

LIGHTING SURVEY RESULTS

1. Response. By 7 April 62 returns were received from 234 resident households, a response rate of 26.5%.

3 returns carried no postcode. Only 8 responses came from postcodes outside the 3 villages. About one third of the village households in Broome & Aston responded, about half of Hopesay. Of those who responded 36 were within sight of a light, 27 were not. Comment: It must be assumed that lighting is not a matter of great concern to those not directly affected, even though they pay for it.

The results that follow are given as numbers of each answer received (with a percentage shown where appropriate). Since some respondents did not answer all the questions, % figures relate to the proportions of those who expressed any view on a particular topic.

2. General Approach. A large majority, 42 (70%), favoured removal of all public lighting. There were 10 (16%) for retention and 8 (14%) for upgrade with energy saving.

3. Running Costs. A large majority, 41 (80%), wished to spend nothing on future lighting power & maintenance (this included some respondents who also asked for retention and improvement), with 9 (18%) for £50 and 1 (2%) for £75pa.

4. Renewal Costs. There was even less support for spending for renewal: 39 (93%) for nothing, 3 (7%) for £100pa.

5. OPTION 1 Removal. 30 (56%) of respondents were in favour, some tempering their opinion by saying that the majority view of residents in each village should nonetheless prevail. A few were for removal over time.

6. OPTION 2 Replace Over Time. 3 (6%) favoured this.

7. OPTION 3 Remove and/or Replace by Village Majority. 11 (20%) favoured this.

8. OPTION 4 Energy Saving with Selective Replacement. 10 (18%) favoured this, including several who wished to pay nothing towards it. (This may have arisen from lack of clarity about the intention that costs be met from Precept, adjusted up for costs or down for savings).

9. Lights to Go. The results here were less consistent because many respondents did not answer whereas others had very strong views on particular lights, mostly against. 18 respondents wanted all lights removed. Others wanted particular lights removed (generally, but not always, within their postcode) The bids for removal of particular lights (in brackets after each light number) were; 1 (6), 2 (4), 3 (7), 4 (4), 5 (6), 6 (0), 7 (6), 8(3), 9 (7), 10 (8), 11 (11).

There was some support for upgrading light 6, Arbor Tree, and nobody singled out this light for removal. There was one specific request to retain 7 and one to retain 10.

Considering only those responses from households within sight of lights, there was still a substantial majority for removal.

10. Comments & Suggestions. 32 responses included a contribution and these have been collected into an Annex.