

Appendix 9 - Newton Poppleford & Harford Housing Styles Survey Analysis

A) Principles:

57 surveys were completed.

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

B) Summary of Findings

Feature	Acceptable Options	Unacceptable Options
Materials for walls	Favourites were reclaimed and new red brick. Some support for stone and cob effect	Plastic/uPVC cladding and modern/glass and metal.
Materials for roof	Most popular by far was slate tiles. Some support for clay and thatch.	Least popular was metal roofs, followed by plastic tiles.
Materials for hardstanding	Greencore, brick and gravel were all similarly popular.	Concrete was the most unacceptable. Some people thought gravel was unacceptable.
House frontage	Open lawns, stone walls and brick walls were most popular. Some support for privet hedging, wooden fencing, railings, shrubs; wild hedgerows and mixed hedge.	Gabions, conifer hedging, rendered walls and metal fencing.
Street aspect	Features most welcomed were wild hedgerows and Devon banks. Some support for tarmac footpaths, street lighting and cycle paths.	Least popular were bollards and shared car/foot spaces
Distance from neighbours	80% said it was very important to implement current guidance on the minimum distance between houses.	Only 1 person thought it was unimportant.

Q1a – Materials to use for walls (57 responses)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q1b – Materials to use for roof (56 responses)

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

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

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

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

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

Q2a – Materials to use for hardstanding (56 responses)

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

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

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

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

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

Q2b – Type of car parking (55 responses)

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

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

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

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

Q3 – Number of parking spaces (49 responses)

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

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

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

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

Q4 – House frontage (53 responses)

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

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

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

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

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

Q5 – Street aspect (52 responses)

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

All options were considered 'unacceptable' by at least two respondents. Features most welcomed by respondents, however, were wild hedgerows (57.8 points), Devon banks (45.9), tarmac footpaths (32.4), street lighting (32.4) and cycle paths (27.4).

The most commonly-selected favourite option was wild hedgerows (n=10), and this was also the option most commonly found within a respondent's top three (n=32) by some distance (next most popular option was Devon banks, with 24 occurrences).

Unpopular options, which overall respondents would not like to see, were bollards (-11.7 points, 14 considered unacceptable) and shared car/foot spaces (-5.7 points, 14 unacceptable). However, in both cases the option could be found in the top three choices of a small number of respondents (3 and 6 respectively).

Q6 – Distance from neighbours (49 responses)

Analysis of responses – simple count of responses from 'very important' to 'very unimportant'.

Overall, the statement that current guidance on minimum distances between new-build properties and existing properties should be adhered to was very strongly supported. Of the 49 respondents, 39 (79.6%) stated that this was very important to them, while a further three responses (6.1%) stated it was quite important. Six respondents (12.2%) were neutral on the issue and only one person (2.0%) felt it was quite unimportant.

Q7 – Preferred housing styles

Sixteen house styles (representing a range of established and recently-built properties from around Devon) were shown to respondents, who were asked to choose their favourite three styles. Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

The most popular house style overall of the 16 presented was number 3 (44 points), being amongst the top three options for 21 people, and the top choice of 7 of these. Popular features of this house style (free text comments) were: traditional yet individual design, trees, railings, space between house and road, large bay windows, garage/parking space at side.



Housing style 3

House style number 1 was the first choice design for a greater number of respondents (n=11), but gained fewer points overall (38) due to being one of the top three options of fewer people (15). Respondents liked the traditional style in keeping with East Devon area, cob & thatch, leaded windows, countryside/scenic views.



Housing style 1

Other popular housing styles were numbers 12 (27 points), 13 (27 points) & 14 (29 points).



Housing style 12

This style was the first choice option for 4 respondents and in the top three for 14 people. Features that were popular with respondents were: interesting twist on vernacular style (curved), terraced houses, sympathetic look and size for village, brick walls, large leaded windows, porches, quiet setting.



Housing style 13

This style was the first choice option for 4 respondents and in the top three for 14 people. Features that were popular with respondents were: open/grassed frontage, dormer/leaded windows, porches, roof, brick (and brick around window), traditional style suitable for country village, terraced.



Housing style 14

This style was the first choice option for 3 respondents and in the top three for 16 people. Features that were popular with respondents were: traditional design, look & feel, brick wall, large leaded windows & bay windows, space between house and road, railings.

Q8 – Unacceptable housing styles

Sixteen house styles (representing a range of established and recently-built properties from around Devon) were shown to respondents, who were asked to choose their three least favourite styles. Analysis of responses - Points were allocated as follows: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2; 3rd choice = 1. Where a respondent gave more than one answer for one of their rankings, the appropriate number of points was divided equally between these options, e.g. two options given as first choice = 5 points (first and second choices) divided between the two options = 2.5 points each.

The least popular housing style by some distance was number 6 (68 points). It was in the three least favourite options for 26 respondents, of whom 19 selected it as their least favourite option. Reasons stated were: over-modern design only suitable for towns or cities, overbearing, too large and expensive-looking, too much glass, roof angles, parking in front and too much hard surfacing.



Housing style 6

Other housing styles that were not popular with respondents were numbers 7 (36 points) and 16 (29 points).



Housing style 7

This style was the least favourite option for four respondents and in the three least favourite options for 18 people in total. Reasons given were: modern design not in keeping with a village, too large & expensive executive-style housing, flat roof, angular, mirrored windows.



Housing style 16

This style was in the three least popular options for 15 respondents, and the least favourite for four people. Reasons given were: small windows, colour of brick, bland, soulless, boring, too urban.

When a net score was calculated, by subtracting the 'least favourite' score from the 'favourite' score, the least popular option remained style number 6 (-63 points), but the second least favourite became style 16 (-29 points) and third least favourite style 7 (-24 points).

Respondents' favourite styles were number 3 (39 points), followed by number 14 (28 points) followed by numbers 12 and 13 (25 points each).