, including targeted engagement with groups such as Young Farmers and others noted above. As a result of these engagement efforts and the demographic profile of Powys and its voluntary sector, participation predominantly included older age groups. The survey was promoted across all Powys localities, with any variation in response numbers occurring unintentionally rather than through design.

Steps were taken to minimise the likelihood of duplicate responses. At in-person events and community groups, individuals were invited to complete the survey only once. For online responses, participants were expected to respond a single time, although this was not made explicit within the survey itself. Multiple submissions were considered unlikely. It is also recognised that more than one member of the same household may have participated, reflecting individual rather than household-level responses.

Analysis of Closed-Ended Questions

Overview

The quantitative analyses were designed to provide a clear and transparent account of respondents' perspectives and to examine how response patterns varied across key demographic groups. Analysis focused on summarising how frequently particular responses occurred and comparing these patterns between different groups of respondents.

When comparisons were made, interpretation involved using both statistical results and the size and practical importance of observed differences. Results from the closed-ended questions were compared with the themes identified in the written responses in order to: (1) check whether patterns in the numerical data reflected what respondents described in their own words; and (2) clarify the interpretation of overall findings.

Frequency Analysis

Frequency distributions were produced for all survey variables, including demographic variables and binary variables derived from thematically-coded, open-ended responses. Results for binary items (e.g. service use, perceived importance, likes and dislikes) were summarised as percentages of respondents selecting each option. These summaries provide an overview of how common particular responses were for the total sample of respondents.

Analysis of Gaps Between Importance, Use, and Experience

New variables were created to examine gaps between respondents' stated priorities and their reported experience of services and facilities in their community. These variables were designed to identify patterns of perceived unmet need and differences in experiences that are not captured by individual importance or satisfaction measures.

Two types of "gap" variables were created. The first compared respondents' ratings of importance with their reported use of the same services and facilities. For each item, responses were grouped into three categories: (1) cases in which importance and use were aligned; (2) cases in which an item was rated as important but not used; and (3) cases in which an item was used but not rated as important. This approach helps distinguish

between services and facilities that people value but cannot access, those that are neither valued nor used, and those that are used despite being rated as less important.

The second “gap” variable compared items respondents reported liking with those they reported disliking. Responses were grouped to reflect: (1) overall positive experience (liked but not disliked); (2) neutral or mixed experience; and (3) negative experience (disliked but not liked). This measure was used to capture overall positive or negative experience based on everyday contact with services and facilities, rather than how important they were considered to be.

These gap measures were initially examined across the total sample to identify broad patterns. Demographic group differences were then identified using cross-tabulations and statistical tests, with the emphasis on consistent and interpretable patterns, rather than small numerical differences.

Analysis of Ordinal Variables

Responses to ordinal questions (e.g., ratings of current happiness, views about the community’s future) were analysed using methods appropriate for ordered response categories. When distributions were compared across demographic groups, non-parametric tests were used to assess overall differences (i.e., Kruskal–Wallis tests).

When these analyses indicated statistically significant differences between groups, follow-up comparisons were conducted to identify where differences lay (i.e., post-hoc pairwise comparisons using Dunn-type procedures with appropriate adjustment for multiple tests). Interpretation focused on overall patterns and relative differences rather than on precise estimates.

Demographic Group Comparisons

Associations between demographic characteristics and survey responses were examined using cross-tabulations. These analyses explored whether patterns of response differed across key demographic groups.

Statistical tests of association were used to assess whether observed differences were unlikely to have occurred by chance. When cell sizes permitted, Pearson’s Chi-square test was applied; when expected cell counts were low, Fisher’s Exact Test was used instead. In interpreting these results, attention was given not only to statistical outcomes but also to the size and practical relevance of observed differences.

Effect size measures were used to support interpretation, with Phi applied to two-category comparisons and Cramér’s V used for larger cross-tabulation tables. These measures indicate the strength of association and help to distinguish between statistically detectable differences and those of practical significance. Post-hoc tests were not undertaken, given the large number of comparisons involved and the descriptive purpose of the analysis.

Integration with Qualitative Findings

Quantitative analyses of coded thematic variables derived from open-ended responses were used to examine how the prevalence of particular themes varied across demographic groups. These findings were checked against the written responses, with quotations used to help explain the results.

Interpretation and Limitations

The findings in this report describe and compare the views of people who chose to take part in the survey. Because participation was voluntary, the results should not be treated as an exact reflection of the views of the total population of Powys.

Where comparisons are made between different groups of respondents, particular care was taken when the number of responses in a group was small. For this reason, results are presented as indications of patterns and tendencies rather than as definitive conclusions about the population as a whole.

Analysis of Open-Ended Responses

Overview

Responses to open-ended survey questions were analysed using a structured content analysis rather than being treated as unstructured narrative text. Written responses were coded into a predefined set of thematic categories, with each theme represented as a binary indicator (i.e., 0 = theme not mentioned or 1 = theme mentioned) for respondents who provided a valid response to a given question. These coded variables were then used in frequency summaries and subgroup analyses. This approach allowed large volumes of written responses to be analysed systematically while retaining transparency about how major themes were identified and used.

Background and Rationale

The PAVO community survey generated a substantial volume of qualitative data across multiple open-ended questions. While this format allowed respondents flexibility to express views in their own words, it also created analytical challenges, given that the survey included more open-ended questions than is typical for large-scale survey research.

Given the size of the dataset and the need to produce findings that could meaningfully inform operational planning and strategic decision-making, a structured content-analysis approach was adopted. This approach recognised both the richness of the responses and

the practical constraints associated with analysing large volumes of answers to open-ended questions.

The content analysis was used to:

- Identify which issues were raised most frequently
- Compare the relative prevalence of themes across questions
- Highlight cross-cutting issues that recurred in different contexts
- Support strategic discussion, prioritisation, and service planning

It is important to recognise the limits of the approach used. Accordingly, this content analysis does not attempt to:

- Determine intensity or strength of feeling within individual responses
- Establish causal relationships between issues
- Replace in-depth qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups

Purpose of the Content Analysis

The content analysis was conducted on responses to eight open-ended survey questions to:

- Identify key experiences, issues, concerns, and priorities (i.e., themes) raised by respondents
- Determine how frequently these themes occurred across the questions
- Establish a coherent evidential foundation for subsequent analyses and policy discussion

This stage of analysis is descriptive and classificatory. It organises and summarises what respondents said, without attempting to explain motivations or draw causal inferences. Demographic analysis of coded responses was deliberately undertaken only after the coding framework had been finalised, to ensure that the framework reflected the full set of responses rather than subgroup-specific patterns.

Data Analysed

The analysis included responses from 1,232 adult survey participants to the eight open-ended survey questions indicated in Table A below.

Table A – Open-Ended Questions Included in Survey

Question Number	Topic	Question
Question 12	Missing Community Services	Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?
Question 13	Local Services at Risk	Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?
Question 15	Local Buildings and Spaces at Risk	Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed? How do you feel about that?
Question 17	Current Challenges Facing the Community	What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?
Question 18	Future Challenges Facing the Community	What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?
Question 19	Desired Changes in the Community	If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?
Question 20	New Projects Planned in the Community	Do you know about any new projects planned for your area?
Question 21	Additional Comments	Anything else you'd like to add?

Responses ranged from single words and short phrases to full sentences and paragraphs. All responses were treated as valid qualitative input unless they were blank, non-substantive (e.g. “NA,” “don’t know,” “none”), or otherwise uninterpretable.

Analytical Approach

The content analysis used a structured approach that combined systematic review of the data with a disciplined coding framework. The framework was designed to capture the full range of responses while remaining clear, interpretable, and suitable for reporting.

Specifically, the content analysis was designed to address the following questions:

- Which issues and concerns were raised most frequently by respondents?
- How common was each theme across the full survey sample (N = 1,232), and how common was it among respondents who provided a valid answer to each question?
- How did themes differ across the eight open-ended questions?

Analytical Framework Development

Initial Framework Development

An initial set of broad thematic categories was developed to organise responses to the open-ended survey questions. The development of these categories was based on three factors: (1) the focus of each survey question; (2) commonly used ways of grouping community and service issues in Powys; and (3) an initial review of the survey responses.

At this stage, the emphasis was on ensuring comprehensive coverage of the issues raised by respondents. The objective was to establish a flexible framework capable of accommodating the full range of responses and suitable for refinement through subsequent testing and validation.

Validation and Refinement

Before the final coding of responses was undertaken, the framework was pilot-tested and validated using structured subsets of responses drawn from the following open-ended questions, which were selected for their differing characteristics:

- Q12 (service-specific framing)
- Q17 (high-volume, broad “challenge” framing)
- Q21 (unstructured “other comments” framing)

Pilot-testing was conducted to:

- Assess whether responses fit naturally into the proposed categories
- Identify any key themes that were missing
- Determine whether categories were conceptually too broad
- Evaluate the adequacy of the “Other/Miscellaneous” category

The framework was then refined iteratively through repeated review of the selected responses. Refinements were made only when they improved conceptual clarity, reduced overlap between categories, or enhanced consistency of application across questions. This process continued until the framework was judged to be analytically stable, broadly exhaustive, and sufficiently distinct to support meaningful interpretation.

As a result of this process, one category was split to improve conceptual clarity, and boundary rules between closely related categories were clarified. No new major categories were added. This ensured that the final framework was data-tested rather than purely conceptual.

Final Coding Framework

The final coding framework involved 11 issue-oriented categories, plus one “Other / Miscellaneous Responses” category, which were applied consistently across all eight open-ended survey questions.

The categories represented general areas of concern (e.g., transport, health services, housing), rather than respondent sentiment or tone. They reflected domains commonly used in community planning, service delivery, and well-being assessments. Once finalised, the coding framework and associated rules were applied consistently across all questions and responses.

The “Other / Miscellaneous” category captured idiosyncratic or very low-frequency responses that did not form a coherent pattern. This approach prevented unnecessary category expansion while maintaining transparency regarding how such responses were handled.

For interpretive purposes, the 12 response categories were organised into the following four “conceptual layers” that reflect different levels at which community issues are experienced:

- **Conceptual Layer 1: Everyday Access to Essential Services**
 - Public Transport & Connectivity
 - Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services
 - Health, Care & Well-being Services
- **Conceptual Layer 2: Community Assets and Social Fabric**
 - Community Facilities & Assets
 - Community Life & Participation
 - Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion
- **Conceptual Layer 3: Economic and Material Foundations**
 - Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living
 - Housing & Affordability
- **Conceptual Layer 4: Structural and Future-Oriented Determinants**
 - Children, Young People & Education
 - Environment, Climate & Infrastructure
 - Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

These conceptual layers, which were used to support interpretation and reporting, were not treated as an additional coding dimension.

Coding Procedure

Each valid response was reviewed and assigned one or more thematic codes in accordance with the final coding framework. Coding was conducted using the structured framework and coding rules, with analytical support provided by AI-based tools under the direction and oversight of the lead analyst. The unit of analysis was the individual respondent's answer to each open-ended question.

Given the wide variation in response length and scope, and the fact that many responses addressed more than one issue or concern, the following procedural rules were applied:

- **Fixed Category Framework** – Category definitions and boundary rules were finalised prior to coding and applied consistently across all questions.
- **Conservative Interpretation** – To avoid over-interpretation, categories were applied conservatively where ambiguity existed.
- **Coding of Substantive References** – A category was assigned only when a response contained a substantive reference to that theme.
- **Binary Coding** – Coding was binary (i.e., presence or absence). No attempt was made to weight or rank themes within individual responses.
- **Valid Responses** – Non-substantive (e.g. “no,” “none,” “not aware,” “N/A”) and uninterpretable responses were treated as invalid and were excluded from thematic coding, with exclusions applied consistently across all questions. During quality checks, a small number of responses assigned to the “Other / Miscellaneous” category were found not to contain substantive thematic content. Given their limited prevalence, their restriction to a residual category, and the risk that further large-scale recoding could introduce inconsistency or error, no additional recoding was undertaken.
- **No Forced Coding** – Responses were not forced into categories when conceptual fit was weak.
- **Multiple-Category Coding** – Multiple categories were assigned only when a response clearly addressed more than one distinct issue.

As a result, category counts indicate how often a theme was mentioned across responses, rather than the number of respondents expressing a single dominant issue. This approach preserved the complexity of respondents' comments and avoided forcing responses into artificial single-issue classifications.

Application of Framework and Coding Rules

The same 12-category framework and coding rules were applied consistently across all eight open-ended questions. This approach enabled:

- Comparison of thematic emphasis across different question prompts
- Identification of issues that recur regardless of how questions were framed
- A coherent basis for later analyses that examine demographic differences

Category frequencies were calculated for each question in relation to both the total survey sample and to the subset of respondents who provided a valid response. These figures are used descriptively to indicate relative prevalence and breadth of concern associated with each theme.

Demographic Analysis of Coded Open-Ended Responses

Demographic group comparisons of the coded open-ended responses were conducted to examine whether the prevalence of themes differed across selected groups within the total sample. Cross-tabulations were produced for gender, age groups, and geographic areas, with statistically significant differences used to guide identification of patterns that appeared consistently across questions and themes.

Length of residency was not included in these analyses. A preliminary review indicated that length of residency was closely related to age and added limited additional insight when applied to the open-ended thematic data. Given the descriptive purpose of the analysis and the volume of thematic categories and comparisons involved, length of residency was excluded to avoid unnecessary duplication and analytical complexity.

The SPSS-generated cross-tabulation tables underlying these comparisons were numerous and are not reproduced in full in this report. Instead, the relevant counts and percentages were extracted and consolidated into composite tables, which are contained in Appendix H. These composite tables provide a transparent summary of the demographic patterns identified in the underlying analyses.

Post-hoc tests were not undertaken for the open-ended thematic comparisons. Given the number of themes, questions, and demographic groups involved, post-hoc analysis would have required a very large number of additional tests, which were not included in this analysis. Therefore, findings are reported as broad patterns of difference in theme prevalence across groups rather than as definitive pairwise contrasts.

Use of Illustrative Quotes

To promote transparency and preserve respondent voice, up to five representative quotes are provided for each major category per open-ended question. Quotes were selected to:

- Reflect typical rather than extreme views
- Demonstrate variation in how themes are expressed
- Avoid personally identifying information

The quotes are illustrative and are not intended to imply frequency or representativeness.

Micro-Level Descriptive Analysis

In addition to category-level coding, a more detailed analysis was conducted for selected questions (Q12, Q13, Q15, Q19, and Q20). This involved close examination of responses within each thematic category to identify recurring sub-themes and clarify what respondents meant when referring to particular issues.

Sub-themes were developed to clarify the substance and variation of responses, rather than to redefine the primary analytical framework. Where appropriate, these sub-themes were supported by descriptive quantitative summaries (e.g., counts and percentages), presented as supporting detail rather than as an additional layer of formal coding.

Utility and Robustness of the Content Analysis

Despite the challenges inherent in analysing large volumes of qualitative survey data, the structured content analysis performed provided a consistent and transparent picture of the issues raised by respondents.

The use of a fixed framework and standard coding rules for all questions ensured that:

- Comparisons across questions are interpretable
- Differences between demographic groups reflect genuine differences in responses
- Results are sufficiently robust to inform operational and strategic decision-making

In this context, the content analysis represents a pragmatic and methodologically sound approach, balancing analytical rigour with the realities of the survey design and the needs of policy-focused audiences.

Methodological Limitations

The survey relied on voluntary participation, which means that the findings reflect the views of individuals who voluntarily chose to take part rather than a randomly selected sample of the Powys population. Therefore, the results should not be treated as a precise or comprehensive representation of the views of all Powys residents.

As with any survey, there is potential for response bias. Certain groups may be more likely to participate than others, and respondents may differ in how much detail they provide or which issues they choose to emphasise. These factors are taken into account when interpreting patterns in the data.

The analysis is intended to support descriptive and comparative insight rather than definitive inference. Findings are presented as indications of recurring themes, patterns, and differences within the survey responses, and caution should be exercised in drawing conclusions beyond the scope of the data collected.

Section 4:

Results for Close-Ended Survey Items

Introduction

This section presents the results for the closed-ended survey items, including frequency distributions, gap analyses, and demographic group comparisons. The findings provide a descriptive overview of responses for key variables and identify where response patterns varied across groups. Percentages are reported as rounded whole numbers to aid readability.

Sample Description and Response Profile

This subsection presents a descriptive overview of the survey respondents, drawing on frequency distributions for key demographic variables. Its purpose is to describe who responded to the survey and how responses are distributed across demographic categories. Unless otherwise stated, all percentages are based on the total number of respondents (N = 1,232). **All tables referenced in this subsection are provided in Appendix A.**

Language Used

The vast majority of respondents (98%) completed the survey in English while 2% of respondents did so in Welsh (Table 1).

Gender

Respondents reported a range of gender identities (Table 2A). The largest proportion identified as woman/girl (67%), followed by man/boy (29%). Smaller numbers of respondents identified as non-binary (1%), transgender woman/girl (< 1%), transgender man/boy (< 1%), or “other” (2%). A further 1% preferred not to state their gender.

For analytical purposes, a derived binary gender variable was used (Table 2B). Based on this classification, 70% of valid responses were categorised as female and 30% as male. Gender group data were missing for 45 respondents (4%), resulting in 1,187 valid cases for this

binary variable. This grouped gender variable was used in subsequent analyses to examine whether response patterns varied by gender.

Age

Respondents were distributed across a wide age range (Table 3A). A small proportion were under 18 years old, including 2% under 16 years old and 2% 16–18 years old. Respondents 19–25 years old accounted for 4% of the sample.

Older age groups made up the majority of respondents. Those 26–40 years old represented 11% of the sample, while 55% were 41–70 years old, and 27% were over 70 years old.

For some analyses, age was grouped into four broader categories, including < 26, 26–40, 41–70, and > 70 (Table 3B). Using this categorisation, respondents over 40 years old accounted for 82% of the sample, while those under 40 years old accounted for the remaining 18%. This grouped age variable was used in subsequent analyses to examine whether patterns of response varied by length of residency.

Nationality

Respondents reported a range of national identities (Table 4). The most frequently selected category was English (44%), followed by Welsh (37%) and British (16%). A further 4% selected “other.” This demographic variable was not used in subsequent analyses.

Place of Residence

Respondents reported residence across 18 towns or localities in Powys (Table 6). The largest numbers of respondents were from Brecon (16%), Newtown (8%), and Llandrindod Wells (8%).

For analytical purposes, these locations were categorised into four broader geographic areas (Table 7). Using this grouping, 37% of respondents were classified within the Brecon area (Brecon, Crickhowell, Hay-on-Wye, Talgarth, Ystradgynlais), 31% within the Llandrindod Wells area (Builth Wells, Knighton, Llandrindod Wells, Llanwrtyd Wells, Presteigne, Rhayader), 19% within the Newtown area (Llanfair Caereinion, Llanidloes, Machynlleth, Newtown), and 13% within the Welshpool area (Llanfyllin, Montgomery, Welshpool). This grouped residency variable was used in subsequent analyses to examine whether patterns of response varied by length of residency.

Length of Residency

Respondents were asked how long they had lived in the local area (Table 8). Most respondents reported relatively long-term residency. Nearly half of the total sample reported having lived in the area for more than 15 years (45.6%). A further 16.4% reported

residency of 10–15 years, and 18.4% reported residency of 5–10 years. Smaller proportions reported having lived in the area for 1–5 years (13.5%) or less than one year (4.3%).

For analytical purposes, length of residency was also grouped into broader categories (Table 9). This grouped length of residency variable was used in subsequent analyses to examine whether patterns of response varied by length of residency.

Sample Size and Interpreting Results

The survey sample includes 1,232 respondents, which is large in absolute terms relative to the size of the adult population of Powys. In practical terms, a sample of this size provides a high degree of numerical stability for describing overall response patterns and for comparing demographic subgroups within the respondent pool.

In many applied survey contexts, a sample of this magnitude would typically be considered sufficient to support robust descriptive and comparative analyses. However, the survey was administered as a voluntary online questionnaire, with respondents choosing to participate rather than being selected through a probability-based sampling process. As a result, formal statistical margins of error are not strictly applicable.

In this context, the primary value of the sample size lies not in precise population inference, but in its capacity to support robust descriptive analysis and meaningful comparisons within the total sample. The size of the sample reduces the likelihood that observed patterns are due to random variation in participation. Consequently, the analyses undertaken in this report are not materially limited by the number of respondents.

Demographic Profile and Representativeness

Purpose and Analytic Approach

This subsection presents an assessment of the demographic composition of the survey sample and its relationship to the adult population of Powys County.

The purpose of this assessment was to provide a transparent account of how closely the survey sample aligns with key population characteristics and to identify any major departures from population structure that should be considered when interpreting subsequent analyses. The intention is not to establish statistical representativeness in a strict sampling sense, but to contextualise the findings and support interpretation.

The assessment focused on the following core demographic variables of gender, age, and geographic residence, which were selected on the basis of substantive relevance and the availability of reliable population benchmarks.

Survey distributions for these variables were compared with the most recent official population data for Powys, drawing primarily on the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census 2021 Powys local profile and related published estimates, available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/visualisations/censusareachanges/W06000023>

Comparisons were undertaken using broadly comparable category groupings, recognising that exact alignment between survey variables and official population classifications is not always possible. No weighting or post-stratification adjustments were applied. All results are descriptive.

Demographic Variables and Recoding Process

Gender information was collected using free self-identification, allowing respondents to select from a range of categories. For the purposes of population benchmarking, a binary analytic variable (female / male) was derived. All other responses — including transgender, non-binary, other, and “prefer not to say” — were treated as missing for the representativeness comparison. This approach reflects the structure of available population benchmarks and avoids forcing small groups into categories that are not directly comparable.

Respondents were classified into four age groups (< 26, 26–40, 41–70, and > 70 years old) for analytical purposes. Although the survey was intended to reflect adult perspectives, a small number of respondents under the age of 18 were included and grouped within the < 26 age category. To assess whether their inclusion materially affected conclusions, a sensitivity analysis was conducted in which respondents under 18 were excluded and age distributions were recalculated for adults only (18+ years old).

Residence was originally captured at the town or village level and subsequently recoded into four broader geographic areas to support stable analysis. The original 18 town-level categories were retained for internal comparisons within the survey sample where appropriate. However, because directly comparable population benchmarks are not available for the four geographic areas used in this study, geographic representativeness was assessed in general terms only, focusing on broad patterns of coverage rather than precise population-level alignment.

Gender Composition of the Survey Sample

The gender profile of the survey sample differs noticeably from that of the adult population of Powys. Approximately two-thirds of respondents identified as female, while fewer than one-third identified as male. By contrast, the adult population of Powys is almost evenly divided between women and men.

This pattern indicates an imbalance in participation rather than a difference that could reasonably be explained by chance alone. It is consistent with well-documented participation biases in voluntary community surveys in which women are often more likely to engage with consultation exercises, particularly those relating to community services, well-being, or local development.

Male perspectives are present in the survey data but are under-represented relative to their prevalence in the Powys adult population. This imbalance should be taken into account when interpreting gender-based comparisons and when considering the extent to which the findings can be regarded as reflective of priorities across the adult population of Powys.

Age Composition of the Survey Sample

The age profile of respondents shows a strong concentration in older age groups. In the total sample, and even more clearly in the adult-only sensitivity analysis, respondents over 40 years old account for the large majority of cases, with those over 70 years old making up more than a quarter of respondents.

Younger adults, particularly those under 26 years old, are substantially under-represented relative to the county's population structure. The sensitivity analysis confirms that this pattern is not an artefact of how the age groups were developed. When the analysis is restricted to adults only, the proportion of respondents in the youngest age group becomes even smaller, while the relative dominance of middle-aged and older respondents increases slightly. This indicates that the observed age pattern reflects differences in participation across age groups rather than the way age categories were defined.

While Powys has a relatively high median age compared with many other areas, the survey sample is older still. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted as reflecting issues and priorities that are particularly salient among older residents, with more limited insight into the perspectives of younger adults.

Geographic Composition of the Survey Sample

Respondents were drawn from all four recoded geographic areas, indicating broad engagement across Powys rather than concentration in a single locality. No single area overwhelmingly dominates the sample.

However, because directly comparable population benchmarks are not available for the geographic groupings used in this study, it is not possible to make precise statements about geographic representativeness. Geographic patterns observed in the data, therefore, should be interpreted as relative differences within the respondent group, rather than as estimates of how views are distributed across Powys as a whole.

Overall Assessment and Implications for Interpretation

Overall, the demographic assessment indicates that the survey involved a large and analytically robust sample, but one that is not demographically representative of the adult population of Powys in a strict sense.

The most salient departures from the population structure relate to gender and age, with female respondents and middle-aged and older residents over-represented in the sample, and males and younger adults correspondingly under-represented.

These patterns do not invalidate the survey findings. Rather, they define the lens through which the results should be interpreted. The survey results provide a rich and reliable account of the issues, concerns, and priorities raised by those who chose to participate — particularly women and older residents — while not necessarily indicating how widely those views are shared across the population of Powys.

For this reason, subsequent demographic analyses are framed as comparisons of emphasis and salience within the respondent group, rather than as estimates of population-level viewpoints. No weighting adjustments were applied to the data collected, and all analyses are descriptive. This approach makes the basis of the findings transparent, encourages cautious interpretation, and allows the substantive content of the responses to be examined in a clear and structured way.

Analysis of Closed-Ended Questions

Frequency Distributions

This subsection presents frequency distributions for the closed-ended survey questions. It provides a clear descriptive overview of the principal response patterns across key items, supported by summary tables and interpretive commentary focused on observable trends.

Percentages reported in this report have been rounded to the nearest whole number to aid readability. Exact percentages and corresponding counts are available in Appendix A. Readers should note that the results reflect the demographic composition of the survey sample, which includes a higher proportion of women and older individuals than is typical of the Powys population.

Unless otherwise stated, percentages are based on the total survey sample (N = 1,232). **All frequency tables referenced in this subsection are provided in Appendix A.**

Current Happiness and Future Outlook

Respondents were asked to rate their level of happiness regarding their life in the community and also how positive they felt about their community's future. Table B provides the results to these questions. Tables 10-13 provide full results for these survey items.

Table B – Summary of Current Happiness and Future Outlook

Rating Options	Percentages of Respondents Selecting Rating	
	How happy are you with life in your community?	How positive do you feel about your community's future?
	Feelings About Life in Community	Feelings About Community's Future
Very Unhappy	1 %	3 %
Unhappy	4 %	15 %
Neutral	14 %	40 %
Happy	52 %	37 %
Very Happy	29 %	5 %

Responses to the happiness question were strongly concentrated at the positive end of the scale (Table 10). Around four in five respondents described themselves as either “happy” or “very happy” with life in their community, while relatively few selected negative response options. Neutral responses accounted for a smaller portion of the distribution. For a small number of hard-copy questionnaires in which this item was left blank, a “neutral” response was entered during data processing.

Responses regarding feelings about the community's future were more evenly distributed across the scale than responses to current well-being (Table 12). Neutral responses formed the single largest category, accounting for 40% of respondents. When combined, positive responses accounted for 42% of the sample, while negative responses represented a much smaller but noticeable minority.

“Likes” and “Dislikes” About the Community

Respondents were asked to indicate what they like and dislike about living in their community. Table C summarises the percentages of respondents selecting each community aspect. Items are listed in descending order according to how frequently they were selected as “likes.” Highlighting is used to draw attention to community aspects selected by a substantial percentage of respondents, or to aspects that show a clear contrast between likes and dislikes. Full frequency tables are provided in Tables 14–29.

Table C – Summary of Likes and Dislikes

Community Aspects	Percentages of Respondents Selecting Aspect	
	What do you like about living in your community?	What do you dislike about living in your community?
Access to Nature	80 %	2 %
Sense of Community	69 %	7 %
Local Events and Activities	55 %	8 %
Local Shops and Amenities	43 %	23 %
Family Lives Nearby	36 %	5 %
Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)	28 %	31 %
Public Transport Links	17 %	56 %
Other	8 %	33 %

Selections of what respondents like about their community were dominated by environmental and social characteristics. Access to nature and sense of community were selected by large majorities, followed by local events and activities. Fewer respondents selected practical or service-related aspects such as shops, local services, or transport as things they like about their community.

In contrast, responses to the “dislike” items were more concentrated around a smaller number of aspects. “Public transport links” was selected by a majority of respondents as something they dislike, making this the most prominent negative aspect. “Local services” was selected by approximately one-third of respondents. Other aspects, including sense of community and access to nature, were rarely selected as dislikes.

Taken together, these responses show a clear contrast between the aspects of community life that respondents value most and those they most often view negatively, with transport-related issues standing out in particular.

Use and Importance of Local Services

Respondents were asked which local services they use regularly and which services they consider important or valuable, even if they do not personally use them. Table D summarises these results. Items are listed in descending order of reported use. Full frequency tables are provided in Tables 30–65.

Highlighting in Table D is used selectively to draw attention to two types of local services. First, it identifies services that are both widely used and widely valued by respondents, reflecting services that form part of everyday community life (shown with a darker highlight). Second, it identifies a single service that, while used by fewer respondents, is rated as important by a large proportion of the sample, indicating its perceived significance at a community-wide level rather than solely through personal use (shown with a lighter highlight).

Table D – Summary of Services Used and Rated as Important

Local Services	Percentages of Respondents Selecting Service	
	What local services do you use regularly?	What local services are important or valuable, even if you don't personally use them?
Local Shops / Post Office	72 %	74 %
GP / Health Centre	70 %	82 %
Council Services	62 %	67 %
Pharmacy	60 %	74 %
Community Group	37 %	55 %
Village Hall	36 %	57 %
Dentist	35 %	72 %
Library	31 %	62 %
Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	28 %	63 %
Public Transport	24 %	74 %
Community Centre	23 %	58 %
Local Schools / Childcare	17 %	66 %
Places of Worship	17 %	48 %
Youth Services / Youth Clubs	9 %	62 %
Other	8 %	8 %
Support Services	7 %	55 %
Adult Learning / Training Opportunities	6 %	52 %
Community Transport	6 %	60 %

Reported use of local services varied widely across items. Essential services such as local shops, GP services, council services, and pharmacies are used by clear majorities of respondents. Use of community services and facilities, such as community groups, village halls, and libraries, was reported by roughly one-quarter to one-third of respondents. Use of transport-related and specialist services, including public transport, community transport, and adult learning, is comparatively low.

Ratings of importance were generally higher and more evenly distributed across services than reported levels of use. Many services that were used by smaller proportions of respondents were also rated as important by substantial majorities. This was particularly evident for healthcare services, public transport, pharmacies, dentists, and several community facilities. Youth services, leisure facilities, and libraries were also widely rated as important despite lower levels of reported use.

Overall, these responses suggest that respondents distinguish between services they personally use and services they consider important to have available within the community.

Buildings, Places, and Spaces That Matter Most

Respondents were asked to identify which buildings, places, and spaces matter most to them. Table E summarises the results, with items listed in descending order of selection. Highlighting is used to draw attention to buildings, places, and spaces selected by a clear majority of respondents, indicating those that stand out most strongly in terms of overall salience. Full frequency tables are provided in Tables 66–83.

Table E – Summary of Buildings, Places, and Spaces That Matter Most

Buildings, Places, and Spaces	Percentages of Respondents Selecting Type of Building, Place, or Space
Healthcare / GP Surgery	74 %
Local Park / Green Space	66 %
Local Shop	65 %
Pub / Café	60 %
Walking / Cycling Paths	51 %
Library	48 %
Public Transport Hub	43 %
Village Hall	43 %
Community Centre	41 %
Sports Centre / Leisure Facility	41 %
Local Market	37 %
Playground / Play Area	36 %
School / College	34 %
Historic Building / Landmark	29 %
Allotments / Community Garden	28 %
Place of Worship	25 %
Youth Centre / Club	24 %
Other	7 %

Respondents most frequently selected healthcare facilities, local parks and green spaces, local shops, and pubs or cafés as buildings, places, and spaces that matter most to them. Other places — including walking and cycling paths, libraries, transport hubs, village halls, community centres, and leisure facilities — were also selected by notable proportions of respondents, though less often than the items selected most frequently. More specialised spaces, such as youth centres and community gardens, were selected by comparatively fewer respondents.

Analysis of Unmet Community Needs

This subsection reports gaps between reported importance and use, and between reported likes and dislikes, for the total sample. The analysis describes the extent to which facilities, services, and aspects of local life that respondents rated as important or positive were not matched by reported use or positive experience. No demographic comparisons are included in this subsection.

Importance–Use Gaps

Across most services and facilities, a majority of respondents reported that use and importance were aligned. However, several items showed comparatively high proportions of respondents who rated a service or facility as important but reported not using it, indicating unmet need within the total sample (Table F).

Highlighting in Table F is used selectively to support visual interpretation of differences in the prevalence of importance–use gaps across services and facilities. Darker highlighting identifies services where around half or more of respondents in the total sample rated the service as important but reported not using it, indicating higher levels of unmet need. Lighter highlighting identifies services where this pattern was reported by a substantial minority of respondents, typically around one-third to just under one-half of the sample. Services below this level are not highlighted.

Table F – Summary of Importance – Use Gaps for Total Sample

Services and Facilities	Importance – Use Gap Options	
	Not Used but Rated Important (Unmet Need)	Use and Importance Are Aligned
Youth Services / Youth Clubs	56 %	41 %
Public Transport	56 %	38 %
Community Transport	55 %	43 %
Local Schools / Childcare	54 %	41 %
Support Services (Food, Advice)	50 %	48 %
Adult Learning / Training Oppor.	47 %	51 %
Dentist	44 %	49 %
Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	41 %	53 %
Community Centre	41 %	53 %
Library	38 %	56 %
Places of Worship	35 %	62 %
Village Hall	30 %	61 %
Community Group	27 %	64 %
Pharmacy	26 %	63 %
GP / Health Centre	24 %	63 %
Council Services	19 %	67 %

Services and Facilities	Importance – Use Gap Options	
	Not Used but Rated Important (Unmet Need)	Use and Importance Are Aligned
Local Shops / Post Office	17 %	70 %
Other	5 %	89 %

The largest importance–use gaps were observed for youth services or youth clubs, public transport, community transport, and local schools or childcare, where just over half of respondents reported that the service was important but not used. Similarly elevated levels of unmet need were reported for support services and adult learning or training opportunities, where close to half of respondents indicated importance without corresponding use.

Moderate levels of unmet need were reported for dentists, leisure centres or sports facilities, community centres, libraries, and places of worship, where around one-third to two-fifths of respondents reported importance without use.

Lower levels of unmet need were observed for GP or health centres, pharmacies, community groups, council services, and local shops or post offices, where alignment between importance and use was more common and the proportion reporting unmet need was comparatively smaller.

Across all facilities and services, the proportion of respondents who reported use without rating the item as important was generally small, indicating limited evidence of low-salience use in the total sample.

Like–Dislike Gaps

Responses to the like–dislike measures showed substantial variation across different aspects of local life (Table G).

Highlighting in Table G is used selectively to support visual interpretation of variation in like–dislike response patterns across aspects of local life. Darker highlighting identifies aspects where a relatively high proportion of respondents reported “dislike only” responses, indicating less favourable overall assessments within the total sample. Lighter highlighting identifies aspects where dislike responses were reported by a smaller but still notable proportion of respondents, alongside substantial neutral or mixed responses. Aspects below this level are not highlighted.

Table G – Summary of Like - Dislike Gaps for Total Sample

Aspects of Community	Like - Dislike Gap Options		
	Dislike Only	Neither / Both	Like Only
Public Transport Links (Bus, Train)	54 %	32 %	14 %
Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)	28 %	48 %	24 %
Other	28 %	69 %	3 %
Local Shops and Amenities	22 %	37 %	41 %
Local Events and Activities	7 %	39 %	54 %
Sense of Community	6 %	26 %	68 %
Family Lives Nearby	4 %	61 %	35 %
Access to Nature	1 %	21 %	78 %

Strongly positive patterns were evident for access to nature and sense of community, where large majorities of respondents reported liking these aspects and only small minorities reported disliking them. Local events and activities also showed a predominantly positive pattern, though with a larger proportion of respondents reporting neutral or mixed views.

More mixed response patterns were observed for local shops and amenities and local services such as schools and healthcare, where substantial proportions of respondents reported neutral or mixed views alongside both positive and negative responses.

The least favourable pattern was observed for public transport links, where a majority of respondents reported disliking this aspect and only a small minority reported liking it. This contrasts with most other aspects of community life, where positive responses were more common than negative ones.

Responses relating to family living nearby were characterised primarily by neutral or mixed views, reflecting variation in personal circumstances rather than a uniformly positive or negative assessment.

Differences in Happiness and Future Outlook Across Groups

Two ordinal variables (i.e., Current Level of Happiness, Feelings About the Community's Future) were examined using non-parametric methods. Comparisons were conducted by gender, age group, and geographic area. Kruskal–Wallis tests were used for comparisons involving multiple groups, and Mann–Whitney U tests were used for binary comparisons. When tests were statistically significant, targeted post-hoc Mann–Whitney U tests were conducted with appropriate Bonferroni adjustments.

All crosstabulation tables referenced in this subsection are provided in Appendix B.

Analysis of Current Level of Happiness

Gender Differences

A Mann–Whitney U test indicated no statistically significant difference in reported happiness between females and males [$U = 139,695.0$, $Z = -1.09$, $p = .277$] (Table 214). Reported happiness levels were similar for women and men, indicating no meaningful difference by gender.

Age Group Differences

A Kruskal–Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference in current happiness across age groups [$\chi^2(3) = 18.67$, $p < .001$] (Table 215). Mean ranks indicated a clear age-related pattern, with lower reported happiness among respondents 26–40 years old and progressively higher happiness among older age groups, particularly those over 70 years old.

Given the statistically significant test result, pairwise Mann–Whitney U tests were conducted between age groups using a Bonferroni-adjusted significance threshold of $p \leq .0083$ (Tables 216–221). Two comparisons were found statistically significant after correction:

- 26–40 years old vs 41–70 years old ($U = 37,779.5$, $Z = -3.31$, $p < .001$)
- 26–40 years old vs over 70 years old ($U = 17,418.0$, $Z = -4.15$, $p < .001$)

The other four pairwise comparisons did not reach the adjusted significance threshold. These results indicate that the age-related difference is mainly due to lower reported happiness among respondents 26–40 years old, rather than meaningful differences between each age group.

Geographic Area Differences

No statistically significant differences in current happiness were observed across geographic areas [$\chi^2(3) = 5.87$, $p = .118$] (Table 222). Reported happiness levels were similar across the Brecon, Llandrindod Wells, Newtown, and Welshpool areas, suggesting little variation by location.

Analysis of Feelings About the Community's Future

Gender Differences

A Mann–Whitney U test indicated a statistically significant gender difference regarding feelings about the community's future [$U = 133,798.5$, $Z = -2.01$, $p = .044$] (Table 223). Men expressed slightly more positive feelings than women, although the difference was small.

Age Group Differences

A Kruskal–Wallis test revealed a statistically significant difference regarding feelings about the community’s future across age groups [$\chi^2(3) = 9.10$, $p = .028$] (Table 224). The results indicated that older respondents, particularly those over 70 years old, tended to express more positive or optimistic feelings than younger respondents.

Post-hoc Mann–Whitney U tests were conducted using a Bonferroni-adjusted significance threshold of $p \leq .0083$ (Tables 225–230). Only one comparison was found statistically significant after correction: 41–70 years old vs over 70 years old ($U = 99,445.5$, $Z = -2.73$, $p = .006$).

All other age group comparisons failed to reach the adjusted significance threshold. This finding indicates that age-related differences in future outlook are fairly minor and reflect greater optimism among the oldest respondents.

Geographic Area Differences

Geographic area was significantly associated with feelings about the community’s future [$\chi^2(3) = 11.21$, $p = .011$] (Table 231). Overall response patterns indicated lower levels of optimism among respondents in Llandrindod Wells compared with respondents in other towns.

To examine this pattern in more detail, pairwise Mann–Whitney U tests were conducted across all geographic areas using a Bonferroni-adjusted significance threshold of $p \leq .0167$ (Tables 232–237). Comparisons involving Llandrindod Wells were the only ones to show statistically significant differences after correction:

- Llandrindod Wells vs Brecon ($U = 76,588.5$, $Z = -2.92$, $p = .003$)
- Llandrindod Wells vs Welshpool ($U = 25,731.5$, $Z = -2.44$, $p = .015$)

The comparison between Llandrindod Wells and Newtown did not meet the adjusted significance threshold ($p = .028$), and no statistically significant differences were observed among the remaining town-to-town comparisons.

Taken together, these results indicate that the overall geographic difference is largely attributable to lower optimism among respondents in Llandrindod Wells, rather than consistent differences across all towns.

Summary of Happiness and Future Outlook Findings

Current level of happiness varies significantly by age, with respondents 26–40 years old reporting lower happiness than middle-aged and older groups. No statistically significant differences regarding current happiness were observed by gender or geographic area.

In contrast, views about the community's future vary by both age and geographic area, with greater optimism among the oldest respondents and lower optimism concentrated among respondents in Llandrindod Wells. Gender differences were found regarding feelings about the community's future but not for current happiness, with women expressing slightly more pessimistic views than men.

Analysis of Demographic Group Differences

This subsection examines demographic group differences in responses to close-ended survey questions. Group differences were assessed using statistical tests suited to the type of response, and the findings are reported descriptively. The purpose is to identify where response patterns differ across groups, not to explain why such differences occur.

A summary table of statistically significant differences is provided in Appendix C. For each closed-ended survey item, the table shows whether there were any statistically significant differences in the responses in the demographic groups (i.e., gender, age groups, geographic areas, length of residency). Three levels of statistical significance are used to indicate stronger or weaker evidence of group differences. Blank cells indicate that responses did not differ at the $p \leq .05$ level of significance.

The analyses below focus on overall patterns and recurring differences, with full statistical details provided in Appendices D-G.

Analysis of Gender Differences

Responses from women and men were compared across the closed-ended survey questions. **Detailed results for all gender comparisons are provided in Appendix D (Tables 238–309).**

Women and men express very similar views about what they like and dislike in their communities. Across all like–dislike items, no statistically significant gender differences were observed, indicating broadly shared positive and negative assessments of local life (Tables 238–253).

Patterns of service use are also largely similar for women and men. For most facilities and services, reported use did not differ significantly by gender (Tables 254–271). The one clear exception was use of local schools or childcare, which women were more likely than men to report using (Table 261).

Where gender differences are most apparent is not in what people used or liked, but in what they regarded as important. Women were consistently more likely than men to rate a wide range of services and facilities as important, even when reported use was similar (Tables 272–289). This suggests differences in emphasis rather than differences in everyday experience.

A similar pattern is seen in responses relating to the buildings, places, and spaces that matter most. Women were more likely than men to select healthcare facilities or GP

surgeries, community centres, libraries, local shops, public transport hubs, playgrounds or play areas, local markets, and allotments or community gardens as places that matter most (Tables 292–306).

Responses relating to overall well-being were very similar for women and men. Current levels of happiness did not differ significantly by gender (Table 308). A similar pattern is observed in responses relating to women’s and men’s feelings about the community’s future (Table 309). Therefore, women and men report very similar levels of current well-being and broadly comparable views about the future of their community.

Overall, these findings indicate that women and men share largely similar experiences of community life, particularly in terms of likes, dislikes, and patterns of service use. The main gender difference relates to what is seen as important: women tend to identify a wider range of services and community assets as central to community well-being, even when patterns of use are similar.

Analysis of Age Group Differences

Responses of individuals in different age groups were compared across the closed-ended survey questions. **Detailed results for all age group comparisons are provided in Appendix E (Tables 310–381).**

What people like and dislike in their communities varies by age group for several items. Differences by age were found regarding liking sense of community, access to nature, local events and activities, local shops and amenities, and public transport links (Tables 310–316). In general, respondents in the older age groups were more likely than those in the youngest age group to report liking these aspects of local life. By contrast, likes regarding local services such as schools and healthcare did not differ significantly by age group (Tables 313).

Age-related differences are also found regarding what respondents report disliking. Differences by age group were identified for local events and activities, local services, local shops and amenities, and public transport links (Tables 320–323). In contrast, respondents across age groups expressed similar views about sense of community, access to nature, and having family living nearby, with no statistically significant differences identified for these items (Tables 318, 319, and 324).

Service and facility use shows the clearest age-related variation. Differences were identified across a wide range of services, including healthcare, transport, community and leisure facilities, schools and childcare, council services, local shops or post offices, libraries, village halls, and youth services (Tables 326–343). In general, reported use of many health-related and community services increased with age. Some facilities, such as leisure centres and youth-related services, showed higher use among younger or middle-aged respondents. Use of support services and adult learning or training opportunities showed little variation by age group (Tables 337 and 339).

Ratings of importance also vary across age groups for most services and facilities (Tables 344–361). Differences by age group were identified for health services, transport-related

services, community facilities, retail and council services, support services, places of worship, adult learning or training opportunities, and libraries. Across many of these areas, respondents in older age groups were more likely to rate services as important, although the pattern varied depending on the type of service or facility.

Age-group differences also are found regarding buildings, places, and spaces respondents identified as mattering most to them (Tables 362–379). Healthcare facilities/GP surgeries and places of worship were selected more frequently by older respondents (Tables 369 and 371). In contrast, items associated with family and caregiving roles, such as playgrounds and play areas, were selected most often by respondents 26–40 and 41–70 years old, and less often by the youngest and oldest groups (Table 363). Schools and colleges were selected less frequently among respondents over 70 years old (Table 370). These patterns suggest that what people consider most important is strongly shaped by their stage of life, with different age groups prioritising places and spaces that support their everyday activities, responsibilities, and ways of participating in community life.

Responses relating to overall well-being varied significantly by age group (Table 380). Older respondents were more likely to report higher levels of happiness than younger respondents. In particular, those over 70 years old showed the highest proportion reporting being “very happy,” while respondents 26–40 years old were less likely to place themselves in this category and more likely to report being unhappy or neutral.

Views about the future of the community also differed significantly by age group, though less strongly than current happiness (Table 381). Respondents over 70 years old were the most likely to express positive views about the future of their community, while respondents 26–40 years old were more likely to report neutral or less positive views. These results indicate that age is associated with differences in both present well-being and future outlook, with older age groups tending to report higher happiness and greater optimism about the future than younger and middle-aged groups.

Overall, comparisons by age group show that people at different stages of life report different experiences and priorities across several aspects of community life. These differences extend to what respondents like and dislike about their communities, which services they use, how important they consider different services to be, and which buildings, places, and spaces they identify as mattering most. Compared with gender, age group is associated with a wider and more consistent set of differences, particularly in patterns of service use, judgments about importance, and the types of community assets prioritised at different stages of life.

Analysis of Geographic Area Differences

Responses of individuals in different geographic areas were compared across the closed-ended survey questions. **Detailed results for all geographic area comparisons are provided in Appendix F (Tables 382–453).**

Comparisons by geographic area show that some aspects of community life vary across locations, while others are viewed in similar ways. For the “like” items, differences by area were identified regarding access to nature (Table 383) and several practical aspects of local life, including local services (i.e., schools and healthcare), local shops and amenities, and public transport links (Tables 385–387). In contrast, views about sense of community, local events and activities, and having family living nearby were similar across areas, with no statistically significant differences identified for these items (Tables 382, 384, 388).

A similar pattern is observed for reported dislikes. Differences by geographic area were identified for disliking access to nature, local services, local shops and amenities, and public transport links (Tables 391, 393–395). By contrast, respondents across geographic areas expressed comparable views about sense of community, local events and activities, and having family living nearby, with no statistically significant differences identified for these items (Tables 390, 392, 396).

Geographic area differences are most pronounced regarding reported use of services and facilities. Differences were identified for use of GP or health centres, dentists, pharmacies, public transport, community transport, community groups, community centres, libraries, village halls, and support services (Tables 398–403, 406–407, 412–413). In contrast, reported use of leisure centres or sports facilities, local schools or childcare, local shops or post offices, places of worship, adult learning or training opportunities, and youth services or youth clubs was generally similar across geographic areas, with no statistically significant differences identified for these items (Tables 404–405, 408, 410–411, 414).

Ratings of importance varied less by geographic area than reported service use. Across most services and facilities, ratings of importance were similar across locations, including health services, transport-related services, community groups, local schools or childcare, libraries, village halls, and support services (Tables 416–421, 423–432). One exception concerned the importance of leisure centres or sports facilities, which did differ significantly by geographic area (Table 422).

Geographic differences were also examined for the buildings, places, and spaces respondents identified as mattering most to them (Tables 434–451). For many items, including local markets and allotments/community gardens, priorities were similar across areas (Tables 448 and 449). However, some differences were identified. For example, selection of healthcare/GP surgery and of walking/cycling paths varied by location, indicating that certain community assets carry different weight depending on local context (Tables 443 and 450).

Responses relating to overall well-being and future outlook provide further insight into how place shapes experience. Current levels of happiness did not differ significantly across geographic areas, indicating generally similar self-reported well-being regardless of location (Table 452). By contrast, views about the future of the community varied by geographic area (Table 453). Respondents in Llandrindod Wells were more likely than those in other areas to express unhappy or less positive views about their community’s future, while respondents in Brecon, Newtown, and Welshpool were more likely to report positive expectations. This contrast suggests that, while present-day well-being is broadly shared across locations,

optimism about the future varies more by location and is more closely tied to local circumstances.

Overall, comparisons of responses across geographic areas show that differences pertain mainly to how people experience local conditions and use certain services and facilities, rather than to what people consider important or how they assess their current well-being. In contrast to age group, geographic area is associated with a smaller and more targeted set of differences, most clearly in service use, the prominence of particular local assets, and expectations about the future of the community.

Analysis of Length of Residency Differences

Responses of individuals were compared across groups defined by length of residency in the local area. **Detailed results for all comparisons by length of residency are provided in Appendix G (Tables 454–525).**

Comparisons by length of residency show that most responses are similar regardless of how long people have lived in the area, with a small number of differences associated with longer-term residency. For the “like” items, differences by residency group were identified regarding access to nature, local shops and amenities, and family living nearby (Tables 455, 458, 460); longer-term residents were more likely to select the latter two items. By contrast, liking local services (i.e., schools and healthcare) did not differ significantly by length of residency (Table 457). Liking public transport links showed a borderline pattern but did not meet conventional significance thresholds (Table 459).

For the “dislike” items, responses were generally consistent across length of residency groups (Tables 462–469). In other words, disliking something does not differ significantly by length of residency.

Reported use of services and facilities varied little by length of residency (Tables 470–487), though there were two clear exceptions. Use of dentists and use of village halls differed across length of residency groups, with higher reported use among longer-term residents (Tables 471 and 485).

Ratings of importance were generally similar across residency groups for many core services (Tables 488–505). For example, ratings of importance for GP/health centres and pharmacy did not differ significantly by length of residency (Tables 488 and 490). However, some importance ratings did vary. Longer-term residents were more likely to rate dental services as important (Table 489), and importance ratings for village halls also differed significantly by length of residency (Table 503).

Length of residency was also examined in relation to the buildings, places, and spaces respondents identified as mattering most (Tables 506–523). Several selections differed by length of residency group. Village halls were selected more often by longer-term residents (Table 508), and selections of schools/colleges and healthcare/GP surgery also varied by length of residency (Tables 514 and 515). By contrast, selection of playgrounds/play areas did not differ significantly by residency group (Table 507).

Finally, broader evaluative measures show no meaningful differences by length of residency. Current levels of happiness and feelings about the community's future did not differ significantly across residency groups (Tables 524-525).

Overall, comparisons by length of residency show a modest and selective pattern of differences. Where differences do occur, they pertain mainly to connection with local amenities and community spaces (such as village halls), and to higher use and perceived importance of certain services among longer-term residents.

Summary of Demographic Group Differences

Analysis of the closed-ended survey responses shows that people's experiences and views differ across demographic groups, but not in the same way or to the same extent. Some demographic characteristics involve wide-ranging differences across many aspects of community life, while others are associated with fewer and more specific differences.

Differences between women and men are relatively small. Women and men express very similar views about what they like and dislike in their communities and report generally similar patterns of service use. Where gender differences do occur, they relate mainly to what people consider important rather than to what they use or experience from day to day. Women are more likely than men to identify a broader range of services, facilities, and community assets as important and to select more places and spaces as mattering most. Overall, this suggests that women and men experience community life in broadly similar ways, but differ in how widely they define what matters and how much weight they place on different services and community assets.

Differences by age group are more pronounced and extend across many items in the survey. Age is linked to differences in what people like and dislike, how services are used, how important services are rated, and which places and spaces are prioritised. Older respondents tend to report greater use of many services and are more likely to view them as important, while younger and middle-aged groups place greater emphasis on spaces and facilities connected to family life, participation, and active use. Age also shapes an overall sense of well-being and expectations about the future, with older respondents generally reporting more happiness and greater optimism. Among the demographic characteristics examined, age group shows the broadest and most consistent pattern of differences.

Differences by geographic area are present but more specific. Differences across locations relate mainly to how people experience local conditions and how they use particular services and facilities. By contrast, views about what is important and assessments of current well-being are essentially similar across locations. Where differences do occur, they tend to reflect the local prominence of particular community assets and differences in how people view the future of their community, rather than fundamentally different priorities.

Differences by length of residency are the most limited. Most responses are similar regardless of how long people have lived in the area. When differences do occur, they are mainly associated with longer-term residents and reflect stronger connections to local amenities, higher use of certain spaces, and greater perceived importance of specific services. Feelings about well-being and future outlook do not differ by length of residence.

Across all demographic characteristics, differences are more likely to appear in evaluative judgments — particularly regarding the importance of services and what buildings and spaces matter most — than in basic likes, dislikes, or reported use. At the same time, several measures, including current happiness and views about the future, vary little across most groups. This pattern suggests that, while experiences of community life are widely shared, people differ in how they prioritise, interpret, and value services, spaces, and future challenges.

Section 5:

Results for Open-Ended Survey Items

Introduction

This section presents the results of the content analysis of responses to the eight open-ended survey questions. The analysis identifies the key issues, concerns, and priorities raised by respondents and describes how patterns vary depending on the framing and focus of each question.

Tables G-N present the distribution of responses across thematic categories for each open-ended question. Percentages of the total survey sample indicate how widespread a theme was across all respondents, while percentages of valid responses indicate how prominent it was among those who answered each question. Percentages are reported as rounded whole numbers to aid readability.

Demographic patterns in the open-ended responses are reported using composite tables in Appendix H, derived from underlying cross-tabulations described in Section 3. Appendix I contains representative quotations from respondents.

Reporting Frequencies and Valid Responses

Frequencies are reported as counts and as percentages of the total survey sample (N = 1,232) and of the valid responses for each question. Reporting both figures supports comparison across questions and clarifies the distinction between overall salience across the full sample and prominence among those who provided a valid response to a given question.

Because individual responses may reference multiple issues, categories are not mutually exclusive and percentages do not sum to 100%.

Micro-level analyses use a broader definition of valid responses than macro-level analyses, reflecting their different analytical purposes. Macro-level tables use the standard valid-response definition for the content analysis; micro-level tables include any response that clearly identifies a specific service, facility, or issue, even when it does not map cleanly onto the macro framework. As a result, valid response counts may differ between macro and micro tables for the same question.

Interpreting Category Frequencies

Because thematic categories differ in scope and conceptual breadth, differences in category frequencies should be interpreted with care. Some categories capture issues that are narrowly defined or tied to specific services or infrastructures. Others capture broader, relational, or contextual aspects of experiences that may cut across multiple domains. Categories of this latter type may appear more frequently because respondents refer to them incidentally while discussing a wide range of issues, not necessarily because they represent a single or prioritised concern.

Accordingly, higher category frequencies should be understood as indicators of how commonly a theme arises in respondents' accounts, rather than as direct measures of priority, importance, or preference. The analysis is intended to document patterns of expressed concern, not to rank issues or infer relative weight.

Visual Highlighting of Category Prominence

To support visual interpretation, categories within each table are highlighted using percentage thresholds based on the distribution of valid responses for that question. Darker shading indicates categories that represent the most prominent themes for a given question, while lighter shading indicates categories of moderate prominence.

The thresholds are applied within individual tables rather than across tables and are not intended as rigid cut-offs. Thresholds differ for macro- and micro-level analyses to reflect their different levels of granularity. Highlighting is intended to aid readability and should be interpreted as indicative of relative prominence within each question, not as a measure of absolute importance or priority.

Categories and micro-categories are ordered by descending percentage of valid responses.

Results for Open-Ended Questions

Analysis of Missing Services in the Community

Tables H1 and H2 summarise responses to Question 12, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' comments regarding missing services in their community.

Table H1 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 12
(Missing Services in the Community)

Question 12: Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 890)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Public Transport & Connectivity	284	32 %	23 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	248	28 %	20 %
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	169	19 %	14 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	159	18 %	13 %
Children, Young People & Education	138	16 %	11 %
Community Life & Participation	127	14 %	10 %
Community Facilities & Assets	86	10 %	7 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	42	5 %	3 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	39	4 %	3 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	38	4 %	3 %
Housing & Affordability	15	2 %	1 %
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	7	1 %	1 %

Table H2 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 12
(Missing Services in the Community)

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 1,009)
Public transport (buses, rail, frequency, routes)	221	22 %
Health services – GP, dentist, NHS access	198	20 %
Shops & everyday retail (general shops, food shops)	176	17 %
Leisure & sport facilities (leisure centres, pools, gyms)	154	15 %
Youth facilities & activities	143	14 %
Community centres / village halls / Canolfan	129	13 %
Mental health & well-being support	118	12 %
Social care / day centres / support for older people	104	10 %
Public toilets	97	10 %
Buses for older people / accessible transport	91	9 %
Affordable housing	88	9 %

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 1,009)
Libraries	83	8 %
Activities for young people (non-sport)	79	8 %
Banks / Post Office	76	8 %
Employment opportunities / local jobs	71	7 %
Childcare / early years provision	64	6 %
Green spaces / parks / play areas	59	6 %
Arts, culture & creative spaces	53	5 %
Education & training (adult learning, FE)	48	5 %
Transport links to hospitals	44	4 %
Support services (advice, benefits, third sector)	41	4 %
Broadband / digital connectivity	38	4 %
Affordable food / food security	35	4 %
Community cafés / social meeting spaces	33	3 %
Policing / community safety	29	3 %

At the macro level, responses to Question 12 highlight perceived gaps in everyday service provision. Public Transport & Connectivity (32%) and Health, Care & Well-being Services (28%) are the most frequently cited missing services, indicating that access to essential services remains a central concern. Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services (18%) and Children, Young People & Education (16%) also feature strongly, suggesting that both basic amenities and family-related provision are viewed as insufficient in many communities.

Micro-level analysis provides additional specificity about what respondents mean by “missing services.” The most frequently cited gaps relate to public transport services, primary healthcare access (GPs and dentists), everyday retail, and leisure and sport facilities. Youth provision, community centres, mental-health support, and social-care services also appear repeatedly, pointing to a perceived lack of spaces and services that support participation, well-being, and social connection.

Taken together, the macro and micro findings indicate that concerns about missing services are practical and place-based, centred on the infrastructure needed to sustain everyday life rather than on abstract or system-level issues.

Analysis of Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing

Tables I1 and I2 summarise responses to Question 13, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents’ comments regarding local services at risk of closing or changing.

Table I1 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 13
(Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing)

Question 13: Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N=610)	% of Total Sample (N=1,232)
Community Facilities & Assets	191	31 %	16 %
Children, Young People & Education	160	26 %	13 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	146	24 %	12 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	103	17 %	8 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	92	15 %	8 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	69	11 %	6 %
Community Life & Participation	20	3 %	2 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	19	3 %	2 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	12	2 %	1 %
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	11	2 %	1 %
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	9	2 %	1 %
Housing & Affordability	5	1 %	< 1 %

Table I2 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 13
(Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing)

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 720)
Leisure centre / swimming pool / sports facilities	119	17 %
Schools / education provision (6th form, Welsh med., nursery)	90	13 %
Public transport routes and services (bus/train)	81	11 %
Library services	69	10 %
Local shops / retail services	58	8 %
Dentists / dental services	54	8 %
Council services / funding cuts (general)	45	6 %
Hospital services (incl MIU/A&E)	44	6 %
GP surgeries / doctors	37	5 %
Emergency services (air ambulance, fire, police)	30	4 %

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 720)
Community centres / village halls / community facilities	30	4 %
Social care and day services (day centres, respite, carers)	28	4 %
Community transport schemes	22	3 %
Pubs / cafes / restaurants	20	3 %
Youth services (youth club, youth service)	20	3 %
Post office services	19	3 %
Pharmacy / chemist	19	3 %
Banks / cash access (bank, ATM, cashpoint)	16	2 %
Public toilets	13	2 %
Waste / recycling / tip	7	1 %

Responses to Question 13 shift attention from absence to vulnerability of existing services. At the macro level, Community Facilities & Assets dominate (31%), followed by Children, Young People & Education (26%) and Health, Care & Well-being Services (24%). This pattern suggests widespread concern about the stability of shared spaces and core services rather than about marginal or peripheral services.

Micro-level analysis shows that respondents most frequently identified leisure centres and swimming pools, schools and education services, and public transport services as being at risk. Libraries, local shops, and dental services also feature prominently. Many responses reference named facilities, often framed as essential to community functioning, particularly in rural areas.

A notable subset of responses points to council services and funding pressures, alongside social care, community transport, and emergency services. This pattern indicates that respondents are not only identifying individual services at risk, but are also mentioning those risks within a broader context of financial constraint and institutional uncertainty.

Analysis of Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk

Tables J1 and J2 summarise responses to Question 15, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' comments regarding local buildings or spaces at risk.

**Table J1 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 15
(Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk)**

Question 15: Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed? How do you feel about that?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 558)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	217	39 %	18 %
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	149	27 %	12 %
Community Facilities & Assets	129	23 %	11 %
Children, Young People & Education	121	22 %	10 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	85	15 %	7 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	80	14 %	7 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	78	14 %	6 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	53	10 %	4 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	46	8 %	4 %
Housing & Affordability	27	5 %	2 %
Community Life & Participation	14	3 %	1 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	8	1 %	1 %

**Table J2 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 15
(Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk)**

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 548)
Community buildings (centres, halls, institutes)	64	12 %
Churches & chapels	59	11 %
Retail & town centre premises	45	8 %
Leisure & sport facilities	43	8 %
Schools & education buildings	41	8 %
Library	36	7 %
Pubs & hotels	33	6 %
Banks & Post Office	30	6 %
Development/change of use pressures	26	5 %

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 548)
Health facilities	21	4 %
Green spaces & play areas	20	4 %
Social care/day centres	19	4 %
Heritage/historic/listed buildings	18	3 %
Natural assets & water	14	3 %
Public Toilets	11	2 %

Question 15 produces one of the most concentrated patterns of response across the survey. At the macro level, Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion (39%), Community Facilities & Assets (23%), and Children, Young People & Education (22%) together account for a large proportion of valid responses, indicating that the potential loss of buildings and spaces is widely understood in terms of its social consequences.

Micro-level analysis confirms that respondents are primarily concerned with community buildings, churches, retail premises, leisure facilities, and schools. Many responses refer to specific, locally significant places, often described as anchors of community life or informal social infrastructure.

Compared to other questions, transport and environmental issues are relatively marginal, reinforcing the interpretation that this item elicited place-specific and emotionally grounded concerns about tangible assets rather than broader systems. The diversity of micro-categories reflects the highly localised nature of perceived risk.

Analysis of Current Challenges Facing the Community

Table K summarises responses to Question 17, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' comments regarding biggest challenges facing the community now.

**Table K – Categorisation of Responses to Question 17
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Now)**

Question 17: What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 1,044)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	378	36 %	31 %
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	359	34 %	29 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	264	25 %	21 %
Children, Young People & Education	253	24 %	21 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	231	22 %	19 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	227	22 %	18 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	194	19 %	16 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	150	14 %	12 %
Community Facilities & Assets	101	10 %	8 %
Housing & Affordability	97	9 %	8 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	78	8 %	6 %
Community Life & Participation	45	4 %	4 %

Responses to Question 17 indicate a shift away from narrowly defined service gaps toward broader social and economic pressures. Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion (34%) emerges as the most prominent challenge, followed by Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living (25%) and Children, Young People & Education (24%), suggesting that respondents view immediate challenges as rooted in social resilience, affordability, and the conditions affecting future generations.

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making (19%) appears as a significant but secondary theme, often framing how respondents understand the origins or persistence of these challenges rather than replacing them as the primary concern. Compared with earlier questions focused on missing or vulnerable services, transport and amenities remain present but are less dominant, indicating a shift from access issues toward questions of sustainability, economic pressure, and social cohesion.

Analysis of Future Challenges Facing the Community

Table L summarises responses to Question 18, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' comments regarding biggest challenges facing the community over the next 5-10 years.

**Table L – Categorisation of Responses to Question 18
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Over the Next 5–10 Years)**

Question 18: What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 1,011)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	491	49 %	40 %
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	388	38 %	32 %
Children, Young People & Education	216	21 %	18 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	215	21 %	18 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	142	14 %	12 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	123	12 %	10 %
Housing & Affordability	118	12 %	10 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	99	10 %	8 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	97	10 %	8 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	81	8 %	7 %
Community Facilities & Assets	74	7 %	6 %
Community Life & Participation	19	2 %	2 %

Looking ahead, respondents emphasise long-term structural risks. Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion (38%) remains the most prominent category, followed by Children, Young People & Education (21%) and Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living (21%).

Environmental and infrastructure concerns increase relative to Question 17, reflecting heightened awareness of climate, sustainability, and cumulative pressures over time. The very high proportion of Other / Miscellaneous responses suggests that future-oriented thinking is more speculative and less settled, with respondents articulating emerging or interconnected concerns that resist simple categorisation.

Analysis of Desired Changes in the Community

Tables M1 and M2 summarise responses to Question 19, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' comments regarding desired changes in their community.

**Table M1 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 19
(One Change Respondents Would Make in Their Community)**

Question 19: If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 886)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	318	36 %	26 %
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	288	33 %	23 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	219	25%	18 %
Children, Young People & Education	158	18 %	13 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	142	16 %	12 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	95	11 %	8 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	87	10 %	7 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	77	9 %	6 %
Community Facilities & Assets	71	8 %	6 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	57	6 %	5 %
Housing & Affordability	55	6 %	5 %
Community Life & Participation	36	4 %	3 %

Table M2 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 19
(One Change Respondents Would Make in Their Community)

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 886)
Public transport improvements (buses, frequency, routes)	182	21 %
Better access to health services (GP, dentist, NHS)	161	18 %
More shops / stronger town centre	149	17 %
Leisure centre / swimming pool / sports facilities	132	15 %
More activities & facilities for young people	128	15 %
Community centre / village hall / Canolfan	117	13 %
Improved local governance / council decisions	103	12 %
Affordable housing / housing availability	99	11 %
Jobs / local employment opportunities	92	10 %
Public toilets	86	10 %
Safer roads / traffic / parking	81	9 %
Support for older people / day centres / social care	77	9 %
Cleaner, better maintained public spaces	74	8 %
Protection of green spaces / countryside	69	8 %
Libraries	65	7 %
Pubs / cafés / social meeting places	61	7 %
More community activities / events	58	7 %
Better consultation / being listened to	54	6 %
Schools / education provision	49	6 %
Reduced overdevelopment / housing pressure	46	5 %
Improved safety / policing	43	5 %
Better support for vulnerable groups	41	5 %
Improved broadband / digital access	38	4 %

Question 19 elicits a more action-oriented distribution of responses. At the macro level, Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion (36%) and Public Transport & Connectivity (25%) are most prominent, followed by Children, Young People & Education (18%) and Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living (16%).

Micro-level analysis shows that respondents prioritise transport improvements, better access to health services, stronger town centres, leisure facilities, and facilities for young people. Community centres and governance-related actions, such as improved consultation and decision-making, also feature strongly.

Together, these findings suggest that respondents identify both practical interventions and institutional changes as means for improving community life, with an emphasis on actions that enable participation, access, and stability.

Analysis of Awareness of New Projects in the Community

Tables N1 and N2 summarise responses to Question 20, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' comments regarding their awareness of new projects planned for their area.

**Table N1 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 20
(Awareness of New Projects Planned for the Area)**

Question 20: Do you know about any new projects planned for your area?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 769)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	231	30 %	19 %
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	156	20 %	13 %
Children, Young People & Education	114	15 %	9 %
Community Facilities & Assets	88	11 %	7 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	61	8 %	5 %
Housing & Affordability	52	7 %	4 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	48	6 %	4 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	40	5 %	3 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	22	3 %	2 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	19	3 %	2 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	15	2 %	1 %
Community Life & Participation	13	2 %	1 %

Table N2 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 20
(Awareness of New Projects Planned for the Area)

Micro-Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 769)
Housing developments (general / private / estates)	168	22 %
Renewable energy projects (wind, solar, pylons, grid)	152	20 %
Road / transport infrastructure works	121	16 %
Community facilities projects (centres, halls, hubs)	103	13 %
Leisure & sport facilities (leisure centre, pool, pitches)	97	13 %
Town centre regeneration / redevelopment	91	12 %
School / education-related projects	84	11 %
Health facilities or service changes	79	10 %
Active travel schemes (cycle paths, walking routes)	73	10 %
Environmental / conservation projects	68	9 %
Commercial / retail developments	62	8 %
Tourism-related developments	57	7 %
Community-led or volunteer-run projects	54	7 %
Changes to existing buildings / repurposing	49	6 %
Infrastructure upgrades (utilities, broadband)	45	6 %
Public realm improvements (green spaces, parks)	42	6 %
Social care / supported housing projects	38	5 %
Arts, culture, or heritage projects	34	4 %
Uncertainty / rumours about possible projects	31	4 %

Responses to Question 20 reflect uneven and fragmented awareness regarding projects planned in local areas.

At the macro level, Other / Miscellaneous responses (30%) and Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion (20%) are most prominent, indicating that awareness of planned projects is often partial, informal, or framed in terms of perceived social consequences rather than detailed project knowledge. Children, Young People & Education (15%) also features at a moderate level, suggesting that where awareness exists, it tends to centre on visible, place-based developments with direct community relevance.

Micro-level analysis shows that awareness clusters around housing developments, renewable energy projects, and road and transport infrastructure. The prominence of “uncertainty or rumours” as a micro-category underscores the fragmented nature of the responses and suggests potential gaps in communication or consultation.

Analysis of Additional Comments

Table O summarises responses to Question 21, showing the distribution of themes identified in respondents' additional comments.

**Table O – Categorisation of Responses to Question 21
(Other Comments)**

Question 21: Anything else you'd like to add?			
Category	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 455)	% of Total Sample (N = 1,232)
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	208	46 %	17 %
Public Transport & Connectivity	108	24 %	9 %
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	108	24 %	9 %
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	94	21 %	8 %
Children, Young People & Education	92	20 %	8 %
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	73	16 %	6 %
Community Facilities & Assets	54	12 %	4 %
Health, Care & Well-being Services	35	8 %	3 %
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	33	7 %	3 %
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	30	7 %	2 %
Housing & Affordability	21	5 %	2 %
Community Life & Participation	16	4 %	1 %

The final open-ended question functions as a catch-all for broader responses. Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion (46%) is the most prominent category, followed by Public Transport & Connectivity (24%), Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living (21%), Children, Young People & Education (20%), and Governance, Funding & Decision-Making (16%).

This pattern indicates that respondents articulated broader concerns, critiques, and viewpoints that extend beyond the scope of previous questions. The high proportion of Other / Miscellaneous responses reinforces the open-ended nature of this item and its role as a repository for diverse perspectives.

Synthesis of Responses Across All Questions

The preceding tables present findings for each open-ended question separately. This subsection integrates those results to identify patterns that recur across questions and to clarify how different aspects of community experience are connected in responses.

Across all eight questions, respondents consistently describe community issues as interconnected rather than isolated. Although the emphasis shifts depending on how each question is framed — ranging from missing services and vulnerable assets to broader challenges and future risks — the same core domains appear repeatedly. This indicates that the community concerns of Powys residents are experienced as layered, cumulative, and mutually reinforcing.

The recurring prominence of the “Other / Miscellaneous” category across several questions reflects not analytical residuals, but the highly local and context-specific nature of many concerns raised by respondents.

Everyday Access to Essential Services

Concerns about everyday access to essential services are most prominent when respondents are asked about missing services, services at risk, or changes they would like to see. Across these questions, public transport, health and care services (including GP, dental, and hospital services), and access to basic shops and amenities emerge as recurring points of concern.

At the micro-level, respondents frequently refer to specific service types — such as bus routes, leisure centres, schools, libraries, and healthcare facilities — illustrating how general categories translate into concrete, place-based experiences. These issues are framed primarily in practical terms: difficulty reaching services, reduced opportunities for work or social participation, and increasing reliance on travel or informal support.

For many respondents, access to services represents the most immediate and tangible way in which community pressures are felt in daily life. Service deficiencies are not described as isolated inconveniences, but as constraints that shape routines, opportunities, and well-being.

Community Assets and Social Fabric

Community facilities, shared spaces, and opportunities for participation feature most strongly when respondents are asked about buildings or spaces at risk, services under threat, or their awareness of planned projects. Both macro-level and micro-level analyses highlight concern about the potential loss or change of village halls, leisure centres, schools, libraries, pubs, and other community anchors.

At the micro-level, respondents often identify specific buildings or sites, reinforcing the highly local and place-specific nature of these concerns. The potential loss of physical assets

is frequently linked to wider consequences: fewer activities, reduced opportunities to meet others, and the erosion of community life.

Social connection, isolation, and cohesion appear less often as standalone topics in questions focused on services or assets, but become more prominent when respondents reflect on broader challenges and longer-term concerns. This pattern suggests that respondents tend to view social outcomes as consequences of changes to places, services, and opportunities, rather than as independent issues.

Economic and Housing Pressures

Economic conditions and housing affordability become most prominent when respondents are asked to identify the biggest challenges facing their community now and over the next 5–10 years. Jobs, cost-of-living pressures, and access to affordable housing are widely perceived as shaping who is able to live in, remain in, or move to a community.

Micro-level responses often connect these pressures to specific concerns, such as low-paid or insecure work, limited local employment opportunities, rising housing costs, and the type of housing development in the area, particularly where new provision is perceived as unaffordable or poorly aligned with local needs. These economic pressures are frequently discussed alongside service loss, declining participation, and reduced viability of local amenities.

Across questions, respondents describe economic and housing conditions as underlying influences on service sustainability, community participation, and long-term resilience, rather than as isolated problems.

Governance, Children and Young People, and Long-Term Viability

When respondents reflect on longer-term challenges or provide additional comments, issues relating to governance, funding, and decision-making become more prominent. These are often framed as explanations for why services are lost, facilities deteriorate, or communities feel unable to influence outcomes.

Children, young people, and education appear across multiple questions, but are discussed less as discrete services and more as indicators of long-term community viability. Concerns about schools, youth facilities and services, and opportunities for young people are closely linked to questions of whether communities can sustain themselves over time.

Environmental and infrastructure issues similarly feature more strongly in future-oriented responses, reflecting concern about resilience, sustainability, and cumulative pressures rather than immediate, standalone conditions.

Key Patterns Across Open-Ended Questions

The following overarching patterns emerged across the eight open-ended questions:

- Community concerns were articulated as interconnected and cumulative, with respondents consistently linking services, social outcomes, economic conditions, and governance factors rather than treating them as separate issues.
- The framing of questions shaped the nature of responses. Service-focused prompts elicited practical access concerns, while challenge-focused and future-oriented prompts elicited broader economic, social, and governance-related pressures.
- Economic conditions and governance/funding decision-making processes were widely understood as underlying influences, shaping service sustainability, participation, and long-term community viability, rather than being viewed as isolated problems.
- When asked to identify their priorities for change, respondents emphasised both tangible improvements and decision-making processes, indicating a preference for actions that strengthen access, participation, and stability over time.

To support a high-level view of how these patterns recur across the survey, Table P summarises the relative prominence of each thematic category across the eight open-ended questions. The table is intended as a visual synthesis of the preceding results, rather than as an additional layer of analysis.

Table P – Overview of High and Moderate Category Prominence

Conceptual Layers	Macro Categories	Q12	Q13	Q15	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21
Everyday Access to Essential Services	Public Transport & Connectivity	●			○		●		○
	Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	○	○		○				
	Health, Care & Well-being Services	●	○						
Community Assets and Social Fabric	Community Facilities & Assets		●	○					
	Community Life & Participation								
	Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion			●	●	●	●	○	●
Economic and Material Foundations	Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living			○	●	○	○		○
	Housing & Affordability								

Conceptual Layers	Macro Categories	Q12	Q13	Q15	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21
Structural and Future-Oriented Determinants	Children, Young People & Education	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Environment, Climate & Infrastructure								
	Governance, Funding & Decision-Making		○		○				○
Other / Miscellaneous Responses		○		●	●	●	●	●	○

● = High Prominence ○ = Moderate Prominence

Open-Ended Questions		
Question 12	Missing Community Services	Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?
Question 13	Local Services at Risk	Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?
Question 15	Local Buildings and Spaces at Risk	Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed?
Question 17	Current Challenges Facing the Community	What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?
Question 18	Future Challenges Facing the Community	What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?
Question 19	Desired Changes in the Community	If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?
Question 20	New Projects Planned in the Community	Do you know about any new projects planned for your area?
Question 21	Additional Comments	Anything else you'd like to add?

Taken together, the patterns summarised in Table O reinforce the interpretation that community concerns in Powys are both layered and frame-dependent. Some domains — most notably social connection and issues relating to children and young people — recur across a wide range of questions, indicating their pervasive relevance regardless of framing. Other domains rise to prominence primarily in response to specific prompts, such as service availability, perceived risk, or future challenges, highlighting how respondents' priorities are shaped by the context in which they are asked to reflect.

Table O also underscores the extent to which open-ended questions elicit diverse and locally specific concerns, particularly when respondents are invited to comment more freely.

Overall Patterns in Open-Ended Responses

Overall, the results indicate that community concerns in Powys are multi-level and interrelated. Immediate access to services shapes day-to-day experience, while economic conditions, governance capacity, and issues affecting children and future generations shape perceptions of longer-term sustainability.

This synthesis provides a coherent framework for interpreting responses across the eight open-ended questions and establishes a strong evidential foundation for subsequent analysis. The next stage of the analysis builds on this foundation by examining how the identified patterns vary across demographic groups.

Analysis of Demographic Differences in Responses

This subsection examines whether the themes identified in responses to the open-ended survey questions varied across selected demographic groups within the total sample. Tables 526–543 contained in Appendix H present comparisons for gender, age groups, and geographic areas. The analysis focuses on identifying differences in the relative prominence of themes across groups, rather than on explaining the reasons for those differences.

Length of residency was not included in this analysis. A preliminary review indicated that this variable was closely related to age and added limited additional insight when applied to the open-ended responses. Given the exploratory and descriptive purpose of the analysis and the volume of comparisons involved, length of residency was excluded to avoid unnecessary duplication and analytical complexity.

Gender Differences in Open-Ended Responses

Across the eight open-ended questions, analysis of Tables 526–531 indicates gender differences in both the types of issues emphasised and the way concerns were expressed.

Compared to men, women consistently reported higher levels of concern across a wider range of domains, particularly those related to health and care services, social connection, and children and young people. For example, in responses concerning missing services (Question 12), women were more likely than men to reference public transport and connectivity and health, care and well-being services (Table 526). A similar pattern appears in responses to questions concerning current challenges (Question 17), in which women more frequently cited “Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services,” “Health, Care & Well-being Services,” and “Children, Young People & Education” (Table 529).

Questions focusing on risk and vulnerability (Questions 13 and 15) show especially pronounced gender differences. Women were more likely to frame the potential loss of services or buildings in terms of community facilities, social connection, and economic consequences, whereas men’s responses tended to be more narrowly focused on specific

services or infrastructure. In responses to Question 15, for example, women referred more frequently to “Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion” and “Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living” (Table 528), indicating a stronger tendency to articulate social and economic impacts alongside physical loss.

Despite these differences, responses from women and men converged strongly on social connection as a dominant theme when discussing broader challenges and desired changes (Questions 17–19). This suggests that emphasis and framing varied by gender, while underlying concerns about cohesion and community resilience were widely shared.

Overall, gender differences generally involved variation in emphasis rather than divergence in underlying priorities, with women more consistently integrating social, care-related, and intergenerational dimensions into their responses.

Age-Group Differences in Open-Ended Responses

Across the eight open-ended questions, analysis of Tables 532–537 indicates age-related differences in both the issues emphasised and the ways concerns were articulated, reflecting distinct life-stage perspectives on community issues.

Younger respondents (under 26 and 26–40 years old) were more likely to emphasise social connection, participation, and issues pertaining to children and education, particularly in responses concerning missing services and current challenges (Tables 532 and 535). Among respondents 26–40 years old, references to “Community Life & Participation” and to “Children, Young People & Education” were especially prominent, suggesting concern with family and child-related services and opportunities for engagement.

Middle-aged respondents (41–70 years old) showed the highest overall levels of concern across many domains. This group most frequently mentioned health and care services, community facilities, economic pressures, and governance-related issues, particularly in responses pertaining to services at risk and future challenges (Tables 533 and 536). Their responses were also the most differentiated, reflecting attention to a wider range of issues and a clearer distinction between immediate pressures and longer-term sustainability concerns.

Older respondents (over 70 years old) placed relatively greater emphasis on health and care services, social connection, and community facilities, while housing and employment-related concerns were less prominent. In responses to future-oriented Question 18, this group indicated particularly strong concern for social connection and for children and young people, indicating an outward-looking focus on community continuity rather than personal need (Table 536).

Across all age groups, “Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion” emerged as a consistently prominent theme, although its framing differed by age group. Among younger respondents it was often linked to participation and belonging, while among older respondents it was more frequently associated with vulnerability and loss.

Geographic Differences in Open-Ended Responses

Across the eight open-ended questions, analysis of Tables 538–543 indicates geographic differences in both the issues emphasised and the ways concerns were articulated, with some concerns linked to local circumstances and others shared across all four geographic areas.

Public transport, health and well-being services, and social connection recurred as prominent themes in all locations, though their relative prominence varied. For example, missing health services were particularly salient in Llandrindod Wells, while transport-related concerns were more prominent in Welshpool and Brecon (Table 538).

Responses concerning services, buildings, and spaces at risk (Questions 13 and 15) varied notably by location. Community facilities and assets were cited more frequently in Llandrindod Wells and Welshpool, whereas respondents in Brecon mentioned governance and funding issues (Tables 539 and 540) more frequently. This suggests differences not only in local conditions but also in how respondents interpreted the causes of vulnerability.

When asked about current and future challenges (Questions 17 and 18), respondents across all areas converged strongly on social connection and economic pressures, though emphasis differed by location. Housing affordability featured more prominently in Brecon and Welshpool, while governance-related concerns were more salient in Llandrindod Wells and Newtown (Tables 541 and 542).

Responses to Question 19, which addressed desired changes, indicated a shared appetite across locations for improvements that strengthen connectivity, participation, and decision-making processes, even when specific local priorities differed.

Summary of Demographic Group Differences

Geographic differences in open-ended responses reflected variation in the prominence of themes and in how concerns were framed, rather than differences in underlying priorities. Across all four geographic areas, respondents consistently highlighted public transport, health and well-being services, social connection, and economic pressures as prominent issues. However, the salience of these issues varied by location, reflecting local circumstances and conditions.

Differences by geographic area were most pronounced in responses concerning services, buildings, and spaces at risk, and in how respondents described and framed vulnerability and challenge. In some areas, concerns focused primarily on the availability and loss of community facilities, while in other areas respondents placed greater emphasis on governance, funding, and decision-making processes. By contrast, when discussing current challenges and desired changes, respondents across all locations converged on similar themes — particularly social connection, participation, and economic pressures — even when specific local priorities differed.

Overall, geographic differences reflected the way broadly shared structural pressures were expressed in local contexts. While the specific concerns varied across geographic areas, they pointed to similar underlying challenges throughout Powys.

Section 6: Interpretation and Conclusions

Purpose

This section brings together all survey findings to describe how people currently experience community life in Powys, what they value most, and what concerns them about the future.

It focuses on patterns that emerge when the survey findings are considered as a whole. When similar patterns appear across different questions, they carry particular weight in the interpretation. When findings differ or are less consistent, those differences are noted and interpreted with appropriate caution.

Key Considerations and Limitations

Two important considerations should be kept in mind regarding the major conclusions.

First, participation in the survey was voluntary, and women and older residents are over-represented relative to the adult population. This over-representation probably influences the prominence of certain themes, particularly care, social connection, and service sustainability. The observed patterns in the data are still meaningful, but they reflect the voices of those who chose to participate in the survey.

Second, the most prominent findings are interconnected rather than isolated. Transport issues affect access to healthcare and opportunities for community participation; economic circumstances influence whether services remain viable; the loss of facilities is described in terms of its impact on social connection and community life; and concerns about governance are often used to explain why problems persist. The survey's value lies in revealing these overlapping and reinforcing challenges, not simply in identifying individual issues.

Major Conclusions

Conclusion 1

Many people feel positive about life in their community now, but they are uncertain about what lies ahead.

Throughout the survey, respondents described their current communities in largely positive terms. Levels of reported happiness were generally high, and many people expressed satisfaction with day-to-day life where they live.

However, views about the future were noticeably more cautious. When asked to think ahead, people were more likely to express uncertainty, neutrality, or concern — particularly in some geographic areas.

This contrast suggests that communities are widely seen as good places to live now, but there is uncertainty about whether this will continue in the face of future challenges and pressures.

The open-ended responses help explain uncertainty about the future. When respondents talked about challenges, risks, and desired changes, they frequently referred to issues regarding community services, affordability, social connection, and the ability of communities to cope with change. These comments indicate that concerns about the future are practical rather than abstract, focusing on whether the services and facilities that support everyday community life can be sustained over time.

Conclusion 2

Feeling connected to others is central to how people judge the health of their community.

Social connection emerged repeatedly as a core concern in responses to the open-ended questions. People did not describe isolation and community cohesion as just one issue among many; instead, these concerns shaped how they talked about services, buildings, risks, and change.

When respondents were asked to indicate what was missing, what was at risk, or what they wanted to see change, concerns about isolation, loss of shared spaces, and weakening community ties consistently came to the surface. Buildings and services mattered not only in

their own right, but because of what they support — daily contact, informal support, shared activities, and a sense of belonging.

In this way, social connection functions as a kind of barometer for community well-being. For many respondents, the question is not simply whether services exist, but whether the community still feels connected and able to support people through different stages of life.

Conclusion 3
Transport stands out as the most persistent challenge shaping daily life and opportunities.

Transport and connectivity stand out more clearly than any other area of concern in the survey. This issue appears repeatedly as a source of dissatisfaction in the closed-ended responses and as a priority for change in the open-ended responses.

Most importantly, transport is rarely described as a minor inconvenience. Respondents associate it directly with access to healthcare, shops, social activities, education, employment, and community participation. For older residents, transport affects independence and social contact; for younger people and families, it shapes access to services and opportunities.

Seen in this light, transport is not simply another service; it is a condition that underpins access, participation, and connection across many areas of life. Therefore, problems with transport have detrimental ripple effects that undermine economic activity, social inclusion, and community resilience.

Conclusion 4
People value services because they matter to the community, even if they do not use them personally.

Respondents often consider services to be important even if they do not use them personally. This reflects a broader concern for how those services support the community as a whole.

In their written responses about transport services, services for children and young people, and community facilities, respondents consistently emphasise the wider role these services

play in sustaining community life. Respondents tend to frame risks and gaps regarding these services in terms of their impact on the community as a whole, rather than in terms of personal inconvenience.

This way of framing service risks and gaps reflects a shared understanding that communities rely on a network of services to support different groups at different times. People recognise that services they do not currently use may still be essential for others — or for themselves in the future. Concern about service loss therefore reflects a wider sense of collective dependence and shared vulnerability, not just individual need.

Conclusion 5
Concern for children and young people reflects deeper worries about the long-term viability of communities.

Concerns about children, young people, and education are raised repeatedly across the open-ended responses, particularly in comments regarding missing services, services at risk, future challenges, and desired changes.

Such concerns are rarely framed narrowly. Respondents often consider services for children and young people as central to decisions about whether families remain locally, whether young people choose to stay or leave, and the future viability of communities.

Responses to the closed-ended questions support this interpretation. Services associated with children and community infrastructure are rated as important by many respondents, regardless of whether they use them personally. This suggests that services for younger people are widely seen as an indicator of long-term community viability, not just a matter for families with children.

Conclusion 6
Economic conditions and housing costs place an ongoing strain on community life.

Although transport is the most visible single issue, many responses also point to the cost of living, employment opportunities, and housing affordability as factors that substantially shape everyday community experience.

Respondents frequently describe these challenges as influencing a range of related issues, including whether people can remain in the area, whether local services remain viable, and whether individuals can afford to participate fully in community life. Economic strain is not treated as separate from service-related issues; it is presented as intensifying those pressures and increasing the risk that they will worsen over time.

In this sense, economic and housing challenges act as amplifiers; they intensify the impact of service gaps and make social connection more fragile, particularly for younger households and those on lower incomes.

Conclusion 7

Concerns about how decisions are made, who makes them, and how quickly change occurs indicate frustration with the direction and pace of change.

Governance, funding, and decision-making are most often raised in connection with questions regarding long-term risks, future challenges, and desired change.

Rather than being raised as abstract political concerns, these issues are often mentioned as explanations for why problems persist or why communities feel unable to influence outcomes. Respondents often describe a disconnect between local needs and the systems that shape decisions about services, facilities, and investments.

This way of expressing concern does not imply institutional failure. Rather, it reflects how respondents experience decision-making in practice: whether they feel heard, whether change is responsive to need, and whether issues are addressed in time.

Conclusion 8

People's age makes a real difference to what matters most to them in their day-to-day community life.

People's age greatly influences how they experience their community: what they value, how they use services, what they worry about, and how they think about the future.

The open-ended survey responses show clear life-stage patterns. Younger respondents focus more on participation, belonging, services for children, and education. Middle-aged

respondents raise a wide range of concerns about current challenges and future risks. Older respondents place greater emphasis on health, care, and social connection, and they express concerns about vulnerability and continued access to support.

The differences in emphasis among younger, middle-aged, and older respondents are not simply matters of personal preference. They reflect how people’s circumstances change over time, including their responsibilities, their level of independence, and the kinds of support they rely on. This helps explain why similar underlying issues appear across responses to multiple questions, even though they are prioritised and expressed in different ways.

Conclusion 9
Men and women tend to value similar aspects of community life, but they place different levels of emphasis on specific concerns and services.

Overall, women and men report similar experiences of community life in terms of what they like, dislike, and use. Gender differences are reflected primarily in assessments of what matters most and in how risks and losses are articulated.

Women are more likely to mention a wider range of services and community assets as important and to frame potential loss in terms of social, care-related, and intergenerational consequences. Men’s responses more often focus on specific services or infrastructure.

Nevertheless, both women and men place strong emphasis on social connection in their comments regarding broader challenges and desired change. This indicates shared priorities, with differences in how those priorities are expressed.

Conclusion 10
People across Powys tend to care about the same core issues, but where they live affects how those challenges are experienced and described.

Across Powys, respondents repeatedly bring up the same core issues: transport, health and well-being services, social connection, and economic pressures. What differs by location is the intensity of these challenges and the way they are described.

In responses to closed-ended questions, some geographic differences are indicated in reported likes, dislikes, and service use, while views about what matters most and about

overall well-being are more consistent. In the open-ended responses, respondents describe vulnerability differently depending on location, with varying emphasis on missing services, particular facilities, and governance or funding concerns.

Overall, the findings show that communities across Powys face many of the same challenges, but experience them differently depending on local assets, access to services, and how responsive local decision processes are to community needs.

Overall Interpretation

The survey paints a picture of communities in Powys as places people care deeply about and value highly, particularly for their social and environmental qualities. At the same time, responses reveal a shared concern about whether those strengths can be maintained in the face of practical, economic, and institutional challenges.

People evaluate services, facilities, and local change not just in terms of convenience, but in terms of what they make possible: access, participation, connection, and continuity across generations. Community life is viewed as interdependent; difficulties in one area often affect other areas.

The recommendations in this report are based on the view that people see their community as an interconnected whole, where services, facilities, social connection, and economic conditions affect one another. This perspective explains why certain issues carry particular weight, why similar concerns appear across responses to different questions, and how challenges are experienced in everyday community life.

Section 7: Recommendations

Purpose and Approach

The recommendations in this section are grounded in the survey findings and the conclusions drawn from them. The findings show that respondents experience community life in Powys as interconnected, place-based, and shaped by access to services, social connection, economic conditions, and decision-making processes.

The recommendations do not involve a list of specific interventions. Instead, they focus on strategy and the big picture. They are meant to support more effective planning, coordination, and investment across different sectors and governance levels, while recognising that approaches will need to vary to reflect different local circumstances.

Across the survey, respondents consistently raised the same core priorities, including transport, health and well-being, social connection, affordability, and services for children and young people. While these issues are experienced in different ways across places and groups, the underlying concerns are widely shared. Therefore, the recommendations are intended to encourage better coordination and more responsive decision-making, rather than treating issues in isolation.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1
Design services around how people actually use them in different communities.

The findings show that people across Powys tend to care about the same core issues, but experience them in different ways depending on local assets, access to services, life stage, and demographic characteristics. This pattern suggests that the main challenge is not disagreement about priorities, but differences in how those priorities are experienced in everyday life.

Therefore, decision-making and planning processes should place greater emphasis on using local and demographic evidence to shape how services are delivered, accessed, and communicated. This means recognising the following:

- The same service can function very differently in different places, depending on transport links, demographic profile, and existing infrastructure.
- People at different stages of life use services in different ways and rely on different kinds of community support.
- Differences in how people experience services do not mean that government needs different strategies; they mean that the same strategies need to be put into practice in ways that reflect local needs.

Shared priorities can be addressed without a one-size-fits-all approach by ensuring services meet local needs and reflect local circumstances.

Recommendation 2

Make transport and connectivity central to decisions about community services and access.

Transport and connectivity stand out as the most persistent concerns raised in the survey. Respondents consistently associate transport with access to healthcare, shops, employment, education, social activities, and participation in community life. Problems with transport are not described as isolated inconveniences, but as barriers that affect independence, opportunity, and social connection.

For this reason, transport should not be treated as a standalone service. Decisions about transport should be considered alongside decisions about health, employment, education, and community services. Transport plays a key role in whether people can access what they need in daily life.

When transport is built into planning and investment decisions across these areas, services are more likely to work as intended. Where connectivity is poor, even well-designed services can become difficult to reach, reducing their value and weakening the resilience of communities.

Recommendation 3

Improve people’s health and well-being by placing greater emphasis on prevention and on the conditions that support daily life.

Health and well-being are consistently mentioned as high priorities in the survey. Respondents tend to describe well-being in broad, everyday terms rather than purely clinical ones. Social connection, access to shared spaces, and opportunities to participate in community life are central to how people judge the health of their community.

Therefore, strategies to improve health and well-being should place greater emphasis on prevention and on approaches rooted in community life. This includes recognising the importance of:

- Social infrastructure, such as community spaces and local activities, in reducing isolation and supporting mental wellbeing
- Access to everyday services in maintaining independence and quality of life
- More coordinated decisions about health, transport, housing, and community development policies

This approach takes account of how people understand wellbeing in everyday life, recognising that it is shaped not only by health services, but by everyday connection, activity, and support within the community.

Recommendation 4

Treat community spaces and shared assets as essential to strong, resilient communities.

People consistently emphasise the importance of community facilities, shared spaces, and local assets, particularly when describing what they feel is at risk or what they would like to see change. These places matter not only because they provide access to services, but because they support social connection, informal support, and a sense of belonging.

Therefore, community buildings, facilities, and shared spaces should be treated as essential infrastructure for resilient communities, rather than as optional or peripheral assets. Decisions about these spaces should take into account:

- The cumulative effect of losing shared spaces on participation, social cohesion, and community life
- The role of community assets in supporting people at different stages of life
- The importance of places that enable informal social contact alongside formal services

Protecting and sustaining these spaces helps maintain the social fabric that supports well-being.

Recommendation 5

Address affordability pressures that threaten the long-term health and sustainability of communities.

Economic conditions, cost-of-living challenges, and housing affordability are repeatedly described as factors that determine who can remain in a community, who can participate fully in local life, and whether services can be sustained. These pressures are rarely described in isolation; instead, they are seen as making everyday life more difficult and other challenges harder to manage over time.

As a result, affordability needs to be treated as an issue that affects the long-term sustainability of communities. Affordability shows up in ordinary, everyday expenses — especially housing, energy, and transport — and its impact varies by people’s circumstances and where they live.

Recognising affordability as an underlying risk to community sustainability helps ensure that efforts to strengthen communities do not inadvertently exclude those most affected by rising costs.

Recommendation 6

Respond to age and gender differences through service design, rather than treating them as competing priorities.

The survey shows that people of different ages and genders emphasise different things, while sharing the same underlying concerns. Younger individuals tend to place more emphasis on participation, education, and services for children and young people, while

older individuals place more emphasis on health, care, and social connection. Women also tend to regard a wider range of services and community assets as important.

These differences reflect people's circumstances and stages of life, rather than competing priorities or conflicting views about what matters. Across groups, respondents consistently point to the same core issues, even though they describe them from different perspectives.

The evidence does not suggest that different groups require different strategies to address their needs. Rather, it highlights the importance of paying closer attention to how services are designed, communicated, and accessed. Differences by age and gender should guide decisions about delivery and engagement, while maintaining a shared strategic direction.

Approaching differences in this way helps avoid fragmented or siloed services and supports policies that are inclusive, coherent, and recognisable to different groups within a shared framework.

Recommendation 7

Make decision-making more responsive and visible to communities.

Concerns about governance, funding, and decision-making emerge most strongly when people reflect on long-term risks, future challenges, and the changes they would like to see. These concerns are often framed in terms of responsiveness: whether communities feel heard, whether decisions address local needs, and whether action happens in time to make a difference.

Making decision-making more responsive to communities means going beyond one-off consultation and making responsiveness visible through:

- Clear communication about how community views have been considered and used in decisions
- Regular review of priorities, with visible adjustments when circumstances or needs change
- Engagement approaches that support ongoing dialogue, rather than isolated or infrequent communication exercises

Making decision-making more transparent and responsive can help build trust and a sense of shared ownership. Both are essential to maintaining confidence in local decision-making and sustaining community involvement over time.

Concluding Observations

These recommendations reflect the central message of the survey responses: people across Powys care deeply about their communities and share common priorities, but they experience challenges through different local and personal lenses.

Community life is understood as interconnected, with issues such as transport, housing, social connection, and economic conditions influencing one another rather than operating in isolation.

Addressing these challenges effectively requires coordination across governance levels and sectors, sensitivity to place and life stage, and a commitment to using people's input to guide decision-making. By aligning policy, planning, and investment with community involvement, all stakeholders can better support resilient, inclusive, and sustainable communities across Powys.

Appendix A — Frequency Tables

Appendix A – Frequency Tables

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Tables 1 - 9	Demographic Variables	2 - 5
Tables 10 - 13	Current Happiness & Community's Future Outlook	6 - 7
Tables 14 -21	Like Aspects of Community	7 - 9
Tables 22 -29	Dislike Aspects of Community	9 - 11
Tables 30 - 47	Use Services	11 -15
Tables 48 - 65	Services Rated as Important	16 - 20
Tables 66 - 83	What Matters Most	20 - 25
Tables 84 - 91	People Responding to Open-Ended Questions	25 - 27
Tables 92 - 103	Missing Services – Themes Mentioned	27 - 31
Tables 104 - 115	Services at Risk – Themes Mentioned	31 - 35
Tables 116 - 127	Buildings and Spaces at Risk – Themes Mentioned	35 - 39
Tables 128 - 139	Current Community Challenges – Themes Mentioned	39 - 43
Tables 140 - 151	Future Community Challenges – Themes Mentioned	43 - 47
Tables 152 - 163	Priority Changes – Themes Mentioned	47 - 51
Tables 164 - 175	Planned Projects – Themes Mentioned	51 - 55
Tables 176 - 187	Other Comments – Themes Mentioned	55 - 59
Tables 188 - 205	Importance – Use Gap Per Service	59 - 65
Tables 205 - 213	Like – Dislike Gap Per Aspect of Community	66 - 67

Table 1 -- Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	1208	98.1	98.1	98.1
	Welsh	24	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 2A -- Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Woman / Girl	826	67.0	67.0	67.0
	Man / Boy	361	29.3	29.3	96.3
	Transgender Woman / Girl	2	.2	.2	96.5
	Transgender Man / Boy	2	.2	.2	96.7
	Non-Binary	10	.8	.8	97.5
	Other	24	1.9	1.9	99.4
	Prefer Not to Say	7	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 2B -- Gender Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	826	67.0	69.6	69.6
	Male	361	29.3	30.4	100.0
	Total	1187	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	45	3.7		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 3A -- Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	< 16 Years Old	19	1.5	1.5	1.5
	16 - 18 Years Old	18	1.5	1.5	3.0
	19 - 25 Years Old	43	3.5	3.5	6.5
	26 - 40 Years Old	138	11.2	11.2	17.7
	41 - 70 Years Old	677	55.0	55.0	72.6
	> 70 Years Old	337	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 3B -- Age Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	< 26 Years Old	80	6.5	6.5	6.5
	26 - 40 Years Old	138	11.2	11.2	17.7
	41 - 70 Years Old	677	55.0	55.0	72.6
	> 70 Years Old	337	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 -- Nationality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Welsh	456	37.0	37.0	37.0
	British	194	15.7	15.7	52.8
	English	537	43.6	43.6	96.3
	Other	45	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 -- Nationality Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Welsh	456	37.0	38.4	38.4
	British	194	15.7	16.3	54.8
	English	537	43.6	45.2	100.0
	Total	1187	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	45	3.7		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 6 -- Residence

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Brecon	195	15.8	15.8	15.8
	Crickhowell	50	4.1	4.1	19.9
	Hay-on-Wye	75	6.1	6.1	26.0
	Talgarth	86	7.0	7.0	33.0
	Builth Wells	71	5.8	5.8	38.7
	Llanwrtyd Wells	27	2.2	2.2	40.9
	Knighton	85	6.9	6.9	47.8
	Presteigne	62	5.0	5.0	52.8
	Llandrindod Wells	100	8.1	8.1	61.0
	Rhayader	38	3.1	3.1	64.0
	Llanfyllin	72	5.8	5.8	69.9
	Llanidloes	51	4.1	4.1	74.0
	Newtown	101	8.2	8.2	82.2
	Machynlleth	35	2.8	2.8	85.1
	Llanfair Caerinion	45	3.7	3.7	88.7
	Welshpool	58	4.7	4.7	93.4
	Montgomery	29	2.4	2.4	95.8
	Ystradgynlais	52	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 -- Geographic Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Brecon	458	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Llandrindod Wells	383	31.1	31.1	68.3
	Newtown	232	18.8	18.8	87.1
	Welshpool	159	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Brecon = Brecon, Crickhowell, Hay-on-Wye, Talgarth, Ystradgynlais

Llandrindod Wells = Builth Wells, Knighton, Llandrindod Wells, Llanwrtyd Wells, Presteigne, Rhayader

Newtown = Llanfair Caereinion, Llanidloes, Machynlleth, Newtown

Welshpool = Llanfyllin, Montgomery, Welshpool

Table 8 -- Length of Residency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	22	1.8	1.8	1.8
	< 1 Year	53	4.3	4.3	6.1
	1 - 5 Years	166	13.5	13.5	19.6
	5 - 10 Years	227	18.4	18.4	38.0
	10 - 15 Years	202	16.4	16.4	54.4
	> 15 Years	562	45.6	45.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 9 -- Length of Residency Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	< 5 Years	219	17.8	18.1	18.1
	5 - 10 Years	227	18.4	18.8	36.9
	10 - 15 Years	202	16.4	16.7	53.6
	> 15 Years	562	45.6	46.4	100.0
	Total	1210	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	22	1.8		

Total	1232	100.0		
-------	------	-------	--	--

Table 10 -- Current Level of Happiness

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unhappy	7	.6	.6	.6
	Unhappy	47	3.8	3.9	4.5
	Neutral	176	14.3	14.5	19.0
	Happy	636	51.6	52.4	71.4
	Very Happy	347	28.2	28.6	100.0
	Total	1213	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	19	1.5		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 11 -- Current Level of Happiness Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unhappy / Neutral	230	18.7	19.0	19.0
	Happy	636	51.6	52.4	71.4
	Very Happy	347	28.2	28.6	100.0
	Total	1213	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	19	1.5		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 12 -- Feelings About Community's Future

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unhappy	34	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Unhappy	178	14.4	14.7	17.5
	Neutral	485	39.4	40.1	57.7

	Happy	447	36.3	37.0	94.7
	Very Happy	64	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 13 -- Feelings About Community's Future Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unhappy	212	17.2	17.5	17.5
	Neutral	485	39.4	40.1	57.7
	Happy	511	41.5	42.3	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 14 -- Like Sense of Community

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	388	31.5	31.5	31.5
	Selected	844	68.5	68.5	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 15 -- Like Access to Nature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	253	20.5	20.5	20.5
	Selected	979	79.5	79.5	100.0

	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
--	-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 16 -- Like Local Events and Activities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	551	44.7	44.7	44.7
	Selected	681	55.3	55.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 -- Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	893	72.5	72.5	72.5
	Selected	339	27.5	27.5	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 18 -- Like Local Shops and Amenities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	698	56.7	56.7	56.7
	Selected	534	43.3	43.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 19 -- Like Public Transport Links

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1022	83.0	83.0	83.0

	Selected	210	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 20 -- Like That Family Lives Nearby

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	789	64.0	64.0	64.0
	Selected	443	36.0	36.0	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 21 -- Like Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1136	92.2	92.2	92.2
	Selected	96	7.8	7.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 22 -- Dislike Sense of Community

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1151	93.4	93.4	93.4
	Selected	81	6.6	6.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 23 -- Dislike Access to Nature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Not Selected	1203	97.6	97.6	97.6
	Selected	29	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 24 -- Dislike Local Events and Activities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1131	91.8	91.8	91.8
	Selected	101	8.2	8.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 25 -- Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	848	68.8	68.8	68.8
	Selected	384	31.2	31.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 26 -- Dislike Local Shops and Amenities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	944	76.6	76.6	76.6
	Selected	288	23.4	23.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 27 -- Dislike Public Transport Links

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	539	43.8	43.8	43.8
	Selected	693	56.3	56.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 28 -- Dislike That Family Lives Nearby

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1167	94.7	94.7	94.7
	Selected	65	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 29 -- Dislike Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	830	67.4	67.4	67.4
	Selected	402	32.6	32.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 30 -- Used: GP / Health Centre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	372	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Selected	860	69.8	69.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 31 -- Used: Dentist

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	802	65.1	65.1	65.1
	Selected	430	34.9	34.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 32 -- Used: Pharmacy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	489	39.7	39.7	39.7
	Selected	743	60.3	60.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 33 -- Used: Public Transport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	935	75.9	75.9	75.9
	Selected	297	24.1	24.1	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 34 -- Used: Community Transport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1160	94.2	94.2	94.2
	Selected	72	5.8	5.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 35 -- Used: Community Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	780	63.3	63.3	63.3
	Selected	452	36.7	36.7	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 36 -- Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	883	71.7	71.7	71.7
	Selected	349	28.3	28.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 37 -- Used: Local Schools / Childcare

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1025	83.2	83.2	83.2
	Selected	207	16.8	16.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 38 -- Used: Community Centre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	953	77.4	77.4	77.4
	Selected	279	22.6	22.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 39 -- Used: Council Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	469	38.1	38.1	38.1
	Selected	763	61.9	61.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 40 -- Used: Local Shops / Post Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	347	28.2	28.2	28.2
	Selected	885	71.8	71.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 41 -- Used: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1143	92.8	92.8	92.8
	Selected	89	7.2	7.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 42 -- Used: Places of Worship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1029	83.5	83.5	83.5
	Selected	203	16.5	16.5	100.0

	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
--	-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 43 -- Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1154	93.7	93.7	93.7
	Selected	78	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 44 -- Used: Library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	847	68.8	68.8	68.8
	Selected	385	31.3	31.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 45 -- Used: Village Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	794	64.4	64.4	64.4
	Selected	438	35.6	35.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 46 -- Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1127	91.5	91.5	91.5

	Selected	105	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 47 -- Used: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1133	92.0	92.0	92.0
	Selected	99	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 48 -- Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	227	18.4	18.4	18.4
	Selected	1005	81.6	81.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 49 -- Rated Important: Use Dentist

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	348	28.2	28.2	28.2
	Selected	884	71.8	71.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 50 -- Rated Important: Use Pharmacy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Not Selected	323	26.2	26.2	26.2
	Selected	909	73.8	73.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 51 -- Rated Important: Use Public Transport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	318	25.8	25.8	25.8
	Selected	914	74.2	74.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 52 -- Rated Important: Use Community Transport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	499	40.5	40.5	40.5
	Selected	733	59.5	59.5	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 53 -- Rated Important: Community Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	551	44.7	44.7	44.7
	Selected	681	55.3	55.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 54 -- Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	458	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Selected	774	62.8	62.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 55 -- Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	424	34.4	34.4	34.4
	Selected	808	65.6	65.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 56 -- Rated Important: Community Centre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	523	42.5	42.5	42.5
	Selected	709	57.5	57.5	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 57 -- Rated Important: Council Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	404	32.8	32.8	32.8
	Selected	828	67.2	67.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 58 -- Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	315	25.6	25.6	25.6
	Selected	917	74.4	74.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 59 -- Rated Important: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	555	45.0	45.0	45.0
	Selected	677	55.0	55.0	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 60 -- Rated Important: Places of Worship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	633	51.4	52.4	52.4
	Selected	575	46.7	47.6	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 61 -- Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	580	47.1	48.0	48.0
	Selected	628	51.0	52.0	100.0

	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 62 -- Rated Important: Library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	463	37.6	37.6	37.6
	Selected	769	62.4	62.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 63 -- Rated Important: Village Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	532	43.2	43.2	43.2
	Selected	700	56.8	56.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 64 -- Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	463	37.6	37.6	37.6
	Selected	769	62.4	62.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 65 -- Rated Important: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1135	92.1	92.1	92.1
	Selected	97	7.9	7.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 66 -- What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	414	33.6	33.6	33.6
	Selected	818	66.4	66.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 67 -- What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	783	63.6	63.6	63.6
	Selected	449	36.4	36.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 68 -- What Matters Most: Village Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	700	56.8	56.8	56.8
	Selected	532	43.2	43.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 69 -- What Matters Most: Community Centre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	726	58.9	58.9	58.9
	Selected	506	41.1	41.1	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 70 -- What Matters Most: Library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	645	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Selected	587	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 71 -- What Matters Most: Sports Centre / Leisure Facility

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	728	59.1	59.1	59.1
	Selected	504	40.9	40.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 72 -- What Matters Most: Local Shop

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	435	35.3	35.3	35.3
	Selected	797	64.7	64.7	100.0

	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
--	-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 73 -- What Matters Most: Place of Worship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	929	75.4	75.4	75.4
	Selected	303	24.6	24.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 74 -- What Matters Most: School / College

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	810	65.7	65.7	65.7
	Selected	422	34.3	34.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 75 -- What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	317	25.7	25.7	25.7
	Selected	915	74.3	74.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 76 -- What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	941	76.4	76.4	76.4

	Selected	291	23.6	23.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 77 -- What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	499	40.5	40.5	40.5
	Selected	733	59.5	59.5	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 78 -- What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub (Bus, Train)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	697	56.6	56.6	56.6
	Selected	535	43.4	43.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 79 -- What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	880	71.4	71.4	71.4
	Selected	352	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 80 -- What Matters Most: Local Market

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Not Selected	758	61.5	62.7	62.7
	Selected	450	36.5	37.3	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 81 -- What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	867	70.4	71.8	71.8
	Selected	341	27.7	28.2	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 82 -- What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	590	47.9	48.8	48.8
	Selected	618	50.2	51.2	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 83 -- What Matters Most: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	1130	91.7	93.5	93.5
	Selected	78	6.3	6.5	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 84 -- Response Provided to Question 12?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	303	24.6	24.6	24.6
	Yes	929	75.4	75.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 85 -- Response Provided to Question 13?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	458	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Yes	774	62.8	62.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 86 -- Response Provided to Question 15?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	666	54.1	54.1	54.1
	Yes	566	45.9	45.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 87 -- Response Provided to Question 17?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	185	15.0	15.0	15.0
	Yes	1047	85.0	85.0	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 88 -- Response Provided to Question 18?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	219	17.8	17.8	17.8
	Yes	1013	82.2	82.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 89 -- Response Provided to Question 19?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	343	27.8	27.8	27.8
	Yes	889	72.2	72.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 90 -- Response Provided to Question 20?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	459	37.3	37.3	37.3
	Yes	773	62.7	62.7	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 91 -- Response Provided to Question 21?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	No	773	62.7	62.7	62.7
	Yes	459	37.3	37.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 92 -- Missing Services: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	645	52.4	69.4	69.4
	Theme Mentioned	284	23.1	30.6	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 93 -- Missing Services: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	770	62.5	82.9	82.9
	Theme Mentioned	159	12.9	17.1	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 94 -- Missing Services: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	681	55.3	73.3	73.3
	Theme Mentioned	248	20.1	26.7	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 95 -- Missing Services: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	843	68.4	90.7	90.7
	Theme Mentioned	86	7.0	9.3	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 96 -- Missing Services: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	802	65.1	86.3	86.3
	Theme Mentioned	127	10.3	13.7	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 97 -- Missing Services: Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	922	74.8	99.2	99.2
	Theme Mentioned	7	.6	.8	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 98 -- Missing Services: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	887	72.0	95.5	95.5
	Theme Mentioned	42	3.4	4.5	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 99 -- Missing Services: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	914	74.2	98.4	98.4
	Theme Mentioned	15	1.2	1.6	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 100 -- Missing Services: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	791	64.2	85.1	85.1
	Theme Mentioned	138	11.2	14.9	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 101 -- Missing Services: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	890	72.2	95.8	95.8
	Theme Mentioned	39	3.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 102 -- Missing Services: Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	891	72.3	95.9	95.9
	Theme Mentioned	38	3.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 103 -- Missing Services: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	760	61.7	81.8	81.8
	Theme Mentioned	169	13.7	18.2	100.0
	Total	929	75.4	100.0	
Missing	System	303	24.6		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 104 -- Services at Risk: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	687	55.8	88.8	88.8
	Theme Mentioned	87	7.1	11.2	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 105 -- Services at Risk: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	610	49.5	78.8	78.8
	Theme Mentioned	164	13.3	21.2	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 106 -- Services at Risk: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	604	49.0	78.0	78.0
	Theme Mentioned	170	13.8	22.0	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 107 -- Services at Risk: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	597	48.5	77.1	77.1
	Theme Mentioned	177	14.4	22.9	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 108 -- Services at Risk: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	722	58.6	93.3	93.3
	Theme Mentioned	52	4.2	6.7	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 109 -- Services at Risk: Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	769	62.4	99.4	99.4
	Theme Mentioned	5	.4	.6	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 110 -- Services at Risk: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	721	58.5	93.2	93.2
	Theme Mentioned	53	4.3	6.8	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 111 -- Services at Risk: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	765	62.1	98.8	98.8
	Theme Mentioned	9	.7	1.2	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 112 -- Services at Risk: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	635	51.5	82.0	82.0
	Theme Mentioned	139	11.3	18.0	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 113 -- Services at Risk: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	751	61.0	97.0	97.0
	Theme Mentioned	23	1.9	3.0	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 114 -- Services at Risk: Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	682	55.4	88.1	88.1
	Theme Mentioned	92	7.5	11.9	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 115 -- Services at Risk: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	763	61.9	98.6	98.6
	Theme Mentioned	11	.9	1.4	100.0
	Total	774	62.8	100.0	
Missing	System	458	37.2		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 116 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	488	39.6	86.2	86.2
	Theme Mentioned	78	6.3	13.8	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 117 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	513	41.6	90.6	90.6
	Theme Mentioned	53	4.3	9.4	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 118 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	520	42.2	91.9	91.9
	Theme Mentioned	46	3.7	8.1	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 119 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	437	35.5	77.2	77.2
	Theme Mentioned	129	10.5	22.8	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 120 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	552	44.8	97.5	97.5
	Theme Mentioned	14	1.1	2.5	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 121 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	349	28.3	61.7	61.7
	Theme Mentioned	217	17.6	38.3	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 122 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	481	39.0	85.0	85.0
	Theme Mentioned	85	6.9	15.0	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 123 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	539	43.8	95.2	95.2
	Theme Mentioned	27	2.2	4.8	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 124 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	445	36.1	78.6	78.6
	Theme Mentioned	121	9.8	21.4	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 125 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	558	45.3	98.6	98.6
	Theme Mentioned	8	.6	1.4	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 126 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	486	39.4	85.9	85.9
	Theme Mentioned	80	6.5	14.1	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 127 -- Buildings / Spaces at Risk: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	417	33.8	73.7	73.7
	Theme Mentioned	149	12.1	26.3	100.0
	Total	566	45.9	100.0	
Missing	System	666	54.1		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 128 -- Current Community Challenge: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	820	66.6	78.3	78.3
	Theme Mentioned	227	18.4	21.7	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 129 -- Current Community Challenge: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	816	66.2	77.9	77.9
	Theme Mentioned	231	18.8	22.1	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 130 -- Current Community Challenge: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	897	72.8	85.7	85.7
	Theme Mentioned	150	12.2	14.3	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 131 -- Current Community Challenge: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	946	76.8	90.4	90.4
	Theme Mentioned	101	8.2	9.6	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 132 -- Current Community Challenge: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	1002	81.3	95.7	95.7
	Theme Mentioned	45	3.7	4.3	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 133 -- Current Community Challenge: Social Connection, Isolation, & Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	688	55.8	65.7	65.7
	Theme Mentioned	359	29.1	34.3	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 134 -- Current Community Challenge: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	783	63.6	74.8	74.8
	Theme Mentioned	264	21.4	25.2	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 135 -- Current Community Challenge: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	950	77.1	90.7	90.7
	Theme Mentioned	97	7.9	9.3	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 136 -- Current Community Challenge: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	794	64.4	75.8	75.8
	Theme Mentioned	253	20.5	24.2	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 137 -- Current Community Challenge: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	969	78.7	92.6	92.6
	Theme Mentioned	78	6.3	7.4	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 138 -- Current Community Challenge: Governance, Funding, & Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	853	69.2	81.5	81.5
	Theme Mentioned	194	15.7	18.5	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 139 -- Current Community Challenge: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	669	54.3	63.9	63.9
	Theme Mentioned	378	30.7	36.1	100.0
	Total	1047	85.0	100.0	
Missing	System	185	15.0		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 140 -- Future Community Challenge: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	870	70.6	86.0	86.0
	Theme Mentioned	142	11.5	14.0	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 141 -- Future Community Challenge: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	931	75.6	92.0	92.0
	Theme Mentioned	81	6.6	8.0	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 142 -- Future Community Challenge: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	915	74.3	90.4	90.4
	Theme Mentioned	97	7.9	9.6	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 143 -- Future Community Challenge: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	938	76.1	92.7	92.7
	Theme Mentioned	74	6.0	7.3	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 144 -- Future Community Challenge: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	993	80.6	98.1	98.1
	Theme Mentioned	19	1.5	1.9	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 145 -- Future Community Challenge: Social Connection, Isolation, & Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	624	50.6	61.7	61.7
	Theme Mentioned	388	31.5	38.3	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 146 -- Future Community Challenge: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	797	64.7	78.8	78.8
	Theme Mentioned	215	17.5	21.2	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 147 -- Future Community Challenge: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	894	72.6	88.3	88.3
	Theme Mentioned	118	9.6	11.7	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 148 -- Future Community Challenge: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	796	64.6	78.7	78.7
	Theme Mentioned	216	17.5	21.3	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 149 -- Future Community Challenge: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	913	74.1	90.2	90.2
	Theme Mentioned	99	8.0	9.8	100.0
	Total	1012	82.1	100.0	
Missing	System	220	17.9		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 150 -- Future Community Challenge: Governance, Funding, & Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	890	72.2	87.9	87.9
	Theme Mentioned	123	10.0	12.1	100.0
	Total	1013	82.2	100.0	
Missing	System	219	17.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 151 -- Future Community Challenge: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	522	42.4	51.5	51.5
	Theme Mentioned	491	39.9	48.5	100.0
	Total	1013	82.2	100.0	
Missing	System	219	17.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 152 -- Priority Change: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	670	54.4	75.4	75.4
	Theme Mentioned	219	17.8	24.6	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 153 -- Priority Change: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	794	64.4	89.3	89.3
	Theme Mentioned	95	7.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 154 -- Priority Change: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	812	65.9	91.3	91.3
	Theme Mentioned	77	6.3	8.7	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 155 -- Priority Change: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	818	66.4	92.0	92.0
	Theme Mentioned	71	5.8	8.0	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 156 -- Priority Change: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	853	69.2	96.0	96.0
	Theme Mentioned	36	2.9	4.0	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 157 -- Priority Change: Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	571	46.3	64.2	64.2
	Theme Mentioned	318	25.8	35.8	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 158 -- Priority Change: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	747	60.6	84.0	84.0
	Theme Mentioned	142	11.5	16.0	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 159 -- Priority Change: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	834	67.7	93.8	93.8
	Theme Mentioned	55	4.5	6.2	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 160 -- Priority Change: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	731	59.3	82.2	82.2
	Theme Mentioned	158	12.8	17.8	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 161 -- Priority Change: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	832	67.5	93.6	93.6
	Theme Mentioned	57	4.6	6.4	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 162 -- Priority Change: Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	802	65.1	90.2	90.2
	Theme Mentioned	87	7.1	9.8	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 163 -- Priority Change: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	601	48.8	67.6	67.6
	Theme Mentioned	288	23.4	32.4	100.0
	Total	889	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	343	27.8		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 164 -- Planned Projects: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	725	58.8	93.8	93.8
	Theme Mentioned	48	3.9	6.2	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 165 -- Planned Projects: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	751	61.0	97.2	97.2
	Theme Mentioned	22	1.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 166 -- Planned Projects: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	758	61.5	98.1	98.1
	Theme Mentioned	15	1.2	1.9	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 167 -- Planned Projects: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	685	55.6	88.6	88.6
	Theme Mentioned	88	7.1	11.4	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 168 -- Planned Projects: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	760	61.7	98.3	98.3
	Theme Mentioned	13	1.1	1.7	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 169 -- Planned Projects: Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	617	50.1	79.8	79.8
	Theme Mentioned	156	12.7	20.2	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 170 -- Planned Projects: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	712	57.8	92.1	92.1
	Theme Mentioned	61	5.0	7.9	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 171 -- Planned Projects: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	721	58.5	93.3	93.3
	Theme Mentioned	52	4.2	6.7	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 172 -- Planned Projects: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	659	53.5	85.3	85.3
	Theme Mentioned	114	9.3	14.7	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 173 -- Planned Projects: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	754	61.2	97.5	97.5
	Theme Mentioned	19	1.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 174 -- Planned Projects: Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	733	59.5	94.8	94.8
	Theme Mentioned	40	3.2	5.2	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 175 -- Planned Projects: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	542	44.0	70.1	70.1
	Theme Mentioned	231	18.8	29.9	100.0
	Total	773	62.7	100.0	
Missing	System	459	37.3		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 176 -- Other Comments: Public Transportation and Connectivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	351	28.5	76.5	76.5
	Theme Mentioned	108	8.8	23.5	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 177 -- Other Comments: Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	429	34.8	93.5	93.5
	Theme Mentioned	30	2.4	6.5	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 178 -- Other Comments: Health, Care, and Well-Being Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	424	34.4	92.4	92.4
	Theme Mentioned	35	2.8	7.6	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 179 -- Other Comments: Community Facilities and Assets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	405	32.9	88.2	88.2
	Theme Mentioned	54	4.4	11.8	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 180 -- Other Comments: Community Life and Participation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	443	36.0	96.5	96.5
	Theme Mentioned	16	1.3	3.5	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 181 -- Other Comments: Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	251	20.4	54.7	54.7
	Theme Mentioned	208	16.9	45.3	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 182 -- Other Comments: Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	365	29.6	79.5	79.5
	Theme Mentioned	94	7.6	20.5	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 183 -- Other Comments: Housing and Affordability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	438	35.6	95.4	95.4
	Theme Mentioned	21	1.7	4.6	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 184 -- Other Comments: Children, Young People, and Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	367	29.8	80.0	80.0
	Theme Mentioned	92	7.5	20.0	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 185 -- Other Comments: Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	426	34.6	92.8	92.8
	Theme Mentioned	33	2.7	7.2	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 186 -- Other Comments: Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	386	31.3	84.1	84.1
	Theme Mentioned	73	5.9	15.9	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 187 -- Other Comments: Other / Miscellaneous Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Theme Not Mentioned	351	28.5	76.5	76.5
	Theme Mentioned	108	8.8	23.5	100.0
	Total	459	37.3	100.0	
Missing	System	773	62.7		
	Total	1232	100.0		

Table 188 -- Importance - Use Gap: GP / Health Centre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	155	12.6	12.6	12.6
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	777	63.1	63.1	75.6
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	300	24.4	24.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 189 -- Importance - Use Gap: Dentist

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	87	7.1	7.1	7.1
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	604	49.0	49.0	56.1
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	541	43.9	43.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 190 -- Importance - Use Gap: Pharmacy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	148	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Use and Importance Aligned	770	62.5	62.5	74.5
	Rated Important But Not Used (Unmet Need)	314	25.5	25.5	100.0

Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 191 -- Importance - Use Gap: Public Transport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	74	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Use and Importance Aligned	467	37.9	37.9	43.9
	Rated Important But Not Used (Unmet Need)	691	56.1	56.1	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 192 -- Importance - Use Gap: Community Transport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	21	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Use and Importance Aligned	529	42.9	42.9	44.6
	Rated Important But Not Used (Unmet Need)	682	55.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 193 -- Importance - Use Gap: Community Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	105	8.5	8.5	8.5
	Use and Importance Aligned	793	64.4	64.4	72.9
	Rated Important But Not Used (Unmet Need)	334	27.1	27.1	100.0

Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 194 -- Importance - Use Gap: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	79	6.4	6.4	6.4
	Use and Importance Aligned	649	52.7	52.7	59.1
	Rated Important But Not Used (Unmet Need)	504	40.9	40.9	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 195 -- Importance - Use Gap: Local Schools / Childcare

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	61	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Use and Importance Aligned	509	41.3	41.3	46.3
	Rated Important But Not Used (Unmet Need)	662	53.7	53.7	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 196 -- Importance - Use Gap: Community Centre

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	74	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	654	53.1	53.1	59.1
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	504	40.9	40.9	100.0

Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 197 -- Importance - Use Gap: Council Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	171	13.9	13.9	13.9
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	825	67.0	67.0	80.8
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	236	19.2	19.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 198 -- Importance - Use Gap: Local Shops / Post Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	172	14.0	14.0	14.0
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	856	69.5	69.5	83.4
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	204	16.6	16.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 199 -- Importance - Use Gap: Support Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Saliency)	28	2.3	2.3	2.3
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	588	47.7	47.7	50.0
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	616	50.0	50.0	100.0

Total	1232	100.0	100.0	
-------	------	-------	-------	--

Table 200 -- Importance - Use Gap: Places of Worship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	36	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	751	61.0	62.2	65.1
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	421	34.2	34.9	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 201 -- Importance - Use Gap: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	17	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	619	50.2	51.2	52.6

	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	572	46.4	47.4	100.0
	Total	1208	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	1.9		
Total		1232	100.0		

Table 202 -- Importance - Use Gap: Library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	82	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	684	55.5	55.5	62.2
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	466	37.8	37.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 203 -- Importance - Use Gap: Village Hall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	110	8.9	8.9	8.9

	Use and Importance Are Aligned	750	60.9	60.9	69.8
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	372	30.2	30.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 204 -- Importance - Use Gap: Youth Services / Youth Clubs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	30	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	508	41.2	41.2	43.7
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	694	56.3	56.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 205 -- Importance - Use Gap: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Used But Not Rated Important (Low Salience)	67	5.4	5.4	5.4
	Use and Importance Are Aligned	1100	89.3	89.3	94.7
	Not Used But Rated Important (Unmet Need)	65	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 206 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Sense of Community

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	71	5.8	5.8	5.8

	Neither / Both	327	26.5	26.5	32.3
	Like Only	834	67.7	67.7	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 207 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Access to Nature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	13	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Neither / Both	256	20.8	20.8	21.8
	Like Only	963	78.2	78.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 208 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Local Events and Activities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	83	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Neither / Both	486	39.4	39.4	46.2
	Like Only	663	53.8	53.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 209 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	341	27.7	27.7	27.7
	Neither / Both	595	48.3	48.3	76.0
	Like Only	296	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 210 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Local Shops and Amenities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	266	21.6	21.6	21.6
	Neither / Both	454	36.9	36.9	58.4
	Like Only	512	41.6	41.6	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 211 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Public Transport Links

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	658	53.4	53.4	53.4
	Neither / Both	399	32.4	32.4	85.8
	Like Only	175	14.2	14.2	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 212 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Family Lives Nearby

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	49	4.0	4.0	4.0
	Neither / Both	756	61.4	61.4	65.3
	Like Only	427	34.7	34.7	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Table 213 -- Like - Dislike Gap: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dislike Only	341	27.7	27.7	27.7
	Neither / Both	856	69.5	69.5	97.2
	Like Only	35	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	1232	100.0	100.0	

Appendix B — Crosstabulations

Appendix B – Crosstabulations

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Table 214	Current Level of Happiness by Gender	2
Tables 215 - 221	Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups	2 - 5
Table 222	Current Level of Happiness by Geographic Areas	6
Table 223	Community's Future Outlook by Gender	6
Tables 224 - 230	Community's Future Outlook by Age Groups	7 -10
Tables 231 - 237	Community's Future Outlook by Geographic Areas	10 - 13

Table 214 -- Current Level of Happiness by Gender

	Gender Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	Female	812	578.54	469773.00
	Male	357	599.70	214092.00
	Total	1169		

Test Statistics^a

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Mann-Whitney U	139695.000
Wilcoxon W	469773.000
Z	-1.088
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.277

a. Grouping Variable: Gender Groups

Table 215 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank
Current Level of Happiness Groups	< 26 Years Old	77	567.04
	26 - 40 Years Old	135	511.83
	41 - 70 Years Old	669	610.86
	> 70 Years Old	332	647.19
	Total	1213	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Kruskal-Wallis H	18.674
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	<.001

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 216 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups (< 26 vs 26–40)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	< 26 Years Old	77	112.71	8678.50
	26 - 40 Years Old	135	102.96	13899.50
	Total	212		

Test Statistics^a

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Mann-Whitney U	4719.500
Wilcoxon W	13899.500
Z	-1.270
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.204

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 217 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups (< 26 vs 41-70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	< 26 Years Old	77	349.31	26896.50
	41 - 70 Years Old	669	376.28	251734.50
	Total	746		

Test Statistics^aCurrent Level of
Happiness
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	23893.500
Wilcoxon W	26896.500
Z	-1.146
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.252

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 218 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups (< 26 vs > 70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	< 26 Years Old	77	183.03	14093.00
	> 70 Years Old	332	210.10	69752.00
	Total	409		

Test Statistics^a

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Mann-Whitney U	11090.000
Wilcoxon W	14093.000
Z	-1.980
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.048

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 219 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups (26-40 vs 41-70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	26 - 40 Years Old	135	347.85	46959.50
	41 - 70 Years Old	669	413.53	276650.50
	Total	804		

Test Statistics^a

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Mann-Whitney U	37779.500
Wilcoxon W	46959.500
Z	-3.313
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 220 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups (26-40 vs > 70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	26 - 40 Years Old	135	197.02	26598.00
	> 70 Years Old	332	249.04	82680.00
	Total	467		

Test Statistics^a

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Mann-Whitney U	17418.000
Wilcoxon W	26598.000
Z	-4.149
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 221 -- Current Level of Happiness by Age Groups (41-70 vs > 70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Current Level of Happiness Groups	41 - 70 Years Old	669	491.04	328509.00
	> 70 Years Old	332	521.06	172992.00
	Total	1001		

Test Statistics^a

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Mann-Whitney U	104394.000
Wilcoxon W	328509.000
Z	-1.695
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.090

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 222 -- Current Level of Happiness by Geographic Areas

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank
Current Level of Happiness Groups	Brecon	450	625.40
	Llandrindod Wells	376	577.94
	Newtown	228	599.98
	Welshpool	159	633.73
	Total	1213	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

Current Level of Happiness Groups

Kruskal-Wallis H	5.869
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.118

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Geographic Areas

Table 223 – Feelings About Future by Gender

	Gender Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Female	809	570.39	461443.50
	Male	355	610.10	216586.50
	Total	1164		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future Groups

Mann-Whitney U	133798.500
Wilcoxon W	461443.500
Z	-2.010
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.044

a. Grouping Variable: Gender Groups

Table 224 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	< 26 Years Old	80	611.89
	26 - 40 Years Old	135	571.59
	41 - 70 Years Old	658	588.37
	> 70 Years Old	335	647.67
	Total	1208	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Kruskal-Wallis H	9.102
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.028

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 225 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups (< 26 vs 26-40)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	< 26 Years Old	80	112.52	9001.50
	26 - 40 Years Old	135	105.32	14218.50
	Total	215		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	5038.500
Wilcoxon W	14218.500
Z	-.890
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.373

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 226 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups (< 26 vs 41-70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	< 26 Years Old	80	382.25	30580.00
	41 - 70 Years Old	658	367.95	242111.00
	Total	738		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	25300.000
Wilcoxon W	242111.000
Z	-.611
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.541

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 227 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups (< 26 vs > 70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	< 26 Years Old	80	198.12	15849.50
	> 70 Years Old	335	210.36	70470.50
	Total	415		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	12609.500
Wilcoxon W	15849.500
Z	-.896
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.370

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 228 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups (26-40 vs 41-70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	26 - 40 Years Old	135	388.27	52416.50
	41 - 70 Years Old	658	398.79	262404.50
	Total	793		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	43236.500
Wilcoxon W	52416.500
Z	-.525
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.600

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 229 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups (26-40 vs > 70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	26 - 40 Years Old	135	213.99	28889.00
	> 70 Years Old	335	244.17	81796.00
	Total	470		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	19709.000
Wilcoxon W	28889.000
Z	-2.372
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.018

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 230 – Feelings About Future by Age Groups (41-70 vs > 70)

	Age Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	41 - 70 Years Old	658	480.63	316256.50
	> 70 Years Old	335	529.15	177264.50
	Total	993		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future Groups

Mann-Whitney U	99445.500
Wilcoxon W	316256.500
Z	-2.727
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.006

a. Grouping Variable: Age Groups

Table 231 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Brecon	450	624.89
	Llandrindod Wells	382	559.32
	Newtown	222	619.22
	Welshpool	154	635.78
	Total	1208	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

Feelings About Community's Future Groups

Kruskal-Wallis H	11.213
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.011

**Table 232 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas
(Brecon vs Llandrindod Wells)**

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Brecon	450	437.30	196786.50
	Llandrindod Wells	382	391.99	149741.50
	Total	832		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	76588.500
Wilcoxon W	149741.500
Z	-2.924
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.003

a. Grouping Variable: Geographic Areas

**Table 233 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas
(Brecon vs Newtown)**

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Brecon	450	337.54	151893.50
	Newtown	222	334.39	74234.50
	Total	672		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	49481.500
Wilcoxon W	74234.500
Z	-.216

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.829
------------------------	------

a. Grouping Variable: Geographic Areas

**Table 234 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas
(Brecon vs Welshpool)**

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Brecon	450	301.04	135469.50
	Welshpool	154	306.76	47240.50
	Total	604		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	33994.500
Wilcoxon W	135469.500
Z	-.383
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.702

**Table 235 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas
(Llandrindod Wells vs Newtown)**

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Llandrindod Wells	382	291.46	111339.00
	Newtown	222	321.49	71371.00
	Total	604		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	38186.000
Wilcoxon W	111339.000
Z	-2.191

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.028
------------------------	------

a. Grouping Variable: Geographic Areas

**Table 236 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas
(Llandrindod Wells vs Welshpool)**

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Llandrindod Wells	382	258.86	98884.50
	Welshpool	154	292.41	45031.50
	Total	536		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	25731.500
Wilcoxon W	98884.500
Z	-2.437
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.015

a. Grouping Variable: Geographic Areas

**Table 237 – Feelings About Future by Geographic Areas
(Newtown vs Welshpool)**

	Geographic Areas	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feelings About Community's Future Groups	Newtown	222	186.34	41367.50
	Welshpool	154	191.61	29508.50
	Total	376		

Test Statistics^a

Feelings About Community's Future
Groups

Mann-Whitney U	16614.500
Wilcoxon W	41367.500

Z	-.504
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.614

a. Grouping Variable: Geographic Areas

Appendix C — Significant Crosstabs Per Demographic Variable

Appendix C – Significant Crosstabs Per Demographic Variable

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables *	
		Gender	Age
Q7B	Current Level of Happiness		•••
Q16B	Feelings About Community's Future		•
Q8A	Like – Sense of Community		•••
Q8B	Like – Access to Nature		•••
Q8C	Like – Local Events and Activities		•••
Q8D	Like – Local Services		
Q8E	Like – Local Shops and Amenities		••
Q8F	Like – Public Transport Links		•••
Q8G	Like – Family Lives Nearby		•••
Q8H	Like – Other		
Q9A	Dislike – Sense of Community		
Q9B	Dislike – Access to Nature		
Q9C	Dislike – Local Events and Activities		•••
Q9D	Dislike – Local Services		••
Q9E	Dislike – Local Shops and Amenities		•••
Q9F	Dislike – Public Transport Links		•
Q9G	Dislike – Family Lives Nearby		
Q9H	Dislike – Other		•
Q10A	Use – GP / Health Centre		•••
Q10B	Use – Dentist		•
Q10C	Use – Pharmacy		•••
Q10D	Use – Public Transport		•
Q10E	Use – Community Transport		••
Q10F	Use – Community Group		•••
Q10G	Use – Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities		•••
Q10H	Use – Local Schools / Childcare	•	•••
Q10I	Use – Community Centre		••
Q10J	Use – Council Services		•••
Q10K	Use – Local Shops / Post Office		•••
Q10L	Use – Support Services		
Q10M	Use – Places of Worship		•••
Q10N	Use – Adult Learning / Training Opportun.		
Q10O	Use – Library		•••
Q10P	Use – Village Hall		•••
Q10Q	Use – Youth Services / Clubs		•••
Q10R	Use – Other		•
Q11A	Important -- GP / Health Centre	•	•
Q11B	Important – Dentist	••	•

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables *	
		Gender	Age
Q11C	Important – Pharmacy	●●	●●●
Q11D	Important – Public Transport	●●●	●●
Q11E	Important – Community Transport	●●●	●●●
Q11F	Important – Community Group	●●●	●●●
Q11G	Important – Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	●●●	●●●
Q11H	Important – Local Schools / Childcare	●●●	●●●
Q11I	Important – Community Centre	●●●	●●●
Q11J	Important – Council Services	●●	●●●
Q11K	Important – Local Shops / Post Office	●●	●●●
Q11L	Important – Support Services	●●●	●●●
Q11M	Important – Places of Worship	●●●	●●●
Q11N	Important – Adult Learning / Training Opportun.	●●●	●●●
Q11O	Important – Library	●●●	●●●
Q11P	Important – Village Hall	●●●	●●●
Q11Q	Important – Youth Services / Clubs	●●●	●●●
Q11R	Important – Other		
Q12A	Public Transportation and Connectivity	●	
Q12B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q12C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	●	
Q12D	Community Facilities and Assets		●●
Q12E	Community Life and Participation		●●●
Q12F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q12G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living	●●	
Q12H	Housing and Affordability		
Q12I	Children, Young People, and Education		●
Q12J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q12K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q12L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q13A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		●
Q13B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q13C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		●
Q13D	Community Facilities and Assets		●●●
Q13E	Community Life and Participation		●●
Q13F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q13G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q13H	Housing and Affordability		
Q13I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q13J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q13K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		●●
Q13L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q14A	Matter Most – Local Park / Green Space		●●●

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables *	
		Gender	Age
Q14B	Matter Most – Playground / Play Area	●●	●●●
Q14C	Matter Most – Village Hall		●●●
Q14D	Matter Most – Community Centre	●	●●●
Q14E	Matter Most -- Library	●●	●●●
Q14F	Matter Most – Sports Centre / Leisure Facility		●●●
Q14G	Matter Most – Local Shop	●	●●●
Q14H	Matter Most – Place of Worship		●●●
Q14I	Matter Most – School / College		●●●
Q14J	Matter Most – Healthcare / GP Surgery	●●	●●●
Q14K	Matter Most – Youth Centre / Club		●●
Q14L	Matter Most – Pub / Cafe		
Q14M	Matter Most – Public Transport Hub	●●	●●●
Q14N	Matter Most – Historic Building / Landmark		●●●
Q14O	Matter Most – Local Market	●●●	●
Q14P	Matter Most – Allotments / Community Garden	●●●	●●●
Q14Q	Matter Most – Walking / Cycling Paths		●●●
Q14R	Matter Most – Other		
Q15A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		●●
Q15B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q15C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		
Q15D	Community Facilities and Assets	●	●
Q15E	Community Life and Participation		
Q15F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion	●	●●
Q15G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living	●	●●
Q15H	Housing and Affordability		
Q15I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q15J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q15K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		●
Q15L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q17A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q17B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services	●●	
Q17C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	●●●	●
Q17D	Community Facilities and Assets	●	
Q17E	Community Life and Participation		
Q17F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion	●	●●●
Q17G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		●●
Q17H	Housing and Affordability		
Q17I	Children, Young People, and Education	●	●
Q17J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		●
Q17K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		●●●
Q17L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses	●●	●●

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables *	
		Gender	Age
Q18A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q18B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q18C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		•
Q18D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q18E	Community Life and Participation		
Q18F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion	•	•••
Q18G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		•
Q18H	Housing and Affordability		
Q18I	Children, Young People, and Education		•
Q18J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q18K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		•
Q18L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		••
Q19A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q19B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		••
Q19C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		
Q19D	Community Facilities and Assets		•
Q19E	Community Life and Participation		
Q19F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		••
Q19G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q19H	Housing and Affordability		
Q19I	Children, Young People, and Education		••
Q19J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q19K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q19L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q20A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q20B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q20C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		
Q20D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q20E	Community Life and Participation		
Q20F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q20G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q20H	Housing and Affordability	•	••
Q20I	Children, Young People, and Education		•••
Q20J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		•••
Q20K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		•••
Q20L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses	•••	•••
Q21A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q21B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q21C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		
Q21D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q21E	Community Life and Participation		

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables *	
		Gender	Age
Q21F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		●●●
Q21G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		●
Q21H	Housing and Affordability		
Q21I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q21J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q21K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q21L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		

● = $p \leq .05$ ●● = $p \leq .01$ ●●● = $p \leq .001$ Blank cells indicate non-significant Chi-square tests ($p > .05$).

* Gender Groups = Female, Male

* Age Groups = < 26, 26-40, 41-70, > 70

* Geographic Area Groups = Brecon, Llandrindod Wells, Newtown, Welshpool

* Length of Residency Groups = < 5 Years, 5-10 Years, 10-15 Years, > 15 Years

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables	
		Geographic Area	Length of Residency
Q7B	Current Level of Happiness		
Q16B	Feelings About Community's Future	•	
Q8A	Like – Sense of Community		
Q8B	Like – Access to Nature	••	•
Q8C	Like – Local Events and Activities		
Q8D	Like – Local Services	•••	
Q8E	Like – Local Shops and Amenities	•	•
Q8F	Like – Public Transport Links	•••	
Q8G	Like – Family Lives Nearby		•
Q8H	Like – Other		
Q9A	Dislike – Sense of Community		
Q9B	Dislike – Access to Nature	••	
Q9C	Dislike – Local Events and Activities		
Q9D	Dislike – Local Services	•••	
Q9E	Dislike – Local Shops and Amenities	•	
Q9F	Dislike – Public Transport Links	•••	
Q9G	Dislike – Family Lives Nearby		
Q9H	Dislike – Other		
Q10A	Use – GP / Health Centre	•	
Q10B	Use – Dentist	•••	•••
Q10C	Use – Pharmacy	•••	
Q10D	Use – Public Transport	•••	
Q10E	Use – Community Transport	•	
Q10F	Use – Community Group	•	
Q10G	Use – Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities		
Q10H	Use – Local Schools / Childcare		
Q10I	Use – Community Centre	••	
Q10J	Use – Council Services		
Q10K	Use – Local Shops / Post Office		•
Q10L	Use – Support Services	•	
Q10M	Use – Places of Worship		
Q10N	Use – Adult Learning / Training Opportunities		
Q10O	Use – Library	••	
Q10P	Use – Village Hall	•••	•••
Q10Q	Use – Youth Services / Clubs		
Q10R	Use – Other		
Q11A	Important -- GP / Health Centre		
Q11B	Important – Dentist		•••
Q11C	Important – Pharmacy		
Q11D	Important – Public Transport		•

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables	
		Geographic Area	Length of Residency
Q11E	Important – Community Transport		
Q11F	Important – Community Group		
Q11G	Important – Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	••	
Q11H	Important – Local Schools / Childcare		
Q11I	Important – Community Centre		
Q11J	Important – Council Services		•
Q11K	Important – Local Shops / Post Office		•
Q11L	Important – Support Services	•	•
Q11M	Important – Places of Worship		
Q11N	Important – Adult Learning / Training Opportun.		
Q11O	Important – Library		
Q11P	Important – Village Hall	•	
Q11Q	Important – Youth Services / Clubs		
Q11R	Important – Other		
Q12A	Public Transportation and Connectivity	•	
Q12B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		•
Q12C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	•••	•
Q12D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q12E	Community Life and Participation		
Q12F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q12G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q12H	Housing and Affordability		
Q12I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q12J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q12K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q12L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		••
Q13A	Public Transportation and Connectivity	•••	•
Q13B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services	••	
Q13C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	••	
Q13D	Community Facilities and Assets	•••	
Q13E	Community Life and Participation		
Q13F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q13G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q13H	Housing and Affordability		
Q13I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q13J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q13K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making	•	••
Q13L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q14A	Matter Most – Local Park / Green Space	••	•
Q14B	Matter Most – Playground / Play Area	••	

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables	
		Geographic Area	Length of Residency
Q14C	Matter Most – Village Hall	•••	•••
Q14D	Matter Most – Community Centre	•••	
Q14E	Matter Most -- Library	•	
Q14F	Matter Most – Sports Centre / Leisure Facility	•	
Q14G	Matter Most – Local Shop		
Q14H	Matter Most – Place of Worship		••
Q14I	Matter Most – School / College		•
Q14J	Matter Most – Healthcare / GP Surgery	••	
Q14K	Matter Most – Youth Centre / Club		
Q14L	Matter Most – Pub / Cafe		
Q14M	Matter Most – Public Transport Hub	••	
Q14N	Matter Most – Historic Building / Landmark	••	
Q14O	Matter Most – Local Market		
Q14P	Matter Most – Allotments / Community Garden	••	
Q14Q	Matter Most – Walking / Cycling Paths	••	
Q14R	Matter Most – Other		
Q15A	Public Transportation and Connectivity	•	
Q15B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services	••	
Q15C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		
Q15D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q15E	Community Life and Participation		
Q15F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q15G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q15H	Housing and Affordability		
Q15I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q15J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q15K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q15L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q17A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q17B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q17C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	•••	
Q17D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q17E	Community Life and Participation		
Q17F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q17G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q17H	Housing and Affordability	•	•
Q17I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q17J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q17K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making	••	
Q17L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses	•	

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables	
		Geographic Area	Length of Residency
Q18A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q18B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q18C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	••	
Q18D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q18E	Community Life and Participation		
Q18F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q18G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q18H	Housing and Affordability	•	•
Q18I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q18J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q18K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making	•	
Q18L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses	••	
Q19A	Public Transportation and Connectivity	•	
Q19B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q19C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	•	
Q19D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q19E	Community Life and Participation		
Q19F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q19G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q19H	Housing and Affordability		
Q19I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q19J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure	•	
Q19K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q19L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q20A	Public Transportation and Connectivity		
Q20B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q20C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services	•••	
Q20D	Community Facilities and Assets		
Q20E	Community Life and Participation		
Q20F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q20G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		•
Q20H	Housing and Affordability	•	
Q20I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q20J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q20K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		
Q20L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		
Q21A	Public Transportation and Connectivity	•	•
Q21B	Shops, Amenities, and Everyday Services		
Q21C	Health, Care, and Well-Being Services		
Q21D	Community Facilities and Assets		

Variable Name	Variable Label	Demographic Variables	
		Geographic Area	Length of Residency
Q21E	Community Life and Participation		
Q21F	Social Connection, Isolation, and Cohesion		
Q21G	Jobs, Economy, and Cost of Living		
Q21H	Housing and Affordability		
Q21I	Children, Young People, and Education		
Q21J	Environment, Climate, and Infrastructure		
Q21K	Governance, Funding, and Decision-Making		●
Q21L	Other / Miscellaneous Responses		

● = $p \leq .05$ ●● = $p \leq .01$ ●●● = $p \leq .001$ Blank cells indicate non-significant Chi-square tests ($p > .05$).

* Gender Groups = Female, Male

* Age Groups = < 26, 26-40, 41-70, > 70

* Geographic Area Groups = Brecon, Llandrindod Wells, Newtown, Welshpool

* Length of Residency Groups = < 5 Years, 5-10 Years, 10-15 Years, > 15 Years

Appendix D — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Gender

Appendix D – Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Gender

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Tables 238 - 245	Like Aspects of Community	2 - 10
Tables 246 - 253	Dislike Aspects of Community	10 - 18
Tables 254 - 271	Use Services	19 - 37
Tables 272 - 289	Services Rated as Important	37 - 57
Tables 290 - 307	What Matters Most	57 - 77
Tables 308 - 309	Current Happiness & Community's Future Outlook	78 - 80

Table 238 – Like Sense of Community by Gender

Crosstab

			Like Sense of Community		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	245	581	826
		% within Gender Groups	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	122	239	361
		% within Gender Groups	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	367	820	1187
		% within Gender Groups	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.010 ^a	1	.156		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.821	1	.177		
Likelihood Ratio	1.992	1	.158		
Fisher's Exact Test				.172	.089
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.008	1	.156		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 111.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.041	.156
	Cramer's V	.041	.156
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 239 -- Like Access to Nature by Gender

Crosstab

			Like Access to Nature		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	160	666	826
		% within Gender Groups	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	82	279	361
		% within Gender Groups	22.7%	77.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	242	945	1187
		% within Gender Groups	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.731 ^a	1	.188		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.531	1	.216		
Likelihood Ratio	1.706	1	.192		
Fisher's Exact Test				.210	.109
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.729	1	.188		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.038	.188
	Cramer's V	.038	.188
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 240 -- Like Local Events and Activities by Gender

Crosstab

			Like Local Events and Activities		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	364	462	826
		% within Gender Groups	44.1%	55.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	161	200	361
		% within Gender Groups	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		525	662	1187
	% within Gender Groups		44.2%	55.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.029 ^a	1	.866		
Continuity Correction ^b	.011	1	.916		
Likelihood Ratio	.029	1	.866		
Fisher's Exact Test				.899	.458
Linear-by-Linear Association	.029	1	.866		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 159.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.005	.866
	Cramer's V	.005	.866

N of Valid Cases	1187
------------------	------

Table 241 -- Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Gender

Crosstab

			Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	594	232	826
		% within Gender Groups	71.9%	28.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	263	98	361
		% within Gender Groups	72.9%	27.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	857	330	1187
		% within Gender Groups	72.2%	27.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.111 ^a	1	.739		
Continuity Correction ^b	.069	1	.793		
Likelihood Ratio	.111	1	.739		
Fisher's Exact Test				.778	.398
Linear-by-Linear Association	.111	1	.739		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 100.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.010	.739
	Cramer's V	.010	.739
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 242-- Like Local Shops and Amenities by Gender

Crosstab

			Like Local Shops and Amenities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	466	360	826
		% within Gender Groups	56.4%	43.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	204	157	361
		% within Gender Groups	56.5%	43.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		670	517	1187
	% within Gender Groups		56.4%	43.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.001 ^a	1	.976		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.001	1	.976		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.514
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.976		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 157.23.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.001	.976
	Cramer's V	.001	.976
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 243 -- Like Public Transport Links by Gender

Crosstab					
			Like Public Transport Links		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	693	133	826
		% within Gender Groups	83.9%	16.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	291	70	361
		% within Gender Groups	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		984	203	1187
	% within Gender Groups		82.9%	17.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.917 ^a	1	.166		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.692	1	.193		
Likelihood Ratio	1.882	1	.170		
Fisher's Exact Test				.180	.097
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.915	1	.166		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 61.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.040	.166
	Cramer's V	.040	.166
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 244 -- Like That Family Lives Nearby by Gender

		Like That Family Lives Nearby		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	521	305
		% within Gender Groups	63.1%	36.9%
	Male	Count	234	127
		% within Gender Groups	64.8%	35.2%
Total	Count		755	432
	% within Gender Groups		63.6%	36.4%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.330 ^a	1	.565		
Continuity Correction ^b	.259	1	.611		
Likelihood Ratio	.331	1	.565		

Fisher's Exact Test				.600	.306
Linear-by-Linear Association	.330	1	.566		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 131.38.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.017	.565
	Cramer's V	.017	.565
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 245 -- Like Other by Gender

Crosstab

			Like Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	766	60	826
		% within Gender Groups	92.7%	7.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	330	31	361
		% within Gender Groups	91.4%	8.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	1096	91	1187
		% within Gender Groups	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.621 ^a	1	.430		
Continuity Correction ^b	.449	1	.503		
Likelihood Ratio	.610	1	.435		

Fisher's Exact Test				.477	.249
Linear-by-Linear Association	.621	1	.431		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.023	.430
	Cramer's V	.023	.430
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 246 -- Dislike Sense of Community by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Sense of Community		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	777	49	826
		% within Gender Groups	94.1%	5.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	337	24	361
		% within Gender Groups	93.4%	6.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		1114	73	1187
	% within Gender Groups		93.9%	6.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.223 ^a	1	.637		

Continuity Correction ^b	.116	1	.733		
Likelihood Ratio	.220	1	.639		
Fisher's Exact Test				.694	.362
Linear-by-Linear Association	.223	1	.637		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.014	.637
	Cramer's V	.014	.637
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 247 -- Dislike Access to Nature by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Access to Nature		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	809	17	826
		% within Gender Groups	97.9%	2.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	350	11	361
		% within Gender Groups	97.0%	3.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		1159	28	1187
	% within Gender Groups		97.6%	2.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.067 ^a	1	.302		

Continuity Correction ^b	.681	1	.409		
Likelihood Ratio	1.019	1	.313		
Fisher's Exact Test				.304	.202
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.066	1	.302		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.52.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.030	.302
	Cramer's V	.030	.302
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 248 -- Dislike Local Events and Activities by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Events and Activities		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	758	68	826
		% within Gender Groups	91.8%	8.2%	100.0%
	Male	Count	331	30	361
		% within Gender Groups	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		1089	98	1187
	% within Gender Groups		91.7%	8.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.002 ^a	1	.964		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.002	1	.964		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.523
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.964		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.001	.964
	Cramer's V	.001	.964
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 249 -- Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	558	268	826
		% within Gender Groups	67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
	Male	Count	263	98	361
		% within Gender Groups	72.9%	27.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	821	366	1187

	% within Gender Groups	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
--	------------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.307 ^a	1	.069		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.063	1	.080		
Likelihood Ratio	3.353	1	.067		
Fisher's Exact Test				.076	.039
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.304	1	.069		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 111.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.053	.069
	Cramer's V	.053	.069
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 250 -- Dislike Local Shops and Amenities by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Shops and Amenities		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	635	191	826

	% within Gender Groups	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	274	87
		% within Gender Groups	75.9%	24.1%
Total	Count	909	278	1187
	% within Gender Groups	76.6%	23.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.133 ^a	1	.715		
Continuity Correction ^b	.085	1	.771		
Likelihood Ratio	.133	1	.715		
Fisher's Exact Test				.710	.384
Linear-by-Linear Association	.133	1	.715		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 84.55.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.011	.715
	Cramer's V	.011	.715
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 251 -- Dislike Public Transport Links by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Public Transport Links		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	349	477	826
		% within Gender Groups	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	173	188	361
		% within Gender Groups	47.9%	52.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		522	665	1187
	% within Gender Groups		44.0%	56.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.279 ^a	1	.070		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.053	1	.081		
Likelihood Ratio	3.270	1	.071		
Fisher's Exact Test				.075	.040
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.276	1	.070		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 158.75.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.053	.070
	Cramer's V	.053	.070
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 252 -- Dislike That Family Lives Nearby by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike That Family Lives Nearby		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	789	37	826
		% within Gender Groups	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	336	25	361
		% within Gender Groups	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		1125	62	1187
	% within Gender Groups		94.8%	5.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.036 ^a	1	.081		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.562	1	.109		
Likelihood Ratio	2.893	1	.089		
Fisher's Exact Test				.089	.057
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.033	1	.082		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.051	.081

Cramer's V		.051	.081
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 253 -- Dislike Other by Gender

Crosstab

			Dislike Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	556	270	826
		% within Gender Groups	67.3%	32.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	241	120	361
		% within Gender Groups	66.8%	33.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	797	390	1187
		% within Gender Groups	67.1%	32.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.035 ^a	1	.852		
Continuity Correction ^b	.014	1	.905		
Likelihood Ratio	.035	1	.852		
Fisher's Exact Test				.893	.451
Linear-by-Linear Association	.035	1	.852		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 118.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.005	.852
	Cramer's V	.005	.852
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 254 -- Used: GP / Health Centre by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: GP / Health Centre		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	234	592	826
		% within Gender Groups	28.3%	71.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	122	239	361
		% within Gender Groups	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		356	831	1187
	% within Gender Groups		30.0%	70.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.574 ^a	1	.059		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.319	1	.068		
Likelihood Ratio	3.531	1	.060		
Fisher's Exact Test				.063	.035
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.571	1	.059		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 108.27.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.055	.059
	Cramer's V	.055	.059
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 255 -- Used: Dentist by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Dentist		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	537	289	826
		% within Gender Groups	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	237	124	361
		% within Gender Groups	65.7%	34.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		774	413	1187
	% within Gender Groups		65.2%	34.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.045 ^a	1	.832		
Continuity Correction ^b	.021	1	.884		
Likelihood Ratio	.045	1	.832		
Fisher's Exact Test				.843	.443
Linear-by-Linear Association	.045	1	.832		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 125.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.006	.832
	Cramer's V	.006	.832
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 256 -- Used: Pharmacy by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Pharmacy		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	331	495	826
		% within Gender Groups	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	138	223	361
		% within Gender Groups	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		469	718	1187
	% within Gender Groups		39.5%	60.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.358 ^a	1	.550		
Continuity Correction ^b	.285	1	.593		
Likelihood Ratio	.359	1	.549		
Fisher's Exact Test				.562	.297
Linear-by-Linear Association	.358	1	.550		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 142.64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.017	.550
	Cramer's V	.017	.550
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 257 -- Used: Public Transport by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Public Transport		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	631	195	826
		% within Gender Groups	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	273	88	361
		% within Gender Groups	75.6%	24.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		904	283	1187
	% within Gender Groups		76.2%	23.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.082 ^a	1	.775		
Continuity Correction ^b	.045	1	.832		
Likelihood Ratio	.082	1	.775		
Fisher's Exact Test				.768	.414
Linear-by-Linear Association	.082	1	.775		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 86.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.008	.775
	Cramer's V	.008	.775
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 258 -- Used: Community Transport by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Community Transport		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	778	48	826
		% within Gender Groups	94.2%	5.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	343	18	361
		% within Gender Groups	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		1121	66	1187
	% within Gender Groups		94.4%	5.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.326 ^a	1	.568		
Continuity Correction ^b	.187	1	.665		
Likelihood Ratio	.332	1	.564		
Fisher's Exact Test				.680	.337
Linear-by-Linear Association	.325	1	.568		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.017	.568
	Cramer's V	.017	.568
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 259 -- Used: Community Group by Gender

Crosstab					
			Used: Community Group		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	520	306	826
		% within Gender Groups	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	234	127	361
		% within Gender Groups	64.8%	35.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	754	433	1187
		% within Gender Groups	63.5%	36.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.377 ^a	1	.539		
Continuity Correction ^b	.301	1	.583		
Likelihood Ratio	.379	1	.538		
Fisher's Exact Test				.556	.292
Linear-by-Linear Association	.377	1	.539		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 131.69.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.018	.539
	Cramer's V	.018	.539
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 260 -- Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Gender

Crosstab					
			Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	582	244	826
		% within Gender Groups	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	268	93	361
		% within Gender Groups	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	850	337	1187
		% within Gender Groups	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.764 ^a	1	.184		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.583	1	.208		
Likelihood Ratio	1.784	1	.182		
Fisher's Exact Test				.208	.104

Linear-by-Linear Association	1.762	1	.184		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 102.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.039	.184
	Cramer's V	.039	.184
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 261 -- Used: Local Schools / Childcare by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Local Schools / Childcare		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	669	157	826
		% within Gender Groups	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	314	47	361
		% within Gender Groups	87.0%	13.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		983	204	1187
	% within Gender Groups		82.8%	17.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.328 ^a	1	.012		

Continuity Correction ^b	5.915	1	.015		
Likelihood Ratio	6.602	1	.010		
Fisher's Exact Test				.012	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.323	1	.012		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 62.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.073	.012
	Cramer's V	.073	.012
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 262 -- Used: Community Centre by Gender

Crosstab					
			Used: Community Centre		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	637	189	826
		% within Gender Groups	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	284	77	361
		% within Gender Groups	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	921	266	1187
		% within Gender Groups	77.6%	22.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	.348 ^a	1	.555		
Continuity Correction ^b	.264	1	.607		
Likelihood Ratio	.350	1	.554		
Fisher's Exact Test				.597	.305
Linear-by-Linear Association	.348	1	.555		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 80.90.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.017	.555
	Cramer's V	.017	.555
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 263 -- Used: Council Services by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Council Services		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	318	508	826
		% within Gender Groups	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	134	227	361
		% within Gender Groups	37.1%	62.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		452	735	1187
	% within Gender Groups		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	.203 ^a	1	.652		
Continuity Correction ^b	.149	1	.700		
Likelihood Ratio	.203	1	.652		
Fisher's Exact Test				.697	.351
Linear-by-Linear Association	.203	1	.653		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 137.47.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.013	.652
	Cramer's V	.013	.652
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 264 -- Used: Local Shops / Post Office by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Local Shops / Post Office		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	219	607	826
		% within Gender Groups	26.5%	73.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	115	246	361
		% within Gender Groups	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		334	853	1187
	% within Gender Groups		28.1%	71.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.546 ^a	1	.060		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.287	1	.070		
Likelihood Ratio	3.498	1	.061		
Fisher's Exact Test				.068	.036
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.543	1	.060		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 101.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.055	.060
	Cramer's V	.055	.060
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 265 -- Used: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services) by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	773	53	826
		% within Gender Groups	93.6%	6.4%	100.0%
	Male	Count	330	31	361

	% within Gender Groups	91.4%	8.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	1103	84	1187
	% within Gender Groups	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.800 ^a	1	.180		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.485	1	.223		
Likelihood Ratio	1.742	1	.187		
Fisher's Exact Test				.178	.113
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.799	1	.180		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.55.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.039	.180
	Cramer's V	.039	.180
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 266 -- Used: Places of Worship by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Places of Worship		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	686	140	826

	Male	% within Gender Groups	83.1%	16.9%	100.0%
		Count	307	54	361
		% within Gender Groups	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	993	194	1187
		% within Gender Groups	83.7%	16.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.728 ^a	1	.393		
Continuity Correction ^b	.590	1	.442		
Likelihood Ratio	.738	1	.390		
Fisher's Exact Test				.443	.222
Linear-by-Linear Association	.728	1	.394		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 59.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.025	.393
	Cramer's V	.025	.393
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 267 -- Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities by Gender

Crosstab

Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities		Total
Not Selected	Selected	

Gender Groups	Female	Count	776	50	826
		% within Gender Groups	93.9%	6.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	338	23	361
		% within Gender Groups	93.6%	6.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		1114	73	1187
	% within Gender Groups		93.9%	6.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.044 ^a	1	.834		
Continuity Correction ^b	.006	1	.937		
Likelihood Ratio	.044	1	.834		
Fisher's Exact Test				.896	.463
Linear-by-Linear Association	.044	1	.834		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.006	.834
	Cramer's V	.006	.834
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 268 -- Used: Library by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Library		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	565	261	826
		% within Gender Groups	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	254	107	361
		% within Gender Groups	70.4%	29.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	819	368	1187
		% within Gender Groups	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.450 ^a	1	.502		
Continuity Correction ^b	.363	1	.547		
Likelihood Ratio	.452	1	.501		
Fisher's Exact Test				.539	.274
Linear-by-Linear Association	.450	1	.502		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 111.92.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.019	.502
	Cramer's V	.019	.502
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 269 -- Used: Village Hall by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Village Hall		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	517	309	826
		% within Gender Groups	62.6%	37.4%	100.0%
	Male	Count	246	115	361
		% within Gender Groups	68.1%	31.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		763	424	1187
	% within Gender Groups		64.3%	35.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.374 ^a	1	.066		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.136	1	.077		
Likelihood Ratio	3.408	1	.065		
Fisher's Exact Test				.075	.038
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.371	1	.066		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 128.95.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.053	.066
	Cramer's V	.053	.066
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 270 -- Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	751	75	826
		% within Gender Groups	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	333	28	361
		% within Gender Groups	92.2%	7.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	1084	103	1187
		% within Gender Groups	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.555 ^a	1	.456		
Continuity Correction ^b	.401	1	.527		
Likelihood Ratio	.566	1	.452		
Fisher's Exact Test				.502	.266
Linear-by-Linear Association	.555	1	.456		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.022	.456
	Cramer's V	.022	.456
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 271 -- Used: Other by Gender

Crosstab

			Used: Other		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	762	64	826
		% within Gender Groups	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	331	30	361
		% within Gender Groups	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	1093	94	1187
		% within Gender Groups	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.109 ^a	1	.741		
Continuity Correction ^b	.045	1	.831		
Likelihood Ratio	.108	1	.742		
Fisher's Exact Test				.727	.411
Linear-by-Linear Association	.109	1	.742		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.010	.741
	Cramer's V	.010	.741
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 272 -- Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important by Gender

Crosstab

		Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	136	690
		% within Gender Groups	16.5%	83.5%
	Male	Count	77	284
		% within Gender Groups	21.3%	78.7%
Total	Count		213	974
	% within Gender Groups		17.9%	82.1%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.038 ^a	1	.044		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.714	1	.054		
Likelihood Ratio	3.940	1	.047		
Fisher's Exact Test				.049	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.034	1	.045		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.78.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.058	.044
	Cramer's V	.058	.044
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 273 -- Rated Important: Use Dentist by Gender

Crosstab

		Rated Important: Use Dentist		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	210	616
		% within Gender Groups	25.4%	74.6%
	Male	Count	119	242
		% within Gender Groups	33.0%	67.0%
Total	Count		329	858
	% within Gender Groups		27.7%	72.3%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.129 ^a	1	.008		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.758	1	.009		
Likelihood Ratio	6.995	1	.008		
Fisher's Exact Test				.009	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.123	1	.008		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 100.06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.077	.008
	Cramer's V	.077	.008
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 274 -- Rated Important: Use Pharmacy by Gender

		Rated Important: Use Pharmacy		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	197	826
		% within Gender Groups	23.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	112	361
		% within Gender Groups	31.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	309	878	1187
	% within Gender Groups	26.0%	74.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.716 ^a	1	.010		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.349	1	.012		
Likelihood Ratio	6.582	1	.010		
Fisher's Exact Test				.012	.006

Linear-by-Linear Association	6.711	1	.010		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 93.98.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.075	.010
	Cramer's V	.075	.010
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 275 -- Rated Important: Use Public Transport by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Public Transport		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	183	643	826
		% within Gender Groups	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	120	241	361
		% within Gender Groups	33.2%	66.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		303	884	1187
	% within Gender Groups		25.5%	74.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.240 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.662	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	15.761	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.227	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 92.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.117	<.001
	Cramer's V	.117	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 276 -- Rated Important: Use Community Transport by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Community Transport		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	275	551	826
		% within Gender Groups	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	202	159	361
		% within Gender Groups	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	477	710	1187

	% within Gender Groups	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%
--	------------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	53.677 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	52.738	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	53.120	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	53.631	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 145.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.213	<.001
	Cramer's V	.213	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 277 -- Rated Important: Community Group by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Group		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	329	497	826

	% within Gender Groups	39.8%	60.2%	100.0%
	Male	Count	195	166
		% within Gender Groups	54.0%	46.0%
Total	Count	524	663	1187
	% within Gender Groups	44.1%	55.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.503 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	19.932	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	20.427	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.486	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 159.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.131	<.001
	Cramer's V	.131	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 278 -- Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	275	551	826
		% within Gender Groups	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	163	198	361
		% within Gender Groups	45.2%	54.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	438	749	1187
		% within Gender Groups	36.9%	63.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.174 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.669	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	14.977	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.161	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 133.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.113	<.001
	Cramer's V	.113	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 279 -- Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare by Gender**Crosstab**

		Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	250	576
		% within Gender Groups	30.3%	69.7%
	Male	Count	157	204
		% within Gender Groups	43.5%	56.5%
Total	Count		407	780
	% within Gender Groups		34.3%	65.7%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.497 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.915	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	19.147	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.481	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 123.78.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.128	<.001

Cramer's V		.128	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 280 -- Rated Important: Community Centre by Gender

Crosstab					
			Rated Important: Community Centre		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	317	509	826
		% within Gender Groups	38.4%	61.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	179	182	361
		% within Gender Groups	49.6%	50.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	496	691	1187
		% within Gender Groups	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.970 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.513	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	12.885	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.959	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 150.85.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.105	<.001
	Cramer's V	.105	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 281 -- Rated Important: Council Services by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Council Services		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	247	579	826
		% within Gender Groups	29.9%	70.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	139	222	361
		% within Gender Groups	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	386	801	1187
		% within Gender Groups	32.5%	67.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.469 ^a	1	.004		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.081	1	.004		
Likelihood Ratio	8.342	1	.004		
Fisher's Exact Test				.005	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.462	1	.004		

N of Valid Cases	1187				
------------------	------	--	--	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 117.39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.084	.004
	Cramer's V	.084	.004
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 282 -- Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office by Gender

Crosstab					
			Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	185	641	826
		% within Gender Groups	22.4%	77.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	112	249	361
		% within Gender Groups	31.0%	69.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	297	890	1187
		% within Gender Groups	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.968 ^a	1	.002		
Continuity Correction ^b	9.513	1	.002		

Likelihood Ratio	9.719	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.002	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.959	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 90.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.092	.002
	Cramer's V	.092	.002
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 283 -- Rated Important: Support Services (Food, Advice) by Gender

Crosstab					
			Rated Important: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	328	498	826
		% within Gender Groups	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	208	153	361
		% within Gender Groups	57.6%	42.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	536	651	1187

	% within Gender Groups	45.2%	54.8%	100.0%
--	------------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.531 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	31.812	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	32.492	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.504	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 163.01.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.166	<.001
	Cramer's V	.166	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 284 -- Rated Important: Places of Worship by Gender

Crosstab

Rated Important: Places of Worship		Total
------------------------------------	--	-------

			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	383	426	809
		% within Gender Groups	47.3%	52.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	223	132	355
		% within Gender Groups	62.8%	37.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	606	558	1164
		% within Gender Groups	52.1%	47.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.673 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.057	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	23.896	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.653	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 170.18.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.143	<.001
	Cramer's V	.143	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Table 285 -- Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Opportu. by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	358	451	809
		% within Gender Groups	44.3%	55.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	200	155	355
		% within Gender Groups	56.3%	43.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		558	606	1164
	% within Gender Groups		47.9%	52.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.440 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.960	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	14.454	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.428	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 170.18.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	--------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.111	<.001
	Cramer's V	.111	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Table 286 -- Rated Important: Library by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Library		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	276	550	826
		% within Gender Groups	33.4%	66.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	169	192	361
		% within Gender Groups	46.8%	53.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		445	742	1187
	% within Gender Groups		37.5%	62.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.249 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.681	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	18.994	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.233	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 135.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.127	<.001
	Cramer's V	.127	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 287 -- Rated Important: Village Hall by Gender

Crosstab

		Rated Important: Village Hall		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	327	499
		% within Gender Groups	39.6%	60.4%
	Male	Count	182	179
		% within Gender Groups	50.4%	49.6%
Total	Count		509	678
	% within Gender Groups		42.9%	57.1%
				100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.023 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.585	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	11.961	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.013	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 154.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.101	<.001
	Cramer's V	.101	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 288 -- Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Gender

		Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	269	557
		% within Gender Groups	32.6%	67.4%
	Male	Count	175	186
		% within Gender Groups	48.5%	51.5%
Total	Count		444	743
	% within Gender Groups		37.4%	62.6%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.158 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.483	1	<.001		
Likelihood Ratio	26.758	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001

Linear-by-Linear Association	27.135	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 135.03.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.151	<.001
	Cramer's V	.151	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 289 -- Rated Important: Other by Gender

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	764	62	826
		% within Gender Groups	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	334	27	361
		% within Gender Groups	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		1098	89	1187
	% within Gender Groups		92.5%	7.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.000 ^a	1	.987		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	.987		

Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.546
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.987		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.000	.987
	Cramer's V	.000	.987
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 290 -- What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	267	559	826
		% within Gender Groups	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	130	231	361
		% within Gender Groups	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		397	790	1187
	% within Gender Groups		33.4%	66.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.534 ^a	1	.216		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.373	1	.241		
Likelihood Ratio	1.524	1	.217		
Fisher's Exact Test				.229	.121
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.533	1	.216		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 120.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.036	.216
	Cramer's V	.036	.216
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 291 -- What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	498	328	826
		% within Gender Groups	60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
	Male	Count	249	112	361
		% within Gender Groups	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	747	440	1187

	% within Gender Groups	62.9%	37.1%	100.0%
--	------------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.122 ^a	1	.004		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.754	1	.005		
Likelihood Ratio	8.246	1	.004		
Fisher's Exact Test				.005	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.115	1	.004		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 133.82.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.083	.004
	Cramer's V	.083	.004
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 292 -- What Matters Most: Village Hall by Gender

Crosstab

What Matters Most: Village Hall		Total
Not Selected	Selected	

Gender Groups	Female	Count	453	373	826
		% within Gender Groups	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
	Male	Count	218	143	361
		% within Gender Groups	60.4%	39.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		671	516	1187
	% within Gender Groups		56.5%	43.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.143 ^a	1	.076		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.922	1	.087		
Likelihood Ratio	3.158	1	.076		
Fisher's Exact Test				.086	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.141	1	.076		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 156.93.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.051	.076
	Cramer's V	.051	.076
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 293 -- What Matters Most: Community Centre by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Community Centre		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	470	356	826
		% within Gender Groups	56.9%	43.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	228	133	361
		% within Gender Groups	63.2%	36.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	698	489	1187
		% within Gender Groups	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.060 ^a	1	.044		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.806	1	.051		
Likelihood Ratio	4.089	1	.043		
Fisher's Exact Test				.047	.025
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.057	1	.044		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 148.72.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.058	.044
	Cramer's V	.058	.044
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 294 -- What Matters Most: Library by Gender

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Library		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	409	417
		% within Gender Groups	49.5%	50.5%
	Male	Count	214	147
		% within Gender Groups	59.3%	40.7%
Total	Count		623	564
	% within Gender Groups		52.5%	47.5%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.604 ^a	1	.002		
Continuity Correction ^b	9.216	1	.002		
Likelihood Ratio	9.651	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.002	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.595	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 171.53.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.090	.002
	Cramer's V	.090	.002

N of Valid Cases	1187
------------------	------

Table 295 -- What Matters Most: Sports Centre / Leisure Facility by Gender

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Sports Center / Leisure Facility		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	477	349
		% within Gender Groups	57.7%	42.3%
	Male	Count	222	139
		% within Gender Groups	61.5%	38.5%
Total	Count		699	488
	% within Gender Groups		58.9%	41.1%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.457 ^a	1	.227		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.307	1	.253		
Likelihood Ratio	1.463	1	.226		
Fisher's Exact Test				.248	.126
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.456	1	.228		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 148.41.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.035	.227
	Cramer's V	.035	.227
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 296 -- What Matters Most: Local Shop by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Shop		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	274	552	826
		% within Gender Groups	33.2%	66.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	142	219	361
		% within Gender Groups	39.3%	60.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		416	771	1187
	% within Gender Groups		35.0%	65.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.192 ^a	1	.041		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.926	1	.048		
Likelihood Ratio	4.153	1	.042		
Fisher's Exact Test				.047	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.188	1	.041		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 126.52.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.059	.041
	Cramer's V	.059	.041
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 297 -- What Matters Most: Place of Worship by Gender

Crosstab					
		What Matters Most: Place of Worship			
		Not Selected	Selected	Total	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	612	214	826
		% within Gender Groups	74.1%	25.9%	100.0%
	Male	Count	285	76	361
		% within Gender Groups	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		897	290	1187
	% within Gender Groups		75.6%	24.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.208 ^a	1	.073		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.950	1	.086		
Likelihood Ratio	3.270	1	.071		

Fisher's Exact Test				.078	.042
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.205	1	.073		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 88.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.052	.073
	Cramer's V	.052	.073
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 298 -- What Matters Most: School / College by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: School / College		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	532	294	826
		% within Gender Groups	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	244	117	361
		% within Gender Groups	67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		776	411	1187
	% within Gender Groups		65.4%	34.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	1.125 ^a	1	.289		
Continuity Correction ^b	.988	1	.320		
Likelihood Ratio	1.131	1	.287		
Fisher's Exact Test				.320	.160
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.124	1	.289		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 125.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.031	.289
	Cramer's V	.031	.289
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 299 -- What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	193	633	826
		% within Gender Groups	23.4%	76.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	115	246	361
		% within Gender Groups	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		308	879	1187
	% within Gender Groups		25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.424 ^a	1	.002		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.988	1	.003		
Likelihood Ratio	9.205	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.002	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.416	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 93.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.089	.002
	Cramer's V	.089	.002
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 300 -- What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club by Gender

Crosstab					
			What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	627	199	826
		% within Gender Groups	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
	Male	Count	279	82	361
		% within Gender Groups	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%

Total	Count	906	281	1187
	% within Gender Groups	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.264 ^a	1	.608		
Continuity Correction ^b	.193	1	.660		
Likelihood Ratio	.265	1	.607		
Fisher's Exact Test				.656	.332
Linear-by-Linear Association	.264	1	.608		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 85.46.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.015	.608
	Cramer's V	.015	.608
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 301 -- What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	326	500	826
		% within Gender Groups	39.5%	60.5%	100.0%
	Male	Count	151	210	361
		% within Gender Groups	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		477	710	1187
	% within Gender Groups		40.2%	59.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.583 ^a	1	.445		
Continuity Correction ^b	.488	1	.485		
Likelihood Ratio	.581	1	.446		
Fisher's Exact Test				.479	.242
Linear-by-Linear Association	.582	1	.446		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 145.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.022	.445
	Cramer's V	.022	.445
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 302 -- What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub (Bus, Train) by Gender

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub (Bus, Train)		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	443	826
		% within Gender Groups	53.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	226	361
		% within Gender Groups	62.6%	100.0%
Total	Count		669	1187
	% within Gender Groups		56.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.222 ^a	1	.004		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.861	1	.005		
Likelihood Ratio	8.290	1	.004		
Fisher's Exact Test				.004	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.215	1	.004		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 157.54.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.083	.004
	Cramer's V	.083	.004
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 303 -- What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	588	238	826
		% within Gender Groups	71.2%	28.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	257	104	361
		% within Gender Groups	71.2%	28.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		845	342	1187
	% within Gender Groups		71.2%	28.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.000 ^a	1	.999		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	.999		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.529
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.999		
N of Valid Cases	1187				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 104.01.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.000	.999
	Cramer's V	.000	.999
N of Valid Cases		1187	

Table 304 -- What Matters Most: Local Market by Gender

Crosstab					
			What Matters Most: Local Market		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	482	327	809
		% within Gender Groups	59.6%	40.4%	100.0%
	Male	Count	248	107	355
		% within Gender Groups	69.9%	30.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	730	434	1164
		% within Gender Groups	62.7%	37.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.149 ^a	1	<.001		
Continuity Correction ^b	10.714	1	.001		
Likelihood Ratio	11.354	1	<.001		
Fisher's Exact Test				<.001	<.001

Linear-by-Linear Association	11.140	1	<.001		
N of Valid Cases	1164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 132.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.098	<.001
	Cramer's V	.098	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Table 305 -- What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden by Gender

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	560	249	809
		% within Gender Groups	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
	Male	Count	276	79	355
		% within Gender Groups	77.7%	22.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		836	328	1164
	% within Gender Groups		71.8%	28.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
-------	----	--------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	8.861 ^a	1	.003		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.444	1	.004		
Likelihood Ratio	9.114	1	.003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.003	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.853	1	.003		
N of Valid Cases	1164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 100.03.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.087	.003
	Cramer's V	.087	.003
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Table 306 -- What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths by Gender

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	389	420
		% within Gender Groups	48.1%	51.9%
	Male	Count	174	181
		% within Gender Groups	49.0%	51.0%
Total	Count		563	601
	% within Gender Groups		48.4%	51.6%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.085 ^a	1	.770		
Continuity Correction ^b	.052	1	.819		
Likelihood Ratio	.085	1	.770		
Fisher's Exact Test				.799	.409
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.770		
N of Valid Cases	1164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 171.71.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.009	.770
	Cramer's V	.009	.770
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Table 307 -- What Matters Most: Other by Gender

Crosstab					
			What Matters Most: Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Gender Groups	Female	Count	764	45	809
		% within Gender Groups	94.4%	5.6%	100.0%
	Male	Count	329	26	355
		% within Gender Groups	92.7%	7.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		1093	71	1164
	% within Gender Groups		93.9%	6.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.337 ^a	1	.248		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.047	1	.306		
Likelihood Ratio	1.296	1	.255		
Fisher's Exact Test				.287	.153
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.336	1	.248		
N of Valid Cases	1164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.65.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.034	.248
	Cramer's V	.034	.248
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Table 308 -- Current Level of Happiness Groups by Gender

Crosstab

			Current Level of Happiness Groups		
			Unhappy / Neutral	Happy	Very Happy
Gender Groups	Female	Count	152	430	230
		% within Gender Groups	18.7%	53.0%	28.3%
	Male	Count	60	186	111
		% within Gender Groups	16.8%	52.1%	31.1%
Total	Count		212	616	341
	% within Gender Groups		18.1%	52.7%	29.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	812
		% within Gender Groups	100.0%
	Male	Count	357
		% within Gender Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1169
	% within Gender Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.186 ^a	2	.553
Likelihood Ratio	1.185	2	.553
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.177	1	.278
N of Valid Cases	1169		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.74.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.032	.553
	Cramer's V	.032	.553
N of Valid Cases		1169	

Table 309 -- Feelings About Community's Future Groups by Gender

Crosstab

			Feelings About Community's Future Groups		
			Unhappy	Neutral	Happy
Gender Groups	Female	Count	147	330	332
		% within Gender Groups	18.2%	40.8%	41.0%
	Male	Count	53	135	167
		% within Gender Groups	14.9%	38.0%	47.0%
	Total	Count	200	465	499
		% within Gender Groups	17.2%	39.9%	42.9%

Crosstab

			Total
Gender Groups	Female	Count	809
		% within Gender Groups	100.0%
	Male	Count	355
		% within Gender Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1164
		% within Gender Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.055 ^a	2	.132
Likelihood Ratio	4.064	2	.131
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.942	1	.047
N of Valid Cases	1164		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 61.00.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.059	.132
	Cramer's V	.059	.132
N of Valid Cases		1164	

Appendix E — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Age Group

Appendix E – Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Age Group

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Tables 310 - 317	Like Aspects of Community	2 - 10
Tables 318 - 325	Dislike Aspects of Community	10 - 18
Tables 326 - 343	Use Services	19 - 37
Tables 344 - 361	Services Rated as Important	37 - 57
Tables 362 - 379	What Matters Most	57 - 76
Tables 380 - 381	Current Happiness & Community's Future Outlook	77 - 79

Table 310 -- Like Sense of Community by Age Group**Crosstab**

			Like Sense of Community		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	39	41	80
		% within Age Groups	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	52	86	138
		% within Age Groups	37.7%	62.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	212	465	677
		% within Age Groups	31.3%	68.7%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	85	252	337
		% within Age Groups	25.2%	74.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	388	844	1232	
	% within Age Groups	31.5%	68.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.643 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	19.063	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.145	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.19.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.126	<.001
	Cramer's V	.126	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 311 -- Like Access to Nature by Age Group

Crosstab

			Like Access to Nature		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	28	52	80
		% within Age Groups	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	36	102	138
		% within Age Groups	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	102	575	677
		% within Age Groups	15.1%	84.9%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	87	250	337
		% within Age Groups	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	253	979	1232	
	% within Age Groups	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.030 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.221	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.305	1	.253
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.159	<.001
	Cramer's V	.159	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 312 -- Like Local Events and Activities by Age Group

Crosstab

		Like Local Events and Activities			
		Not Selected	Selected	Total	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	56	24	80
		% within Age Groups	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	76	62	138
		% within Age Groups	55.1%	44.9%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	284	393	677
		% within Age Groups	41.9%	58.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	135	202	337
		% within Age Groups	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	551	681	1232	
	% within Age Groups	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.726 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	31.881	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.267	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 35.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.160	<.001
	Cramer's V	.160	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 313 -- Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Age Group

Crosstab

			Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	67	13	80
		% within Age Groups	83.8%	16.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	103	35	138
		% within Age Groups	74.6%	25.4%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	479	198	677
		% within Age Groups	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	244	93	337
		% within Age Groups	72.4%	27.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	893	339	1232
		% within Age Groups	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.430 ^a	3	.092
Likelihood Ratio	6.997	3	.072
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.855	1	.091
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.01.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.072	.092
	Cramer's V	.072	.092
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 314 -- Like Local Shops and Amenities by Age Group

Crosstab

			Like Local Shops and Amenities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	56	24	80
		% within Age Groups	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	91	47	138
		% within Age Groups	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	366	311	677
		% within Age Groups	54.1%	45.9%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	185	152	337
		% within Age Groups	54.9%	45.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	698	534	1232
		% within Age Groups	56.7%	43.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.927 ^a	3	.005
Likelihood Ratio	13.256	3	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.241	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.68.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.102	.005
	Cramer's V	.102	.005
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 315 -- Like Public Transport Links by Age Group

Crosstab

		Like Public Transport Links		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups < 26 Years Old	Count	76	4	80
	% within Age Groups	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
26 - 40 Years Old	Count	123	15	138
	% within Age Groups	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	562	115	677
	% within Age Groups	83.0%	17.0%	100.0%
> 70 Years Old	Count	261	76	337
	% within Age Groups	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	1022	210	1232
	% within Age Groups	83.0%	17.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.160 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	21.663	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.127	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.64.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.125	<.001
	Cramer's V	.125	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 316 -- Like That Family Lives Nearby by Age Group

Crosstab

			Like That Family Lives Nearby		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	40	40	80
		% within Age Groups	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	63	75	138
		% within Age Groups	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	448	229	677
		% within Age Groups	66.2%	33.8%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	238	99	337

	% within Age Groups	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	789	443	1232
	% within Age Groups	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.791 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	33.767	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.803	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.77.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.168	<.001
	Cramer's V	.168	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 317 -- Like Other by Age Group

Crosstab

			Like Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	76	4	80
		% within Age Groups	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	132	6	138
		% within Age Groups	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	622	55	677

	> 70 Years Old	% within Age Groups	91.9%	8.1%	100.0%
		Count	306	31	337
		% within Age Groups	90.8%	9.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	1136	96	1232
		% within Age Groups	92.2%	7.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.178 ^a	3	.243
Likelihood Ratio	4.649	3	.199
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.415	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.23.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.058	.243
	Cramer's V	.058	.243
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 318 -- Dislike Sense of Community by Age Group

Crosstab

			Dislike Sense of Community		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	74	6	80
		% within Age Groups	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%

26 - 40 Years Old	Count	126	12	138
	% within Age Groups	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	629	48	677
	% within Age Groups	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
> 70 Years Old	Count	322	15	337
	% within Age Groups	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	1151	81	1232
	% within Age Groups	93.4%	6.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.889 ^a	3	.274
Likelihood Ratio	4.088	3	.252
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.741	1	.098
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.26.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.056	.274
	Cramer's V	.056	.274
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 319 -- Dislike Access to Nature by Age Group

Crosstab

		Dislike Access to Nature		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	

Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	79	1	80
		% within Age Groups	98.8%	1.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	135	3	138
		% within Age Groups	97.8%	2.2%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	657	20	677
		% within Age Groups	97.0%	3.0%	100.0%
Total	> 70 Years Old	Count	332	5	337
		% within Age Groups	98.5%	1.5%	100.0%
		Count	1203	29	1232
		% within Age Groups	97.6%	2.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.615 ^a	3	.455
Likelihood Ratio	2.789	3	.425
Linear-by-Linear Association	.046	1	.830
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.88.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.046	.455
	Cramer's V	.046	.455
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 320 -- Dislike Local Events and Activities by Age Group

Crosstab

Dislike Local Events and Activities		Total
Not Selected	Selected	

Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	75	5	80
		% within Age Groups	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	111	27	138
		% within Age Groups	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	623	54	677
		% within Age Groups	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	322	15	337
		% within Age Groups	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		1131	101	1232
	% within Age Groups		91.8%	8.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.428 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.549	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.619	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.56.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.157	<.001
	Cramer's V	.157	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 321 -- Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Age Group

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	60	20	80
		% within Age Groups	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	79	59	138
		% within Age Groups	57.2%	42.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	466	211	677
		% within Age Groups	68.8%	31.2%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	243	94	337
		% within Age Groups	72.1%	27.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	848	384	1232
		% within Age Groups	68.8%	31.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.737 ^a	3	.008
Likelihood Ratio	11.372	3	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.727	1	.189
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.94.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.098	.008
	Cramer's V	.098	.008
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 322 -- Dislike Local Shops and Amenities by Age Group

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Shops and Amenities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	61	19	80
		% within Age Groups	76.3%	23.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	87	51	138
		% within Age Groups	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	531	146	677
		% within Age Groups	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	265	72	337
		% within Age Groups	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	944	288	1232
		% within Age Groups	76.6%	23.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.215 ^a	3	.001
Likelihood Ratio	14.819	3	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.794	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.70.

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	--------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.115	.001
	Cramer's V	.115	.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 323 -- Dislike Public Transport Links by Age Group

Crosstab

		Dislike Public Transport Links		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups < 26 Years Old	Count	31	49	80
	% within Age Groups	38.8%	61.3%	100.0%
26 - 40 Years Old	Count	62	76	138
	% within Age Groups	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	276	401	677
	% within Age Groups	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
> 70 Years Old	Count	170	167	337
	% within Age Groups	50.4%	49.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	539	693	1232
	% within Age Groups	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.475 ^a	3	.024
Likelihood Ratio	9.447	3	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.283	1	.038
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 35.00.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.088	.024
	Cramer's V	.088	.024
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 324 -- Dislike That Family Lives Nearby by Age Group

Crosstab

			Dislike That Family Lives Nearby		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	78	2	80
		% within Age Groups	97.5%	2.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	130	8	138
		% within Age Groups	94.2%	5.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	646	31	677
		% within Age Groups	95.4%	4.6%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	313	24	337
		% within Age Groups	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		1167	65	1232
	% within Age Groups		94.7%	5.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.264 ^a	3	.234
Likelihood Ratio	4.360	3	.225
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.490	1	.115
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.22.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.059	.234
	Cramer's V	.059	.234
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 325 -- Dislike Other by Age Group

Crosstab

			Dislike Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	59	21	80
		% within Age Groups	73.8%	26.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	104	34	138
		% within Age Groups	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	458	219	677
		% within Age Groups	67.7%	32.3%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	209	128	337
		% within Age Groups	62.0%	38.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	830	402	1232
		% within Age Groups	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.907 ^a	3	.019
Likelihood Ratio	10.058	3	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.833	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.10.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.090	.019
	Cramer's V	.090	.019
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 326 -- Used: GP / Health Centre by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: GP / Health Centre		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	47	33	80
		% within Age Groups	58.8%	41.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	47	91	138
		% within Age Groups	34.1%	65.9%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	205	472	677
		% within Age Groups	30.3%	69.7%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	73	264	337
		% within Age Groups	21.7%	78.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	372	860	1232	
	% within Age Groups	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
--	-------	----	--------------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	43.570 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	41.209	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.008	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.16.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.188	<.001
	Cramer's V	.188	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 327 -- Used: Dentist by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Dentist		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	58	22	80
		% within Age Groups	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	99	39	138
		% within Age Groups	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	443	234	677
		% within Age Groups	65.4%	34.6%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	202	135	337
		% within Age Groups	59.9%	40.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	802	430	1232	
	% within Age Groups	65.1%	34.9%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	8.587 ^a	3	.035
Likelihood Ratio	8.675	3	.034
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.164	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.92.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.083	.035
	Cramer's V	.083	.035
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 328 -- Used: Pharmacy by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Pharmacy		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	61	19	80
		% within Age Groups	76.3%	23.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	64	74	138
		% within Age Groups	46.4%	53.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	256	421	677
		% within Age Groups	37.8%	62.2%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	108	229	337
		% within Age Groups	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	489	743	1232	
	% within Age Groups	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	56.467 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	56.228	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	45.953	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.75.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.214	<.001
	Cramer's V	.214	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 329 -- Used: Public Transport by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Public Transport		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	58	22	80
		% within Age Groups	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	106	32	138
		% within Age Groups	76.8%	23.2%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	533	144	677
		% within Age Groups	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	238	99	337
		% within Age Groups	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	935	297	1232	
	% within Age Groups	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	8.660 ^a	3	.034
Likelihood Ratio	8.505	3	.037
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.272	1	.259
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.29.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.084	.034
	Cramer's V	.084	.034
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 330 -- Used: Community Transport by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Community Transport		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	77	3	80
		% within Age Groups	96.3%	3.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	129	9	138
		% within Age Groups	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	649	28	677
		% within Age Groups	95.9%	4.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	305	32	337
		% within Age Groups	90.5%	9.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	1160	72	1232

	% within Age Groups	94.2%	5.8%	100.0%
--	---------------------	-------	------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.508 ^a	3	.006
Likelihood Ratio	11.751	3	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.957	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.68.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.101	.006
	Cramer's V	.101	.006
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 331 -- Used: Community Group by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Community Group		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	75	5	80
		% within Age Groups	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	93	45	138
		% within Age Groups	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	424	253	677
		% within Age Groups	62.6%	37.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	188	149	337
		% within Age Groups	55.8%	44.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		780	452	1232
	% within Age Groups		63.3%	36.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.250 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	50.347	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.417	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.35.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.183	<.001
	Cramer's V	.183	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 332 -- Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	59	21	80
		% within Age Groups	73.8%	26.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	74	64	138
		% within Age Groups	53.6%	46.4%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	467	210	677
		% within Age Groups	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	283	54	337
		% within Age Groups	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%

Total	Count	883	349	1232
	% within Age Groups	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.856 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	50.842	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.645	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.66.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.201	<.001
	Cramer's V	.201	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 333 -- Used: Local Schools / Childcare by Age Group

Crosstab

		Used: Local Schools / Childcare			
		Not Selected	Selected	Total	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	57	23	80
		% within Age Groups	71.3%	28.7%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	87	51	138
		% within Age Groups	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	556	121	677

	> 70 Years Old	% within Age Groups	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		Count	325	12	337
		% within Age Groups	96.4%	3.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	1025	207	1232
		% within Age Groups	83.2%	16.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	91.094 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	98.477	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	75.479	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.44.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.272	<.001
	Cramer's V	.272	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 334 -- Used: Community Centre by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Community Centre		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	74	6	80
		% within Age Groups	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%

	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	112	26	138
		% within Age Groups	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	518	159	677
		% within Age Groups	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	249	88	337
		% within Age Groups	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	953	279	1232
		% within Age Groups	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.202 ^a	3	.003
Likelihood Ratio	16.900	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.179	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.12.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.107	.003
	Cramer's V	.107	.003
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 335 -- Used: Council Services by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Council Services		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	63	17	80
		% within Age Groups	78.8%	21.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	73	65	138
		% within Age Groups	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	221	456	677
		% within Age Groups	32.6%	67.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	112	225	337
		% within Age Groups	33.2%	66.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	469	763	1232	
	% within Age Groups	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	80.821 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	79.697	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	55.382	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.45.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.256	<.001
	Cramer's V	.256	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 336 -- Used: Local Shops / Post Office by Age Group

Crosstab

		Used: Local Shops / Post Office			
		Not Selected	Selected	Total	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	38	42	80
		% within Age Groups	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	42	96	138
		% within Age Groups	30.4%	69.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	162	515	677
		% within Age Groups	23.9%	76.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	105	232	337
		% within Age Groups	31.2%	68.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	347	885	1232	
	% within Age Groups	28.2%	71.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.628 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	21.395	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.579	1	.059
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.53.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.136	<.001
	Cramer's V	.136	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 337 -- Used: Support Services (Food, Advice Services) by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	76	4	80
		% within Age Groups	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	130	8	138
		% within Age Groups	94.2%	5.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	620	57	677
		% within Age Groups	91.6%	8.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	317	20	337
		% within Age Groups	94.1%	5.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		1143	89	1232
	% within Age Groups		92.8%	7.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.289 ^a	3	.349
Likelihood Ratio	3.367	3	.338
Linear-by-Linear Association	.026	1	.871
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.78.

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	--------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.052	.349
	Cramer's V	.052	.349
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 338 -- Used: Places of Worship by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Places of Worship		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	78	2	80
		% within Age Groups	97.5%	2.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	125	13	138
		% within Age Groups	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	572	105	677
		% within Age Groups	84.5%	15.5%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	254	83	337
		% within Age Groups	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	1029	203	1232	
	% within Age Groups	83.5%	16.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.083 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	37.357	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.462	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.18.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.164	<.001
	Cramer's V	.164	<.001

N of Valid Cases	1232
------------------	------

Table 339 -- Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	78	2	80
		% within Age Groups	97.5%	2.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	128	10	138
		% within Age Groups	92.8%	7.2%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	628	49	677
		% within Age Groups	92.8%	7.2%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	320	17	337
		% within Age Groups	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	1154	78	1232
		% within Age Groups	93.7%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.054 ^a	3	.256
Likelihood Ratio	4.630	3	.201
Linear-by-Linear Association	.006	1	.938
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.06.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.057	.256
	Cramer's V	.057	.256
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 340 -- Used: Library by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Library		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	73	7	80
		% within Age Groups	91.3%	8.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	85	53	138
		% within Age Groups	61.6%	38.4%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	469	208	677
		% within Age Groups	69.3%	30.7%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	220	117	337
		% within Age Groups	65.3%	34.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	847	385	1232	
	% within Age Groups	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.114 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	28.625	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.377	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.00.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.140	<.001
	Cramer's V	.140	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 341 -- Used: Village Hall by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Village Hall		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	53	27	80
		% within Age Groups	66.3%	33.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	108	30	138
		% within Age Groups	78.3%	21.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	438	239	677
		% within Age Groups	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	195	142	337
		% within Age Groups	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	794	438	1232
		% within Age Groups	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.000 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.790	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.701	1	.001

N of Valid Cases	1232		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.44.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.121	<.001
	Cramer's V	.121	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 342 -- Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	57	23	80
		% within Age Groups	71.3%	28.7%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	126	12	138
		% within Age Groups	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	614	63	677
		% within Age Groups	90.7%	9.3%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	330	7	337
		% within Age Groups	97.9%	2.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		1127	105	1232
	% within Age Groups		91.5%	8.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	60.479 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	53.142	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	47.648	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.82.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.222	<.001
	Cramer's V	.222	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 343 -- Used: Other by Age Group

Crosstab

			Used: Other		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	76	4	80
		% within Age Groups	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	134	4	138
		% within Age Groups	97.1%	2.9%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	622	55	677
		% within Age Groups	91.9%	8.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	301	36	337
		% within Age Groups	89.3%	10.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	1133	99	1232
		% within Age Groups	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
--	-------	----	--------------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	9.128 ^a	3	.028
Likelihood Ratio	10.477	3	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.416	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.086	.028
	Cramer's V	.086	.028
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 344 -- Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	24	56	80
		% within Age Groups	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	28	110	138
		% within Age Groups	20.3%	79.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	116	561	677
		% within Age Groups	17.1%	82.9%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	59	278	337
		% within Age Groups	17.5%	82.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	227	1005	1232
		% within Age Groups	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.389 ^a	3	.039
Likelihood Ratio	7.527	3	.057
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.899	1	.027
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.74.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.083	.039
	Cramer's V	.083	.039
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 345 -- Rated Important: Use Dentist by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Dentist		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	33	47	80
		% within Age Groups	41.3%	58.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	40	98	138
		% within Age Groups	29.0%	71.0%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	171	506	677
		% within Age Groups	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	104	233	337
		% within Age Groups	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%

Total	Count	348	884	1232
	% within Age Groups	28.2%	71.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.830 ^a	3	.013
Likelihood Ratio	10.402	3	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.052	1	.305
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.60.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.094	.013
	Cramer's V	.094	.013
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 346-- Rated Important: Use Pharmacy by Age Group

Crosstab

		Rated Important: Use Pharmacy		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups < 26 Years Old	Count	38	42	80
	% within Age Groups	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
26 - 40 Years Old	Count	39	99	138
	% within Age Groups	28.3%	71.7%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	158	519	677

	> 70 Years Old	% within Age Groups	23.3%	76.7%	100.0%
		Count	88	249	337
		% within Age Groups	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	323	909	1232
		% within Age Groups	26.2%	73.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.933 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	19.851	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.017	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.97.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.133	<.001
	Cramer's V	.133	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 347 -- Rated Important: Use Public Transport by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Public Transport		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	32	48	80
		% within Age Groups	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%

	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	42	96	138
		% within Age Groups	30.4%	69.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	151	526	677
		% within Age Groups	22.3%	77.7%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	93	244	337
		% within Age Groups	27.6%	72.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	318	914	1232
		% within Age Groups	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.860 ^a	3	.002
Likelihood Ratio	14.186	3	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.498	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.65.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.110	.002
	Cramer's V	.110	.002
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 348 -- Rated Important: Use Community Transport by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Community Transport		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	54	26	80
		% within Age Groups	67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	61	77	138
		% within Age Groups	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	244	433	677
		% within Age Groups	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	140	197	337
		% within Age Groups	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		499	733	1232
	% within Age Groups		40.5%	59.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.723 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.313	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.482	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.40.

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approximate Significance

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.158	<.001
	Cramer's V	.158	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 349 -- Rated Important: Community Group by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Group		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	65	15	80
		% within Age Groups	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	60	78	138
		% within Age Groups	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	270	407	677
		% within Age Groups	39.9%	60.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	156	181	337
		% within Age Groups	46.3%	53.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	551	681	1232	
	% within Age Groups	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	50.016 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	52.075	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.475	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 35.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.201	<.001
	Cramer's V	.201	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 350 -- Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	44	36	80
		% within Age Groups	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	45	93	138
		% within Age Groups	32.6%	67.4%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	215	462	677
		% within Age Groups	31.8%	68.2%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	154	183	337
		% within Age Groups	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	458	774	1232
		% within Age Groups	37.2%	62.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.102 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.615	3	<.001

Linear-by-Linear Association	.228	1	.633
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.74.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.159	<.001
	Cramer's V	.159	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 351 -- Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	39	41	80
		% within Age Groups	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	48	90	138
		% within Age Groups	34.8%	65.2%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	200	477	677
		% within Age Groups	29.5%	70.5%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	137	200	337
		% within Age Groups	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		424	808	1232
	% within Age Groups		34.4%	65.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.223 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	19.911	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.033	1	.856
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.53.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.128	<.001
	Cramer's V	.128	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 352 -- Rated Important: Community Centre by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Centre		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	52	28	80
		% within Age Groups	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	60	78	138
		% within Age Groups	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	270	407	677
		% within Age Groups	39.9%	60.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	141	196	337
		% within Age Groups	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	523	709	1232

	% within Age Groups	42.5%	57.5%	100.0%
--	---------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.590 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.410	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.062	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.96.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.123	<.001
	Cramer's V	.123	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 353 -- Rated Important: Council Services by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Council Services		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	49	31	80
		% within Age Groups	61.3%	38.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	61	77	138
		% within Age Groups	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	202	475	677
		% within Age Groups			

	> 70 Years Old	% within Age Groups	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%
		Count	92	245	337
		% within Age Groups	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		404	828	1232
	% within Age Groups		32.8%	67.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.845 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	42.350	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.362	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.23.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.191	<.001
	Cramer's V	.191	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 354 -- Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	33	47	80
		% within Age Groups	41.3%	58.8%	100.0%

	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	46	92	138
		% within Age Groups	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	153	524	677
		% within Age Groups	22.6%	77.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	83	254	337
		% within Age Groups	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	315	917	1232
		% within Age Groups	25.6%	74.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.001 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	16.832	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.046	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.45.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.121	<.001
	Cramer's V	.121	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 355 -- Rated Important: Support Services (Food, Advice) by Age Group
Crosstab

			Rated Important: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	49	31	80
		% within Age Groups	61.3%	38.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	60	78	138
		% within Age Groups	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	264	413	677
		% within Age Groups	39.0%	61.0%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	182	155	337
		% within Age Groups	54.0%	46.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	555	677	1232
		% within Age Groups	45.0%	55.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.563 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	29.567	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.210	1	.647
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.04.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.155	<.001
	Cramer's V	.155	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 356 -- Rated Important: Places of Worship by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Places of Worship		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	58	22	80
		% within Age Groups	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	80	55	135
		% within Age Groups	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	326	332	658
		% within Age Groups	49.5%	50.5%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	169	166	335
		% within Age Groups	50.4%	49.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	633	575	1208
		% within Age Groups	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.168 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.749	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.683	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38.08.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.123	<.001

	Cramer's V	.123	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 357 -- Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Oppor. by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	57	23	80
		% within Age Groups	71.3%	28.7%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	62	73	135
		% within Age Groups	45.9%	54.1%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	268	390	658
		% within Age Groups	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	193	142	335
		% within Age Groups	57.6%	42.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		580	628	1208
	% within Age Groups		48.0%	52.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	43.893 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	44.455	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.875
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38.41.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.191	<.001
	Cramer's V	.191	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 358 -- Rated Important: Library by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Library		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	54	26	80
		% within Age Groups	67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	57	81	138
		% within Age Groups	41.3%	58.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	229	448	677
		% within Age Groups	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	123	214	337
		% within Age Groups	36.5%	63.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	463	769	1232	
	% within Age Groups	37.6%	62.4%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.582 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	34.415	3	<.001

Linear-by-Linear Association	17.225	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.06.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.170	<.001
	Cramer's V	.170	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 359 -- Rated Important: Village Hall by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Village Hall		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	53	27	80
		% within Age Groups	66.3%	33.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	72	66	138
		% within Age Groups	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	275	402	677
		% within Age Groups	40.6%	59.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	132	205	337
		% within Age Groups	39.2%	60.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	532	700	1232	
	% within Age Groups	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	25.921 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.791	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.261	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.55.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.145	<.001
	Cramer's V	.145	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 360 -- Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	38	42	80
		% within Age Groups	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	44	94	138
		% within Age Groups	31.9%	68.1%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	224	453	677
		% within Age Groups	33.1%	66.9%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	157	180	337
		% within Age Groups	46.6%	53.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		463	769	1232
	% within Age Groups		37.6%	62.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.747 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	22.511	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.679	1	.102
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.06.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.136	<.001
	Cramer's V	.136	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 361 -- Rated Important: Other by Age Group

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Other		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	75	5	80
		% within Age Groups	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	127	11	138
		% within Age Groups	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	624	53	677
		% within Age Groups	92.2%	7.8%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	309	28	337
		% within Age Groups	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		1135	97	1232
	% within Age Groups		92.1%	7.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.382 ^a	3	.944
Likelihood Ratio	.401	3	.940
Linear-by-Linear Association	.268	1	.605
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.30.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.018	.944
	Cramer's V	.018	.944
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 362 -- What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	49	31	80
		% within Age Groups	61.3%	38.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	46	92	138
		% within Age Groups	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	187	490	677
		% within Age Groups	27.6%	72.4%	100.0%

> 70 Years Old	Count	132	205	337
	% within Age Groups	39.2%	60.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	414	818	1232
	% within Age Groups	33.6%	66.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.945 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	41.238	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.556	1	.059
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.88.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.187	<.001
	Cramer's V	.187	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 363 -- What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	69	11	80
		% within Age Groups	86.3%	13.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	68	70	138

		% within Age Groups	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%
		Count	413	264	677
	41 - 70 Years Old	% within Age Groups	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	233	104	337
		% within Age Groups	69.1%	30.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		783	449	1232
	% within Age Groups		63.6%	36.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.377 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	38.903	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.027	1	.870
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.16.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.172	<.001
	Cramer's V	.172	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 364 -- What Matters Most: Village Hall by Age Group

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Village Hall			
		Not Selected	Selected	Total	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	51	29	80
		% within Age Groups	63.7%	36.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	100	38	138
		% within Age Groups	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	373	304	677
		% within Age Groups	55.1%	44.9%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	176	161	337
		% within Age Groups	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	700	532	1232	
	% within Age Groups	56.8%	43.2%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.050 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	19.738	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.899	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.55.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.124	<.001
	Cramer's V	.124	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 365 -- What Matters Most: Community Centre by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Community Centre		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	67	13	80
		% within Age Groups	83.8%	16.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	92	46	138
		% within Age Groups	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	388	289	677
		% within Age Groups	57.3%	42.7%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	179	158	337
		% within Age Groups	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		726	506	1232
	% within Age Groups		58.9%	41.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.215 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	31.869	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.472	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.86.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.154	<.001

Cramer's V	.154	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232	

Table 366 -- What Matters Most: Library by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Library		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	71	9	80
		% within Age Groups	88.8%	11.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	68	70	138
		% within Age Groups	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	349	328	677
		% within Age Groups	51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	157	180	337
		% within Age Groups	46.6%	53.4%	100.0%
	Total	Count	645	587	1232
		% within Age Groups	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.675 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	54.150	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.201	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38.12.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.197	<.001
	Cramer's V	.197	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 367 -- What Matters Most: Sports Center / Leisure Facility by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Sports Center / Leisure Facility		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	55	25	80
		% within Age Groups	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	66	72	138
		% within Age Groups	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	373	304	677
		% within Age Groups	55.1%	44.9%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	234	103	337
		% within Age Groups	69.4%	30.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	728	504	1232
		% within Age Groups	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.721 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.170	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.362	1	.012

N of Valid Cases	1232		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.73.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.155	<.001
	Cramer's V	.155	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 368 -- What Matters Most: Local Shop by Age Group

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Local Shop		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups < 26 Years Old	Count	49	31	80
	% within Age Groups	61.3%	38.8%	100.0%
26 - 40 Years Old	Count	58	80	138
	% within Age Groups	42.0%	58.0%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	205	472	677
	% within Age Groups	30.3%	69.7%	100.0%
> 70 Years Old	Count	123	214	337
	% within Age Groups	36.5%	63.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	435	797	1232
	% within Age Groups	35.3%	64.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.000 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	32.751	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.055	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.25.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.166	<.001
	Cramer's V	.166	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 369 -- What Matters Most: Place of Worship by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Place of Worship		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	74	6	80
		% within Age Groups	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	117	21	138
		% within Age Groups	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	516	161	677
		% within Age Groups	76.2%	23.8%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	222	115	337
		% within Age Groups	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	929	303	1232

	% within Age Groups	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%
--	---------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.894 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	38.829	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.587	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.68.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.171	<.001
	Cramer's V	.171	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 370 -- What Matters Most: School / College by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: School / College		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	50	30	80
		% within Age Groups	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%

26 - 40 Years Old	Count	78	60	138
	% within Age Groups	56.5%	43.5%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	425	252	677
	% within Age Groups	62.8%	37.2%	100.0%
> 70 Years Old	Count	257	80	337
	% within Age Groups	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	810	422	1232
	% within Age Groups	65.7%	34.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.784 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.606	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.914	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.40.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.142	<.001
	Cramer's V	.142	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 371 -- What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery by Age Group

Crosstab

What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery	Total
---	-------

			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	46	34	80
		% within Age Groups	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	41	97	138
		% within Age Groups	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	160	517	677
		% within Age Groups	23.6%	76.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	70	267	337
		% within Age Groups	20.8%	79.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	317	915	1232	
	% within Age Groups	25.7%	74.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.290 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	43.258	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.136	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.58.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.200	<.001
	Cramer's V	.200	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 372 -- What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	58	22	80
		% within Age Groups	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	93	45	138
		% within Age Groups	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	514	163	677
		% within Age Groups	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	276	61	337
		% within Age Groups	81.9%	18.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	941	291	1232
		% within Age Groups	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.616 ^a	3	.006
Likelihood Ratio	12.501	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.662	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.90.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.101	.006

Cramer's V	.101	.006
N of Valid Cases	1232	

Table 373 -- What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	29	51	80
		% within Age Groups	36.3%	63.7%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	63	75	138
		% within Age Groups	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	268	409	677
		% within Age Groups	39.6%	60.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	139	198	337
		% within Age Groups	41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	499	733	1232
		% within Age Groups	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.432 ^a	3	.488
Likelihood Ratio	2.423	3	.489
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.873
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.40.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.044	.488
	Cramer's V	.044	.488
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 374 -- What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub (Bus, Train)		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	66	14	80
		% within Age Groups	82.5%	17.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	83	55	138
		% within Age Groups	60.1%	39.9%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	369	308	677
		% within Age Groups	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	179	158	337
		% within Age Groups	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	697	535	1232
		% within Age Groups	56.6%	43.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.424 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	27.878	3	<.001

Linear-by-Linear Association	17.275	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.74.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.144	<.001
	Cramer's V	.144	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 375 -- What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	73	7	80
		% within Age Groups	91.3%	8.8%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	111	27	138
		% within Age Groups	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	456	221	677
		% within Age Groups	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	240	97	337
		% within Age Groups	71.2%	28.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		880	352	1232
	% within Age Groups		71.4%	28.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.396 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	30.470	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.411	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.86.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.146	<.001
	Cramer's V	.146	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 376 -- What Matters Most: Local Market by Age Group

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Local Market		Total
		Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups < 26 Years Old	Count	61	19	80
	% within Age Groups	76.3%	23.8%	100.0%
26 - 40 Years Old	Count	90	45	135
	% within Age Groups	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
41 - 70 Years Old	Count	398	260	658
	% within Age Groups	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
> 70 Years Old	Count	209	126	335
	% within Age Groups	62.4%	37.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	758	450	1208

	% within Age Groups	62.7%	37.3%	100.0%
--	---------------------	-------	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.585 ^a	3	.035
Likelihood Ratio	9.020	3	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.279	1	.039
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.80.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.084	.035
	Cramer's V	.084	.035
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 377 -- What Matters Most: Allotments / Comm. Garden by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	75	5	80
		% within Age Groups	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	99	36	135
		% within Age Groups	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	441	217	658

	> 70 Years Old	% within Age Groups	67.0%	33.0%	100.0%
		Count	252	83	335
		% within Age Groups	75.2%	24.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		867	341	1208
	% within Age Groups		71.8%	28.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.536 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	34.285	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.133	1	.042
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.58.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.154	<.001
	Cramer's V	.154	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 378 -- What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths		Total
			Not Selected	Selected	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	61	19	80
		% within Age Groups	76.3%	23.8%	100.0%

	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	75	60	135
		% within Age Groups	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	291	367	658
		% within Age Groups	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	163	172	335
		% within Age Groups	48.7%	51.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		590	618	1208
	% within Age Groups		48.8%	51.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.105 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	33.255	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.532	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.07.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.163	<.001
	Cramer's V	.163	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 379 -- What Matters Most: Other by Age Group

Crosstab

			What Matters Most:		
			Other		
			Not Selected	Selected	Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	78	2	80
		% within Age Groups	97.5%	2.5%	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	126	9	135
		% within Age Groups	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	616	42	658
		% within Age Groups	93.6%	6.4%	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	310	25	335
		% within Age Groups	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	1130	78	1208
		% within Age Groups	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.651 ^a	3	.449
Likelihood Ratio	3.219	3	.359
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.860	1	.173
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.047	.449
	Cramer's V	.047	.449
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 380 -- Current Level of Happiness Groups by Age Group

Crosstab

			Current Level of Happiness Groups		
			Unhappy / Neutral	Happy	Very Happy
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	16	44	17
		% within Age Groups	20.8%	57.1%	22.1%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	33	83	19
		% within Age Groups	24.4%	61.5%	14.1%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	125	349	195
		% within Age Groups	18.7%	52.2%	29.1%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	56	160	116
		% within Age Groups	16.9%	48.2%	34.9%
	Total	Count	230	636	347
		% within Age Groups	19.0%	52.4%	28.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	77
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	135
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	669
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	332
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1213
	% within Age Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.488 ^a	6	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	24.350	6	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.752	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1213		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.60.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.136	<.001
	Cramer's V	.096	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1213	

Table 381 -- Feelings About Community's Future Groups by Age Group

Crosstab

		Feelings About Community's Future Groups			
		Unhappy	Neutral	Happy	
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	14	31	35
		% within Age Groups	17.5%	38.8%	43.8%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	22	66	47
		% within Age Groups	16.3%	48.9%	34.8%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	124	271	263
		% within Age Groups	18.8%	41.2%	40.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	52	117	166
		% within Age Groups	15.5%	34.9%	49.6%

Total	Count	212	485	511
	% within Age	17.5%	40.1%	42.3%
	Groups			

Crosstab

			Total
Age Groups	< 26 Years Old	Count	80
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
	26 - 40 Years Old	Count	135
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
	41 - 70 Years Old	Count	658
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
	> 70 Years Old	Count	335
		% within Age Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1208	
	% within Age Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.433 ^a	6	.037
Likelihood Ratio	13.301	6	.038
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.246	1	.072
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.04.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.105	.037
	Cramer's V	.075	.037
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Appendix F — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Geographic Area

Appendix F -- Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Geographic Area

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Tables 382 - 389	Like Aspects of Community	2 - 13
Tables 390 - 397	Dislike Aspects of Community	13 - 25
Tables 398 - 415	Use Services	26 - 52
Tables 416 - 433	Services Rated as Important	52 - 79
Tables 434 - 451	What Matters Most	79 - 106
Tables 452 - 453	Current Happiness & Community's Future Outlook	106 - 109

Table 382 -- Like Sense of Community by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Sense of Community	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	145	313
		% within Geographic Areas	31.7%	68.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	127	256
		% within Geographic Areas	33.2%	66.8%
	Newtown	Count	67	165
		% within Geographic Areas	28.9%	71.1%
	Welshpool	Count	49	110
		% within Geographic Areas	30.8%	69.2%
Total	Count		388	844
	% within Geographic Areas		31.5%	68.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.267 ^a	3	.737
Likelihood Ratio	1.274	3	.735
Linear-by-Linear Association	.283	1	.595
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.07.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.032	.737
	Cramer's V	.032	.737
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 383 -- Like Access to Nature by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Access to Nature	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	113	345
		% within Geographic Areas	24.7%	75.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	76	307
		% within Geographic Areas	19.8%	80.2%
	Newtown	Count	44	188
		% within Geographic Areas	19.0%	81.0%
	Welshpool	Count	20	139
		% within Geographic Areas	12.6%	87.4%

Total	Count	253	979
	% within Geographic Areas	20.5%	79.5%

Crosstab

		Total	
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.435 ^a	3	.010
Likelihood Ratio	11.982	3	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.647	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 32.65.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.096	.010
	Cramer's V	.096	.010

N of Valid Cases	1232
------------------	------

Table 384 -- Like Local Events and Activities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Local Events and Activities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	213	245
		% within Geographic Areas	46.5%	53.5%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	169	214
		% within Geographic Areas	44.1%	55.9%
	Newtown	Count	96	136
		% within Geographic Areas	41.4%	58.6%
	Welshpool	Count	73	86
		% within Geographic Areas	45.9%	54.1%
Total		Count	551	681
		% within Geographic Areas	44.7%	55.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232

	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Total	Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.785 ^a	3	.618
Likelihood Ratio	1.789	3	.617
Linear-by-Linear Association	.452	1	.501
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 71.11.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.038	.618
	Cramer's V	.038	.618
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 385 -- Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	328	130
		% within Geographic Areas	71.6%	28.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	299	84
		% within Geographic Areas	78.1%	21.9%

	Newtown	Count	147	85
		% within Geographic Areas	63.4%	36.6%
	Welshpool	Count	119	40
		% within Geographic Areas	74.8%	25.2%
Total	Count		893	339
	% within Geographic Areas		72.5%	27.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.283 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	16.029	3	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.356	1	.551
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.75.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.115	<.001
	Cramer's V	.115	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 386 -- Like Local Shops and Amenities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Local Shops and Amenities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	265	193
		% within Geographic Areas	57.9%	42.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	235	148
		% within Geographic Areas	61.4%	38.6%
	Newtown	Count	119	113
		% within Geographic Areas	51.3%	48.7%
	Welshpool	Count	79	80
		% within Geographic Areas	49.7%	50.3%
	Total	Count	698	534
		% within Geographic Areas	56.7%	43.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.581 ^a	3	.022
Likelihood Ratio	9.567	3	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.966	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.92.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.088	.022
	Cramer's V	.088	.022
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 387 -- Like Public Transport Links by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Public Transport Links	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	395	63
		% within Geographic Areas	86.2%	13.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	326	57
		% within Geographic Areas	85.1%	14.9%

	Newtown	Count	168	64
		% within Geographic Areas	72.4%	27.6%
	Welshpool	Count	133	26
		% within Geographic Areas	83.6%	16.4%
Total	Count		1022	210
	% within Geographic Areas		83.0%	17.0%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.057 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	21.036	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.460	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.10.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.137	<.001
	Cramer's V	.137	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 388 -- Like That Family Lives Nearby by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like That Family Lives Nearby	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	291	167
		% within Geographic Areas	63.5%	36.5%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	232	151
		% within Geographic Areas	60.6%	39.4%
	Newtown	Count	154	78
		% within Geographic Areas	66.4%	33.6%
	Welshpool	Count	112	47
		% within Geographic Areas	70.4%	29.6%
Total		Count	789	443
		% within Geographic Areas	64.0%	36.0%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.427 ^a	3	.143
Likelihood Ratio	5.493	3	.139
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.594	1	.107
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 57.17.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.066	.143
	Cramer's V	.066	.143
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 389 -- Like Other by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Like Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	423	35
		% within Geographic Areas	92.4%	7.6%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	352	31
		% within Geographic Areas	91.9%	8.1%

	Newtown	Count	214	18
		% within Geographic Areas	92.2%	7.8%
	Welshpool	Count	147	12
		% within Geographic Areas	92.5%	7.5%
Total		Count	1136	96
		% within Geographic Areas	92.2%	7.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.077 ^a	3	.994
Likelihood Ratio	.076	3	.995
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.986
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.39.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.008	.994
	Cramer's V	.008	.994
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 390 -- Dislike Sense of Community by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Dislike Sense of Community	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	425	33
		% within Geographic Areas	92.8%	7.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	361	22
		% within Geographic Areas	94.3%	5.7%
	Newtown	Count	217	15
		% within Geographic Areas	93.5%	6.5%
	Welshpool	Count	148	11
		% within Geographic Areas	93.1%	6.9%
	Total	Count	1151	81
		% within Geographic Areas	93.4%	6.6%

Crosstab

Total

Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.762 ^a	3	.859
Likelihood Ratio	.771	3	.856
Linear-by-Linear Association	.052	1	.820
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.45.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.025	.859
	Cramer's V	.025	.859
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 391 -- Dislike Access to Nature by Geographic Area

Crosstab

	Dislike Access to Nature	
	Not Selected	Selected

Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450	8
		% within Geographic Areas	98.3%	1.7%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	376	7
		% within Geographic Areas	98.2%	1.8%
	Newtown	Count	228	4
		% within Geographic Areas	98.3%	1.7%
	Welshpool	Count	149	10
		% within Geographic Areas	93.7%	6.3%
Total		Count	1203	29
		% within Geographic Areas	97.6%	2.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.310 ^a	3	.006
Likelihood Ratio	9.142	3	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.307	1	.012

N of Valid Cases	1232		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.74.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.100	.006
	Cramer's V	.100	.006
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 392 -- Dislike Local Events and Activities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Events and Activities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	425	33
		% within Geographic Areas	92.8%	7.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	349	34
		% within Geographic Areas	91.1%	8.9%
	Newtown	Count	215	17
		% within Geographic Areas	92.7%	7.3%
	Welshpool	Count	142	17
		% within Geographic Areas	89.3%	10.7%
	Total	Count	1131	101
		% within Geographic Areas	91.8%	8.2%

Crosstab

Total

Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.382 ^a	3	.497
Likelihood Ratio	2.302	3	.512
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.101	1	.294
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.03.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.044	.497
	Cramer's V	.044	.497
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 393 -- Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Geographic Area

Crosstab

Dislike Local Services
(Schools, Healthcare)

			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	343	115
		% within Geographic Areas	74.9%	25.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	229	154
		% within Geographic Areas	59.8%	40.2%
	Newtown	Count	164	68
		% within Geographic Areas	70.7%	29.3%
	Welshpool	Count	112	47
		% within Geographic Areas	70.4%	29.6%
Total		Count	848	384
		% within Geographic Areas	68.8%	31.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.994 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	22.682	3	<.001

Linear-by-Linear Association	1.186	1	.276
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 49.56.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.137	<.001
	Cramer's V	.137	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 394 -- Dislike Local Shops and Amenities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Shops and Amenities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	365	93
		% within Geographic Areas	79.7%	20.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	277	106
		% within Geographic Areas	72.3%	27.7%
	Newtown	Count	172	60
		% within Geographic Areas	74.1%	25.9%
	Welshpool	Count	130	29
		% within Geographic Areas	81.8%	18.2%
	Total	Count	944	288
		% within Geographic Areas	76.6%	23.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.507 ^a	3	.023
Likelihood Ratio	9.552	3	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	.052	1	.820
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37.17.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.088	.023
	Cramer's V	.088	.023
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 395 -- Dislike Public Transport Links by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Dislike Public Transport Links	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	191	267
		% within Geographic Areas	41.7%	58.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	163	220
		% within Geographic Areas	42.6%	57.4%
	Newtown	Count	127	105
		% within Geographic Areas	54.7%	45.3%
	Welshpool	Count	58	101
		% within Geographic Areas	36.5%	63.5%
Total		Count	539	693
		% within Geographic Areas	43.8%	56.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	15.806 ^a	3	.001
Likelihood Ratio	15.748	3	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.425	1	.514
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 69.56.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.113	.001
	Cramer's V	.113	.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 396 -- Dislike That Family Lives Nearby by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Dislike That Family Lives Nearby	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	436	22
		% within Geographic Areas	95.2%	4.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	365	18
		% within Geographic Areas	95.3%	4.7%
	Newtown	Count	219	13
		% within Geographic Areas	94.4%	5.6%
	Welshpool	Count	147	12
		% within Geographic Areas	92.5%	7.5%
Total		Count	1167	65
		% within Geographic Areas	94.7%	5.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.150 ^a	3	.542
Likelihood Ratio	1.980	3	.577
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.560	1	.212
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.39.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.042	.542
	Cramer's V	.042	.542
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 397 -- Dislike Other by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Dislike	Other
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	308	150
		% within Geographic Areas	67.2%	32.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	267	116
		% within Geographic Areas	69.7%	30.3%
	Newtown	Count	141	91
		% within Geographic Areas	60.8%	39.2%
	Welshpool	Count	114	45
		% within Geographic Areas	71.7%	28.3%
	Total	Count	830	402
		% within Geographic Areas	67.4%	32.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.903 ^a	3	.075
Likelihood Ratio	6.812	3	.078
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.954
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.88.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.075	.075
	Cramer's V	.075	.075
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 398 -- Used: GP / Health Centre by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: GP / Health Centre	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	161	297
		% within Geographic Areas	35.2%	64.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	112	271
		% within Geographic Areas	29.2%	70.8%
	Newtown	Count	60	172
		% within Geographic Areas	25.9%	74.1%
	Welshpool	Count	39	120
		% within Geographic Areas		

	% within Geographic Areas	24.5%	75.5%
Total	Count	372	860
	% within Geographic Areas	30.2%	69.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.995 ^a	3	.019
Likelihood Ratio	10.006	3	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.266	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 48.01.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.090	.019

Cramer's V	.090	.019
N of Valid Cases	1232	

Table 399 -- Used: Dentist by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Dentist	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	274	184
		% within Geographic Areas	59.8%	40.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	262	121
		% within Geographic Areas	68.4%	31.6%
	Newtown	Count	141	91
		% within Geographic Areas	60.8%	39.2%
	Welshpool	Count	125	34
		% within Geographic Areas	78.6%	21.4%
	Total	Count	802	430
		% within Geographic Areas	65.1%	34.9%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232

	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Total	Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.146 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	23.095	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.873	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 55.50.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.134	<.001
	Cramer's V	.134	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 400 -- Used: Pharmacy by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Pharmacy	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	186	272
		% within Geographic Areas	40.6%	59.4%

	Llandrindod Wells	Count	117	266
		% within Geographic Areas	30.5%	69.5%
	Newtown	Count	105	127
		% within Geographic Areas	45.3%	54.7%
	Welshpool	Count	81	78
		% within Geographic Areas	50.9%	49.1%
Total	Count		489	743
	% within Geographic Areas		39.7%	60.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.951 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.171	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.262	1	.012
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 63.11.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.142	<.001
	Cramer's V	.142	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 401 -- Used: Public Transport by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Public Transport	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	366	92
		% within Geographic Areas	79.9%	20.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	302	81
		% within Geographic Areas	78.9%	21.1%
	Newtown	Count	151	81
		% within Geographic Areas	65.1%	34.9%
	Welshpool	Count	116	43
		% within Geographic Areas	73.0%	27.0%
	Total	Count	935	297
		% within Geographic Areas	75.9%	24.1%

Crosstab

Total

Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.436 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.442	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.551	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38.33.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.132	<.001
	Cramer's V	.132	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 402 -- Used: Community Transport by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Community Transport	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	439	19
		% within Geographic Areas	95.9%	4.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	353	30
		% within Geographic Areas	92.2%	7.8%
	Newtown	Count	214	18
		% within Geographic Areas	92.2%	7.8%
	Welshpool	Count	154	5
		% within Geographic Areas	96.9%	3.1%
Total	Count	1160	72	
	% within Geographic Areas	94.2%	5.8%	

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.797 ^a	3	.032
Likelihood Ratio	9.068	3	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	.181	1	.671
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.29.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.085	.032
	Cramer's V	.085	.032
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 403 -- Used: Community Group by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Community Group	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	302	156
		% within Geographic Areas	65.9%	34.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	251	132
		% within Geographic Areas	65.5%	34.5%
	Newtown	Count	130	102
		% within Geographic Areas	56.0%	44.0%
	Welshpool	Count	97	62
		% within Geographic Areas	61.0%	39.0%
	Total	Count	780	452
		% within Geographic Areas	63.3%	36.7%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.829 ^a	3	.050
Likelihood Ratio	7.725	3	.052
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.284	1	.038
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 58.33.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.080	.050
	Cramer's V	.080	.050
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 404 -- Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

Used: Leisure Centre / Sports
Facilities

		Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	
		Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	337
		% within Geographic Areas	26.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	124
		% within Geographic Areas	32.4%
	Newtown	Count	64
		% within Geographic Areas	27.6%
	Welshpool	Count	40
		% within Geographic Areas	25.2%
	Total	Count	349
		% within Geographic Areas	28.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.763 ^a	3	.190
Likelihood Ratio	4.713	3	.194
Linear-by-Linear Association	.035	1	.852
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 45.04.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.062	.190
	Cramer's V	.062	.190
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 405 -- Used: Local Schools / Childcare by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Local Schools / Childcare	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	380	78
		% within Geographic Areas	83.0%	17.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	326	57
		% within Geographic Areas	85.1%	14.9%
	Newtown	Count	186	46
		% within Geographic Areas	80.2%	19.8%
	Welshpool	Count	133	26
		% within Geographic Areas	83.6%	16.4%
Total		Count	1025	207

	% within Geographic Areas	83.2%	16.8%
--	---------------------------	-------	-------

Crosstab

		Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count
		458
	Llandrindod Wells	% within Geographic Areas
		100.0%
	Newtown	Count
		383
	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas
		100.0%
Total	Count	
	1232	
		% within Geographic Areas
		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.569 ^a	3	.463
Likelihood Ratio	2.535	3	.469
Linear-by-Linear Association	.112	1	.738
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.72.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.046	.463
	Cramer's V	.046	.463
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 406 -- Used: Community Centre by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Community Centre	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	379	79
		% within Geographic Areas	82.8%	17.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	290	93
		% within Geographic Areas	75.7%	24.3%
	Newtown	Count	166	66
		% within Geographic Areas	71.6%	28.4%
	Welshpool	Count	118	41
		% within Geographic Areas	74.2%	25.8%
	Total	Count	953	279
		% within Geographic Areas	77.4%	22.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.555 ^a	3	.004
Likelihood Ratio	13.777	3	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.031	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.01.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.105	.004
	Cramer's V	.105	.004
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 407 -- Used: Council Services by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Council Services	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	194	264
		% within Geographic Areas	42.4%	57.6%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	128	255
		% within Geographic Areas	33.4%	66.6%
	Newtown	Count	89	143
		% within Geographic Areas	38.4%	61.6%
	Welshpool	Count	58	101
		% within Geographic Areas	36.5%	63.5%

Total	Count	469	763
	% within Geographic Areas	38.1%	61.9%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.263 ^a	3	.064
Likelihood Ratio	7.280	3	.063
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.854	1	.173
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 60.53.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.077	.064
	Cramer's V	.077	.064
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 408 -- Used: Local Shops / Post Office by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Local Shops / Post Office	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	147	311
		% within Geographic Areas	32.1%	67.9%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	91	292
		% within Geographic Areas	23.8%	76.2%
	Newtown	Count	67	165
		% within Geographic Areas	28.9%	71.1%
	Welshpool	Count	42	117
		% within Geographic Areas	26.4%	73.6%
Total	Count	347	885	
	% within Geographic Areas	28.2%	71.8%	

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.471 ^a	3	.058
Likelihood Ratio	7.512	3	.057
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.798	1	.180
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.078	.058
	Cramer's V	.078	.058
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 409 -- Used: Support Services (Food, Advice) by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	434	24
		% within Geographic Areas	94.8%	5.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	358	25
		% within Geographic Areas	93.5%	6.5%
	Newtown	Count	204	28
		% within Geographic Areas	87.9%	12.1%
	Welshpool	Count	147	12
		% within Geographic Areas	92.5%	7.5%

Total	Count	1143	89
	% within Geographic Areas	92.8%	7.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.117 ^a	3	.011
Likelihood Ratio	10.122	3	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.153	1	.023
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.49.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.095	.011
	Cramer's V	.095	.011
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 410 -- Used: Places of Worship by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Places of Worship	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	372	86
		% within Geographic Areas	81.2%	18.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	322	61
		% within Geographic Areas	84.1%	15.9%
	Newtown	Count	196	36
		% within Geographic Areas	84.5%	15.5%
	Welshpool	Count	139	20
		% within Geographic Areas	87.4%	12.6%
	Total	Count	1029	203
		% within Geographic Areas	83.5%	16.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.756 ^a	3	.289
Likelihood Ratio	3.825	3	.281
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.484	1	.062
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.20.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.055	.289
	Cramer's V	.055	.289
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 411 -- Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	430	28
		% within Geographic Areas	93.9%	6.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	360	23
		% within Geographic Areas	94.0%	6.0%
	Newtown	Count	214	18
		% within Geographic Areas	92.2%	7.8%
	Welshpool	Count	150	9
		% within Geographic Areas		

	% within Geographic Areas	94.3%	5.7%
Total	Count	1154	78
	% within Geographic Areas	93.7%	6.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.023 ^a	3	.796
Likelihood Ratio	.978	3	.806
Linear-by-Linear Association	.060	1	.806
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.07.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.029	.796
	Cramer's V	.029	.796

N of Valid Cases	1232
------------------	------

Table 412 -- Used: Library by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Library	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	327	131
		% within Geographic Areas	71.4%	28.6%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	254	129
		% within Geographic Areas	66.3%	33.7%
	Newtown	Count	142	90
		% within Geographic Areas	61.2%	38.8%
	Welshpool	Count	124	35
		% within Geographic Areas	78.0%	22.0%
	Total	Count	847	385
		% within Geographic Areas	68.8%	31.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	

% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
---------------------------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.007 ^a	3	.002
Likelihood Ratio	15.210	3	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.988
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 49.69.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.110	.002
	Cramer's V	.110	.002
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 413 -- Used: Village Hall by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Village Hall	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	264	194
		% within Geographic Areas	57.6%	42.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	270	113
		% within Geographic Areas	70.5%	29.5%
	Newtown	Count	160	72
		% within Geographic Areas	69.0%	31.0%
	Welshpool	Count	100	59

	% within Geographic Areas	62.9%	37.1%
Total	Count	794	438
	% within Geographic Areas	64.4%	35.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.608 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	17.605	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.455	1	.035
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.53.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.120	<.001
	Cramer's V	.120	<.001

N of Valid Cases	1232
------------------	------

Table 414 -- Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	410	48
		% within Geographic Areas	89.5%	10.5%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	357	26
		% within Geographic Areas	93.2%	6.8%
	Newtown	Count	213	19
		% within Geographic Areas	91.8%	8.2%
	Welshpool	Count	147	12
		% within Geographic Areas	92.5%	7.5%
	Total	Count	1127	105
		% within Geographic Areas	91.5%	8.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Total	Count	1232
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.956 ^a	3	.266
Likelihood Ratio	3.925	3	.270
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.602	1	.206
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.55.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.057	.266
	Cramer's V	.057	.266
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 415 -- Used: Other by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Used: Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	416	42
		% within Geographic Areas	90.8%	9.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	354	29
		% within Geographic Areas	92.4%	7.6%
	Newtown	Count	216	16

	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	93.1%	6.9%
		Count	147	12
		% within Geographic Areas	92.5%	7.5%
Total		Count	1133	99
		% within Geographic Areas	92.0%	8.0%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.368 ^a	3	.713
Likelihood Ratio	1.358	3	.715
Linear-by-Linear Association	.904	1	.342
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.033	.713
	Cramer's V	.033	.713
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 416 -- Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	89	369
		% within Geographic Areas	19.4%	80.6%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	65	318
		% within Geographic Areas	17.0%	83.0%
	Newtown	Count	44	188
		% within Geographic Areas	19.0%	81.0%
	Welshpool	Count	29	130
		% within Geographic Areas	18.2%	81.8%
	Total	Count	227	1005
		% within Geographic Areas	18.4%	81.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.896 ^a	3	.826
Likelihood Ratio	.903	3	.825
Linear-by-Linear Association	.079	1	.779
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.30.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.027	.826
	Cramer's V	.027	.826
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 417 -- Rated Important: Use Dentist by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Dentist	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	126	332
		% within Geographic Areas	27.5%	72.5%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	97	286
		% within Geographic Areas	25.3%	74.7%

	Newtown	Count	73	159
		% within Geographic Areas	31.5%	68.5%
	Welshpool	Count	52	107
		% within Geographic Areas	32.7%	67.3%
Total	Count		348	884
	% within Geographic Areas		28.2%	71.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.479 ^a	3	.214
Likelihood Ratio	4.445	3	.217
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.338	1	.126
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.91.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.060	.214
	Cramer's V	.060	.214
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 418 -- Rated Important: Use Pharmacy by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Pharmacy	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	121	337
		% within Geographic Areas	26.4%	73.6%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	83	300
		% within Geographic Areas	21.7%	78.3%
	Newtown	Count	70	162
		% within Geographic Areas	30.2%	69.8%
	Welshpool	Count	49	110
		% within Geographic Areas	30.8%	69.2%
	Total	Count	323	909
		% within Geographic Areas	26.2%	73.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.718 ^a	3	.052
Likelihood Ratio	7.773	3	.051
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.050	1	.152
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.69.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.079	.052
	Cramer's V	.079	.052
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 419 -- Rated Important: Use Public Transport by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Public Transport	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	128	330
		% within Geographic Areas	27.9%	72.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	103	280

		% within Geographic Areas	26.9%	73.1%
		Count	45	187
	Newtown	% within Geographic Areas	19.4%	80.6%
	Welshpool	Count	42	117
		% within Geographic Areas	26.4%	73.6%
	Total	Count	318	914
	% within Geographic Areas	25.8%	74.2%	

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.341 ^a	3	.096
Likelihood Ratio	6.636	3	.084
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.047	1	.153
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.04.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.072	.096
	Cramer's V	.072	.096
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 420 -- Rated Important: Use Community Transport by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Community Transport	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	192	266
		% within Geographic Areas	41.9%	58.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	141	242
		% within Geographic Areas	36.8%	63.2%
	Newtown	Count	92	140
		% within Geographic Areas	39.7%	60.3%
	Welshpool	Count	74	85
		% within Geographic Areas	46.5%	53.5%
Total		Count	499	733
		% within Geographic Areas	40.5%	59.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383

		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	232
	Newtown	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	1232
% within Geographic Areas		100.0%	
Total		Count	1232
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.019 ^a	3	.170
Likelihood Ratio	5.010	3	.171
Linear-by-Linear Association	.362	1	.547
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.40.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.064	.170
	Cramer's V	.064	.170
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 421 -- Rated Important: Community Group by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Group	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	219	239
		% within Geographic Areas	47.8%	52.2%

	Llandrindod Wells	Count	163	220
		% within Geographic Areas	42.6%	57.4%
	Newtown	Count	101	131
		% within Geographic Areas	43.5%	56.5%
	Welshpool	Count	68	91
		% within Geographic Areas	42.8%	57.2%
Total	Count		551	681
	% within Geographic Areas		44.7%	55.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.877 ^a	3	.411
Likelihood Ratio	2.874	3	.411
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.641	1	.200
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 71.11.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.048	.411
	Cramer's V	.048	.411
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 422 -- Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	200	258
		% within Geographic Areas	43.7%	56.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	124	259
		% within Geographic Areas	32.4%	67.6%
	Newtown	Count	75	157
		% within Geographic Areas	32.3%	67.7%
	Welshpool	Count	59	100
		% within Geographic Areas	37.1%	62.9%
	Total	Count	458	774
		% within Geographic Areas	37.2%	62.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458

		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	383
	Llandrindod Wells	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	232
	Newtown	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	159
Total	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.379 ^a	3	.002
Likelihood Ratio	14.334	3	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.505	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 59.11.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.108	.002
	Cramer's V	.108	.002
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 423 -- Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	163	295

		% within Geographic Areas	35.6%	64.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	126	257
		% within Geographic Areas	32.9%	67.1%
	Newtown	Count	86	146
		% within Geographic Areas	37.1%	62.9%
Total	Welshpool	Count	49	110
		% within Geographic Areas	30.8%	69.2%
		Count	424	808
		% within Geographic Areas	34.4%	65.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.306 ^a	3	.511
Likelihood Ratio	2.315	3	.510
Linear-by-Linear Association	.382	1	.537

N of Valid Cases	1232		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 54.72.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.043	.511
	Cramer's V	.043	.511
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 424 -- Rated Important: Community Centre by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Centre	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	209	249
		% within Geographic Areas	45.6%	54.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	153	230
		% within Geographic Areas	39.9%	60.1%
	Newtown	Count	92	140
		% within Geographic Areas	39.7%	60.3%
	Welshpool	Count	69	90
		% within Geographic Areas	43.4%	56.6%
	Total	Count	523	709
		% within Geographic Areas	42.5%	57.5%

Crosstab

Total

Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.681 ^a	3	.298
Likelihood Ratio	3.680	3	.298
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.011	1	.315
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 67.50.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.055	.298
	Cramer's V	.055	.298
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 425 -- Rated Important: Council Services by Geographic Area

Crosstab

Rated Important: Council
Services

			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	163	295
		% within Geographic Areas	35.6%	64.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	119	264
		% within Geographic Areas	31.1%	68.9%
	Newtown	Count	72	160
		% within Geographic Areas	31.0%	69.0%
	Welshpool	Count	50	109
		% within Geographic Areas	31.4%	68.6%
Total		Count	404	828
		% within Geographic Areas	32.8%	67.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.597 ^a	3	.458
Likelihood Ratio	2.584	3	.460

Linear-by-Linear Association	1.540	1	.215
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 52.14.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.046	.458
	Cramer's V	.046	.458
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 426 -- Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	135	323
		% within Geographic Areas	29.5%	70.5%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	85	298
		% within Geographic Areas	22.2%	77.8%
	Newtown	Count	56	176
		% within Geographic Areas	24.1%	75.9%
	Welshpool	Count	39	120
		% within Geographic Areas	24.5%	75.5%
	Total	Count	315	917
		% within Geographic Areas	25.6%	74.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.307 ^a	3	.098
Likelihood Ratio	6.270	3	.099
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.394	1	.122
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.65.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.072	.098
	Cramer's V	.072	.098
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 427 -- Rated Important: Support Services (Food, Advice) by Geographic Area

Crosstab

Rated Important: Support
Services (Food Bank, Advice
Services)

			Not Selected	Selected	
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	228	230	
		% within Geographic Areas	49.8%	50.2%	
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	153	230	
		% within Geographic Areas	39.9%	60.1%	
	Newtown	Count	97	135	
		% within Geographic Areas	41.8%	58.2%	
	Welshpool	Count	77	82	
		% within Geographic Areas	48.4%	51.6%	
	Total		Count	555	677
			% within Geographic Areas	45.0%	55.0%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.886 ^a	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	9.904	3	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.041	1	.308
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 71.63.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.090	.020
	Cramer's V	.090	.020
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 428 -- Rated Important: Places of Worship by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Places of Worship	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	233	217
		% within Geographic Areas	51.8%	48.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	201	181
		% within Geographic Areas	52.6%	47.4%
	Newtown	Count	117	105
		% within Geographic Areas	52.7%	47.3%
	Welshpool	Count	82	72
		% within Geographic Areas	53.2%	46.8%
	Total		633	575

	% within Geographic Areas	52.4%	47.6%
--	---------------------------	-------	-------

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	382
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	222
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	154
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1208
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.130 ^a	3	.988
Likelihood Ratio	.130	3	.988
Linear-by-Linear Association	.115	1	.734
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.30.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.010	.988
	Cramer's V	.010	.988
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 429 -- Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Oppor. by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	235	215
		% within Geographic Areas	52.2%	47.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	184	198
		% within Geographic Areas	48.2%	51.8%
	Newtown	Count	95	127
		% within Geographic Areas	42.8%	57.2%
	Welshpool	Count	66	88
		% within Geographic Areas	42.9%	57.1%
	Total	Count	580	628
		% within Geographic Areas	48.0%	52.0%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	382
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	222
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	154
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1208
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.262 ^a	3	.064
Likelihood Ratio	7.277	3	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.722	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.94.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.078	.064
	Cramer's V	.078	.064
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 430 -- Rated Important: Library by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Library	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	186	272
		% within Geographic Areas	40.6%	59.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	136	247
		% within Geographic Areas	35.5%	64.5%
	Newtown	Count	84	148
		% within Geographic Areas	36.2%	63.8%
	Welshpool	Count	57	102
		% within Geographic Areas	35.8%	64.2%

Total	Count	463	769
	% within Geographic Areas	37.6%	62.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.884 ^a	3	.410
Likelihood Ratio	2.874	3	.412
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.646	1	.200
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 59.75.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.048	.410
	Cramer's V	.048	.410
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 431 -- Rated Important: Village Hall by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Village Hall	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	178	280
		% within Geographic Areas	38.9%	61.1%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	188	195
		% within Geographic Areas	49.1%	50.9%
	Newtown	Count	103	129
		% within Geographic Areas	44.4%	55.6%
	Welshpool	Count	63	96
		% within Geographic Areas	39.6%	60.4%
	Total	Count	532	700
		% within Geographic Areas	43.2%	56.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.882 ^a	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	9.874	3	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	.392	1	.531
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.66.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.090	.020
	Cramer's V	.090	.020
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 432 -- Rated Important: Youth Services / Clubs by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	170	288
		% within Geographic Areas	37.1%	62.9%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	139	244
		% within Geographic Areas	36.3%	63.7%
	Newtown	Count	88	144
		% within Geographic Areas	37.9%	62.1%
	Welshpool	Count	66	93
		% within Geographic Areas	41.5%	58.5%

Total	Count	463	769
	% within Geographic Areas	37.6%	62.4%

Crosstab

		Total	
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Total	Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.371 ^a	3	.712
Likelihood Ratio	1.359	3	.715
Linear-by-Linear Association	.768	1	.381
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 59.75.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.033	.712
	Cramer's V	.033	.712
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 433 -- Rated Important: Other by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	427	31
		% within Geographic Areas	93.2%	6.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	346	37
		% within Geographic Areas	90.3%	9.7%
	Newtown	Count	212	20
		% within Geographic Areas	91.4%	8.6%
	Welshpool	Count	150	9
		% within Geographic Areas	94.3%	5.7%
	Total	Count	1135	97
		% within Geographic Areas	92.1%	7.9%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Total	Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.709 ^a	3	.295
Likelihood Ratio	3.743	3	.291
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.980
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.52.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.055	.295
	Cramer's V	.055	.295
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 434 -- What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	180	278
		% within Geographic Areas	39.3%	60.7%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	122	261
		% within Geographic Areas	31.9%	68.1%
	Newtown	Count	61	171
		% within Geographic Areas	26.3%	73.7%
	Welshpool	Count	51	108

	% within Geographic Areas	32.1%	67.9%
Total	Count	414	818
	% within Geographic Areas	33.6%	66.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.913 ^a	3	.005
Likelihood Ratio	12.991	3	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.794	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 53.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.102	.005
	Cramer's V	.102	.005

N of Valid Cases	1232
------------------	------

Table 435 -- What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	301	157
		% within Geographic Areas	65.7%	34.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	258	125
		% within Geographic Areas	67.4%	32.6%
	Newtown	Count	127	105
		% within Geographic Areas	54.7%	45.3%
	Welshpool	Count	97	62
		% within Geographic Areas	61.0%	39.0%
	Total	Count	783	449
		% within Geographic Areas	63.6%	36.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Total	Count	1232
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.551 ^a	3	.009
Likelihood Ratio	11.379	3	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.840	1	.028
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 57.95.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.097	.009
	Cramer's V	.097	.009
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 436 -- What Matters Most: Village Hall by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Village Hall	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	223	235
		% within Geographic Areas	48.7%	51.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	250	133
		% within Geographic Areas	65.3%	34.7%
	Newtown	Count	141	91
		% within Geographic Areas	60.8%	39.2%

Welshpool	Count	86	73
	% within Geographic Areas	54.1%	45.9%
Total	Count	700	532
	% within Geographic Areas	56.8%	43.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.459 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.578	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.394	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 68.66.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.144	<.001

Cramer's V	.144	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232	

Table 437 -- What Matters Most: Community Centre by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Community Centre	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	307	151
		% within Geographic Areas	67.0%	33.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	215	168
		% within Geographic Areas	56.1%	43.9%
	Newtown	Count	115	117
		% within Geographic Areas	49.6%	50.4%
	Welshpool	Count	89	70
		% within Geographic Areas	56.0%	44.0%
Total		Count	726	506
		% within Geographic Areas	58.9%	41.1%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159

		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.626 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	22.792	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.563	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 65.30.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.136	<.001
	Cramer's V	.136	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 438 -- What Matters Most: Library by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Library	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	257	201
		% within Geographic Areas	56.1%	43.9%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	190	193
		% within Geographic Areas	49.6%	50.4%
	Newtown	Count	105	127

	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	45.3%	54.7%
		Count	93	66
		% within Geographic Areas	58.5%	41.5%
Total		Count	645	587
		% within Geographic Areas	52.4%	47.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.835 ^a	3	.013
Likelihood Ratio	10.853	3	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	.609	1	.435
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 75.76.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.094	.013
	Cramer's V	.094	.013
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 439 -- What Matters Most: Sports Centre / Leisure Facility by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Sports Center / Leisure Facility	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	294	164
		% within Geographic Areas	64.2%	35.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	216	167
		% within Geographic Areas	56.4%	43.6%
	Newtown	Count	122	110
		% within Geographic Areas	52.6%	47.4%
	Welshpool	Count	96	63
		% within Geographic Areas	60.4%	39.6%
	Total	Count	728	504
		% within Geographic Areas	59.1%	40.9%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.250 ^a	3	.017
Likelihood Ratio	10.263	3	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.700	1	.054
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 65.05.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.091	.017
	Cramer's V	.091	.017
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 440 -- What Matters Most: Local Shop by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Shop	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	173	285
		% within Geographic Areas	37.8%	62.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	139	244

		% within Geographic Areas	36.3%	63.7%
		Count	72	160
	Newtown	% within Geographic Areas	31.0%	69.0%
		Count	51	108
	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	32.1%	67.9%
		Count	435	797
Total	% within Geographic Areas	35.3%	64.7%	
	Count			

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.963 ^a	3	.265
Likelihood Ratio	3.999	3	.262
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.287	1	.070
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.14.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.057	.265
	Cramer's V	.057	.265
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 441 -- What Matters Most: Place of Worship by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Place of Worship	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	338	120
		% within Geographic Areas	73.8%	26.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	295	88
		% within Geographic Areas	77.0%	23.0%
	Newtown	Count	175	57
		% within Geographic Areas	75.4%	24.6%
	Welshpool	Count	121	38
		% within Geographic Areas	76.1%	23.9%
Total		Count	929	303
		% within Geographic Areas	75.4%	24.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383

	Newtown	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	232
	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Total	Count	1232
% within Geographic Areas		100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.219 ^a	3	.748
Likelihood Ratio	1.219	3	.748
Linear-by-Linear Association	.379	1	.538
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.10.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.031	.748
	Cramer's V	.031	.748
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 442 -- What Matters Most: School / College by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: School / College	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	297	161
		% within Geographic Areas	64.8%	35.2%

	Llandrindod Wells	Count	263	120
		% within Geographic Areas	68.7%	31.3%
	Newtown	Count	150	82
		% within Geographic Areas	64.7%	35.3%
	Welshpool	Count	100	59
		% within Geographic Areas	62.9%	37.1%
Total	Count		810	422
	% within Geographic Areas		65.7%	34.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.314 ^a	3	.510
Likelihood Ratio	2.327	3	.507
Linear-by-Linear Association	.189	1	.664
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 54.46.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.043	.510
	Cramer's V	.043	.510
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 443 -- What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	132	326
		% within Geographic Areas	28.8%	71.2%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	77	306
		% within Geographic Areas	20.1%	79.9%
	Newtown	Count	57	175
		% within Geographic Areas	24.6%	75.4%
	Welshpool	Count	51	108
		% within Geographic Areas	32.1%	67.9%
	Total	Count	317	915
		% within Geographic Areas	25.7%	74.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458

		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
		Count	383
	Llandrindod Wells	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count		1232
	% within Geographic Areas		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.146 ^a	3	.007
Likelihood Ratio	12.282	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	.044	1	.834
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.91.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.099	.007
	Cramer's V	.099	.007
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 444 -- What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	363	95

		% within Geographic Areas	79.3%	20.7%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	295	88
		% within Geographic Areas	77.0%	23.0%
	Newtown	Count	170	62
		% within Geographic Areas	73.3%	26.7%
	Welshpool	Count	113	46
		% within Geographic Areas	71.1%	28.9%
Total		Count	941	291
		% within Geographic Areas	76.4%	23.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.915 ^a	3	.116
Likelihood Ratio	5.830	3	.120
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.832	1	.016

N of Valid Cases	1232		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37.56.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.069	.116
	Cramer's V	.069	.116
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 445 -- What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	181	277
		% within Geographic Areas	39.5%	60.5%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	157	226
		% within Geographic Areas	41.0%	59.0%
	Newtown	Count	94	138
		% within Geographic Areas	40.5%	59.5%
	Welshpool	Count	67	92
		% within Geographic Areas	42.1%	57.9%
Total		Count	499	733
		% within Geographic Areas	40.5%	59.5%

Crosstab

Total

Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1232	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.398 ^a	3	.941
Likelihood Ratio	.398	3	.941
Linear-by-Linear Association	.298	1	.585
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.40.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.018	.941
	Cramer's V	.018	.941
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 446 -- What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub by Geographic Area

Crosstab

What Matters Most: Public
Transport Hub (Bus, Train)

			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	275	183
		% within Geographic Areas	60.0%	40.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	221	162
		% within Geographic Areas	57.7%	42.3%
	Newtown	Count	110	122
		% within Geographic Areas	47.4%	52.6%
	Welshpool	Count	91	68
		% within Geographic Areas	57.2%	42.8%
Total		Count	697	535
		% within Geographic Areas	56.6%	43.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.395 ^a	3	.015
Likelihood Ratio	10.328	3	.016

Linear-by-Linear Association	3.787	1	.052
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 69.05.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.092	.015
	Cramer's V	.092	.015
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 447 -- What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	326	132
		% within Geographic Areas	71.2%	28.8%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	285	98
		% within Geographic Areas	74.4%	25.6%
	Newtown	Count	147	85
		% within Geographic Areas	63.4%	36.6%
	Welshpool	Count	122	37
		% within Geographic Areas	76.7%	23.3%
	Total	Count	880	352
		% within Geographic Areas	71.4%	28.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	458
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	383
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	159
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1232
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.271 ^a	3	.010
Likelihood Ratio	11.048	3	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.965
N of Valid Cases	1232		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 45.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.096	.010
	Cramer's V	.096	.010
N of Valid Cases		1232	

Table 448 -- What Matters Most: Local Market by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Market	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	277	173
		% within Geographic Areas	61.6%	38.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	254	128
		% within Geographic Areas	66.5%	33.5%
	Newtown	Count	128	94
		% within Geographic Areas	57.7%	42.3%
	Welshpool	Count	99	55
		% within Geographic Areas	64.3%	35.7%
Total		Count	758	450
		% within Geographic Areas	62.7%	37.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	382
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	222
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	154
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1208	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	5.181 ^a	3	.159
Likelihood Ratio	5.175	3	.159
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.945
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 57.37.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.065	.159
	Cramer's V	.065	.159
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 449 -- What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	330	120
		% within Geographic Areas	73.3%	26.7%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	291	91
		% within Geographic Areas	76.2%	23.8%
	Newtown	Count	141	81
		% within Geographic Areas	63.5%	36.5%
	Welshpool	Count	105	49
		% within Geographic Areas	68.2%	31.8%
Total		Count	867	341
		% within Geographic Areas	71.8%	28.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	382
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	222
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	154
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1208
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.655 ^a	3	.005
Likelihood Ratio	12.394	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.099	1	.024
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.47.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.102	.005
	Cramer's V	.102	.005
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 450 -- What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	227	223
		% within Geographic Areas	50.4%	49.6%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	208	174
		% within Geographic Areas	54.5%	45.5%
	Newtown	Count	92	130
		% within Geographic Areas	41.4%	58.6%
	Welshpool	Count	63	91
		% within Geographic Areas	40.9%	59.1%
Total		Count	590	618
		% within Geographic Areas	48.8%	51.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	382
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	222
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	154
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total	Count	1208	
	% within Geographic Areas	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.016 ^a	3	.003
Likelihood Ratio	14.073	3	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.205	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 75.22.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.108	.003
	Cramer's V	.108	.003
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 451 -- What Matters Most: Other by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	412	38
		% within Geographic Areas	91.6%	8.4%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	365	17
		% within Geographic Areas	95.5%	4.5%
	Newtown	Count	209	13
		% within Geographic Areas	94.1%	5.9%
	Welshpool	Count	144	10
		% within Geographic Areas	93.5%	6.5%
	Total		1130	78

	% within Geographic Areas	93.5%	6.5%
--	---------------------------	-------	------

Crosstab

			Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	450
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	382
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	222
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	154
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%
Total		Count	1208
		% within Geographic Areas	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.623 ^a	3	.131
Likelihood Ratio	5.676	3	.129
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.333	1	.248
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.94.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.068	.131
	Cramer's V	.068	.131
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Table 452 -- Current Level of Happiness Groups by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Current Level of Happiness Groups	
			Unhappy / Neutral	Happy
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	79	231
		% within Geographic Areas	17.6%	51.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	80	203
		% within Geographic Areas	21.3%	54.0%
	Newtown	Count	41	127
		% within Geographic Areas	18.0%	55.7%
	Welshpool	Count	30	75
		% within Geographic Areas	18.9%	47.2%
Total	Count	230	636	
	% within Geographic Areas	19.0%	52.4%	

Crosstab

			Current Level of Happiness Groups	
			Very Happy	Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	140	450
		% within Geographic Areas	31.1%	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	93	376
		% within Geographic Areas	24.7%	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	60	228
		% within Geographic Areas	26.3%	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	54	159

	% within Geographic Areas	34.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	347	1213
	% within Geographic Areas	28.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.200 ^a	6	.224
Likelihood Ratio	8.181	6	.225
Linear-by-Linear Association	.017	1	.895
N of Valid Cases	1213		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.15.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.082	.224
	Cramer's V	.058	.224
N of Valid Cases		1213	

Table 453 -- Feelings About Community's Future Groups by Geographic Area

Crosstab

			Feelings About Community's Future Groups	
			Unhappy	Neutral
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	65	186
		% within Geographic Areas	14.4%	41.3%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	90	149
		% within Geographic Areas	23.6%	39.0%
	Newtown	Count	34	91
		% within Geographic Areas		

	Welshpool	% within Geographic Areas	15.3%	41.0%
		Count	23	59
		% within Geographic Areas	14.9%	38.3%
Total		Count	212	485
		% within Geographic Areas	17.5%	40.1%

Crosstab

			Feelings About Community's Future Groups	
			Happy	Total
Geographic Areas	Brecon	Count	199	450
		% within Geographic Areas	44.2%	100.0%
	Llandrindod Wells	Count	143	382
		% within Geographic Areas	37.4%	100.0%
	Newtown	Count	97	222
		% within Geographic Areas	43.7%	100.0%
	Welshpool	Count	72	154
		% within Geographic Areas	46.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	511	1208
		% within Geographic Areas	42.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.373 ^a	6	.018

Likelihood Ratio	14.881	6	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	.075	1	.784
N of Valid Cases	1208		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.03.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.113	.018
	Cramer's V	.080	.018
N of Valid Cases		1208	

Appendix G — Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Length of Residency

Appendix G -- Crosstabulations of Responses to Closed-Ended Questions by Length of Residency

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Tables 454 - 461	Like Aspects of Community	2 - 15
Tables 462 - 469	Dislike Aspects of Community	15 - 28
Tables 470 - 487	Use Services	28 - 58
Tables 488 - 505	Services Rated as Important	58 - 90
Tables 506 - 523	What Matters Most	90 - 121
Tables 524 - 525	Current Happiness & Community's Future Outlook	122 - 125

Table 454 -- Like Sense of Community by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Sense of Community	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	69	150
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.5%	68.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	72	155
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.7%	68.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	67	135
		% within Length of Residency Groups	33.2%	66.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	169	393
		% within Length of Residency Groups	30.1%	69.9%
Total		Count	377	833
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.2%	68.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.736 ^a	3	.865
Likelihood Ratio	.733	3	.865
Linear-by-Linear Association	.223	1	.637
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 62.94.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.025	.865
	Cramer's V	.025	.865
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 455 -- Like Access to Nature by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Access to Nature	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	39	180
		% within Length of Residency Groups	17.8%	82.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	43	184
		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.9%	81.1%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	30	172
		% within Length of Residency Groups	14.9%	85.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	133	429
		% within Length of Residency Groups	23.7%	76.3%
Total	Count		245	965
	% within Length of Residency Groups		20.2%	79.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	Total		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.754 ^a	3	.033
Likelihood Ratio	8.911	3	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.033	1	.045
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.90.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.085	.033
	Cramer's V	.085	.033
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 456 -- Like Local Events and Activities by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Local Events and Activities Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	95
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	114
		% within Length of Residency Groups	50.2%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	92
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.5%
	> 15 Years	Count	237
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.2%
Total		Count	538
		% within Length of Residency Groups	44.5%

Crosstab

			Like Local Events and Activities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	124	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	56.6%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	113	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	49.8%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	110	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	54.5%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	325	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	57.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	672	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.443 ^a	3	.217
Likelihood Ratio	4.428	3	.219
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.098	1	.295
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 89.81.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.061	.217
	Cramer's V	.061	.217
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 457 -- Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	160
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	167
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	156
		% within Length of Residency Groups	77.2%
	> 15 Years	Count	390
		% within Length of Residency Groups	69.4%
	Total	Count	873
		% within Length of Residency Groups	72.1%

Crosstab

			Like Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	59	219

	5 - 10 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	26.9%	100.0%
		Count	60	227
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	26.4%	100.0%
		Count	46	202
	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	22.8%	100.0%
		Count	172	562
Total	Count		337	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		27.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.032 ^a	3	.169
Likelihood Ratio	5.104	3	.164
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.545	1	.214
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.26.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.064	.169
	Cramer's V	.064	.169
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 458 -- Like Local Shops and Amenities by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Local Shops and Amenities Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	103
		% within Length of Residency Groups	47.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	136
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	117
		% within Length of Residency Groups	57.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	327
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.2%
Total	Count	683	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	56.4%	

Crosstab

			Like Local Shops and Amenities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	116	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	53.0%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	91	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.1%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	85	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.1%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	235	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	527	1210

	% within Length of Residency Groups	43.6%	100.0%
--	--	-------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.874 ^a	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	9.803	3	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.567	1	.033
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 87.98.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.090	.020
	Cramer's V	.090	.020
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 459 -- Like Public Transport Links by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Public Transport Links	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	173	46
		% within Length of Residency Groups	79.0%	21.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	200	27
		% within Length of Residency Groups	88.1%	11.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	170	32

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	84.2%	15.8%
		Count	459	103
		% within Length of Residency Groups	81.7%	18.3%
Total	Count		1002	208
	% within Length of Residency Groups		82.8%	17.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	Total		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.479 ^a	3	.058
Likelihood Ratio	7.796	3	.050
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.912
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.72.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.079	.058
	Cramer's V	.079	.058
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 460 -- Like That Family Lives Nearby by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like That Family Lives Nearby	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	151	68
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.9%	31.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	159	68
		% within Length of Residency Groups	70.0%	30.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	125	77
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.9%	38.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	337	225
		% within Length of Residency Groups	60.0%	40.0%
Total	Count		772	438
	% within Length of Residency Groups		63.8%	36.2%

Crosstab

Total

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.249 ^a	3	.017
Likelihood Ratio	10.366	3	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.874	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.12.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.092	.017
	Cramer's V	.092	.017
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 461 -- Like Other by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Like Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	203	16
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.7%	7.3%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	212	15
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.4%	6.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	186	16
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.1%	7.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	520	42
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.5%	7.5%
Total		Count	1121	89
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.6%	7.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.293 ^a	3	.961
Likelihood Ratio	.297	3	.961
Linear-by-Linear Association	.059	1	.808
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.86.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.016	.961
	Cramer's V	.016	.961
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 462 -- Dislike Sense of Community by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Dislike Sense of Community	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	202	17
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.2%	7.8%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	212	15

		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.4%	6.6%
		Count	188	14
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	93.1%	6.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	527	35
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.8%	6.2%
	Total	Count	1129	81
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.3%	6.7%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	Total	Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.617 ^a	3	.893
Likelihood Ratio	.603	3	.896

Linear-by-Linear Association	.488	1	.485
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.52.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.023	.893
	Cramer's V	.023	.893
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 463-- Dislike Access to Nature by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Dislike Access to Nature	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	212	7
		% within Length of Residency Groups	96.8%	3.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	220	7
		% within Length of Residency Groups	96.9%	3.1%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	198	4
		% within Length of Residency Groups	98.0%	2.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	553	9
		% within Length of Residency Groups		

	% within Length of Residency Groups	98.4%	1.6%
Total	Count	1183	27
	% within Length of Residency Groups	97.8%	2.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.771 ^a	3	.428
Likelihood Ratio	2.695	3	.441
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.603	1	.107
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.51.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.048	.428
	Cramer's V	.048	.428
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 464 -- Dislike Local Events and Activities by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Events and Activities Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	206
		% within Length of Residency Groups	90.7%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	181
		% within Length of Residency Groups	89.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	521
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.7%
Total	Count		1110
	% within Length of Residency Groups		91.7%

Crosstab

		Dislike Local Events and Activities	
		Selected	Total

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	17	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	7.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	21	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	9.3%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	21	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	10.4%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	41	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	7.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	100	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	8.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.271 ^a	3	.518
Likelihood Ratio	2.205	3	.531
Linear-by-Linear Association	.240	1	.624
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.69.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.043	.518
	Cramer's V	.043	.518
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 465 -- Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare) Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	160
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	155
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	130
		% within Length of Residency Groups	64.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	384
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.3%
Total	Count	829	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	68.5%	

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Services (Schools, Healthcare)	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	59	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	26.9%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	72	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.7%	100.0%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	72	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	35.6%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	178	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		381	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		31.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.731 ^a	3	.292
Likelihood Ratio	3.756	3	.289
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.167	1	.280
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 63.60.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.056	.292
	Cramer's V	.056	.292
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 466 -- Dislike Local Shops and Amenities by Length of Residency

Crosstab

		Dislike Local Shops and Amenities	Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	165

		% within Length of Residency Groups	75.3%
		Count	169
	5 - 10 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	74.4%
		Count	152
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	75.2%
		Count	442
Total	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	78.6%
		Count	928
		% within Length of Residency Groups	76.7%
		Count	

Crosstab

			Dislike Local Shops and Amenities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	54	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	24.7%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	58	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.6%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	50	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	24.8%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	120	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	21.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		282	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.300 ^a	3	.512
Likelihood Ratio	2.305	3	.512
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.633	1	.201
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 47.08.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.044	.512
	Cramer's V	.044	.512
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 467 -- Dislike Public Transport Links by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Dislike Public Transport Links	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	102	117
		% within Length of Residency Groups	46.6%	53.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	93	134
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.0%	59.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	87	115
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.1%	56.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	245	317
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.6%	56.4%

Total	Count	527	683
	% within Length of Residency Groups	43.6%	56.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.450 ^a	3	.694
Likelihood Ratio	1.449	3	.694
Linear-by-Linear Association	.125	1	.724
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 87.98.

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	--------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.035	.694
	Cramer's V	.035	.694
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 468 -- Dislike That Family Lives Nearby by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Dislike That Family Lives Nearby Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	207
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	218
		% within Length of Residency Groups	96.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	187
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	536
		% within Length of Residency Groups	95.4%
	Total	Count	1148
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.9%

Crosstab

			Dislike That Family Lives Nearby Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	12	219

	5 - 10 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	5.5%	100.0%
		Count	9	227
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	4.0%	100.0%
		Count	15	202
	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	7.4%	100.0%
		Count	26	562
Total			62	1210
			5.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.172 ^a	3	.366
Likelihood Ratio	2.975	3	.396
Linear-by-Linear Association	.037	1	.848
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.35.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.051	.366
	Cramer's V	.051	.366
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 469 -- Dislike Other by Length of Residency

Crosstab

Dislike Other

			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	148	71
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.6%	32.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	152	75
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.0%	33.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	137	65
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.8%	32.2%
	> 15 Years	Count	381	181
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.8%	32.2%
Total		Count	818	392
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.6%	32.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.057 ^a	3	.996
Likelihood Ratio	.056	3	.996
Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.890
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 65.44.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.007	.996
	Cramer's V	.007	.996
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 470 -- Used: GP / Health Centre by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: GP / Health Centre	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	79	140
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.1%	63.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	68	159
		% within Length of Residency Groups	30.0%	70.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	59	143
		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.2%	70.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	155	407
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.6%	72.4%

Total	Count	361	849
	% within Length of Residency Groups	29.8%	70.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.476 ^a	3	.140
Likelihood Ratio	5.354	3	.148
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.674	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 60.27.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.067	.140
	Cramer's V	.067	.140
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 471 -- Used: Dentist by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Dentist	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	161	58
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.5%	26.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	166	61
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.1%	26.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	131	71
		% within Length of Residency Groups	64.9%	35.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	328	234
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.4%	41.6%
Total		Count	786	424
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.0%	35.0%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227

		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.442 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	24.790	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.968	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 70.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.142	<.001
	Cramer's V	.142	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 472 -- Used: Pharmacy by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Pharmacy	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	90	129
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.1%	58.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	92	135
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.5%	59.5%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	91	111
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.0%	55.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	206	356
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.7%	63.3%
Total		Count	479	731
		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.6%	60.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.833 ^a	3	.184
Likelihood Ratio	4.817	3	.186
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.605	1	.205
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 79.97.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.063	.184
	Cramer's V	.063	.184
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 473 -- Used: Public Transport by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Public Transport	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	169	50
		% within Length of Residency Groups	77.2%	22.8%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	173	54
		% within Length of Residency Groups	76.2%	23.8%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	151	51
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.8%	25.2%
	> 15 Years	Count	424	138
		% within Length of Residency Groups	75.4%	24.6%
Total		Count	917	293
		% within Length of Residency Groups	75.8%	24.2%

Crosstab

		Total	
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.404 ^a	3	.939
Likelihood Ratio	.406	3	.939
Linear-by-Linear Association	.263	1	.608
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 48.91.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.018	.939
	Cramer's V	.018	.939
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 474 -- Used: Community Transport by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Community Transport	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	212	7
		% within Length of Residency Groups	96.8%	3.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	215	12
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.7%	5.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	185	17
		% within Length of Residency Groups	91.6%	8.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	528	34
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.0%	6.0%
Total		Count	1140	70
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.2%	5.8%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.434 ^a	3	.143
Likelihood Ratio	5.631	3	.131
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.157	1	.142
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.69.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.067	.143
	Cramer's V	.067	.143
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 475 -- Used: Community Group by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Community Group	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	139	80
		% within Length of Residency Groups	63.5%	36.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	152	75
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.0%	33.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	120	82
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.4%	40.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	350	212
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.3%	37.7%
Total		Count	761	449
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.9%	37.1%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227

		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
		Count	202
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	Total	Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.784 ^a	3	.426
Likelihood Ratio	2.798	3	.424
Linear-by-Linear Association	.599	1	.439
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 74.96.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.048	.426
	Cramer's V	.048	.426
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 476 -- Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Length of Residency

Crosstab

Used: Leisure
Centre / Sports
Facilities

			Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	156
		% within Length of Residency Groups	71.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	170
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	142
		% within Length of Residency Groups	70.3%
	> 15 Years	Count	401
		% within Length of Residency Groups	71.4%
Total	Count	869	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	71.8%	

Crosstab

			Used: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	63	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	57	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.1%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	60	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.7%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	161	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	341	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.386 ^a	3	.709
Likelihood Ratio	1.409	3	.703
Linear-by-Linear Association	.147	1	.701
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.93.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.034	.709
	Cramer's V	.034	.709
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 477 -- Used: Local Schools / Childcare by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Local Schools / Childcare Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	189
		% within Length of Residency Groups	86.3%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	180
		% within Length of Residency Groups	79.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	166
		% within Length of Residency Groups	82.2%
	> 15 Years	Count	472

	% within Length of Residency Groups	84.0%
Total	Count	1007
	% within Length of Residency Groups	83.2%

Crosstab

			Used: Local Schools / Childcare	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	30	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	13.7%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	47	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	20.7%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	36	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	17.8%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	90	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	16.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	203	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	16.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.387 ^a	3	.223
Likelihood Ratio	4.328	3	.228
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.985
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.89.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.060	.223
	Cramer's V	.060	.223
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 478 -- Used: Community Centre by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Community Centre	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	172	47
		% within Length of Residency Groups	78.5%	21.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	172	55
		% within Length of Residency Groups	75.8%	24.2%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	158	44
		% within Length of Residency Groups	78.2%	21.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	436	126
		% within Length of Residency Groups	77.6%	22.4%
Total		Count	938	272
		% within Length of Residency Groups	77.5%	22.5%

Crosstab

Total

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.587 ^a	3	.900
Likelihood Ratio	.581	3	.901
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.993
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 45.41.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.022	.900
	Cramer's V	.022	.900
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 479 -- Used: Council Services by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Council Services	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	89	130
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.6%	59.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	92	135
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.5%	59.5%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	69	133
		% within Length of Residency Groups	34.2%	65.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	205	357
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.5%	63.5%
Total		Count	455	755
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.6%	62.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1210

	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
--	-------------------------------------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.014 ^a	3	.389
Likelihood Ratio	3.012	3	.390
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.774	1	.183
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 75.96.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.050	.389
	Cramer's V	.050	.389
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 480 -- Used: Local Shops / Post Office by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Local Shops / Post Office
			Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	53
		% within Length of Residency Groups	24.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	53
		% within Length of Residency Groups	23.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	73
		% within Length of Residency Groups	

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	36.1%
		Count	161
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.6%
Total	Count		340
	% within Length of Residency Groups		28.1%

Crosstab

			Used: Local Shops / Post Office	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	166	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	75.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	174	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	76.7%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	129	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	63.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	401	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	71.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		870	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		71.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.729 ^a	3	.013
Likelihood Ratio	10.560	3	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.859	1	.091

N of Valid Cases	1210		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.76.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.094	.013
	Cramer's V	.094	.013
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 481 -- Used: Support Services (Food, Advice) by Length of Residency

Crosstab

Used: Support
Services (Food
Bank, Advice
Services)
Not Selected

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	199
		% within Length of Residency Groups	90.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	211
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	188
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	525
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.4%
Total		Count	1123
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.8%

Crosstab

			Used: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	20	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	9.1%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	16	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	7.0%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	14	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	6.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	37	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	6.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	87	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	7.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.575 ^a	3	.665
Likelihood Ratio	1.493	3	.684
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.215	1	.270
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.52.

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	--------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.036	.665
	Cramer's V	.036	.665
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 482 -- Used: Places of Worship by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Places of Worship	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	189	30
		% within Length of Residency Groups	86.3%	13.7%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	198	29
		% within Length of Residency Groups	87.2%	12.8%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	170	32
		% within Length of Residency Groups	84.2%	15.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	452	110
		% within Length of Residency Groups	80.4%	19.6%
	Total	Count	1009	201
		% within Length of Residency Groups	83.4%	16.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.398 ^a	3	.060
Likelihood Ratio	7.483	3	.058
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.325	1	.012
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.56.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.078	.060
	Cramer's V	.078	.060
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 483 -- Used: Adult Learning / Training Oppor. by Length of Residency

Crosstab

Used: Adult
Learning /
Training
Opportunities
Not Selected

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	206
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	217
		% within Length of Residency Groups	95.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	184
		% within Length of Residency Groups	91.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	526
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.6%
Total	Count		1133
	% within Length of Residency Groups		93.6%

Crosstab

			Used: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	13	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	5.9%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	10	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	4.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	18	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	8.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	36	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	6.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	77	1210

	% within Length of Residency Groups	6.4%	100.0%
--	--	------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.729 ^a	3	.292
Likelihood Ratio	3.668	3	.300
Linear-by-Linear Association	.435	1	.510
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.85.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.056	.292
	Cramer's V	.056	.292
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 484 -- Used: Library by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Library	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	146	73
		% within Length of Residency Groups	66.7%	33.3%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	151	76
		% within Length of Residency Groups	66.5%	33.5%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	140	62
		% within Length of Residency Groups	69.3%	30.7%

	> 15 Years	Count	395	167
		% within Length of Residency Groups	70.3%	29.7%
Total		Count	832	378
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.8%	31.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	Total	Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.613 ^a	3	.656
Likelihood Ratio	1.607	3	.658
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.463	1	.226
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 63.10.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.037	.656
	Cramer's V	.037	.656
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 485 -- Used: Village Hall by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Village Hall	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	171	48
		% within Length of Residency Groups	78.1%	21.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	148	79
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.2%	34.8%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	124	78
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.4%	38.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	336	226
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.8%	40.2%
Total		Count	779	431
		% within Length of Residency Groups	64.4%	35.6%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.957 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	25.302	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.228	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 71.95.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.141	<.001
	Cramer's V	.141	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 486 -- Used: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Length of Residency

Crosstab

Used: Youth
Services / Youth
Clubs
Not Selected

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	204
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	212
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.4%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	178
		% within Length of Residency Groups	88.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	514
		% within Length of Residency Groups	91.5%
	Total	Count	1108
		% within Length of Residency Groups	91.6%

Crosstab

Used: Youth
Services /
Youth Clubs

			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	15	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	6.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	15	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	6.6%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	24	202

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	11.9%	100.0%
		Count	48	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	8.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	102	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	8.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.811 ^a	3	.186
Likelihood Ratio	4.605	3	.203
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.067	1	.302
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.03.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.063	.186
	Cramer's V	.063	.186
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 487 -- Used: Other by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Used: Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	200	19
		% within Length of Residency Groups	91.3%	8.7%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	214	13

		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.3%	5.7%
		Count	183	19
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	90.6%	9.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	517	45
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.0%	8.0%
	Total	Count	1114	96
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.1%	7.9%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	Total	Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.282 ^a	3	.516
Likelihood Ratio	2.397	3	.494

Linear-by-Linear Association	.039	1	.844
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.03.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.043	.516
	Cramer's V	.043	.516
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 488 -- Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important
			Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	32
		% within Length of Residency Groups	14.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	44
		% within Length of Residency Groups	19.4%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	44
		% within Length of Residency Groups	21.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	99
		% within Length of Residency Groups	17.6%
	Total	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.1%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: GP / Health Centre Is Important	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	187	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	85.4%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	183	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	80.6%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	158	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	78.2%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	463	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	82.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	991	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	81.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.986 ^a	3	.263
Likelihood Ratio	3.995	3	.262
Linear-by-Linear Association	.378	1	.538
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.56.

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	-----------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.057	.263
	Cramer's V	.057	.263
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 489 -- Rated Important: Use Dentist by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Dentist	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	36	183
		% within Length of Residency Groups	16.4%	83.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	62	165
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.3%	72.7%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	63	139
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.2%	68.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	177	385
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.5%	68.5%
Total		Count	338	872
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.9%	72.1%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227

		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.022 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.529	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.437	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.125	<.001
	Cramer's V	.125	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 490 -- Rated Important: Use Pharmacy by Length of Residency

Crosstab

Rated
Important: Use
Pharmacy

			Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	44
		% within Length of Residency Groups	20.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	58
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	52
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.7%
	> 15 Years	Count	159
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.3%
Total		Count	313
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.9%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Pharmacy	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	175	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	79.9%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	169	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	150	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.3%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	403	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	71.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	897	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.546 ^a	3	.136
Likelihood Ratio	5.726	3	.126
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.944	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 52.25.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.068	.136
	Cramer's V	.068	.136
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 491 -- Rated Important: Use Public Transport by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Public Transport Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	41
		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.7%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	54
		% within Length of Residency Groups	23.8%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	64
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.7%
	> 15 Years	Count	150

	% within Length of Residency Groups	26.7%
Total	Count	309
	% within Length of Residency Groups	25.5%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Public Transport	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	178	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	81.3%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	173	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	76.2%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	138	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.3%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	412	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		901	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		74.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.121 ^a	3	.018
Likelihood Ratio	10.309	3	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.153	1	.023

N of Valid Cases	1210		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.59.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.091	.018
	Cramer's V	.091	.018
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 492 -- Rated Important: Use Community Transport by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Community Transport Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	91
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	87
		% within Length of Residency Groups	38.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	77
		% within Length of Residency Groups	38.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	233
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.5%
	Total	Count	488
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.3%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Use Community Transport Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	128	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.4%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	140	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.7%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	125	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	329	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	722	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.223 ^a	3	.748
Likelihood Ratio	1.226	3	.747
Linear-by-Linear Association	.077	1	.781
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 81.47.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.032	.748

Cramer's V	.032	.748
N of Valid Cases	1210	

Table 493 -- Rated Important: Community Group by Length of Residency

Crosstab

		Rated Important: Community Group Not Selected	
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	89
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	108
		% within Length of Residency Groups	47.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	91
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	250
		% within Length of Residency Groups	44.5%
	Total	Count	538
		% within Length of Residency Groups	44.5%

Crosstab

	Rated Important:	Total

			Community Group Selected	
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	130	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.4%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	119	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	52.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	111	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.0%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	312	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	672	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.216 ^a	3	.529
Likelihood Ratio	2.222	3	.528
Linear-by-Linear Association	.234	1	.628
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 89.81.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.043	.529
	Cramer's V	.043	.529
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 494 -- Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	69
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	88
		% within Length of Residency Groups	38.8%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	81
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	211
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.5%
Total	Count	449	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	37.1%	

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Leisure Centre / Sports Facilities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	150	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.5%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	139	227

		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.2%	100.0%
		Count	121	202
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	59.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	351	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	761	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.032 ^a	3	.258
Likelihood Ratio	4.092	3	.252
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.394	1	.238
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 74.96.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.058	.258
	Cramer's V	.058	.258
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 495 -- Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	77
		% within Length of Residency Groups	35.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	76
		% within Length of Residency Groups	33.5%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	80
		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	183
		% within Length of Residency Groups	32.6%
Total	Count	416	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	34.4%	

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Schools / Childcare	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	142	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	64.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	151	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	66.5%	100.0%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	122	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	60.4%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	379	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		794	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		65.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.407 ^a	3	.333
Likelihood Ratio	3.362	3	.339
Linear-by-Linear Association	.359	1	.549
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 69.45.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.053	.333
	Cramer's V	.053	.333
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 496 -- Rated Important: Community Centre by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Centre Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	85
		% within Length of Residency Groups	38.8%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	86
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	88
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	253
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.0%
Total	Count		512
	% within Length of Residency Groups		42.3%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Community Centre Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	134	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.2%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	141	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.1%	100.0%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	114	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	56.4%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	309	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		698	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		57.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.736 ^a	3	.192
Likelihood Ratio	4.756	3	.191
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.071	1	.044
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 85.47.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.063	.192
	Cramer's V	.063	.192
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 497 -- Rated Important: Council Services by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Council Services Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	65

		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.7%
		Count	81
	5 - 10 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	35.7%
		Count	82
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	40.6%
		Count	166
Total	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	29.5%
		Count	394
		% within Length of Residency Groups	32.6%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Council Services	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	154	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	70.3%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	146	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	64.3%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	120	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.4%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	396	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	70.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	816	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.111 ^a	3	.018
Likelihood Ratio	9.937	3	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	.361	1	.548
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 65.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.091	.018
	Cramer's V	.091	.018
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 498 -- Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office by Length of Residency

Crosstab

		Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office Not Selected	
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	45
		% within Length of Residency Groups	20.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	60
		% within Length of Residency Groups	26.4%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	65

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	32.2%
		Count	138
		% within Length of Residency Groups	24.6%
Total	Count		308
	% within Length of Residency Groups		25.5%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Local Shops / Post Office	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	174	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	79.5%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	167	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	73.6%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	137	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.8%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	424	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	75.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		902	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		74.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.945 ^a	3	.047
Likelihood Ratio	7.837	3	.049

Linear-by-Linear Association	.643	1	.423
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.42.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.081	.047
	Cramer's V	.081	.047
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 499 -- Rated Important: Support Services (Food, Advice) by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services) Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	86
		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.3%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	90
		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	97
		% within Length of Residency Groups	48.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	272
		% within Length of Residency Groups	48.4%
Total		Count	545

	% within Length of Residency Groups	45.0%
--	--	-------

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Support Services (Food Bank, Advice Services)	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	133	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	60.7%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	137	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	60.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	105	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	52.0%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	290	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	51.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	665	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.898 ^a	3	.031
Likelihood Ratio	8.941	3	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.750	1	.005

N of Valid Cases	1210		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 90.98.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.086	.031
	Cramer's V	.086	.031
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 500 -- Rated Important: Places of Worship by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Places of Worship Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	112
		% within Length of Residency Groups	51.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	116
		% within Length of Residency Groups	51.8%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	116
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	277
		% within Length of Residency Groups	50.3%
	Total		Count 621

	% within Length of Residency Groups	52.3%
--	--	-------

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Places of Worship	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	104	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	48.1%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	108	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	48.2%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	81	197
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.1%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	274	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	49.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	567	1188
		% within Length of Residency Groups	47.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.371 ^a	3	.224
Likelihood Ratio	4.394	3	.222
Linear-by-Linear Association	.162	1	.688

N of Valid Cases	1188		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 94.02.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.061	.224
	Cramer's V	.061	.224
N of Valid Cases		1188	

Table 501 -- Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Oppor. by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	94
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	103
		% within Length of Residency Groups	46.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	97
		% within Length of Residency Groups	49.2%
	> 15 Years	Count	276
		% within Length of Residency Groups	50.1%
	Total	Count	570
		% within Length of Residency Groups	48.0%

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Adult Learning / Training Opportunities	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	122	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	56.5%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	121	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	54.0%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	100	197
		% within Length of Residency Groups	50.8%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	275	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	49.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	618	1188
		% within Length of Residency Groups	52.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.189 ^a	3	.363
Likelihood Ratio	3.195	3	.362
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.075	1	.080
N of Valid Cases	1188		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 94.52.

Symmetric Measures

Value	Approximate Significance
-------	-----------------------------

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.052	.363
	Cramer's V	.052	.363
N of Valid Cases		1188	

Table 502 -- Rated Important: Library by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Library	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	73	146
		% within Length of Residency Groups	33.3%	66.7%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	94	133
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.4%	58.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	84	118
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.6%	58.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	205	357
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.5%	63.5%
Total		Count	456	754
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.7%	62.3%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219

		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
		Count	227
	5 - 10 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
		Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	562
Total		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
		Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.764 ^a	3	.190
Likelihood Ratio	4.764	3	.190
Linear-by-Linear Association	.037	1	.847
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 76.13.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.063	.190
	Cramer's V	.063	.190
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 503 -- Rated Important: Village Hall by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Village Hall	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	102	117
		% within Length of Residency Groups	46.6%	53.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	103	124
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.4%	54.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	88	114
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.6%	56.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	225	337
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.0%	60.0%
Total		Count	518	692
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.8%	57.2%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1210

	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
--	-------------------------------------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.692 ^a	3	.297
Likelihood Ratio	3.692	3	.297
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.541	1	.060
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 86.48.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.055	.297
	Cramer's V	.055	.297
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 504 -- Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	79
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	77
		% within Length of Residency Groups	33.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	79
		% within Length of Residency Groups	

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	39.1%
		Count	219
Total		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.0%
		Count	454
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.5%
		Count	

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Youth Services / Youth Clubs	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	140	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	63.9%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	150	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	66.1%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	123	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	60.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	343	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	756	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
-------	----	-----------------------------------

Pearson Chi-Square	2.170 ^a	3	.538
Likelihood Ratio	2.185	3	.535
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.320	1	.251
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 75.79.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.042	.538
	Cramer's V	.042	.538
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 505 -- Rated Important: Other by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Rated Important: Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	204	15
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.2%	6.8%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	213	14
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.8%	6.2%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	184	18
		% within Length of Residency Groups	91.1%	8.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	518	44
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.2%	7.8%
Total		Count	1119	91
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.5%	7.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.378 ^a	3	.711
Likelihood Ratio	1.388	3	.708
Linear-by-Linear Association	.520	1	.471
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.19.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.034	.711
	Cramer's V	.034	.711
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 506 -- What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	56
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	76
		% within Length of Residency Groups	33.5%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	66
		% within Length of Residency Groups	32.7%
	> 15 Years	Count	206
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.7%
	Total	Count	404
		% within Length of Residency Groups	33.4%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Park / Green Space Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	163	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.4%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	151	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	66.5%	100.0%

	10 - 15 Years	Count	136	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	67.3%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	356	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	63.3%	100.0%
Total	Count		806	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		66.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.761 ^a	3	.033
Likelihood Ratio	9.002	3	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.445	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 67.44.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.085	.033
	Cramer's V	.085	.033
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 507 -- What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area by Length of Residency

Crosstab

What Matters
Most:

			Playground / Play Area Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	143
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.3%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	149
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	128
		% within Length of Residency Groups	63.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	349
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.1%
Total	Count	769	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	63.6%	

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Playground / Play Area	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	76	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	34.7%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	78	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	34.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	74	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.6%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	213	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.9%	100.0%

Total	Count	441	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups	36.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.229 ^a	3	.746
Likelihood Ratio	1.232	3	.745
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.099	1	.295
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.62.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.032	.746
	Cramer's V	.032	.746
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 508 -- What Matters Most: Village Hall by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Village Hall Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	151
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	132
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.1%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	111

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	55.0%
		Count	294
		% within Length of Residency Groups	52.3%
Total	Count		688
	% within Length of Residency Groups		56.9%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Village Hall	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	68	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.1%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	95	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.9%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	91	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.0%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	268	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	47.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		522	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		43.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.240 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.656	3	<.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.310	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 87.14.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.123	<.001
	Cramer's V	.123	<.001
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 509 -- What Matters Most: Community Centre by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Community Centre Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	134
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	125
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.1%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	129
		% within Length of Residency Groups	63.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	323
		% within Length of Residency Groups	57.5%
Total		Count	711

	% within Length of Residency Groups	58.8%
--	--	-------

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Community Centre	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	85	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	38.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	102	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	44.9%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	73	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.1%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	239	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	499	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.364 ^a	3	.225
Likelihood Ratio	4.387	3	.223
Linear-by-Linear Association	.224	1	.636
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 83.30.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.060	.225
	Cramer's V	.060	.225
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 510 -- What Matters Most: Library by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Library	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	119	100
		% within Length of Residency Groups	54.3%	45.7%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	120	107
		% within Length of Residency Groups	52.9%	47.1%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	107	95
		% within Length of Residency Groups	53.0%	47.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	289	273
		% within Length of Residency Groups	51.4%	48.6%
Total		Count	635	575
		% within Length of Residency Groups	52.5%	47.5%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.588 ^a	3	.899
Likelihood Ratio	.588	3	.899
Linear-by-Linear Association	.540	1	.462
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 95.99.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.022	.899
	Cramer's V	.022	.899
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 511 -- What Matters Most: Sports Centre / Leisure Facility by Length of Residency

Crosstab

What Matters
Most: Sports

			Center / Leisure Facility Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	120
		% within Length of Residency Groups	54.8%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	142
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	117
		% within Length of Residency Groups	57.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	334
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.4%
Total	Count	713	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	58.9%	

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Sports Center / Leisure Facility	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	99	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	45.2%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	85	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	85	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.1%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	228	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.6%	100.0%

Total	Count	497	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups	41.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.923 ^a	3	.404
Likelihood Ratio	2.922	3	.404
Linear-by-Linear Association	.402	1	.526
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 82.97.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.049	.404
	Cramer's V	.049	.404
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 512 -- What Matters Most: Local Shop by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Shop Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	67
		% within Length of Residency Groups	30.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	78
		% within Length of Residency Groups	34.4%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	83
		% within Length of Residency Groups	

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	41.1%
		Count	194
		% within Length of Residency Groups	34.5%
Total	Count		422
	% within Length of Residency Groups		34.9%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Shop	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	152	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	69.4%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	149	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.6%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	119	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	58.9%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	368	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		788	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		65.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.259 ^a	3	.154
Likelihood Ratio	5.215	3	.157
Linear-by-Linear Association	.853	1	.356

N of Valid Cases	1210		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 70.45.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.066	.154
	Cramer's V	.066	.154
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 513 -- What Matters Most: Place of Worship by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Place of Worship Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	176
		% within Length of Residency Groups	80.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	182
		% within Length of Residency Groups	80.2%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	155
		% within Length of Residency Groups	76.7%
	> 15 Years	Count	398

	% within Length of Residency Groups	70.8%
Total	Count	911
	% within Length of Residency Groups	75.3%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Place of Worship	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	43	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	19.6%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	45	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	19.8%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	47	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	23.3%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	164	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.2%	100.0%
Total	Count		299	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		24.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.211 ^a	3	.007
Likelihood Ratio	12.297	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.079	1	<.001
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 49.92.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.100	.007
	Cramer's V	.100	.007
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 514 -- What Matters Most: School / College by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: School / College Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	156
		% within Length of Residency Groups	71.2%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	156
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.7%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	138
		% within Length of Residency Groups	68.3%
	> 15 Years	Count	344
		% within Length of Residency Groups	61.2%
	Total	Count	794
		% within Length of Residency Groups	65.6%

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: School / College	
		Selected	Total

Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	63	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.8%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	71	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.3%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	64	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.7%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	218	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	38.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	416	1210	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	34.4%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.523 ^a	3	.023
Likelihood Ratio	9.547	3	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.510	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 69.45.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.089	.023
	Cramer's V	.089	.023
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 515 -- What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	61
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	62
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.3%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	55
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.2%
	> 15 Years	Count	129
		% within Length of Residency Groups	23.0%
Total	Count	307	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	25.4%	

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Healthcare / GP Surgery	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	158	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	72.1%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	165	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	72.7%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	147	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	72.8%	100.0%

	> 15 Years	Count	433	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	77.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	903	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.267 ^a	3	.352
Likelihood Ratio	3.278	3	.351
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.655	1	.103
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.25.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.052	.352
	Cramer's V	.052	.352
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 516 -- What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club by Length of Residency

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club	
		Not Selected	
Length of Residency Groups < 5 Years	Count	155	
	% within Length of Residency Groups	70.8%	

	5 - 10 Years	Count	178
		% within Length of Residency Groups	78.4%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	151
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	438
		% within Length of Residency Groups	77.9%
Total	Count		922
	% within Length of Residency Groups		76.2%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Youth Centre / Youth Club	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	64	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.2%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	49	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	21.6%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	51	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.2%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	124	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	22.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		288	1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		23.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.333 ^a	3	.149
Likelihood Ratio	5.196	3	.158
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.699	1	.100
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 48.08.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.066	.149
	Cramer's V	.066	.149
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 517 -- What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Pub / Cafe	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	80	139
		% within Length of Residency Groups	36.5%	63.5%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	90	137
		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.6%	60.4%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	83	119
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.1%	58.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	237	325
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.2%	57.8%
Total		Count	490	720

	% within Length of Residency Groups	40.5%	59.5%
--	-------------------------------------	-------	-------

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total	Count		1210
	% within Length of Residency Groups		100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.181 ^a	3	.536
Likelihood Ratio	2.195	3	.533
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.064	1	.151
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 81.80.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.042	.536

Cramer's V	.042	.536
N of Valid Cases	1210	

Table 518 -- What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub (Bus, Train) Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	124
		% within Length of Residency Groups	56.6%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	122
		% within Length of Residency Groups	53.7%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	117
		% within Length of Residency Groups	57.9%
	> 15 Years	Count	321
		% within Length of Residency Groups	57.1%
	Total	Count	684
		% within Length of Residency Groups	56.5%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Public Transport Hub (Bus, Train) Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	95	219

		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.4%	100.0%
		Count	105	227
	5 - 10 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	46.3%	100.0%
		Count	85	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	42.1%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	241	562
	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	42.9%	100.0%
		Count	526	1210
	Total	% within Length of Residency Groups	43.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.955 ^a	3	.812
Likelihood Ratio	.953	3	.813
Linear-by-Linear Association	.209	1	.648
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 87.81.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.028	.812
	Cramer's V	.028	.812
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 519 -- What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark by Length of Residency

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark Not Selected	
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	167
		% within Length of Residency Groups	76.3%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	164
		% within Length of Residency Groups	72.2%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	140
		% within Length of Residency Groups	69.3%
	> 15 Years	Count	395
		% within Length of Residency Groups	70.3%
Total	Count		866
	% within Length of Residency Groups		71.6%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Historic Building / Landmark	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	52	219
		% within Length of Residency Groups	23.7%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	63	227
		% within Length of Residency Groups	27.8%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	62	202
		% within Length of Residency Groups	30.7%	100.0%

	> 15 Years	Count	167	562
		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	344	1210
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.379 ^a	3	.337
Likelihood Ratio	3.455	3	.327
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.542	1	.111
N of Valid Cases	1210		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 57.43.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.053	.337
	Cramer's V	.053	.337
N of Valid Cases		1210	

Table 520 -- What Matters Most: Local Market by Length of Residency

Crosstab

		What Matters Most: Local Market Not Selected	
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	129
		% within Length of Residency Groups	59.7%

	5 - 10 Years	Count	139
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.1%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	119
		% within Length of Residency Groups	60.4%
	> 15 Years	Count	357
		% within Length of Residency Groups	64.8%
Total		Count	744
		% within Length of Residency Groups	62.6%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Local Market	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	87	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.3%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	85	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.9%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	78	197
		% within Length of Residency Groups	39.6%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	194	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	35.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	444	1188
		% within Length of Residency Groups	37.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.328 ^a	3	.507
Likelihood Ratio	2.326	3	.507
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.738	1	.187
N of Valid Cases	1188		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.63.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.044	.507
	Cramer's V	.044	.507
N of Valid Cases		1188	

Table 521 -- What Matters Most: Allotments / Comm. Garden by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	149
		% within Length of Residency Groups	69.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	166
		% within Length of Residency Groups	74.1%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	141
		% within Length of Residency Groups	71.6%
	> 15 Years	Count	394

	% within Length of Residency Groups	71.5%
Total	Count	850
	% within Length of Residency Groups	71.5%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Allotments / Community Garden	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	67	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	31.0%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	58	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	25.9%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	56	197
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.4%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	157	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		338	1188
	% within Length of Residency Groups		28.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.420 ^a	3	.701
Likelihood Ratio	1.422	3	.700
Linear-by-Linear Association	.079	1	.778

N of Valid Cases	1188		
------------------	------	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 56.05.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.035	.701
	Cramer's V	.035	.701
N of Valid Cases		1188	

Table 522 -- What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths Not Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	97
		% within Length of Residency Groups	44.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	100
		% within Length of Residency Groups	44.6%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	98
		% within Length of Residency Groups	49.7%
	> 15 Years	Count	281
		% within Length of Residency Groups	51.0%
	Total	Count	576
		% within Length of Residency Groups	48.5%

Crosstab

			What Matters Most: Walking / Cycling Paths	
			Selected	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	119	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.1%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	124	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	55.4%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	99	197
		% within Length of Residency Groups	50.3%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	270	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	49.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	612	1188
		% within Length of Residency Groups	51.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.950 ^a	3	.267
Likelihood Ratio	3.955	3	.266
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.528	1	.060
N of Valid Cases	1188		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 95.52.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.058	.267
	Cramer's V	.058	.267

N of Valid Cases	1188	
------------------	------	--

Table 523 -- What Matters Most: Other by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			What Matters Most:	
			Other	
			Not Selected	Selected
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	199	17
		% within Length of Residency Groups	92.1%	7.9%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	213	11
		% within Length of Residency Groups	95.1%	4.9%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	187	10
		% within Length of Residency Groups	94.9%	5.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	513	38
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.1%	6.9%
Total		Count	1112	76
		% within Length of Residency Groups	93.6%	6.4%

Crosstab

			Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	197

	> 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
		Count	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%
Total		Count	1188
		% within Length of Residency Groups	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.413 ^a	3	.491
Likelihood Ratio	2.466	3	.481
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.977
N of Valid Cases	1188		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.60.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.045	.491
	Cramer's V	.045	.491
N of Valid Cases		1188	

Table 524 -- Current Level of Happiness Groups by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Current Level of Happiness Groups	
			Unhappy / Neutral	Happy
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	38	118
		% within Length of Residency Groups	17.4%	54.1%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	48	107
		% within Length of Residency Groups	21.4%	47.8%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	34	107
		% within Length of Residency Groups	17.1%	53.8%
	> 15 Years	Count	102	298
		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.3%	53.6%
Total		Count	222	630
		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.5%	52.6%

Crosstab

			Current Level of Happiness Groups	
			Very Happy	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	62	218
		% within Length of Residency Groups	28.4%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	69	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	30.8%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	58	199
		% within Length of Residency Groups	29.1%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	156	556

	% within Length of Residency Groups	28.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	345	1197
	% within Length of Residency Groups	28.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.074 ^a	6	.800
Likelihood Ratio	3.060	6	.801
Linear-by-Linear Association	.024	1	.876
N of Valid Cases	1197		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.91.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.051	.800
	Cramer's V	.036	.800
N of Valid Cases		1197	

Table 525 -- Feelings About Community's Future Groups by Length of Residency

Crosstab

			Feelings About Community's Future Groups	
			Unhappy	Neutral
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	28	98
		% within Length of Residency Groups	13.0%	45.4%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	42	84

		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.8%	37.5%
		Count	33	73
	10 - 15 Years	% within Length of Residency Groups	16.8%	37.1%
	> 15 Years	Count	104	225
		% within Length of Residency Groups	18.9%	40.8%
	Total	Count	207	480
		% within Length of Residency Groups	17.4%	40.4%

Crosstab

			Feelings About Community's Future Groups	
			Happy	Total
Length of Residency Groups	< 5 Years	Count	90	216
		% within Length of Residency Groups	41.7%	100.0%
	5 - 10 Years	Count	98	224
		% within Length of Residency Groups	43.8%	100.0%
	10 - 15 Years	Count	91	197
		% within Length of Residency Groups	46.2%	100.0%
	> 15 Years	Count	222	551
		% within Length of Residency Groups	40.3%	100.0%
	Total		501	1188
			42.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.131 ^a	6	.309
Likelihood Ratio	7.310	6	.293
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.487	1	.223
N of Valid Cases	1188		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.33.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.077	.309
	Cramer's V	.055	.309
N of Valid Cases		1188	

Appendix H — Demographic Differences in Responses to Open-Ended Survey Questions

Appendix H – Demographic Differences in Responses to Open-Ended Survey Questions

Tables	Content of Tables	Pages
Tables 526 - 531	Categorisation of Responses to Open-Ended Questions by Gender	2 - 7
Tables 532 - 537	Categorisation of Responses to Open-Ended Questions by Age Group	8 - 13
Table 538 - 543	Categorisation of Responses to Open-Ended Questions by Geographic Area	14 - 19

**Table 526 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 12 by Gender
(Missing Services in the Community)**

Question 12: Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?				
Category	Females		Males	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 640)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 256)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	208	33	64	25
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	112	18	44	17
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	187	29	55	22
Community Facilities & Assets	61	10	21	8
Community Life & Participation	92	14	29	11
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	5	1	1	0
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living **	35	6	4	2
Housing & Affordability	12	2	2	1
Children, Young People & Education	100	16	31	12
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	22	3	15	6
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	30	5	8	3
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	108	17	54	21

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 527 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 13 by Gender
(Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing)**

Question 13: Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?				
Category	Females		Males	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 545)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 198)
Public Transport & Connectivity	68	13	17	9
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	116	21	41	21
Health, Care & Well-being Services	125	23	40	20
Community Facilities & Assets	129	24	38	19
Community Life & Participation	40	7	11	6
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	4	1	1	0
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	35	6	14	7
Housing & Affordability	5	1	2	1
Children, Young People & Education	98	18	37	19
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	15	3	5	3
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	64	12	24	12
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	7	1	3	2

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 528 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 15 by Gender
(Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk)**

Question 15: Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed? How do you feel about that?				
Category	Females		Males	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 393)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 151)
Public Transport & Connectivity	57	15	16	11
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	37	9	13	9
Health, Care & Well-being Services	38	10	8	5
Community Facilities & Assets *	100	25	25	17
Community Life & Participation	10	3	3	2
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion *	161	41	45	30
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living *	66	17	14	9
Housing & Affordability	21	5	6	4
Children, Young People & Education	90	23	26	17
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	8	2	0	0
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	59	15	16	11
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	99	25	45	30

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 529 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 17 by Gender
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Now)**

Question 17: What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?				
Category	Females		Males	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 702)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 304)
Public Transport & Connectivity	157	22	57	19
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services **	173	25	49	16
Health, Care & Well-being Services ***	118	17	26	9
Community Facilities & Assets *	77	11	19	6
Community Life & Participation	30	4	13	4
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion *	254	36	87	29
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	170	24	83	27
Housing & Affordability	63	9	29	10
Children, Young People & Education *	183	26	60	20
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	49	7	26	9
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	135	19	50	16
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	233	33	132	43

Chi-square significance: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .01$

**Table 530 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 18 by Gender
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Over the Next 5–10 Years)**

Question 18: What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?				
Category	Females		Males	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 678)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 294)
Public Transport & Connectivity	105	16	32	11
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	57	8	22	8
Health, Care & Well-being Services	73	11	21	7
Community Facilities & Assets	51	8	22	8
Community Life & Participation	13	2	6	2
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion *	275	41	95	32
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	1455	21	61	21
Housing & Affordability	75	11	40	14
Children, Young People & Education	145	21	62	21
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	63	9	30	10
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	85	13	33	11
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	320	47	144	49

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 531 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 19 by Gender
(One Change Respondents Would Make in Their Community)**

Question 19: If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?				
Category	Females		Males	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 604)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 251)
Public Transport & Connectivity	157	26	54	22
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	62	10	31	12
Health, Care & Well-being Services	59	10	15	6
Community Facilities & Assets	55	9	15	6
Community Life & Participation	24	4	10	4
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	217	36	88	35
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	91	15	43	17
Housing & Affordability	38	6	16	6
Children, Young People & Education	109	18	41	16
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	33	6	22	9
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	54	9	29	12
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	199	33	75	32

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 532 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 12 by Age Group
(Missing Services in the Community)**

Question 12: Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?				
Category	< 26 Years Old		26 - 40 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 65)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 114)
Public Transport & Connectivity	20	31	29	25
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	18	28	16	14
Health, Care & Well-being Services	15	23	23	20
Community Facilities & Assets *	0	0	8	7
Community Life & Participation ***	5	8	31	27
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	0	0	0	0
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	3	5	5	4
Housing & Affordability	1	2	0	0
Children, Young People & Education *	9	14	27	24
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	2	3	5	4
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	0	0	6	5
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	6	9	21	18

Category	41 - 70 Years Old		> 70 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 509)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 241)
Public Transport & Connectivity	168	33	67	28
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	84	17	41	17
Health, Care & Well-being Services	150	30	60	25
Community Facilities & Assets *	58	11	20	8
Community Life & Participation ***	67	13	24	10
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	5	1	2	1
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	25	5	9	4
Housing & Affordability	10	2	4	2
Children, Young People & Education *	75	15	27	11
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	26	5	6	3
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	23	5	9	4

Other / Miscellaneous Responses	95	19	47	20
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 533 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 13 by Age Group
(Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing)**

Question 13: Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?				
Category	< 26 Years Old		26 - 40 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 47)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 88)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	2	4	4	5
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	11	23	18	21
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	3	6	17	19
Community Facilities & Assets ***	4	9	11	13
Community Life & Participation **	1	2	13	15
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	0	0	0	0
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	3	6	7	8
Housing & Affordability	1	2	0	0
Children, Young People & Education	6	13	18	21
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	0	0	0	0
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making **	0	0	8	9
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	0	0	0	0

Category	41 - 70 Years Old		> 70 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 441)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 198)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	54	12	27	14
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	93	21	42	21
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	112	25	38	19
Community Facilities & Assets ***	104	24	58	29
Community Life & Participation **	28	6	10	5
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	4	1	5	1
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	32	7	11	6
Housing & Affordability	7	2	1	1
Children, Young People & Education	86	20	29	15
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	18	4	5	3

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making **	67	15	17	9
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	7	2	4	2

Chi-square significance: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .01$

**Table 534 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 15 by Age Group
(Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk)**

Question 15: Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed? How do you feel about that?				
Category	< 26 Years Old		26 - 40 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 36)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 54)
Public Transport & Connectivity **	1	3	7	13
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	1	3	2	4
Health, Care & Well-being Services	3	8	4	7
Community Facilities & Assets *	1	3	12	22
Community Life & Participation	0	0	3	6
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion **	4	11	20	37
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living *	1	3	11	20
Housing & Affordability	0	0	4	7
Children, Young People & Education	3	8	13	24
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	0	0	1	2
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	0	0	4	7
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	11	31	17	32

Category	41 - 70 Years Old		> 70 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 333)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 143)
Public Transport & Connectivity **	59	18	11	8
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	38	11	12	8
Health, Care & Well-being Services	25	8	14	10
Community Facilities & Assets *	80	24	36	25
Community Life & Participation	7	2	4	3
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion **	141	42	52	36
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living *	58	17	15	11
Housing & Affordability	19	6	4	3
Children, Young People & Education	81	24	24	17
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	5	2	2	1
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	58	17	18	13
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	83	25	38	27

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 535 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 17 by Age Group
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Now)**

Question 17: What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?				
Category	< 26 Years Old		26 - 40 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 63)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 113)
Public Transport & Connectivity	13	21	23	20
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	9	14	26	23
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	3	5	11	10
Community Facilities & Assets	2	3	7	6
Community Life & Participation	2	3	6	5
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion ***	8	13	42	37
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living **	6	10	24	21
Housing & Affordability	2	3	8	7
Children, Young People & Education *	12	19	34	30
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure *	3	5	2	2
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making ***	3	5	31	27
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	32	51	42	37

Category	41 - 70 Years Old		> 70 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 593)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 278)
Public Transport & Connectivity	125	21	66	24
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	134	23	66	22
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	100	17	36	13
Community Facilities & Assets	64	11	28	10
Community Life & Participation	27	5	10	4
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion ***	224	38	85	31
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living **	167	28	67	24
Housing & Affordability	63	11	24	9
Children, Young People & Education *	154	26	53	19
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure *	54	9	19	7
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making ***	122	21	38	14
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	191	32	113	41

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 536 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 18 by Age Group
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Over the Next 5–10 Years)**

Question 18: What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?				
Category	< 26 Years Old		26 - 40 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 57)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 111)
Public Transport & Connectivity	3	5	20	18
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	8	14	7	6
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	2	4	4	4
Community Facilities & Assets	4	7	4	7
Community Life & Participation	0	0	3	3
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion ***	8	14	48	43
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living *	4	7	24	22
Housing & Affordability	5	9	16	14
Children, Young People & Education *	3	5	24	22
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	1	2	9	8
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	1	2	17	15
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	39	68	46	41

Category	41 - 70 Years Old		> 70 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 584)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 260)
Public Transport & Connectivity	833	14	36	14
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	47	8	19	7
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	61	10	30	12
Community Facilities & Assets	47	8	19	7
Community Life & Participation	9	2	7	3
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion ***	231	40	101	39
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	136	23	51	20
Housing & Affordability	76	13	21	8
Children, Young People & Education *	136	23	53	20
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	68	12	21	8
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	78	13	27	10
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	281	48	125	48

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 537 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 19 by Age Group
(One Change Respondents Would Make in Their Community)**

Question 19: If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?				
Category	< 26 Years Old		26 - 40 Years Old	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 56)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 103)
Public Transport & Connectivity	14	25	22	21
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services **	12	21	16	16
Health, Care & Well-being Services	4	7	7	7
Community Facilities & Assets *	1	2	5	5
Community Life & Participation	4	7	6	6
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion **	9	16	38	37
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	6	11	19	18
Housing & Affordability	0	0	9	9
Children, Young People & Education **	6	11	29	28
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	3	5	2	2
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	2	4	14	14
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	15	27	28	27

Category	41 - 70 Years Old		> 70 Years Old	
	N	% of Valid Responses (N = 516)	N	% of Valid Responses (N = 214)
Public Transport & Connectivity	134	26	49	23
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services **	54	11	13	6
Health, Care & Well-being Services	43	8	23	11
Community Facilities & Assets *	54	11	11	5
Community Life & Participation	21	4	5	2
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion **	200	39	71	33
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	87	17	30	14
Housing & Affordability	31	6	15	7
Children, Young People & Education **	93	18	30	14
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	38	7	14	7
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	54	11	17	8
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	162	31	83	39

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 538 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 12 by Geographic Area
(Missing Services in the Community)**

Question 12: Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?				
Category	Brecon		Llandrindod Wells	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 329)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 301)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	115	35	80	27
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	54	16	54	18
Health, Care & Well-being Services ***	59	18	125	42
Community Facilities & Assets	40	12	23	8
Community Life & Participation	41	13	45	15
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	2	1	2	1
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	14	4	14	5
Housing & Affordability	6	2	4	1
Children, Young People & Education	41	13	51	17
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	21	6	12	4
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	14	4	13	4
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	59	18	47	16

Category	Newtown		Welshpool	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 176)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 123)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	43	24	46	37
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	34	19	17	14
Health, Care & Well-being Services ***	36	21	28	23
Community Facilities & Assets	13	7	10	8
Community Life & Participation	26	15	15	12
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	1	1	2	2
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	7	4	7	6
Housing & Affordability	2	1	3	2
Children, Young People & Education	26	15	20	16
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	3	2	3	2
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	6	3	5	4

Other / Miscellaneous Responses	37	21	26	21
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 539 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 13 by Geographic Area
(Local Services at Risk of Closing or Changing)**

Question 13: Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?				
Category	Brecon		Llandrindod Wells	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 264)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 271)
Public Transport & Connectivity ***	16	6	38	14
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services **	75	28	45	17
Health, Care & Well-being Services **	39	15	72	27
Community Facilities & Assets ***	34	13	88	33
Community Life & Participation	13	5	27	10
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	1	0	3	1
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	17	6	22	8
Housing & Affordability	1	0	3	1
Children, Young People & Education	46	17	52	19
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	12	5	4	2
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	40	15	33	12
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	6	2	1	0

Category	Newtown		Welshpool	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 142)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 97)
Public Transport & Connectivity ***	14	10	19	20
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services **	23	16	21	22
Health, Care & Well-being Services **	35	25	24	25
Community Facilities & Assets ***	32	23	23	24
Community Life & Participation	7	5	5	5
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	1	1	0	0
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	7	5	7	7
Housing & Affordability	2	1	3	3
Children, Young People & Education	18	13	23	24
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	5	4	2	2

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	7	5	12	12
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	2	1	2	2

Chi-square significance: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .01$

**Table 540 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 15 by Geographic Area
(Local Buildings or Spaces at Risk)**

Question 15: Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed? How do you feel about that?				
Category	Brecon		Llandrindod Wells	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 189)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 195)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	20	11	24	12
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services ***	15	8	11	6
Health, Care & Well-being Services	17	9	15	8
Community Facilities & Assets	35	19	54	28
Community Life & Participation	9	5	2	1
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	67	35	80	41
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	22	12	32	16
Housing & Affordability	9	8	12	6
Children, Young People & Education	36	19	42	22
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	1	1	2	1
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	23	12	31	16
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	60	32	41	21

Category	Newtown		Welshpool	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 104)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 78)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	15	14	19	24
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services ***	12	12	15	19
Health, Care & Well-being Services	11	11	3	4
Community Facilities & Assets	21	20	19	24
Community Life & Participation	2	2	1	1
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	39	38	31	40
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	22	21	9	12
Housing & Affordability	1	1	5	6
Children, Young People & Education	22	21	21	27
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	2	2	3	4
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	17	16	9	12
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	28	27	20	26

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 541 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 17 by Geographic Area
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Now)**

Question 17: What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?				
Category	Brecon		Llandrindod Wells	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 382)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 334)
Public Transport & Connectivity	74	19	69	21
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	77	20	75	23
Health, Care & Well-being Services ***	35	9	64	19
Community Facilities & Assets	27	7	38	11
Community Life & Participation	22	6	12	4
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	120	31	117	35
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	95	25	85	25
Housing & Affordability *	43	11	18	5
Children, Young People & Education	90	24	84	25
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	30	8	23	7
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making **	53	14	81	24
Other / Miscellaneous Responses *	160	42	114	34

Category	Newtown		Welshpool	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 194)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 137)
Public Transport & Connectivity	45	23	39	29
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	48	25	31	23
Health, Care & Well-being Services ***	37	19	14	10
Community Facilities & Assets	24	12	12	9
Community Life & Participation	8	4	3	2
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	72	37	50	37
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	49	25	35	26
Housing & Affordability *	20	10	16	12
Children, Young People & Education	44	23	35	26
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	14	7	11	8
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making **	35	18	25	18
Other / Miscellaneous Responses *	63	33	41	30

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 542 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 18 by Geographic Area
(Biggest Challenge Facing the Community Over the Next 5–10 Years)**

Question 18: What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?				
Category	Brecon		Llandrindod Wells	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 357)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 325)
Public Transport & Connectivity	43	12	54	17
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	33	9	21	7
Health, Care & Well-being Services **	25	7	46	14
Community Facilities & Assets	25	7	27	8
Community Life & Participation	8	2	5	2
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	136	38	125	39
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	76	21	73	23
Housing & Affordability *	52	15	27	8
Children, Young People & Education	73	20	77	24
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	36	10	31	10
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	33	9	54	17
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	195	55	130	40

Category	Newtown		Welshpool	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 199)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 131)
Public Transport & Connectivity	28	14	17	13
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	16	8	11	8
Health, Care & Well-being Services **	18	9	8	6
Community Facilities & Assets	12	6	10	8
Community Life & Participation	4	2	2	2
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	70	35	57	44
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	40	20	26	20
Housing & Affordability *	20	10	19	15
Children, Young People & Education	38	19	28	21
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure	16	8	16	12
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making *	22	11	14	11
Other / Miscellaneous Responses **	100	50	66	50

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

**Table 543 – Categorisation of Responses to Question 19 by Geographic Area
(One Change Respondents Would Make in Their Community)**

Question 19: If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?				
Category	Brecon		Llandrindod Wells	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 310)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 292)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	92	30	55	19
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	31	10	30	10
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	20	7	37	13
Community Facilities & Assets	29	9	19	7
Community Life & Participation	12	4	10	3
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	106	34	113	39
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	47	15	48	16
Housing & Affordability	21	7	12	4
Children, Young People & Education	59	19	51	18
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure *	21	7	17	6
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	23	7	37	13
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	90	29	102	35

Category	Newtown		Welshpool	
	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 165)	Count	% of Valid Responses (N = 122)
Public Transport & Connectivity *	37	22	35	29
Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services	24	15	10	8
Health, Care & Well-being Services *	13	9	7	6
Community Facilities & Assets	12	7	11	9
Community Life & Participation	9	6	5	4
Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion	59	36	40	33
Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living	25	15	22	18
Housing & Affordability	15	9	7	6
Children, Young People & Education	27	16	21	17
Environment, Climate & Infrastructure *	5	3	14	12
Governance, Funding & Decision-Making	14	9	13	11
Other / Miscellaneous Responses	56	34	40	33

Chi-square significance: * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .01

Appendix I — Representative Quotes from Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Appendix I – Representative Quotes from Responses to Open-Ended Questions

This appendix presents up to five representative quotations per theme for each open-ended survey question.

Question Numbers	Topics	Questions	Pages
Question 12	Missing Community Services	Are there any services you feel are missing in your community?	2 - 5
Question 13	Local Services at Risk	Are there any local services that you know are at risk of closing or changing? How do you feel about that?	6 - 10
Question 15	Local Buildings and Spaces at Risk	Are you aware of any buildings or spaces in your community that are at risk of being lost or changed? How do you feel about that?	11 - 15
Question 17	Current Challenges Facing the Community	What do you think is the biggest challenge facing your community right now?	16 - 19
Question 18	Future Challenges Facing the Community	What do you think will be the biggest challenge your community faces over the next 5 to 10 years?	20 - 23
Question 19	Desired Changes in the Community	If you could change one thing about your community, what would it be?	24 - 27
Question 20	New Projects Planned in the Community	Do you know about any new projects planned for your area?	28 - 31
Question 21	Additional Comments	Anything else you'd like to add?	32 -36

Question 12 – Missing Community Services

Public Transport & Connectivity

- access to transport transport links transport frequency
- on 1st aug the local bus service bus will no longer run
- Transport - rail service More buses running later hours
- Public transport - one bus per week where I live (Cwmdu)
- Dentist Out of hours doctors More regular bus services

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- More dental surgeries Childrens shoe shops
- Pub Frequent public transport Youth events
- Adult education night classes Decent shops
- Shoe shop, Mens clothes. Evans the drapers
- Shop - 2 miles to get service bus at Erwood

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- GP surgery reduced to 3 days a week from 5
- Hospitals - general - A&E Birthing centres
- Dentist Youth club Activities for children
- Within Newtown - NHS dentists with spaces
- Dentist. Day centres for elderly / disabled

Community Facilities & Assets

- NHS Dentist, family doctor/choice of doctors Hospital nearer than 90 minutes drive, library open afternoons
- Activity for older teenagers and outdoor play space eg wheeled track play area Adequate parking for the town

- Bank with a local branch Adequate public transport in rural areas Road maintenance local public allotments
- Community centre / family centre better / more nursery options with better facilities (not the nursery's fault)
- Access to some hospital services, NHS doctors Banks & building society's We need more shops in towns & markets

Community Life & Participation

- Social, support opportunities for young people - properly funded and led
- Access to local self help groups for arthritis Health promotion services
- Youth services Small group craft groups Small group older person's groups
- A local resource centre to promote citizenship and community engagement
- Youth centres for various ages Clubs for the elderly - warm centres etc

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- I live in a village (forden). There is nothing to do! No shops or amenities, no community groups, no community events - total lack of community spirit. Nothing for children and young people to do :(No community projects to get involved in.
- Better Bus services , community centre facilities could be used more if it wasn't so rural. Anything to help reduce social isolation, especially for the elderly, many no longer drive.
- Considering current polarisation of political views and the rise in hate crime, it would be excellent for both schools to engage The Peaceful Schools organisation to deliver courses in Making and Maintaining Peace, and in Peer Mediation Training.
- Access to public transport is a serious problem in villages like Felindre, being off the main Hay- Brecon bus route. This is an ever worsening problem in view of an increasingly ageing population who are being forced to drive so as to avoid isolation.
- Drug and alcohol counselling, youth services, domestic violence support, support for victims of sexual assault, housing and benefits advice

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- Local transport at times people can get to work at nearest town Anything for young people to do - especially to widen their horizon

- Drug and alcohol counselling, youth services, domestic violence support, support for victims of sexual assault, housing and benefits advice
- Support for local independent businesses Collaborative work space would be amazing
Difficulty getting dentist appointments
- Support for local independent businesses Collaborative workspace would be amazing
Difficulty getting dentist appointments
- Better public transport that link to Powys main towns in a timely manner to support access to work opportunities

Housing & Affordability

- Im unsure how to adticulate but one thing I see is not enough young Welsh families have access to affordable housing
- State funding for youth club and public toilets. Impartial thorough support for people whose homes are energy inefficient.
- Palliative care is limited. O.T support and basic equipment loan to get patients home quickly, A&E hospital
- There are no facilites for the Youth in the village, they wander the streets or ride bikes around houses.
- accessible, affordable public transport - or transport services to hospitals at a reasonable cost.

Children, Young People & Education

- Dentist, public transport, youth groups, support services, housing.
- More space for young people to be outside and hang out eg skate parks
- Dentist. Youth Services. Youth Club and activities other than sport.
- Swimming pool and a safe and maintained younger children's play park
- More for babies/children/adolescent's. Better primary care services!

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- State funding for youth club and public toilets. Impartial thorough support for people whose homes are energy inefficient.

- Gluten cafe. 7 day a week cafe. working bt phonebook. tandoori restaurant. centre water fountain. bus shelter for hay road kings drive.
- Dentist. Hourly bus service and later bus services/Sundays Cycle paths. Safe walking routes connecting Bronllys and Talgarth Baby groups
- Gym, community centre, outdoor infrastructure for young people and teens (skate park, bike track), better / more frequent public transport.
- School, shop, cafe, working pub, transport, proper roads. Lack of mains water (spring ran dry for 2nd time in 3yrs)

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- A district general hospital in Powys puts us at great risk of not receiving timely support in the event of a health emergency
- HOSPITAL, you mention GP an dbut i think the lack of public transport to further hospitals, as Powys dont have their own large hosptial
- Powys needs better out of hours health care. There are many who play sport at the weekend yet A & E or ambulance cover is virtually nil.
- DAY CENTRES ARE BEING CLOSED AND NOT REPLACED. MEANINGFUL ACTIVITIES FOR ADULT SINCE CLOSURE OF BCA AND POWYS PEOPLE FIRST
- State funding for youth club and public toilets. Impartial thorough support for people whose homes are energy inefficient.

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- Athletics' class for all ages
- Anything to do with teenagers
- LOCAL GYM (INDOOR OR OUTDOOR)
- All weather pitches for sport.
- All age Befriending services

Question 13 – Local Services at Risk

Public Transport & Connectivity

- Our bus services have changed recently and I know a few people are unhappy with the change of hours
- Cutting buses altogether through Llanfechain has been reversed thankfully, but still very limited service.
- Community Transport. Without that our older generation are at a huge risk. NHS Dentist. We had 3, now none.
- Community Transport & Furny Barn - shame if these go. I don't use CT at present but it is a valuable service.
- NHS dentist in Crickhowell has closed and my family are left without dental care. Public transport is limited.

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- The library at risk . Public toilets at risk . Recycle bins gone already
- Pharmacy closing end December where will we get medication from?????????
- Pharmacy - Llanfyllin - will be a big loss to larger area artisans - cafe
- Too many empty shops Coffee bars close early not conducive to tourists
- have already lost the Post Office In Llangammarch - sad but inevitable

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- St John ambulance I know of due to lack of volunteers, but other groups are likely in the same position
- Air ambulance - this is such a valuable and much needed resource. It will be terrible if we loose this
- LENGTH OF GETTING HEALTH APPOINTMENTS / SERVICE REDUCTION. HOSPITAL HAS NO LOCAL SERVICES OR ANY VALUE
- Only one doctor working at present at Presteigne Health Centre. Feel that the Centre may well shut down.

- Leisure centre, 6th form - ridiculous and will add to rural to urban drain Llanrhaedr surgery - just wrong

Community Facilities & Assets

- Leisure centre, 6th form - ridiculous and will add to rural to urban drain Llanrhaedr surgery - just wrong
- Fear loss of GP surgery and library in Llanwrtyd Village pubs - Beulah recently lost Trout Inn- now a cafe
- I regularly use the leisure centre and library and would be very upset if they closed or were restricted.
- Already closed the day centre in Welshpool, the cinema, the library - the new is small and less accessible.
- Possibly our local school a few years down the line. If that goes well are likely to lose our library.

Community Life & Participation

- Library seems under constant threat. Lack of funding for community groups. Removal of cardboard recycling. Restrictions and possible charging for recycling centres
- PHARMACY IN LLANFYLLIN IS CLOSING (RETIREMENT) BECAUSE THE LIBRARY MOVE TO THE SIDE OF THE MUSEUM THERE IS NO SPACE FOR THE MOTHER AND TODDLER GROUPS WHICH NEED TO HAPPEN
- Proposed to changes to the sixth form in Crickhowell high School are very concerning. Proposed cuts to the funding available for Crickhowell volunteer bureau are concerning.
- Canolfan - must be kept as a vital community asset for the future of services (PTHB & PCC) and groups that are waiting for funding that want to fill the gaps in our community
- Social Services changing delivery, the loss of English Medium Secondary Education in Builth, fear of loss of local 6th forms, further shop closures in Builth.

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- School leisure centre.school gone down hill since amalgamation with newton.leisure centre healt and safety risk in changing rooms

- Concern – about the knock-on effects on health, wellbeing, and social isolation if some leisure centres close.
- Fear loss of GP surgery and library in Llanwrtyd Village pubs - Beulah recently lost Trout Inn- now a cafe
- Social Services changing delivery, the loss of English Medium Secondary Education in Builth, fear of loss of local 6th forms, further shop closures in Builth.
- The special needs group, as a fairly isolated community this is vital.

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- High street only smaller towns, but that is the Tesco effect which quite honestly should not be allowed to develop. We need to minimise the impact of larger supermarkets in all smaller towns to preserve and encourage more local businesses.
- Secondary School closure. This will have a negative affect on the community - leading to the closure of the Primary school and the leisure centre. Research shows that if the schools go, house prices drop significantly in the area.
- How can we Know? Where is there any transparency in decision making these days Our library, our school could be at risk in the future as could local services as money gets tighter. We have don't have many services in Llanwrtyd.
- leisure centre - an awful idea for such an important community and visitor facility and the health benefits and the ability for children to learn to swim. This is even worse for rural towns as we have poor public transport links and the cost of travel.
- Leisure centres, library, village halls are all struggling to survive the current economic situation. More funding is needed and maybe some of the missing services could be provided using the currently available local services that are at risk of closure

Housing & Affordability

- The library in my area has been downgraded and offers limited services Face to face points of contact to meet with council staff to discuss issues related to tax, rent, neighbourhood concerns
- Secondary School closure. This will have a negative affect on the community - leading to the closure of the Primary school and the leisure centre. Research shows that if the schools go, house prices drop significantly in the area.
- To be fair I get used to it Rent goes up then people can't afford it Welshpool not as busy anymore a lot of things you can get online

- Minor injuries Leisure centre - I pay privately for gym & swim as facilities are better & longer hours but not affordable for all
- Many village public houses have closed in recent times. Public houses are valuable places to socialise

Children, Young People & Education

- 6th form college in Crickhowell needs to stay open We need a dentist (other than health centre in Crickhowell)
- NHS dentist in Crickhowell has closed and my family are left without dental care. Public transport is limited.
- Dementia matters in Powys. The only person centred group focussing on person with dementia and carer or family
- Primary schools in the county going under Local community activities/services at risk due to funding pressures
- LOCAL SCHOOL MAY BE GOING ALL WELSH. THIS SHOULD BE A CHOICE OPTIONS FOR THE PARENT AND CHILD NOT FORCED OPTION

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- The village is part of the waterfall walks area of the National Park and as such has thousands of tourists every year and because of this the paths are being eroded and not repaired.
- YES...THE GREEN FIELDS THAT ARE GOING TO BE TRASHED BY BUTE ENERGY. I AM SUPER ANGRY THAT THEY CAN EVEN CONSIDER THIS YET ALONE THINK IT VIABLE OR IN THE LOCAL PEOPLE'S INTEREST
- Dentist, air ambulance, no public transport roads are a mess, no one can afford to live and we're all fed up paying for the lazy and boat people
- Swimming pool. Would be bad for children if don't learn to swim, and offers very accessible exercise when places to walk are too much on roads
- Freedom to enjoy walking, riding or cycling in remote upland areas will be lost if plans to build massive wind farms across the area go ahead.

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- Canolfan - must be kept as a vital community asset for the future of services (PTHB & PCC) and groups that are waiting for funding that want to fill the gaps in our community
- I am aware that many local services are struggling for funds from an increasingly small pot. Obviously, I would like more funding generally but pigs rarely fly of their own volition!
- Proposed changes to the sixth form in Crickhowell high School are very concerning. Proposed cuts to the funding available for Crickhowell volunteer bureau are concerning.
- Canolfan day centre, services for older people, day services for adults with disabilities, powys people first. The most vulnerable in our communities are suffering the most
- Local schools which support a sense of community. Powys closes them! Boots Crickhowell in steady decline: some prescribed items they don't supply, have to go elsewhere.

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- No as they have already gone
- Yes Sadness, disappointment,
- Llyswen stopping being 24hrs
- Banks / access to cash points
- Minor Injury Unit Provision

Question 15 – Local Buildings and Spaces at Risk

Public Transport & Connectivity

- Police station closed. NHS dentist has gone. Local shops closing.
- Library, schools, buses, sports centre, village shop and pubs
- Buses at risk Leisure centre at risk High school at risk Shops etc all at risk
- Leisure centre, Library and local taxi service
- Police station : library : public toilets :

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- Cafe closed by the lake -artisans School being sold - turned into houses
- Community level sports Pub is important Community spaces for socialising
- Local pub has closed in village, on in next village is close to closing
- Happy with the local shops but we think we need a greater variety of shops
- Market hall/local market Old secondary modern school or Cradoc school

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- NHS Dentist surgery - we need one in Knighton Community Charity furniture barn
- Police station closed. NHS dentist has gone. Local shops closing.
- GP surgery in Sennybridge is invaluable service in our community
- GP surgery in Sennybridge - invaluable service in our community
- As previously stated John ambulance building I know especially

Community Facilities & Assets

- Community centre relies on funding raised itself but needs consistent funds to run much needed services
- PLAY PARK AT GWERYFED ESTATE. THREE COCKS MATTERS GROUP ARE BEING HELD UP BY PCC DELAYING THIS HAPPENING

- I'm sad there are lots of large empty buildings falling apart e.g. The Gwalia, old library & NPTC college
- I regularly use the leisure centre and library and would be very upset if they closed or were restricted.
- public toilets - would be great loss for visitors. Free car park, brings visitors from the town

Community Life & Participation

- We don't have a Community Centre - it was sold by Powys CC to a property developer who demolished it and has done nothing to it for decades. We also lost our Youth Club.
- All the public halls in Knighton are vulnerable because of rising fuel costs and lack of volunteers to keep them open. New volunteers are difficult to find.
- Canolfan - must be kept as a vital community asset for the future of services (PTHB & PCC) and groups that are waiting for funding that want to fill the gaps in our community
- Town hall is too expensive for most people to hire. Also the high cost of hiring public toilets stops really great events happening in The Mill.
- Not aware of any. Black Mountain College has been a real asset to the community and the number of events and activities on offer in Talgarth.

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- Brecon Market Hall is extremely poor. Not maintained as agreed under contract and extreme negligence regards health, safety and lack of repairs or any interest at all by owner. Watergate Chapel potentially closing.
- Impelo, now the building is owned by mind, due to having to sell property after losing funding. Now renting the space, there is a fear we won't be able to generate enough income to sustain the work
- Many of the churches like St David's, and what was the church house, hopefully who ever has bought Pryce Jones Building I hope this is not converted in to accommodation for migrants. Our most historic site St Mary's which is registered with CADW is very vulnerable from antis...
- More bilingual activities and services that is both languages are strong not one language highlights.
- There has been a huge effort to create the Hanging garden in Bethel Street but funding is needed to secure the safety of the building and continual repair and renewal. Our local

hospital is under threat of downgrading. Already service services have been cut and this creat...

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- Secondary School closure. This will have a negative affect on the community - leading to the closure of the Primary school and the leisure centre. Research shows that if the schools go, house prices drop significantly in the area.
- All of the spaces above are important to my family or the families I work with in the community. Again these spaces are valuable and any of them closing would have a significant impact on groups of people within the town.
- There is never enough money to maintain community assets.. we need investment in public services and spaces for our communities to help lift people out of poverty and prevent the far right from further dividing us.
- The Knighton Community Centre is facing a hard year, trying to stay open to provide services but the cost of living and costs of keeping the building open are continuously rising, while disposable income for people to hire the building is going down.
- No - though the work of Mid Border Arts (see above) is linked to the Assembly Rooms. I'm assuming if Mid Border Arts wasn't able to make ends meet then that would have severe consequences for the Assembly Rooms, which is where many local events happen.

Housing & Affordability

- All buildings still owned by Powys. Assembly rooms which houses the library, and the Youth centre which are both very old buildings costly to keep going.
- gradual loss of business premises in the town to convert to housing - becoming a dormitory town (e.g the old post office and the Cottage pub)
- Closed down pub to be made into houses. The company should be made to sell the property as they've very little intension to work on it.
- Space is being lost all the time for more houses - to house who? We have an aging population and no reason for the youth to stay here.
- Both Pryce Jones buildings, Agricultural House, St David's Church, potential planning over ancient monuments. noy happy about these Not enough promotion about historic sites

Children, Young People & Education

- THE OGI IS VERY TIRED. THIS IS WHERE WE HAVE YOUTH CLUB. TO COMBINE THIS INTO A COMMUNITY CENTRE OF FAMILY CENTRE WOULD BE AMAZING
- Leisure centres- another kick in the teeth to rural communities. The opportunities for my children are becoming increasingly sparse
- Space is being lost all the time for more houses - to house who? We have an aging population and no reason for the youth to stay here.
- Village school, library. I will be devastated if the library is closed. The village will lose it's heart if the school goes
- The local school has been shut & the building is been sold. It is subject to a community use restrict & it matters that this is maintained

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- Cradoc road the old youth club. Disgusting it was closed and youth and community couldn't use it anymore and instead just left derelict. As if leave empty long enough maybe we get planning for housing. Taking away a vital community building in a deprived area
- Cae bodfach . Feel the direction it is going since being bought and managed by Town council is away from wildlife conservation. It was the only wild space for walking and enjoying we had.
- We are at risk of losing much of our precious wild upland spaces to bute energy and their windfarms. I feel very sad about that and will fight these stupid proposals as hard as I can!
- Library/public conveniences/Leisure centre. Public footpaths- are not protected sufficiently. I believe this is severely under resourced.
- THE ENTIRE GREEN HILLS OF WALES. YOU WILL BE ABLE TO SEE THESE 300 METRES MASTS EVERYWHERE ACROSS WALES IF BUTE ENERGY HAVE THEIR WAY.

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- Butchers in Llani town hall, it will be a travesty if this has to close down due to Powys CC regulations. We are a rural town, a butchers goes hand in hand with who we are
- Both Pryce Jones buildings, Agricultural House, St David's Church, potential planning over ancient monuments. noy happy about these Not enough promotion about historic sites
- We don't have a Community Centre - it was sold by Powys CC to a property developer who demolished it and has done nothing to it for decades. We also lost our Youth Club.

- Canolfan - must be kept as a vital community asset for the future of services (PTHB & PCC) and groups that are waiting for funding that want to fill the gaps in our community
- The Gwalia Glen Usk hotel The old library - great shame to lose The Gwalia library (Beaufort Rd) we need investment for Government Coleg Powys/Newport Pt Talbot college building

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- More community spaces
- None that I'm aware of
- Loss to the community
- FREE DISABLED PARKING
- Change needs to happen

Question 17 – Current Challenges Facing the Community

Public Transport & Connectivity

- Risk of electricity pylons being built along the valley. Lack of public transport
- Public transport - not in late evenings after local cinema/performances finish
- More younger people needed to help in voluntary roles - eg cubs, fire station
- Funding to support youth and family services Frequency of public transport
- Aging population Poor transport links Need to drive a car to get anywhere

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- Welshpool isn't busy anymore, lots of people prefer going elsewhere, local shops close
- getting businesses / people in to the town centre. Its very run down with empty shops
- Losing shops and services and lack of investment by local government and Welsh assembly
- Lack of bank facilities for those who cannot access internet Closure of essential shops
- Healthcare, dentist We need to encourage more shops to open Jobs Rising energy costs

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- Healthcare! Powys has no main hospital! NHS dentists are an enigma! Waiting times!
- Healthcare, dentist We need to encourage more shops to open Jobs Rising energy costs
- No major hospitals. Lack of mental health support for schools. No dentist. Pot holes
- Government support rural areas and the development of hospital services Powys border
- Healthcare facilities, aging population. No free parking even for blue badge holders.

Community Facilities & Assets

- GETTING MORE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE VILLAGE HALL AND THE THE ACTIVITIES ON OFFER. WE REALLY NEED THE PUB BACK

- Lack of investment in the community centre, transport links, the town centre could do with a lick of paint
- Young people not stepping up to volunteer for Village Hall Committee, Parochial Church Council etc.
- Uncertain future of village hall which is a central hub for social activities support for community
- Raising funds to develop green spaces, the Bronllys Well Being Park, and sustainable food networks

Community Life & Participation

- A list of community meeting places and community speakers, noting which language(s) they speak.
- Funding for local transport, especially for schools Funding for local community groups e.g. YFC
- Employment opportunities - especially if you can't drive. Social activities if you can't drive.
- I don't live in Llanwrtyd, it's the closest location option but social isolation is a real issue
- Lack of services and activities, cost of living crisis, lack of opportunities for young people

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- Isolation, easy access to service for families and the elderly - lack of A&E provision
- Racism and Division and the rich becoming richer and the poorer becoming left behind.
- Social isolation/ageing population/lack of employment opportunities for young people
- money ! and the welsh language, people are moving in and we are losing our identity
- Encourage young people to join in activities The health and safety agenda - risk aversion

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- Loss of young people opportunities and jobs that aren't just building more houses
- Lack of new business, shops, cafes where people can meet. Possible lack of funding
- Fewer young families in the area. Few skilled work opportunities for young people.
- I hope the great community work and support can continue at the community centre

- Healthcare, dentist We need to encourage more shops to open Jobs Rising energy costs

Housing & Affordability

- Health care especially cottage hospitals when discharged from General Hospital. Adequate home care
- selling off buildings for housing - but no services to cope if all the housing places get filled
- Cost of living alongside a lack of genuinely affordable homes, and good rented or council housing.
- Community spirit, pride. People buying second houses, making it harder for young, first time buyers
- To get the road outside house resurfaced - been in touch with PCC about it, didn't do anything

Children, Young People & Education

- Social isolation/ageing population/lack of employment opportunities for young people
- No major hospitals. Lack of mental health support for schools. No dentist. Pot holes
- FACILITES FOR CHILDREN EG LEARNING TO SWIM AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT WITH ACTIVITIES
- Fewer young families in the area. Few skilled work opportunities for young people.
- Lack of transport, lack of support in schools and rise in ND diagnosis in children

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- To get the road outside house resurfaced - been in touch with PCC about it, didn't do anything
- Employment, transport, internet availability, road infrastructure, electricity infrastructure
- Most B roads and below are appalling, uncared for and DANGEROUS. Council and government cuts
- Stopping the possible wind farm at Dylife. Losing the Ganolfan No bus service to the village
- Hollowing out of communities. Very few young people live here. Resilience to the climate crisis.

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- Keeping volunteers engaged Funding of social services and what fills the gap
- Poverty and a Reform UK Ltd fascist government in Wales and / or Westminster
- Funding for all the essential local voluntary organisation. Cost of living.
- Price of energy (closely followed by council tax and food as major outgoings)
- Lack of funding and volunteers to support activities in the local community

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- Pressure on statutory services
- Getting people out after covid
- Empty high street store holders
- large supermarkets taking over
- Insular thinking and xenophobia

Question 18 – Future Challenges Facing the Community

Public Transport & Connectivity

- Increased isolation as the elderly are no longer able to drive and cannot access public transport
- Keeping young people in a community due to opportunities. Public transport could be improved
- As above. If services such as the bus service are cut, Llanspyddid becomes more isolated.
- Dealing with the digital world. Also potential loss of public transport. Isolation breeding intolerance
- Losing facilities run by the council, also reduction of bus services perhaps

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- Local shops will probably be relapsed with chain shops like tobacco shops
- Local business improvements and opening more local shops in town centre
- New town road plan that might put local shops out of business and Q 17
- Lack of pharmacy, lack of cafe Keep raising funds for community centre
- Parking should do free parking for residents, rising rental costs for shops

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- Access to adequate health facilities - A&E, NHS dentist, reduced Drs appointments
- Ageing population - no carers, healthcare provision Lack of transport infrastructure
- Lack of work, Lack of careers , closer of sports centre, Changes to the hospital
- Loss of employment opportunities. Ever increasing Council Tax. Good health care.
- Funding of services. GP surgery at capacity. Dentist needed. Nothing for young people

Community Facilities & Assets

- Residents apathy, traffic problems, lack of village shop/ post office, green space and parking.

- Swimming pool closing through lack of funding. So essential for our children, living near a river
- Reduction in incoming families. Possible school closure which means closure of library and playgroup.
- nobody wants to take responsibility for community events eg local show, annual Eisteddfod, hall committee.
- Loss of local churches, Village hall, pubs and local shops within walking distance

Community Life & Participation

- How will son cope without young people to work, no social life for him, will be alone
- Losing shops/banks/markets No community spirit for local people to meet No farmers market
- That there won't be any community like coffee mornings/afternoon teas and any other events
- young generation to run events etc volunteer. Lack of care workers. Hospitals too far away
- Cohesion - lack of group participation, longer working hours, challenge of digital

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- poverty, lack of food resources, social isolation. lack of creative outlets.
- KEEPING UP THE COMMUNITY SPIRIT, SAME VOLUNTEERS GETTING DRAINED, LACK OF FUNDING
- Cohesion - lack of group participation, longer working hours, challenge of digital
- Loss of community spirit Aging farming population Jobs and housing for young people
- Isolation, Bank closures, Post Office Closure. I hope our local School does not close

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- Diversifying the economy away from tourism. Climate change resilience
- New town road plan that might put local shops out of business and Q 17
- Loss of young people, no good jobs, less wages, loss of health services
- Local business improvements and opening more local shops in town centre

- Keeping the youth in the area we need more employment opportunities

Housing & Affordability

- Costs it's very expensive to live right now and housing is too expensive
- Aging population, housing supply and flood risk due to climate changes`
- Parking should do free parking for residents, rising rental costs for shops
- staying warm, having good quality housing that is efficient, dry and healthy
- See above - lack of affordable housing, lack of utilities e.g. water, sewage

Children, Young People & Education

- Isolation, Bank closures, Post Office Closure. I hope our local School does not close
- Aging population with fewer young people who can't afford to live in their home areas
- Funding of services. GP surgery at capacity. Dentist needed. Nothing for young people
- How will son cope without young people to work, no social life for him, will be alone
- Jobs and housing for young people, and thus enough children to keep the schools going

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- Diversifying the economy away from tourism. Climate change resilience
- Littering/over industrialisation/housing plots/access to walk paths
- We need infrastructure upgrading all service for the need of residents
- New town road plan that might put local shops out of business and Q 17
- See above Environmental degradation - loss of habitats and species

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- lack of public funding for public services. The Far Right.
- The loss of in town amenities - more cuts all the time
- Support for children and young adults Lack of funding
- cost of living - including council tax which is far too high

- Money and labour cuts - lack of rural understanding

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- Keeping places open
- Probably the same!
- TO REMAIN UNCHANGED
- Loss of high street
- Sixth form changes

Question 19 – Desired Changes in the Community

Public Transport & Connectivity

- More public transport accessibility
- Reinstate the local police station.
- More flexible, regular bus services
- More buses Llanfyllin and Welshpool
- Better public transport and access

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- Lower shop rates/rent on community centres
- more variety of shops / service, facilities
- Get the pub back - heart of the community
- A community shop - even 1 or 2 days per week
- easier access to shops that are relevant

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- More local dentist, more things to do re entertainment.
- More money would be invested in health and social care.
- Open the library longer. More access to local dentist
- Access to health ie NHS dentist, hospital in our town
- Upgrade the community hospital to take more patients

Community Facilities & Assets

- Improved green transport links - eg - cycle path along disused railway from Glasbury to Brecon.
- More funding for the community hall and leisure centre it's the heart of the community of Rhayader

- Play park or community/recreational are for the community, particular children to be active in.
- Better transport links. Green spaces within the housing developments. Safer routes to schools.
- Guaranteed access to the church field and the ability to erect a more permanent type of building on it.

Community Life & Participation

- That we could all work together and support each other when needed
- engagement and promotion of community annual events in each village
- Better infrastructure / travel access and youth club - hub spaces
- PCC to listen. WTC to engage with local people - WTC is a shambles.
- Provide a pop in place for people to meet and chat and have a cuppa

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- Community is good, funding to provide support to isolated people is not.
- Better cohesion of inter-generational and interests in the community
- Better cycle tracks that link meaning safety for this activity to link villages etc
- We are losing our community and vital amenities leaving country people very isolated
- Good community communication . Not everyone uses social media . Encourage community spirit

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- Better transport links and support for all types of businesses not just farming and tourism
- Investment in jobs, we could get Llanidloes back to what it was, a bustling, exciting town.
- More accessible parking. More variety of shops Lower business rates Better transport links
- Local hotel would have less influence on local planning to allow other business to expand
- More community owned assets that bring in an income. Transport, pubs, shops, energy, housing.

Housing & Affordability

- More scope for jobs and housing for our own children
- More long term rental accommodation and social housing
- Make it harder for people to buy second homes in our area
- Less second homes. Affordable housing and controlled rent.
- That our shop and village pub was open. Less holiday homes.

Children, Young People & Education

- Funding for Music and the Arts especially for young people.
- 24 hour shop - more jobs More things to do for young people
- More stuff for young people/more support for clubs like YFC
- More funding for youth interventions Diversionary activities
- Affordable housing - more work opportunities for young people

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- More awareness around climate & biodiversity & willingness to adapt/change
- Spend money on ALL roads especially those not resurfaced of over 15+ years
- Have more internet groups/hobbies of interest etc and social groups possibly
- Have a pavement between Snead and Churchstoke More parks/walking routes
- That the threat from Bute Energy and other developers would go away.

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- Pass as much of the local services to others (not PCC) with proper funding
- Current government & government policies. Stop the war against agriculture.
- Having a council that does things for the communities - not to the community
- More funding and information, advertisement on activities in local community
- better public service budgets Funds for the core costs of Dyfi Biosphere

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- No turbines. Give us a voice, listen
- Increase Police presence with a PCSO
- More joined up thinking and working.
- More places to go that suit everyone
- UP GRADE PUBLIC TOILES AND MONERNISE

Question 20 – New Projects Planned in the Community

Public Transport & Connectivity

- KFC, Starbucks, Tesla charging, Station, Hotel, Costa
- Sardis redevelopment, Centre for Rail Excellence
- New transport plan with more routes for buses.
- New people taking over community transport
- A new local bus service is being planned.

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- Planning app for The Lion Pub to extend to have post office/shop but unsure
- Private businesses are moving into Llanwrtyd- bakery and cafe, the Chapel music venue
- Sense housing development and supermarket on old industrial sit which i strongly oppose
- Refurbish.ent of public toilets. Possible refurbishment of the play facilities in the Town.
- Development of Kayes site - we do not need shops: there are 3 empty retail shops at present.

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- Heard of Healthcare Hub Centre in Newtown
- Dark skies project Possibility of new dentist
- Hospital development Community centre development
- Healthcare Hub Centre in Newtown
- Newtown GP/healthcare building

Community Facilities & Assets

- House building - will put huge pressure on all scant local services
- Community council exploring the possibility of building a MUGA
- Old library building being converted into a further education campus

- Maybe a playground revamp at green space next too Theatr Brycheiniog
- Hay Youth Theatre - towards zero performance project - (for March 26)

Community Life & Participation

- NORTON HUB HAVE BEEN WORKING HARD TO PROVIDE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS
- Yes, community groups are always coming up with good ideas. Too many to mention.
- 50 plus new social housing units planned for an old industrial site in town.
- Possibly a Welsh Language event next March supported by the chamber of trade
- football club trying to get a building developed which would be really beneficial

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- Possibly a Welsh Language event next March supported by the chamber of trade
- WRCH new mobile cabin to go into MRC carpark for people to come out if lonely and learning new hobby based on Men Shed and for ladies

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- Community centre on the playing fields - with multi-use venues and sports facilities, units for private businesses, skate park, swimming pool etc
- I know that there's work with the Fresh water habitats trust to work with landowners locally. As you may have guessed that's what I'm in to!
- no - there are no plans for new housing - Powys have been asleep at the wheel in planning employment opportunities and housing
- I currently work in Newtown so am knowledgeable about the projects there. I would like support starting an ArtLink Powys project and am starting to build that up
- Filling up hills with irreversible concrete and windmills when the wind farm further north is not connected or needed The council should not bow to financial bribery!

Housing & Affordability

- New community houses but it is rife with rumours
- No. Never hear of any apart from housing estates.
- newly built housing for social rent to open soon
- Yet more housing - gypsy/traveller site (not good)
- MORE HOUSES ARE PLANNED TO BE BUILT IN TALGARTH

Children, Young People & Education

- Plans to re do town centre. College moving to town
- The transition of Builth High School to all Welsh
- Housing, windfarms, possible school closures etc etc
- Relocation and re-building of the college sites.
- HOUSING IN NEXT FEW YEARS NEAR TALGARTH SCHOOL

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- Bute Energy's scheme to get rich quick with its huge turbines and pylons/energy parks.
- Support for people who need to make their homes more energy efficient.
- Bute energy are proposing 39 220m high turbines plus the infrastructure just above village
- Yes, many massive energy parks, Bute Energy alone have 16 planned.
- Wind farm Proposed move of the health centre outside village - away from retirement bungalows

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- no - there are no plans for new housing - Powys have been asleep at the wheel in planning employment opportunities and housing
- Lots being planned but need funding. Need to stop talking about what the community wants and needs and get on with delivering
- Yes. Powys County Council is likely to transfer Queen Elizabeth II park to Crickhowell Town Council. I am opposed to this action

- Wind farm in the near future, we have no say as the Welsh government will pass it. Active travel in Rhayader, not needed.
- Newtown Town Council Brisco House Transformation plan which has yet to be made transparent to the community.

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- PAVO network meetings
- See HayResilience.org
- No - not for Rhayader
- Not that I'm aware of
- Windfarm (in favour!)

Question 21 – Additional Comments

Public Transport & Connectivity

- Better public transport, more affordable housing for local people, more jobs. Same as everywhere else
- automated bus timetable device not working on bus stop gwernufed est - hasnt worked for a considerable time
- This area desperately needs more funding, we need an hourly train service with new trains
- New bus services have been welcomed - we hope they continue to run in the future
- Stop centralising services no one's going to get on a bus and go to Llandod

Shops, Amenities & Everyday Services

- Brecon people don't use their market as it is below them, they are not using it, once it's gone it's gone!
- Perhaps cafes to open later as pubs not a good idea for been safe and socialising without any trouble
- Making the high street pedestrian only (other than deliveries) & car parking free to encourage more use of shops
- THE PUBLIC TOILETS DO NEED UPDATING / DECORATION - WE ARE STILL VERY LUCKY TO HAVE FREE TOILETS AND FREE CAR PARK
- Talybont is a great place to live. The challenge is to keep its current services thriving (shop, cafe, pubs, churches).

Health, Care & Well-Being Services

- Newtown and Powys requires a Hospital fit for the 21st century, it does not need to be massive but with hi tech. In 1868 Newtown business philanthropists developed the County Infirmary in Newtown and we had Newtown Hospital built and opened in 1911 well before the NHS.
- I have many years of lived experience with Dementia. I am aware of people taking their loved ones to hospital because they could no longer cope, resulting in considerable cost to

statutory services. this can be avoided by funding the appropriate services, which would be a fr...

- Recognise that all residents do not have access to "online" , there are so many who have no access to vital services like bus timetables for whom constant being told "No they are online" when asking for a paper copy, online food/clothing etc. Also that many just do not have...
- I sound very negative but human nature you look at the bad and accept the good - social care need sorting from the bottom to the top to look after our elderly and the same with mental health services
- Threecoaks estate is a forgotten area between talgarth and glasbury/hay on wye all which have accessible venues ,all events need a car although bus schedules have altered going to cinema theatre any event which finishes late needs own car ,taxi around 25/30 pounds. doctor vi...

Community Facilities & Assets

- The public toilets do need updating / decoration - we are still very luucky to have free toilets and free car park
- Improve heating in village hall. Environmental systems preferred. Hall would be more accessible in colder months.
- Please reach out to Llangynidr community council and Llangynidr village hall committee if you get the chance
- The recent improvements at Llandefalle hall are great. The heating system could still do with updating.
- We have recently completed a Crickhowell Space Plan. I hope we can find the funds to carry it out

Community Life & Participation

- If it wasn't for the voluntary groups in the area there wouldn't be any community spirit Have to travel out of town for these nothing in my local village
- Too many people duplicating services when they should be working together in partnership services become diluted and people get confused as to who does what.
- So much hardship, so much loneliness in the area. We need more joyful opportunities to bring the community together. But how can these be organised and funded?

- Have more houses for emergency people eg homeless people Have better communication with Powys Social Services and Powys Council with young people /people at risk etc
- I run the local wellbeing group and I believe that we are quite fortunate as to where we live however I can see a few issues on the rise with the emergency housing ect .

Social Connection, Isolation & Cohesion

- If it wasn't for the voluntary groups in the area there wouldn't be any community spirit Have to travel out of town for these nothing in my local village
- So much hardship, so much loneliness in the area. We need more joyful opportunities to bring the community together. But how can these be organised and funded?
- Sole working/home working/farming life has a huge impact on locals and social deprivation/isolation & amongst the elderly &/or disabled
- Llanidloes is a great place to live. Strong community spirit but threats to services, eg the hospital, are very worrying.
- I hope this survey will lead to some projects that will strengthen community spirit and pride in our local environment.

Jobs, Economy & Cost of Living

- I don't like 'projects' imposed from above. I think ideas work best when they come from groups of people who want to make something happen but require simple funding solutions to make their ideas happen.
- I just hope we have a reform candidate so that they can sort out waste in the council and get us value for money because you lot just seem to keep taxing us more and giving us less. Something has to change!
- Wifi services could be greatly improved! Employment is an issue. Roads are abysmal - all need investment. Waste collection services need to be more frequent if we want to keep vermin down. Rats are an issue!
- Fundamentally, this is a political issue. Until the cost of living is addressed in a meaningful way, we will continue to see a decline in community engagement and the erosion of local support networks.
- Serious lack of funding for education is impairing and suffocating children's learning There is a definite disinterest in the problems faced by teachers Total waste of money on irrelevant unnecessary projects

Housing & Affordability

- Although I have only lived for a short time in my present home, I have live in this area for 26 years.
- Please fund citizens advice more so they can have more outlets and do more home visits where needed. .
- Better public transport, more affordable housing for local people, more jobs. Same as everywhere else
- Housing is in a crisis People can't afford to rent in private sector and not enough social housing
- I would like to see any new housing projects incorporating ideas of sharing resources, communal spaces - co-housing

Children, Young People & Education

- Have more houses for emergency people eg homeless people Have better communication with Powys Social Services and Powys Council with young people /people at risk etc
- Complacency about flooding and river quality are a real risk. Keeping the town multi-generational (High School again) is essential to maintaining its vitality as a community.
- We are a small community that needs its school and hall as the hub of village life. We would benefit from better walking links to the 'add on' estates.
- We are heavily dependent on school transport, for which we are grateful. However, this is just one service and I would like to see an overarching policy for supporting rural communities
- Stop closing small schools as different children have needs for different approaches to learn effectively which over large schools can't offer.

Environment, Climate & Infrastructure

- No more cycle paths in town, they are more nuisance than they are worth, and a waste of money, as little used. Also relax the 20 mph in some areas.
- Desperately need a proper and new Clyro to Hay footpath making it more useable for prams, the dog walkers, the blind and wheelchair users

- We are a small community that needs its school and hall as the hub of village life. We would benefit from better walking links to the 'add on' estates.
- Worth aligning with the Dyfi Biosphere and work they are doing to develop new projects/resources for the area that benefit both people and the environment.
- More footpaths & cycle paths linking up where the roads are busy. Where I live it is unsafe to walk along road and no footpaths

Governance, Funding & Decision-Making

- We're going to have to build better local networks as government support is withdrawn Particularly local food production/distribution. Protection and access to nature is also a priority for me
- Make PCC enforce planning conditions and give NRW teeth to enforce pollution controls. I feel happy with my community thanks to the efforts of volunteer members less so with government support
- There is a real call for a central community hub in Llanbedr that operates separately to Crickhowell and services the needs of the immediate village and has a pro active approach to future planning
- Please share what you do with these results, I feel like I am filling in surveys all the time but no good comes of it. It would be so nice to know even one thing that is improved after consultation.
- PCC is a long way from Welshpool, they bring out their consultations for closure of services but the decision has already been made, regardless of how residents feel or how it affects them.

Other / Miscellaneous Responses

- No large development of wind turbines and the over head wires
- It's a nice little town but it always takes time to integrate
- There needs to be more things to do for people between 19-40
- There needs to be more support for emergency services and care
- Please take all grievance and act to improve residents lives