Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Parish Survey 2022

RESULTS

Analysed and Prepared by Victoria Wells (Slingsby Resident)
January 2023

Executive Summary

- Survey data was collected in September and October 2022. 129 households, covering the opinions of 257 residents, were collected. 69 responses were on paper, 60 were online.

- The majority of respondents (85%) were from Slingsby.

- A greater number of female's residents completed the survey.

- The Parish contains a greater number of residents in the 31+ age groups. There appears to have been an ageing in the parish population in the last 10 years but a fine-grained analysis is not possible. The age range is similar, although slightly older, than the Ryedale 2021 census data.

- There are 38 one person households, 52 two person households, 23 three person households, 13 four people households, 4 five person households. 104 households are adult only (all members of the household 18+).

- 48 households did not commute (many because they did not work/were retired). Car was the most common method to commute. Most common commuting distance was 6-10 miles (shorter than in 2009). 39 households highlighted some form of home working (full or part time).

- 80% of respondent households mortgaged/owned their home, 19% rented and 1% responded about a holiday/second home.

- Overall 42 respondent households have at least one dog, 31 households have at least one cat and 7 households have at least one other pet.

- There is an even split of household length in the parish reported suggesting new residents are arriving at regular intervals. People joining the parish were attracted by the village and the area (countryside, views, rural location etc).

- Respondents mostly used the village hall sometimes (44%) and used it for social events/meetings.

- Respondents used the sports club sometimes, often and always (40%) and used it for general socialising and meeting friends. The most suggested improvement was improved toilet/changing facilities. There was a split between those respondents using the club for regular socialising and those who only use it when there are specific village events on.

- Respondents use the Sports field sometimes (22%) and the playground for most residents never (53%). The main reasons they were used was to take grandchildren to use the playground and for the car boot sales or annual events (duck race etc). The most suggested improvement was a greater variety of playground equipment. Suggestion that the sports field could be more dog friendly.

- Respondents visited the Grapes Pub sometimes (41%).

- 88% of respondents did not have an allotment. Allotment surplus is shared with friends, family and neighbours.

- 60% of respondents felt that they would like to see Slingsby Castle conserved, consolidated and usable for visitors/the community. 78% of respondents felt they would like to see Slingsby Castle conserved as a ruin supporting wildlife.

- 33% of respondents used the mobile post office regularly- mostly for postal items but also for banking.

- 93% of respondents said they would like a permanent shop in Slingsby which would be similar to the Hovingham Shop and should sell essential groceries and household goods, bakery, dairy, newspapers and contain a delivery hub (click and collect). It could also be a café/tea rooms and should be in a central location with adequate parking.

- Most respondents get their large food and non-perishable shopping from Malton (supermarkets) and their top up shopping from Hovingham.

- 33% of respondents visited the All Saints Church sometimes. They visited most'y for displays and special events.

- Most respondents did not use the Methodist Chapel (53% never) but when they did visit it was for displays and special events.

- Both the church and chapel were noted for their importance to the community, as a social hub and for a supportive drop in environment.

- The most commonly used information sources in the parish are The Triangle, Word of Mouth and the Slingsby Website. While analogue sources of information are still used, digital methods have increased significantly since 2009.

- Respondents are generally happy with the reliability and speed of their broadband and their TV channels but are dissatisfied with their mobile phone reception.

- Overall respondents appeared to be most concerned about dog fouling, flooding, drainage/sewerage, and surface drainage. Additionally, respondents said they would welcome a 20mph trial in the village.

- Dog fouling is considered a problem in the parish, especially in Fryton and South Holme. Non-dog owners perceive it to be a greater problem than dog owners. Respondents suggested that there should be further dog facilities in Slingsby.

- Most residents (79%) had not needed to use the emergency services in the last 12 months.

- Respondents are concerned about speeding in the parish and on the main B1257 Malton road. They are also concerned about on street parking.

- 83 households reported using mains electricity with 62 households using oil. Eleven households had solar panels, four households had a ground source heat pump and four households had an air source heat pump.

- Most respondents would like to invest in renewable technologies or felt they needed more information. The main barrier to renewable technologies is cost/available funding.

- Most respondents were confident in energy efficiency and would like to see a range of environmental initiatives in the parish (e.g. tree planting, wildflower areas, bird boxes etc). Respondents felt that further development could have a detrimental effect on the environment in the parish.

- Overall 114 households have at least one car, 8 households have oan EV and 82 households have at least one bicycle. Overall 198 cars, 8 EVs and 187 bicycles were represented in the survey responses. 52 households would welcome a community EV charging point.

- The highest number of respondents don't use the bus service at all (49% respondents reported never) but for those who do use the bus service it is predominantly for shopping/socialising/entertainment in Malton. Respondents stated they would appreciate buses at different times (e.g. evenings) and more frequently and buses that were better coordinated with trains to Scarborough and York.

- Respondents do not wish to see further housing development in the parish and if further development is to go ahead this should include accessible and affordable housing and should be dependent on upgrades to infrastructure and amenities.

- Respondents would like to see a planning group formed to represent the parish.

- Respondents are broadly against development at site 305 or 305 A, B & C due to obscured views, effects on the sports/club/field, flooding, access and traffic concerns, pressure on village amenities etc.

- 53% of respondents were aware of the village design statement.

- 82% of respondents felt there was a community spirit in the parish.

- 44% of respondents knew who some of the parish councillors were. 74% knew what the parish council does and 39% never attended parish council meetings.

Contents

List of Tables

1.   Overview of Survey

In 2022 the Slingsby, South Holme and Fryton Parish Council (hereafter the Parish Council) decided to run a Parish Survey. The last Parish Survey took place in 2009, published in 2010, and was funded by Rural Action Yorkshire. The results of the 2009 survey were shared in the village in a printed copy of the plan, and have been used to inform policies and priorities by the Parish, District and County Council ever since. A further consultation was carried out in 2015 to create a Village Design Statement[1] (adopted by Ryedale as a Supplementary Planning Document in 2016). It was felt, especially with current development proposals in and around the village, that an updated and extended survey would be useful to allow future decisions to be made with a suitable evidence base.

The survey was released to the village in September 2022 online and with paper copies available from a number of pick up points (communicated via posters in the village, Slingsby village website and @slingsbyvillage social media). In response to an early low response rate paper copies were included in distributed copies of The Triangle. The survey closed on Friday 21st October with 129 responses. The earliest response was on the 21st August 2022 (as part of the test run), the latest response was on the 26th October 2022 (when the survey had officially closed). 69 responses were via paper hard copy and 60 via the online platform (google forms). The response rate in 2009 was 214 so fewer households chose to take part in the survey this time. However, this still provides a statistically significant sample and results can in most places be carefully extrapolated to the parish (notes where this may not be possible are indicated where relevant below).

Older respondents generally favoured completing the survey in paper form with younger residents completing the survey online. The table below shows response mode by age group of the first member of the household (making the assumption that the first member of the household completed the survey)[2].

Table One: Survey respondents age and completion mode								
	12-18	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	80+
Online	1	0	8	15	11	10	6	3
Paper	0	1	3	3	9	21	19	13

Responses were collected by household and the results therefore cover the opinions of 257 residents[3]. The residents reflected in study are broken down by gender and

---

[1]https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s28946/2%20-%20Appendix_1_Slingsby_SHolme_Fryton_VDS_SPD_Aug_2016.pdf
[2] Note that one respondent did not give their age.
[3] NB Not all residents completed all questions.

age below. 36 residents reflected in the results are children (18 or under) with the rest adults (18 years+).

Table Two: Survey Respondent Age and Sex										
	under 5	6-11	12-18	19-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	80+
Male	5	2	8	4	8	18	15	26	19	8
Female	3	9	9	4	11	18	25	24	14	12
Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Some questions were not answered by some respondents so absolute numbers may not add up to the survey total of 129 in some places and percentages are given to allow detailed comparison[4].

The sections below follow the outline of the 2022 survey. Comparisons to the 2009 survey and results are made where possible. Additional questions were added to the 2022 survey meaning comparisons are not always possible.

At relevant points exact quotations from respondents are included (in "quotation marks"). These are as typed/written and therefore any spelling/grammar mistakes remain.

2.   Your Household

This section of the questionnaire provided basic overall data about each household respondent to the survey. This included details about the part of the parish they live in, demographic details, commuting, home working, school/college attendance, pets etc. Each question, and responses are contained in the sections below (with comparisons to 2009 where possible).

Table Three: Which part of the parish do you live in?				
Village	Number of Households (2009)	Percentage of Households (2009)	Number of Households (2022)	Percentage of Households (2022)
Slingsby	191	89%	93	85%
Fryton	14	7%	9	8%
South Holme	9	4%	7	7%

---

[4] Please note that percentages may not always add to 100% due to rounding.

The overall breakdown of residents reflected in the survey is as can be seen in Table Three/Four (as noted in section 1). These are broken down by parish area as above.

Table Four: Survey respondents by sex and parish area			
	Fryton	Slingsby	South Holme
Male	8	89	10
Female	13	104	7
Prefer not to say	0	1	0

Due to different age brackets being collected (to allow a finer grained analysis in the 2022 survey) an exact comparison to 2009 data is not possible. However a partial comparison is included in the table below.

Table Five: Survey respondents by age and parish area (2009 and 2022)						
Age	Fryton 2009[5]	Fryton 2020	Slingsby 2009	Slingsby 2020	South Holme 2009	South Holme 2020
Under 5	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	13 33%)	7 (4%)	2 (9%)	1 (11%)
5-11/6-11[6]	5 (13%)	0 (0%)	22 (6%)	9 (5%)	1 (4%)	2 (22%)
12-18	6 (32%)	2 (11%)	34 (9%)	13 (7%)	1 (4%)	3 (33%)
19-30	5 (13%)	1 (<1%)	29 (7%)	7 (4%)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)
31-65/31-70[7]	16 (42%)	15 (79%)	172 (44%)	117 (61%)	10 (43%)	1 (11%)
Over 65/71 & over[8]	5 (13%)	1 (5%)	118 (30%)	40 (21%)	6 (26%)	2 (22%)

In 2020 the respondents are generally older with most being in the 31-70 age bracket. This is also reflected in the 2009 figures although a greater set of respondents lies in this group than in the 2009 survey (for example in Fryton 79% are in the group in 2020 compared to 42% in 2009). This may be reflective of respondents but may not be reflective of the composition of the Parish. Apart from Fryton (where the response rate at 31-70 years was 79% and Slingsby (where the response rate was 61%) the spread is similar to the 2021 census age categories for

---

[5] Note that in the 2009 survey results the table containing this data contains an error of swapped values between Slingsby and Fryton. This has been corrected in the above.
[6] Pre / is the measurement used in 2009, post / is the measurement used in 2020.
[7] Pre / is the measurement used in 2009, post / is the measurement used in 2020. In the 2020 survey this was measured across five categories- 31-40, 41-50, 51-69, 61-70.
[8] Pre / is the measurement used in 2009, post / is the measurement used in 2020. In the 2020 survey this was measured across two categories- 71-18, 80+

Ryedale (4 and under 4%, 5-9 years 5%, 10-19 years 10%, 20-29 year 9%, 30-69 years is 52%, 70+ years 20%). This suggests that the respondents are slightly older in range than the Ryedale average.

Household breakdown
Across the respondents households had up to 5 people. 38 households contained 1 person, 52 households contained 2 people, 23 households contained 3 people, 13 households contained 4 people and 4 households contained 5 people. 104 households were adult only (all members of household over 18 years) and 17 households contained residents under the age of 18.

Overall the data suggests that the most common household size in the parish contains 2 adults.

Household commute patterns
In the 2009 survey respondents were simply asked how far members of the household travelled to work but it is not clear from this whether respondents answered for the household in total, or a main commuter in the household. For 2020 the question about commuting was made a qualitative/text question to allow further details. Of the households who completed the questionnaire 13 did not enter any commuting details and 48 answered No or n/a with a number indicating this was because they had retired.

As can be seen in the table below, for those residents who indicated a mode of commute, commutes by car were the most common by a significant amount.

Table Six: Household transport modes		
Mode of Commute	Number Household (at least one person)	Number Individual
Car	62	82
Walk	2	2
Bicycle	2	2
Bus	2	2

For households/individuals who indicated a regular commute (by any means) to the same place there was a significant range of distances travelled one way with the most popular destinations being York and Malton (although people travelled to locations all over Ryedale and beyond)[9].

---

[9] NB - some respondents reported a location where they commuted too, some a distance was provided. All have been transformed to a mile distance.

Table Seven: Household Commute Distances							
	Under 5 miles	6-10 miles	11-20 miles	21-30 miles	31-40 miles	41-50 miles	51+ miles
Number - individuals	10	28	26	3	1	2	5

Most commuting which takes place is between 6-10 miles and 11-20 miles from the Parish. Comparing with the 2009 data where the main commuting distance was between 10-20 miles and 20-30 miles from the parish it appears that where people are commuting they are commuting slightly shorter distances. It is also clear from the responses to the question that a number of people commuted to various places and that many people did not commute everyday suggesting a very variable pattern of commuting and travel to work across the parish.

Working from home.
Given the variability of commuting and work patterns indicated in response to the above questions it became clear that a number of people were using increased flexibility (particularly since Covid) to work some or all of the time from home. For those who responded to the question regarding home working 70 responded No or n/a with a number noting this was due to not working/being retired. 39 respondents indicated some form of home working and where they added further detail 9 people indicated part time home working with 19 people noting that they worked from home mostly or full-time. While not every respondent added further detail some added they worked from home due to a home workshop, farm or they were self employed. It can be assumed that many of those who worked from home worked in a home office although this is only a speculation.

As a relatively recent phenomenon working from home was not considered in the 2009 survey so no comparison is possible.

Attendance at local school or college.
Given the older population represented in the survey it is not surprising that the majority of respondents indicated that no one in their household attended a local school or college. For those who did respond 8 individuals are attending Slingsby Primary School, 2 are attending Terrington Primary, 5 are attending Ryedale School and 6 are attending Malton school. One respondent indicated that they used a local nursery.

Table Eight: Household Status		
	Number	Percentage
Mortgage/Own	99	80%

Rent	23	19%
Second Home/Holiday Home	1	1%

Overall (see Table Nine) 42 households have at least one dog, 31 households have at least one cat and 7 households have at least one other pet. Overall 61 dogs, 48 cats and 15 other pets were represented by the survey respondents. Of those households with pets 14 had multiple types of pets and 52 had just one type of pet.

Table Nine: Number of Pets		
	Numbers of pets	Number of Households
Dogs	1	27
	2	11
	3	4
Cats	1	17
	2	12
	3	1
	4	1
Other Pet	1	2
	2	3
	3	1
	4	1

There is quite an even split of household length in the parish (see Table Ten) across different year ranges. This suggests that new households are joining the parish regularly. In the 2009 survey a greater percentage of households sat in the 5-10, 10-20 and over 30 years categories than other categories suggesting there has been a shift in the composition of household length in the parish since 2009. It may be that households who had been in the parish for 5-20 or over 30 years have left the parish making way for new residents (who will show in the up to 10 years categories in this survey).

Table Ten: Length of Time Living in the Parish								
Years	≤ 1	2-5	6-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	50+
Household - Number	10	18	19	18	17	13	8	17

Moving to the Parish at different times

Where different members of a household have moved into the parish at different times this appears to have been largely due to marriage or partnership (a husband, wife or partner joining someone already living in the parish) or someone joining family who live in the parish (see Table Eleven).

Table Eleven: Attraction to the Parish	
Reason given for moving into the Parish (within the last 10 years)[10]	Number of mentions
To live with partner/family/after marriage	3
The property/house(s) available/price	13
The community/people (friendly people, community spirit)	9
The village and area (pretty, rural location, quiet, environment, village life, beautiful views, general location, countryside)	27
Village with a pub/club	3
Had grown up/born in the area/village	5
Good access to towns/cities/A64(and/or other travel links)	7
To be closer to relatives/family	7
Proximity to Castle Howard	1
School catchment area/better schools available/safer for children	3
In/close to AONB/Howardian Hills/Yorkshire Moors	4
Various activities and socials	1
Village with a bus service	1
Village with a shop	1

The main reasons people who have joined the parish in the last 10 years gave for moving to the parish were the village and area and the house or property available. Unlike in the 2009 survey people did not mention retiring to the village which in that survey was a key reason. Similar to the 2009 survey people were attracted by the rural location, and being closer to family and schools.

3.   Leisure Facilities

This section of the survey asked questions about a range of leisure facilities across the parish including the village hall, the sports club, allotments etc.

---

[10] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Table Twelve: Village Hall Usage					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use the village hall?	14 (11%)	35 (28%)	54 (44%)	16 (13%)	4 (3%)

Table Thirteen: Reasons for Village Hall Usage	
When/why do you use the village hall?[11]	Number of mentions
Voting	12
Produce show	16
Parish Council Meetings/Village meetings	13
Social Events/Meetings (concerts, coffee mornings, bingo, fundraising events, charity breakfast	70
Sowers and Growers	6
History Group	6
Parties/Birthday Celebrations	7
Mayday	2
School events	7
On the village hall committee	1
Yoga	2
Badminton	4

The majority of respondents using the village hall used it for events or meetings. A number of specific events or meetings were mentioned and are listed in the table above.

A couple of respondents mentioned some events etc they had previously attended at the village hall such as bowls club, zumba, other fitness classes etc.   While those who responded to this question were generally positive about the village hall and its uses, one person suggested it should offer a charge point and/or recycling point. Another respondent noted that:

"I was shocked to hear that the Village Hall committee had rejected the school's request to use the Village Hall at a slightly reduced rate."

In the other comments section another resident mentioned costs issues related to the village hall:

---

[11] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

"I think the village hall would be used regularly if the rental costs were negotiable particularly for Slingsby groups & organisations e.g. Slingsby community school."

In the 2009 village survey approximately 58% of respondents said they had used the village hall 2-6 times in the last 12 months which appears to be relatively close to those who in 2020 reported visiting the village hall sometimes (44%).

Sports club
While the highest percentage of respondents never visited the club 40% responded that they visited the club sometimes, often or always (see Table Fourteen).

Table Fourteen: Sports Club Usage					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use the sports club?	49 (41%)	23 (19%)	23 (19%)	20 (17%)	5 (4%)

Table Fifteen: Reasons for Sports Club Usage	
When/Why do you use the sports club?[12]	Number of mentions
General socialising/meeting friends/social activities/meetings/general atmosphere	27
Drinks/Bar facilities	8
When village events are held there	17
Quiz night	11
Car boot sales	5
Bingo	2
Cricket/football matches/other sports events	10
Darts	1

Overall most people who used the sports club used it for socialising (see Table Fifteen) and a number of people highlighted specific aspects of this including the bingo and quiz. There appeared to be a split between those who used the sports club for regular socialising and those that used it only when they attended a village event which happened to be at the sports club and therefore were only occasional visitors. As well as the above reasons respondents also highlighted their role as a volunteer and/or member as a reason to go to the club. While most comments regarding the sports club were positive a few more negative comments were received as noted below:

---

[12] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

"It's a shame the village hall & sports club couldn't be combined. So much potential."
"Found it too cliquey. Don't feel comfortable."
"I don't feel it is appropriate for a single woman to use a sports club which has a history of male membership/usage."

A number of respondents also suggested that there were potential improvements which could be made to the cub (see Table Sixteen below).

Table Sixteen: Sports Club Suggested Improvements	
What improvements/additional facilities would you like to see at the sports club?[13]	Number of mentions
Enlarged/extended facilities	5
Improved toilet/changing facilities	9
Outside development - Gazebos, under cover area, better outdoor seating	4
Outside exercise/fitness equipment/outdoor gym	5
Extended opening hours - to attract families, coffee mornings etc	2
Better kitchen facilities	1
Improved/extended sports facilities (for example aimed at less sporty types, younger people, a running club, a tennis club, archery, outdoor cricket equipment etc	5
Disabled access/Inclusivity	7
Facilities/events for children	1
Include a village shop/become a community hub, warm space	3
More subtle lighting	1
Allow dogs on to the sports field	1
More music/live events	1

As in the response to the questions above a couple of respondents noted the potential synergies between the sports club and village hall as follows:
"Extend the sports club to include village hall, As the facilities would be better. Village Hall needs refurbishment."
"perhaps joining village hall to the Sports Club in a 5-10 year rebuild, to a really environmentally friendly and beautiful design"

---

[13] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Sports field & Playground

Respondents tended to use the sportsfield sometimes and the majority of people never used the playground. However it is likely that use of the playground, as can be seen in Table Nineteen below, that use of the playground was dependent on having children/grandchildren.

Table Seventeen: Sports Field Usage					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use the Sports Field?	27 (22%)	27 (22%)	51 (22%)	13 (11%)	3 (2%)

Table Eighteen: Playground Usage					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use the playground?	64 (53%)	15 (13%)	24 (20%)	16 (13%)	1 (1%)

Table Nineteen: Reasons for Sports Field/Playground Usage	
When/Why do you use the sports field/playground?[14]	Number of mentions
Car boot	32
Celebrations/Events - e.g. jubilee, duck race, bonfire night etc	26
Watching/Playing sport - cricket, football, running	17
Take visiting grandchildren/children to use playground/field	32
Own children to using playground/field	8
Views/countryside/walks	5
To use the sports club/bar	1
School sports day	3
Tennis	6

Perhaps surprisingly the two most popular uses for the sports field are non sporting- car boot sales and for when residents have grandchildren/other children visiting.

Respondents also suggested a number of improvements that could be made to these facilities (as can be seen in Table Twenty below).

---

[14] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Table Twenty: Sports Field/Playground Suggested Improvements	
What improvements/additional facilities would you like to see at the sports field/playground?[15]	Number of mentions
More variety /better playground equipment (more equipment for older/younger children)	24
More welcoming to dogs/dogs allowed on the field, dog enclosure	6
More live music/events	1
Covered area for shade/weather protection (esp in the play area)	4
More/better seating (esp in the play area)	4
Open toilets for use when the sports club is not open	1
New cricket scoreboard/cricket net/practice wicket	2
Tennis club	1

Additionally a number of individuals suggested outside gym/exercise equipment would be a useful addition to the sports field.

The most popular suggestion was that the playground equipment be improved or more variety provided. A number of respondents indicated that the Hovingham play area would be a good benchmark as follows:
"Take a look at the hovingham playground; Slingsby could take some ideas for improvement on the play area. Hovingham play area is exceptionally good."
A few people also suggested equipment that would be welcomed including monkey bars, a zip wire, a play house, an obstacle course, a sand pit and basketball hoop. Additionally people felt that some shelter and improved seating would be welcomed in the play area especially for parents/grandparents visiting with their children.

Finally, a number of people felt very strongly that the sports field should be available, fully, or partially, for responsible dog walkers as follows:
"Dog access to the sports field, even if only to a small part of it. Slingsby has no dog facilities but a LOT of dog owners." (The level of dog overship is confirmed in Table Nine.)
"Responsible dog owners/dog walkers should be permitted to use the sportsfield. At present they are excluded even though dogs are clearly allowed on to the sportsfield on car boot sale days. For those with mobility problems or health issues the sportsfield would be a safe area to walk around (manageable, not too big and close to help if needed). Excluding a large number of villagers from accessing this area seems to go against the spirit of the village and its community."

---

[15] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

"Slingsby feels very 'anti-canine' and alienates dog owners. There should be better facilities for dogs to play, especially considering the amount of land around us."

"There should be a safe off lead area for locals with dogs, a gated area with dog poop bins, signage. There is nothing for dogs in Slingsby. Aware other towns, villages are more dog friendly and have more facilities for dogs e.g. safe gated off leash areas just for dogs."

The Grapes Pub

Across the respondents most visited The Grapes sometimes (41%)- see Table Twenty-One below.

Table Twenty-One: The Grapes Pub Usage					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you visit the Grapes Pub?	14 (11%)	39 (32%)	51 (41%)	18 (15%)	1 (1%)

Allotment

Across the respondents 11% had an allotment (see table Twenty-Two).

Table Twenty-Two: Allotment Usage			
	Yes	No	Would like one/Not on the waiting list
Do you have an allotment?	14 (11%)	107 (88%)	1 (1%)

Contact details were included in the survey for anyone who would like to go onto the allotment waiting list. Most people do not have an allotment but no comments across the survey suggested that there was significant further demand so the results do not suggest more allotments should be made available at this time. In the 2009 survey (prior to allotments being made available) about 18% of households responded that they would be interested in an allotment This is a little more than the 14% who responded in this survey that they have an allotment.

Where allotment holders indicated they had surplus (some stated they did not have surplus due to being new to their allotment) they generally shared with friends, family, neighbours, friends or other allotment holders. Some allotment holders also made their surplus available by placing it on their wall fo people to pick up

Slingsby Castle

Two questions which can be compared to one question in the 2009 asked about what residents would like to see happen with Slingsby Castle (see Table Twenty-Three).

Table Twenty-Three: Slingsby Castle	Yes	No	No opinion
Would you like to see Slingsby Castle conserved, consolidated and usable for visitors/the community?	67 (60%)	27 (24%)	18 (16%)
Would you like to see Slingsby Castle conserved as a ruin supporting wildlife?	90 (78%)	14 (12%)	11 (10%)
2009 question- Slingsby Castle should be maintained and made accessible to the public?	128 (61%)	44 (21%)	36 (17%)

It is clear that residents would like to see something done with Slingsby Castle but there is more support for it to be conserved for wildlife and not for visitors. A greater percentage feel it should be conserved in 2020 (78%) than in 2009 (61%) although the 2009 figure is similar to the percentage who would like it consolidated for visitors. Some practical suggestions were received regarding the castle such as:

"Would like to see Slingsby Castle preserved but think it too costly to make it usable for visitors/community. If conserved as a ruin we would like to see work on it to stop it falling down. Could remove/lop trees surrounding it to make it more open for viewing."

"A clear information board in a suitable position would assist visitors in understanding what the Castle history is."

"I think the castle would be a brilliant idea to restore and open a viewing visitor centre which had a good coffee shop like Rivleux Abby for example. It's in an incredible location and I think would attract a good market for business and walks."

Overall people felt shocked by how the castle had been left to ruin:

"I feel it is absolutely scandalous that nothing has been done to protect such a wonderful piece of heritage [the castle]. It is disgraceful."

Other comments on parish leisure facilities.

The final question in this section asked for any further comments about the parish leisure facilities.

People suggested that it would be good to have groups, clubs and activities for currently underrepresented parts of the parish. Examples included men, adults (vs children), teenagers/older children

One resident suggested parking needed addressing in the parish (see later sections) And another that trees need maintenance.

Improvements to footpaths and making the most of footpath routes (especially opening them up to disabled residents, pushchairs and visitors) was mentioned by a number of respondents. In particular two comments were made about a specific footpath section below:

"Public Footpath needs to be moved from Jayne Hodgson's farm to the field next to cemetery which has a wide grassy path and connects to the wooden bridge. The

existing footpath is inaccessible as it is too narrow and dangerous with its electric fence and has way too many stiles to climb over. It is also not dog friendly. If it was moved I do think residents and visitors would really enjoy it."

"The footpath off Green Dyke Lane especially. The styles are collapsing which is forcing people to walk against electric fencing. This is not ideal when walking with children."

4.   Retail Facilities

This section of the survey asked about use of retail facilities both in the parish and beyond but also about what residents would like to see if a village shop was reinstated.

Table Twenty-Four: Use of Mobile Post Office					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use the mobile post office service?	28 (15%)	14 (11%)	41 (33%)	29 (23%)	12 (10%)

Table Twenty-Five: Reason for Use of Mobile Post Office	
When/why do you use the mobile post office?[16]	Number of mentions
Convenience/Saves a journey to Malton	18
Friendly/Helpful Staff/Great Service	7
Banking/pay bills/cash/phone top ups	28
Postal services - stamps, parcels	50
Other retail aspects - cards etc	4

Unsurprisingly the majority of people used the post office van for postal services with a number of people highlighting that it was a useful resource for returning parcels.

Respondents highlighted that if they didn't use the post office van they would have to travel to Malton to use this service instead.

Significantly a large number of people highlighted that they used the post office van for banking and described the van as a *"Community life line" and that it is "....a valued asset and needs to be supported."*

---

[16] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Where people did not use the van this was because they worked full time and it was not therefore available when they were or they used doorstep parcel pick up where available.

In the 2009 survey there was a close split between those who used the mobile post office van (approx 52%) and those who didn't use it (48%). This is very different to the 15% who said they never used the mobile post office in 2020 although this may be related to the way the question was worded.

Slingsby shop

Since the 2009 survey the village shop has closed in Slingsby and this subsection sought to understand whether residents would welcome a new village shop and what it should stock.

Table Twenty-Six: A Slingsby Permanent Shop	Yes	No	No opinion
Would you like a permanent shop in Slingsby?	115 (93%)	2 (2%)	6 (5%)

Table Twenty-Seven: Slingsby Shop Offer What would you like the shop to stock/offer?[17]	Number of mentions
Essential general groceries and household goods[18]	83
Milk/Eggs/Butter	18
Newspapers/Magazines	26
Bakery items/Bread	22
Treats	1
Delivery hub/Click and Collect/Amazon lockers	26
Tea rooms/cafe	10
Local produce	8
Fresh Fruit & Veg	12
Cheese	1
Meat	2
Hardware	1

---

[17] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.
[18] Includes those who stated "the same as Hovingham Stores".

Postal services	3
Gifts/Greeting cards.local crafts	4
Sandwiches/Lunch	2
Ice creams	1
Beer/wine/alcohol	4
Sweets	1
Information centre	1
Refillable containers	1

The vast majority of respondents favoured a general store and some indicated specific stock they would like to see. Many respondents simply reported that they wanted a store like Hovingham with one person stating: *"Hovingham have a perfect village shop, stocking exactly what local people need. Mirror that."*

Respondents were clear that they did not want an expensive farm shop and suggested that having a cafe/tea shop as part of a shop may make it a useful community asset open during the day. One respondent stated: *"Community shop and cafe. Would be good for visitors to the area as well as locals to meet as alternative to pub/club + open during the day."* This also reflected comments that the school/cafe could be available not just for residents but also visitors, passing trade and wider Ryedale residents. A number of respondents stated the shop/cafe could be community run or could follow an account holder model: *"What about a card (and/or account holders) only self serve shop. Could be open 7 days a week with long hours but without having to be permanently staffed. The space at the side of the club maybe."* And one respondent suggested that if it is not possible to set up a permanent shop, a pop up shop to test demand before a permanent shop site could be developed might be a helpful step.

A number of suggestions for locations were made such as the village hall, sportsfield/sportclub, the old blacksmiths, Tony's old shop, The Grapes etc. Additionally respondents suggested that Castle Howard could provide one of their empty properties. Key considerations were that it should be accessible for all but that adequate parking should be available to not cause traffic issues and that it should be centrally located.

The survey also sought to understand how and where residents hopped now (see Tables Twenty-Eight and Twenty-Nine below).

Table Twenty-Eight: Shopping	
When/how do you shop for large food and non-perishable items?[19]	Number of mentions
Supermarket - Malton	66
Supermarket - York	27
Farm shops	3
Online supermarket/delivery	42
Malton (general-shop not specified)	26
Helmsley (general-shop not specified)	3
York (general - shop not specified)	9
Supermarket (location not specified)	4
Kirkbymoorside	1
Other delivery - e.g. meat, veg etc	1

When/how do you shop for 'top-up' shopping?[20]	Number of mentions
Caravan Park	2
Co-op Kirkbymoorside/other shops	2
Hovingham Stores/Hovingham Bakery/Farmers market	82
Malton (all stores)	43
Co-op Helmsley/other shops	2
Milk/Dairy Delivery	4
Castle Howard Farm Shop	3
Terrington Store	3
Brandsby	1
Newspaper delivery	5
York	3

It is clear from the responses that respondents did not always shop in the same place but would shop in both Malton and York etc based on where they were for other activities or where they were passing. They would also mix in person shopping with online shopping in a number of cases. The most common time scale given for this type of shopping was weekly with a few stating monthly.

[19] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.
[20] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

For top up shopping respondents indicated that this could be once a week to a number of times a week. Overall the most popular place for top up shopping was Hovingham Stores (or other Hovingham retail). This fits with the overall liking of the Hovingham Store offering as noted above and perhaps indicates the level of demand for a Slingsby Store.

5.   Religious Facilities

This part of the survey sought to understand use of the religious facilities in the parish.

Table Twenty-Nine: Use of All Saints Church					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use/visit the parish church (All Saints Church)?	31 (25%)	35 (29%)	40 (33%)	10 (8%)	6 (5%)

Table Thirty: Reason for Use of All Saints Church	
When/why do you use the parish church?[21]	Number of mentions
Services/Worship	19
Community Hub	1
Peace and Reflection	6
To pray	2
Funerals	16
Displays, special events, concerts (e.g. Christmas Eve/Day, Choir concerts, Jubilee weekend), meetings, fund raising, school event	51
Weddings	11
Christenings	3
Enjoy visiting the graveyard- wildlife, leisure, part of walk	4

Overall respondents mostly use the Parish Church for one off occasions- either events or occasions such as weddings or funerals. This compares quite well with the 2009 survey.

---

[21] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Table Thirty-One: Use of Methodist Church					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you use/visit the parish chapel (Methodist Church)?	63 (53%)	24 (20%)	25 (21%)	3 (3%)	4 3%)

Table Thirty-Two: Reason for Use of Methodist Church	
When/why do you use the parish chapel?[22]	Number of mentions
Services/Worship	9
Combined/shared service with the church	5
Soupa Lunch	8
To pray	1
Funerals	6
Displays, special events, concerts (e.g. Christmas Eve/Day, Religious festivals), meetings, fund raising, school event	26
Weddings	4
Christenings	1
School activities	4
Other function	1
Elections	1

As with the church, mostly people use the Chapel for one off occasions- either events, regular meetings (Ladies Group, History Group), specific religious festivals (e.g. Harvest) or events (e.g. Scarecrow Trail).

Respondents also made some suggestions for improvements to the church/chapel which can be seen in Table Thirty-Three below. Respondents highlighted the important community aspects of the religious facilities and highlighted that heating, toilet and kitchen improvements would be welcomed. They also highlight the important historical and architectural significance of the buildings.

---

[22] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Table Thirty-Three: Church/Chapel - Suggested Improvements	
What do you value most about the church/chapel? How could they be improved[23]	Number of mentions
Church Heating improvement	6
Importance for community, fellowship, social hub, part of community, supportive, drop in	27
Toilet facility improvements	6
Kitchen facility improvements	5
No regular church vicar/more services welcomed	3
Historical/Architectural significant buildings	10
Importance for the school	3
Beautiful and peaceful setting	9
Replacement of pews with chairs/Making a more flexible space	3
Importance of attracting families/younger worshipers	3
Offer a sunday school	1

6.   Communication

This section concentrated on questions regarding different types of communication across the parish. The section started by asking a question about which information sources people use (see Table Thirty-Four).

Table Thirty-Four: Parish Information Sources	
Information Source	Number of Respondents
Word of Mouth	93
The Triangle	111
Slingsby Website	70
Sports Club	26
Sports Club Facebook	19
Local Paper	13
Parish Notice Boards	45
The Grapes	16

[23] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

School	6
@slingsbyvillage Social Media	19

The Triangle, followed by Word of Mouth and the Slingsby Website are the most popular sources of information across the parish. Additionally the respondents noted that they also use the church/chapel newsletter, friends, the Grapes facebook/instagram, leaflets, and local magazine*s as sources of information. Additionally one respondent noted that they felt that "social media very poor. Could learn a lot from Hovingham"*

The 2009 survey asked the question "Would you use a parish website?". 77 households responded yes, with 75 responding no, and 45 responding don't know. The Slingsby Village website was set up in response to the 2009 survey. The 2009 survey results suggest that about 39% of residents would use a website. The 2022 survey suggests that 89% of residents use the website. This suggests a conclusion that the website has been an extremely successful introduction to the village since the last survey.

In the 2009 survey the most popular information source was the church newsletter. This now appears to have been taken over by The Triangle which was introduced since 2010. Word of mouth remains an important source of information. The village shop is no longer open so does not show in the 2022 survey. New social media and website sources have seen the most growth. While online sources have become increasingly popular, analogue sources are still popular, such as the Parish Notice Boards which were also used by approximately 70% of respondents in the 2009 survey and mentioned by 45 residents in the 2022 survey.

The second part of the communication section asked a number of likert scales questions regarding communication.   The outcomes are summarised in Table Thirty-Five.

Table Thirty-Five: Broadband, Mobile Phones and TV Channels						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
My broadband is reliable	6 (5%)	14 (12%)	11 (10%)	60 (53%)	22 (19%)	0 (0%)
My broadband is an acceptable speed	4 (5%)	22 (20%)	17 (15%)	53 (47%)	16 (14%)	0 (0%)
I have good mobile phone reception	59 (53%)	34 (30%)	9 (8%)	11 (10%)	1 (1%)	7 (6%)
I have good TV reception	5 (4%)	17	13	52	23	10

		(14%)	(11%)	(43%)	(19%)	(8%)
I have good access to TV channels	4 (3%)	11 (9%)	17 (14%)	55 46%	25 (21%)	7 (6%)

Most respondents were happy with the reliability and speed of their broadband. Most were also happy with their TV reception and access to TV channels. However a significant percentage (83%) of respondents were disappointed with the mobile phone reception in the parish. Only 1% strongly agreed that they had a good mobile phone reception. This matches the 2009 survey where respondents indicated they had acceptable broadband speed (approx 45%) but not acceptable mobile phone reception (approx 80%). Unlike in the 2009 survey, no one indicated that they did not use broadband (approx 23% in 2009) suggesting an overall increase in internet connectivity across the parish.

A further analysis was run to check if working from home affected people's perceptions of mobile and broadband reliability etc (see Table Thirty-Six). The results are broadly similar between all respondents and respondents who have some level of working from home but respondents working from home reported a slightly less reliable broadband (42% agree compared to 53%), slightly less acceptability of speed (42% agree compared to 47%) and are more concerned about the mobile phone reception (61% strongly disagree compared to 53%). As home working is predicted to increase the impact of perceived problems in communications may become more problematic in attracting residents to and/or retaining them in the parish.

Table Thirty-Six: Broadband, Mobile Phones and TV Channels - Home Workers						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
My broadband is reliable - all respondents	6 (5%)	14 (12%)	11 (10%)	60 (53%)	22 (19%)	0 (0%)
My broadband is reliable - respondent households indicating some level of home working	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	6 (17%)	15 (42%)	10 (28%)	0 (0%)
My broadband is an acceptable speed - all respondents	4 (5%)	22 (20%)	17 (15%)	53 (47%)	16 (14%)	0 (0%)
My broadband is an acceptable speed - respondent households indicating some level of home working	2 (6%)	4 (11%)	8 (22%)	15 (42%)	7 (19%)	0(0%)
I have good mobile phone reception - all respondents	59 (53%)	34 (30%)	9 (8%)	11 (10%)	1 (1%)	7 (6%)
I have good mobile phone reception	22 (61%)	9 (25%)	2 (6%)	2	0 (0%)	1

				(6%)		(3%)
- respondent households indicating some level of home working						

The further comments question regarding communication also highlighted that the issue of most interest to respondents was poor mobile signal (see Table Thirty-Seven).

Table Thirty-Seven: Problems and Issues with Parish Communications		
Communication Mode	Problem/Issue	Mentions
Mobile Phone Signal	Terrible or non existent mobile phone signal, regardless of provider.	23
	Use of wi-fi calling to overcome poor signal	3
Parish Council	Lack of communication	1
Broadband	Need for fibre/faster broadband	3
	Broadband unreliable at times	3
Social Media	Not everyone uses social media so should not be relied upon for transferring information	1
Written Communications e.g. The Triangle	Monthly newsletter preferred (short version of Triangle)	1
Inconsistency	Inconsistencies in messages - dates/times change and are not updated	1
TV	Problems caused by Bilsdale fire/services not returned to normal	4

A number of respondents highlighted that they had had to upgrade, or use alternative technology to get either adequate mobile phone coverage and/or broadband. There was also a concern that has a number of people were relying on wifi calling and no longer had standard phone lines that this could be problematic in an emergency: *"The move of landlines to the web means there is no emergency phone if there is a disruption to electricity supply making the internet go down."* As individuals were also still experiencing poor mobile signal away from their homes it would be difficult/impossible to call for emergency services should the need arise.

Most people were positive about the many information sources available and one stated:
"We very much value the excellent Triangle newsletter and regularly updated website, FB pages and noticeboards (general and club)!"

7. Physical Infrastructure (including roads, pavements and footpaths) and support services

This section assessed perceptions of physical infrastructure in the Parish. The first question used likert scales to assess feelings about a number of aspects of infrastructure across the parish (see Table Thirty-Eight).

Table Thirty-Eight: Parish Infrastructure	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
Dog fouling is a problem in the parish	2 (2%)	10 (9%)	24 (21%)	52 (46%)	26 (23%)	0 (0%)
Flooding is a problem in the parish	0 (0%)	11 (10%)	19 (17%)	47 (41%)	37 (32%)	0 (0%)
Litter is a problem in the parish	1 (1%)	46 (39%)	46 (39%)	19 (16%)	6 (5%)	0 (0%)
Aircraft noise is a problem in the parish	7 (6%)	27 (23%)	32 (27%)	31 (26%)	20 (17%)	0 (0%)
Traffic noise is a problem in the parish	6 (5%)	37 (32%)	33 (28%)	27 (23%)	14 (12%)	0 (0%)
I would welcome a 20mph trial limit	20 (16%)	19 (15%)	18 (14%)	30 (23%)	41 (32%)	0 (0%)
Amenities are in good condition (bus stops, play area etc)	4 (3%)	8 (7%)	29 (25%)	59 (50%)	11 (9%)	7 (6%)
Grass verges are well maintained	8 (7%)	10 (8%)	21 (18%)	71 (59%)	10 (8%)	0 (0%)
The drainage/sewerage system worlds well in the parish	42 (36%)	33 (28%)	12 (10%)	14 (12%)	6 (5%)	10 (9%)
Surface drainage is a problem in the parish	3 (3%)	11 (9%)	17 (15%)	42 (36%)	43 (37%)	0 (0%)
Street lighting is adequate in the parish	5 (4%)	17 (15%)	27 (24%)	49 (43%)	15 (13%)	0 (0%)
The pavements are well maintained in the parish	16 (14%)	23 (20%)	30 (26%)	41 (36%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)
Footpaths are well maintained in the parish	16 (14%)	23 (20%)	31 (26%)	44 (28%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
I am aware of the Hovingham to Malton "A path for everyone" proposal	35 (32%)	24 (22%)	13 (12%)	19 (17%)	10 (9%)	9 (8%)

I am in support of the Hovingham to Malton "A path for everyone" proposal	2 (2%)	7 (6%)	27 (24%)	33 (29%)	45 (39%)	0 (0%)
Crime is a problem in the parish	18 (16%)	48 (42%)	43 (38%)	4 (4%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Antisocial behaviour is a problem in the parish	17 (15%)	45 (39%)	41 (36%)	9 (8%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
The local police service is good	5 (4%)	17 (14%)	58 (49%)	23 (19%)	3 (3%)	13 (11%)
The local ambulance service is good	1 (1%)	6 (5%)	57 (48%)	38 (32%)	8 (7%)	10 (8%)
The local fire and resume service is good	7 (6%)	53 (43%)	34 (28%)	9 (7%)	4 (3%)	15 (12%)
I would welcome a doctors surgery in the parish	2 (3%)	10 (8%)	19 (16%)	52 (44%)	35 (30%)	0 (0%)
I would welcome a dentist surgery in the parish	3 (3%)	15 (14%)	31(28%)	37 (34%)	24 (22%)	0 (0%)

Overall respondents appeared to be most concerned about dog fouling, flooding, drainage/sewerage, and surface drainage. Additionally respondents said they would welcome a 20mph trial in the village. Overall respondents seemed happy with the levels of aircraft and traffic nose, street lighting, pavements and footpaths. In 2009 dog fouling was the issue of most concern for residents and this continues to be an issue in 2022. Flooding and surface/drainage was not seen as a significant issue of concern in 2009 but this is now a significant area of concern for residents. In 2009 improvements were considered necessary in street lighting, but this was not the case in 2022 suggesting improvements have had a positive effect. As in 2009 crime and antisocial behaviour was not seen as an issue of concern.

Table Thirty-Nine below analyses whether location in the parish affects the concern for dog fouling.

Table Thirty-Nine: Dog Fouling by Parish Area						
Dog fouling is a problem in the Parish						
Household Location	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
Fryton	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)
Slingsby	2 (2%)	5 (6%)	19 (22%)	43 (49%)	18 (21%)	0 (0%)
South Holme	0 (0%)	1 (20%	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)

This suggests that dog fouling is broadly seen as the same level of concern across the parish suggesting it is an issue across all respondents and all areas. South Holme could potentially be seen as having a stronger concern for this (40% strongly agree compared to 21% and 33%) but given the small number of respondents this would be a risky conclusion to draw.

Table Forty analyses whether being a dog owner or not affects the perception of whether dog fouling is a problem.

Table Forty: Doug Fouling by Dog Ownership						
Dog fouling is a problem in the Parish						
Dog Owner	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
No	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	14 (19%)	37 (49%)	21 (28%)	0 (0%)
Yes	2 (5%)	7 (18%)	10 (26%)	15 (38%)	5 (13%)	0 (0%)

This data suggests that dog fouling is perceived as a greater issue by non dog owners with 77% of non dog owners agreeing that dog fouling is a problem compared to 51% of dog owners.

In a later comments section in particular areas where dog fouling is a problem are noted: *"Railway line to Fryton, Around Fryton and Footpath from High Street to Fryton."*

Tables Forty-One and Forty-Two examine how flooding and related issues are perceived across the different parish areas.

Table Forty-One: Flooding by Parish Area						
Flooding is a problem in the Parish						
Household Location	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
Fryton	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)
Slingsby	0 (0%)	8 (9%)	17 (19%)	38 (43%)	25 (28%)	0 (0%)
South Holme	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)

Table Forty-Two: Drainage/Sewerage by Parish Area						
The drainage/sewage system works well in the parish						
Household Location	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
Fryton	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
Slingsby	3 (5%)	26 (45%)	10 (17%)	12 (21%)	4 (7%)	3 (5%)
South Holme	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0)%	0 (0%)

Looking across the two tables above it can be seen that residents in Fryton and South Holme are more concerned about flooding in the parish (more respondents in the strongly agree rather than agree category). For Fryton and Slingsby there is similar concern regarding the sewerage/drainage (respondents who disagree) but more responses in Fryton are neutral compared to Slingsby residents who are neutral, agree or answered n/a. The numbers of respondents in Fryton and South Holme is so small however that this cannot be statistically confirmed.

Table Forty-Three: Infrastructure - Further Comments	
Further comments - infrastructure	Number of Mentions
Would welcome more regular police presence, on foot, for speeding etc	7
Castle Howard should take more responsibility for amenities- e.g. shop, GP etc	1
30mph limit on the B1257/Speeding on B1257/Speeding in the parish	9
Traffic noise	2
Sewerage/flooding/drainage problems	12
Pavement improvement (e.g. Fryton to Wath Court, Railway Street, High Street, problem with overgrown hedges)	7
Dog fouling/barking/escaping	7
Anti-social behaviour	1
Derwent surgery struggling	1
Hovingham Surgery opening hours extended	2
Cat fouling	3
Dangerous/inconsiderate joggers	1
Clearing of footpaths from vegetation more regularly, maintenance of footpaths (would welcome one from the Balk to	8

Slingsby Bank footpath, inaccessible footpath from Green Dyke lane north, signage removed)	
Aircraft noise and low level flying	1
Parking outside the Grapes pub blocking traffic	2
Increasing levels of litter	1
Welcome doctors/dentists in the parish	2
Lack of a shop problematic (suggestion that CH should provide premises)	4
School signage (did not give further details)	1
Non existent mobile signal	1
Crime- poaching gangs	1
Better bus service welcomed	1

In the further comments section (see Table Forty-Three) concerns about drainage remain with concerns that further development will add to these problems. This is also the case for crime and antisocial behaviour with one respondent stating: *"it is not a problem NOW, but this is an area we feel particularly concerned could change if there is a large amount of development allowed in the parish / the size of the community grows to the extent proposed."*

In the 2009 survey 34 households (16%) had had reason to use the emergency services in the last 12 months. In 2022 this figure has increased a little to around 21% (although does not take into account services that were used concurrently) - see Table Forty-Four.

Table Forty-Four: Emergency Service Usage				
	Ambulance	Fire	Police	None
Which of the following emergency services has your household used in the last 12 months?	16 (14%)	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	88 (79%)

8. Traffic and Travel

This section of the survey examined various aspects of traffic and travel in the parish starting with a Likert scales section to assess general overall views (see Table Forty-Five).

Table Forty-Five: Traffic and Travel Perceptions						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
Speeding is a problem on the B1257 (Malton to Hovingham road)]	4 (3%)	10 (8%)	22 (18%	42 (34%)	43 (36%)	0 (0%)
Speeding is a problem in other parts of the parish]	3 (3%)	10 (8%)	36 (30%)	39 (33%)	32 (27%)	0 (0%)
On street parking is a problem in the parish]	4 (3%)	14 (12%)	32 (27%)	34 (29%)	34 (29%)	0 (0%)
Parking on pavements is a problem in the parish]	7 (6%)	15 (13%)	40 (35%)	31 (27%)	22 (19%)	0 (0%)
Noise from traffic is a problem in the parish	8 (7%)	31 (26%)	41 (34%)	21 (18%)	18 (10%)	0 (0%)
Pedestrians are safe in the parish	2 (2%)	16 (13%)	26 (21%)	63 (52%)	14 (12%)	0 (0%)
Cyclists are safe in the parish	4 (3%)	16 (14%)	41 (35%)	44 (37%)	7 (6%)	6 (5%)
I would welcome traffic calming measures in the parish	17 (14%)	24 (20%)	16 (13%)	29 (24%)	33 (28%)	0 (0%)
I would like to see flashing 'slow down' signs in the village	13 (11%)	17 (15%)	14 (12%)	35 (30%)	37 (32%)	0 (0%)
The local bus service is reliable]	12 (10%)	14 (12%)	42 (36%)	17 (15%)	2 (2%)	29 (25%)

Table Forty-Six: Traffic and Travel Problems	
Please provide details about issues indicating where in the village this is an issue[24]	Number of mentions
On street parking (e.g. outside the pub, outside Slingsby School, pavement parking - Sycamore close, Porch Farm Close)	17
Lake of safe cycleways	1
Speeding, traffic problems (e.g. on Railway Street, through South Holme, would welcome flashing 'slow down' signs) and traffic noise	33
Unreliable/inadequate bus service (not synced with trains, too early last bus, doesn't always turn up, should go to Helmsley, bus needed to Ryedale School/York)	16

[24] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Light aircraft (doing aerobatics) noise	1
More visibility needed on roads by hedge cutting	1
Would not welcome speed humps or traffic calming measures	2
Cyclists using footpaths	1

Traffic problems, in particular speeding, was the most commented aspect to this question. One respondent summarised:

"we often see cars flying through the village and tractors/lorries doing well over 40-50mph putting pedestrians, dogs, cats, children and wildlife at risk. problem with large speeding tractors with drivers on mobile phones."

In the 2009 survey 65% of respondents stated they would like to see flashing slowdown signs in the village and that there were concerns about speeding on the B1257 suggesting this is a problem that has not gone away.

Additionally respondents indicated many issues with the bus service, including a lack of destinations (respondents would welcome buses to York, Helmsley, Ryedale School), unreliable services (respondents report buses not turning up) and the timetable not being extensive enough to allow regular use. For example respondents commented:

"I have put "strongly disagree" for the bus service being reliable, mainly because I was once stranded in Malton when the last bus due to return to Hovingham just didn't turn up - I've since heard of lots of similar stories….. there just are not enough buses on the timetable to make it a properly useful service! If I want to go in on the 11am bus, for example, I need to get everything I need to do in an hour, OR wait until 3ish to return! This often is not workable at all."

"The bus is usually reliable and on time but fairly regularly services just don't turn up at all - also the frequency of buses is the biggest problem. We need more regular buses that run later and on a Sunday. Also a direct service to York/Castle Howard/Helmsley would be wonderful."

The comment regarding light aircraft was also picked up in the final 'other comments' section with one respondent stating:

"The problem with Air Traffic is one guy doing acrobatics whenever it's a nice day, for hours and hours. Would happily contribute to a village Ground-to-Air missile. Maybe it could go next to the defibrillator."

9.   Environment

The environmental section of the survey was added in the 2022 survey in response to increasing interest in environmental issues since the last survey. A number of the questions utilised were taken from the Hovingham Environmental Survey which

means there could be a comparison with the results from Hovingham village residents.

This section started with a number of questions relating to household energy and energy efficiency before asking more general perceptions of environmental issues in the parish.

Table Forty-Seven: Heating/Fuel Source	
	Number
Mains Electricity	82
LPG	22
Oil	62
Bottle Gas	11
Solar Panels	11 (plus one in planning)
Ground Source Heat Pump	4
Air Source Heat Pump	4

Most respondents indicated that they used mains electricity with the highest use of oil as a heating source. Very few respondents indicated renewable energy resources but of these solar panels were the most common. As can be seen in Table Fifty below the biggest barrier to investing in renewable technology is cost.

Table Forty-Eight: Household Environmental Infrastructure			
	Yes	Partial	No
Double Glazing	102	6	8
Secondary Glazing	9	9	68
Lagged Pipes	74	4	17
Loft Insulation	110	6	3
Energy Saving Bulbs	108	8	2
Radiator Foil	6	12	90

Most households had basic energy efficiency aspects with most respondents having double glazing, loft insulation and energy saving bulbs although very few used radiator foil (see Table Forty-Eight).

Table Forty-Nine: Renewable Energy Investment				
	Yes	No	Not sure	Would need more information
If you don't have renewable technology in your home would you like to invest in this?	36[25] (37%)	14 (14%)	14[26] (14%)	37 (37%)

Table Fifty: Renewable Energy Barriers	
What are the main barriers to you putting renewable technologies in your home?[27]	Number of mentions
Cost, available funding, return on investment	56
Logistics, infrastructure, space, suitability, implementation, reliability of information and tradespeople	29
Impact on aesthetics of property/parish, age of property, conservation area, listed building	8
Age of respondent	3
Respondent is a renter	9

As noted above cost was a major barrier to residents having renewable home technology but logistics, age of property, age of the respondent and rental status also played a part in these decisions (see Table Fifty).

Table Fifty-One: Environmental Perceptions						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
I am confident in making my home more energy efficient	1 (1%)	10 (9%)	31 (27%)	55 (47%)	16 (14%)	0 (0%)
I am confident in making my home more water efficient	1 (1%)	13 (11%)	33 (29%)	54 (47%)	13 (11%)	0 (0%)
I would welcome small scale renewables in the parish (e.g. wind turbines, small solar farm)	7 (6%)	15 (13%)	21 (19%)	50 (44%)	20 (2%)	0 (0%)
I would like to see more support for birds in the parish (e.g.bird boxes)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	21 (18%)	53 (44%)	41 (34%)	0 (0%)
I would like more	1 (1%)	6 (5%)	15	57 (48%)	40	0 (0%)

---

[25] Includes one person who said both yes and not sure.
[26] Includes one person who said both yes and not sure.
[27] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

wildflower/wild areas in the parish			(13%)		(34%)	
Biodiversity protection is important	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	18 (16%)	46 (40%)	49 (43%)	0 (0%)
I would like a nature garden in the parish	4 (3%)	6 (5%)	31 (27%)	43 (37%)	31 (27%)	0 (0%)
I would be willing to be involved in litter picking in the parish	6 (5%)	12 (11%)	27 (25%)	48 (44%)	17 (15%)	0 (0%)
I would be interested in a repair café in the parish	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	40 (34%)	55 (47%)	19 (16%)	0 (0%)
I would like to see more trees planted in the parish	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	28 (24%)	53 (45%)	32 (27%)	0 (0%)
I would like a second hand swap shop in the village.	3 (3%)	9 (8%)	42 (36%)	47 (40%)	17 (14%)	0 (0%)
I would like book swap/library in the parish	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	31 (28%)	54 (49%)	20 (18%)	0 (0%)
I would use a party kit available to hire for special occasions such as children's parties (to reduce single-use partyware)	7 (6%)	10 (9%)	55 (48%)	15 (13%)	6 (5%)	22 (19%)
If available I would attend environmentally themed events/talks in the parish	3 (3%)	10 (9%)	38 (33%)	55 (48%)	8 (7%)	0 (0%)
I am concerned about air pollution in the parish]	14 (12%)	27 (26%)	42 (37%)	23 (20%)	7 (6%)	0 (0%)

As can be seen in Table Fifty-One the majority of respondents were in favour of environmental initiatives in the parish with wildflower areas, a book swap and environmentally themed talks being the most popular. As can be seen in Table Fifty-Two the main environmental concern for residents was future housing development and growth of the parish.

Table Fifty-Two: Other Environmental Comments	
Do you have any other comments related to the environment? What do you value in your environment? How would you like to see the village reduce its carbon footprint? How could the environment be protected?[28]	Number of mentions
Sceptical of some environmental initiatives (e.g. rewilding, shop would bring more traffic etc), need for balance	3

---

[28] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Community renewable energy (site for wind turbine for village?), encouraging household Renewable energy, funding heating conversion	7
Restrict development/growth (houses etc) to halt pollution. Protect wildlife etc	9
Reduce car traffic/speed (e.g. to School), reducing traffic noise and pollution	6
Improve public transport and connectivity	2
Community Transport/Community EV charging	4
Protecting flood plains	1
Need for a local shop with local produce to reduce car journeys, good available direct from farms	3
Plant more trees	2
Wildflower garden, rewilding	3
Increasing noise from crows	1
Repair cafe[29],, book swap etc	2
Walk instead of drive in the parish	1
Improve footpaths, cycle paths between village	2
Ensure bee-friendly pesticides are being used	1
Abolish pheasant shooting	1
Reduce light pollution	1

10.   Transport

This section assessed perceptions of transports and related issues in the Parish. As in the 2009 survey many houses had either 1 or 2 cars. Unlike in 2009 where a number of households did not have a vehicle (esp in Slingsby) only a handful of respondents do not have a vehicle (see Table Fifty-Three). Only a small number of households have an EV but many have bicycles.

Table Fifty-Three: Motor Vehicles, EVs and Bicycles in the Parish		
	Numbers of ….	Number of Households
Motor Vehicles	0	8

---

[29] Comment from one respondent: *"Isn't there already a Repair Cafe in Hovingham? Do we need two?"*

	1	53
	2	40
	3	19
	4	2
EVs	0	111
	1	8
Bicycles	0	37
	1	30
	2	23
	3	10
	4	14
	5	5

Overall 114 households have at least one car, 8 households have one EV and 82 households have at least one bicycle. Overall 198 cars, 8 EVs and 187 bicycles were represented in the survey responses. 8 households responded that they had an EV home charging point (presumably are the same people who have EVs and put a charging point in when they bought the vehicle). 52 households would welcome a community EV charging point, 40 had no opinion, 12 responded no and 14 don't know.

Table Fifty-Four: Car Share Scheme				
	Yes	No	Not sure/Don't know	Maybe but would need more information
Would you be interested in a car share scheme?	6 (5%)	76 (67%)	16 (14%)	16 (14%)

Very few residents were interested in a car share scheme and a significant number of respondents never used the bus service. Reasons for use/non use of the bus service are contained in Table Fifty-Six and Fifty-Seven.

Table Fifty-Five: Bus Service Usage					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you or members of your family use the local bus service?	60 (49%)	32 (26%)	18 (15%)	9 (7%)	3 (2%)

Table Fifty-Six: Bus Service Usage - Reasons	
Please provide details of when, who in your household and why they use the local bus service?[30]	Number of mentions
To visit the dentist/doctor	1
For shopping (location not specified)	2
For pleasure (location not specified)	1
For shopping/socialising/entertainment in Malton	11
To visit the Malton food festival	1
To connect to trains	4
To attend Malton school	5
To Hovingham	1

Table Fifty-Seven: Bus Service Improvements	
What improvements would you like to see in the local bus service?[31]	Number of mentions
Would appreciate buses at other times, more frequent buses (e.g. earlier than 11am but after the school bus, evening buses), Would use if times were better coordinated, impossible to use for commuting	29
Would like a direct service to York	2
Would like a connection to Helmsley	1
Better connection with York trains	3
Would like to see at connection to Helmsley	1
A more reliable service (would then be used more)	2
Need to reinstall the bus to Ryedale School	2
Needs to be more affordable	2

It is clear that the current bus and timetable is not fit for purpose. It currently does not fit commuting patterns, there are no evening buses and the link for trains is not reliable. This appears to be particularly important for older residents who are more dependent on the bus service.   Worryingly one respondent, highlighting the

---

[30] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.
[31] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

unreliable bus service, states: *"I no longer try to book GP appointments because I can't afford the taxi fares."*

11.   Development and Planning

The development and planning section has been significantly expanded in the 2022 survey, firstly to get a broader picture of development perceptions within the parish but also to collect data about specific current development discussions. The first question asked a number of Likert questions regarding general development and planning (see Table Fifty-Eight).

Table Fifty-Eight: Development and Planning Perceptions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	n/a
I am aware of the current development proposals affecting the parish	9 (7%)	4 (3%)	4 (3%)	48 (40%)	56 (46%)	0 (0%)
I have sufficient information about current development proposals]	8 (7%)	25 (20%)	15 (12%)	50 (41%)	24 (20%)	0 (0%)
I have felt confident to respond to current development proposals	8 (7%)	12 (11%)	22 (20%)	47 (42%)	23 (21%)	0 (0%)
I would be happy to see further housing development in the parish	47 (41%)	27 (23%)	21 (18%)	20 (17%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
The parish has had enough housing development in recent years	2 (2%)	11 (9%)	28 (24%)	25 (21%)	52 (44%)	0 (0%)
Any housing development should include affordable housing	5 (4%)	4 (3%)	13 (11%)	38 (32%)	58 (49%)	0 (0%)
Any housing development should include accessible housing	5 (4%)	0 (0%)	20 (17%)	42 (37%)	48 (42%)	0 (0%)
Any housing development should include a Local Needs Occupancy Condition (prioritised for local people)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	11 (21%)	39 (33%)	63 (54%)	0 (0%)
Any housing development should include a primary residence occupancy condition (would restrict second homes)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	14 (12%)	32 (27%)	70 (58%)	0 (0%)

Any housing development would need to provide extra amenities to the village (e.g. shop, doctors surgery etc)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	12 (10%)	28 (24%)	78 (66%)	0 (0%)
Any housing development would need to be dependent on upgrades to infrastructure (e.g. roads, drainage, broadband etc)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	16 (13%)	99 (83%)	0 (0%)
I would be happy to see further business development in the parish	5 (4%)	9 (8%)	32 (27%)	48 (41%)	23 (20%)	0 (0%)
I would be happy to see further leisure development in the parish	5 (4%)	8 (7%)	27 (23%)	54 (47%)	22 (19%)	22 (19%)
I would like to see a 'planning group' formed to represent the parish	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	14 (12%)	46 (40%)	50 (43%)	0 (0%)

It is clear that the majority of respondents would not like to see further housing development in the parish. If housing development were to take place they would welcome accessible/affordable housing, Local Needs Occupancy Conditions, primary residence occupancy conditions and highlight that amenities and infrastructure would need to be in place to allow this expansion. In the 2009 survey residents were asked "To what extent would you be in favour of further housing developments if it was affordable to meet only the needs of local people?". 116 (57%) people said they would support this development. This is comparable with the 49% who strongly agreed with the statement: "Any housing development should include affordable housing".

Table Fifty-Nine shows further comments made by respondents which in particular highlight the need for infrastructure and amenity upgrades to support any development.

Table Fifty-Nine: Development and Planning Comments	
Do you have any other broad comments on development in the village (please use the sections below for specific site by site comments). Please also let us know how you get information about development proposals and how you would like information (e.g. website, word of mouth, parish meetings etc[32]	Number of mentions
Any development would need amenity and infrastructure development (including school development, flooding mitigation, shop etc) to support the increase in scale - proportionate development is needed	23

[32] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Castle Howard workers should have homes closer to Castle Howard, should build a new village	2
Current development plans too large for the village to sustain	2
Would be better to bring current properties up to scratch and use currently empty buildings	3
Development altering the structure/character/community feel of the village would not be welcomed	10
Local needs occupancy welcomed, affordability, rental properties for those who cannot afford to buy	5

With regards a planning group one resident notes: *"I feel a planning group would be a good idea, ONLY if there was fair representation of those who aren't opposed to local development, and those who are. As well as those that are indifferent."*

The section then asked for specific levels of agreement and comments regarding the two proposed development sites - see Tables Sixty to Sixty-Two.

Table Sixty: Acceptance of Current Planning Proposals				
	Yes	No	Not sure	Happy for some development
Are you in favour of development at site 305?	0 (0%)	89 (75%)	4 (3%)	26 (22%)
Are you in favour of development at site 301 A, B and C?	2 (2%)	73 (63%)	6 (5%)	35 (30%)

It is clear that overall respondents are not in favour of development at either site although an amount of people would be happy to see some development.

Table Sixty-One: Comments on site 305	
Please provide further details and comments on potential development on this site. (305)[33]	Number of mentions
Access concerns (pedestrian/vehicle), access should not be allowed via the Lawns/Sports field/club, Effect on public footpaths	10
Increased traffic	7
Obscures protected view	23
Prime agricultural land	3

---

[33] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Land/Castle is historically important	9
Land subject to flooding,will increase problem with flooding/drainage etc	16
Any development must not affect the sports club/field and playground, leisure opportunities	21
A small affordable development would be welcomed/ok	5
Would increase the village to too large a point, extends boundary of village too far, village sprawl, would be detached from the village	7
Could threaten identity and character of village, needs sympathetic design	5
Detrimental to wildlife	2
Needs to have infrastructure developments	3
Light pollution	1
Development should be in brown field, not green belt sites	1

Many of the respondents identified various issues relating to the development at site 305, which are represented in the table above. One example of a resident highlighting multiple issues is as follows:

"Numerous reasons why this site is unsuitable. Its position between Slingsby and Fryton, which currently is a very obvious haven for wildlife, from rabbits to various species of wild bird. If anything, we should be encouraging wildlife and biodiversity in this area, particularly given what a refuge for nature is currently provided by the castle site, untouched by human intervention for years and therefore quite unique.

Secondly, regardless of the promises to build a new clubhouse etc. should it need to be moved, any development of this scale at site 305 will completely alter the current setting of far-reaching views, peace and tranquility. During development, the site will be difficult if not impossible for families to access in the way they currently do, and there are also concerns over how much biodiversity and heritage will be disturbed or lost during construction (including at least one tree, as already outlined in the proposed plans). We also have concerns over the increase in traffic to reach the site, during construction and also related to the residents of the resulting dwellings, in addition to the additional stress placed on drainage/sewage/road infrastructure. There will also be consequences in terms of how secure the setting fields, once overlooked by a new estate (currently, parents feel the playground is a very safe place for older children to go to with friends, and this may change completely once there is increased traffic and housing right next to it)."

Table Sixty-Two: Comments on sites 301 A, B & C	
Please provide further details and comments on potential development on this site. (301 A, B & C)[34]	Number of mentions
Should not be built on as it is an AONB	14
Problems of access on/off B1257 and increased traffic (on an already dangerous junction)- any development needs to improve road layout and safety (to allow people to cross safely)	38
Potential impact on drainage/flooding	14
Would divide/split/be cut off from the village	9
Should not be built on ancient quarry site	3
Unsustainable development for the school	2
Pressure on village amenities, infrastructure and community - would need to be solved prior to housing development - development is 'too big'	18
Would be more acceptable/less invasive than other sites as at the edge of the village and accessible on to main roads	4
Would ruin approach/entrance to Slingsby village	3
Would spoil views	3
Should not be built on due to archeological significance	1
Would set a precedent for development along the south side of B1257 villages/further development	2
Should remain as farm/agricultural land	2

For 301 (A, B & C) respondents were concerned about the significant increase in traffic and resulting potential for traffic accidents and safety for residents coming in and out of the central village (for example coming to school). As one resident stated: *"There are regular accidents on this stretch of road and it is a notorious junction for misuse leading to many near misses, given the increase in vehicles it can only become worse possibly leading to loss of life."*

It was also felt that there was enough housing development going on in the village (The Balk, High Street development) which should be completed first before any further development was considered. The multiple impacts of these developments are worrying to the community as noted by one resident:
"The sites are in a dangerous position (the road is incredibly fast moving, drivers do not currently observe the speed limit) and pedestrians would be at risk. Coupled with the fourth site the village will be swamped (it will double in size) and the village will

---

[34] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

be lost. The sites are so far removed from the heart of the village it is hard to see how the residents will feel as though they are part of the community."

Overall across responses to the development questions a number of respondents highlight that they felt a 'need' for these houses needed to be proven and they felt that Castle Howard wanted these houses to be built due to 'greed' and their need and further development risked damaging the village. Respondents stated:
"Castle Howard are greedy and think they can dictate to local residents."
"If Castle Howard want to build more houses, let them do it on their own doorstep - not ours. Pure greed."
"Is there a need for this development? Who needs these houses? Where will the people work? Such development will create a soulless ghost estate of strangers."

Overall many respondents highlighted that they felt Slingsby had had enough development and any getting any bigger would not be widely welcomed.

12.   Village Design Statement

This section of the survey sought to understand whether respondents were aware of the Village Design Statement and what they particularly liked about the parish to allow an assessment of whether the Village Design Statement should be updated (see Tables Sixty-Three to Sixty-Six below).

Table Sixty-Three: Awareness of Village Design Statement			
	Yes	No	Not sure
Are you aware of the Village Design Statement Planning Document adopted by Ryedale Council in 2016?	62 (53%)	38 (33%)	16 (14%)

Table Sixty-Four: Favourite/Least Favourite Buildings etc in Parish	
What are your favourite buildings and/or streets/areas in the parish?	What are your least favourite buildings and/or streets/areas in the parish?[35]
All Saints Church	Cavendish Court
Slingsby Hall	Area around the base of the castle (messy and untidy)
Railway Street	Village Hall
The Green (including school, maypole and trees)	Empty/tenanted estate/Castle Howard properties that need a major upgrade
School	High Street (untidy)

---

[35] Any mention of specific houses have not been reported.

Castle Farm	Church Street (should be made one way)
Views (castle, church, to Fryton woods)	New build houses not in keeping
Sports Club	Sports Club (less attractive)
Village Hall	The Balk
The Grapes pub	Advertising signs on the B1257 (dangerous and unsightly)
Methodist Hall/Chapel	Dilapidated barn (on B1257)
Castle	Green Crescent road surface
Slingsby woods	Less characterful newer arts of the village
All the stone built houses	B1257
Railway Track walk	Bull/pig shed
Chestnut trees at the Balk entrance	Beckside
Playing fields/Playground	Sycamore Close
The Lawns	Aspen Way
High Street	Wath beck culvert in Fryton
The Balk	Church Lane
Rectory	

While respondents did list areas that were favourite or least favourite, many simply stated that the parish was attractive and that the mix of houses was welcomed with one respondent stating that it's: *"just an eclectic mix which works".*

Table Sixty-Five: Favourite Open Spaces in the Parish
What are your favourite open spaces in the parish and why?
Open countryside surrounding the village - fields, woods
Railway Track walk and the circular walk between Fryton and Slingsby/Footpath network around Singsby - good for walks, running, dog walking and wildlife, peaceful, don't have to worry about cars
Sports Field - view to Fryton, the heart of Slingsby,good for watching sports, use for big community events
The Lawns
Village Green - maypole, school
View from Slingsby Heights (sheep walk) overlooking the vale of Pickering towards the Moors- "The view of the village as you approach from Castle Howard with uninterrupted views from the hill.", the ridge of trees

Unspoilt views from the B1257
Allotments
The Balk
Castle
Fields east of Railway Street
AONB
Green Dyke Lane
Mowbray Oak field - "could this be incorporated into a village path/park?)"
The church - a place of history and wildlife protection
Mucky Lane
Wood around Castle Howard

The open spaces which were added in the response to the question were numerous and people felt strongly that these spaces should be protected and maintained. One respondent commented:

"All open spaces in the village are to be encouraged re fauna and flora, biodiversity, leisure activities, dog walking, children/adults playing etc."

Table Sixty-Six: Favourite Views in the Parish
Are there any particular views you particularly value in the parish (and why)?
View from the sheepwalk approached from Castle Howard over Ryedale and towards the Moors - *"Simply stunning, awesome, paradise."*
Views from Baxton How ridge to Slingsby
View from the village as you approach from Barton on the B1257
View to Fryton (from Church and Sportsfield (esp bench))
Views of the Castle
View of Slingsby Castle rom High Street
View from Fryton to Slingsby Church/Castle
View north to the moors
View across the green
Views of open countryside
Views from houses on the east side of Railway Street
Views from Fryton woods into Fryton

Views up and down Railway Street
Views of the church and churchyard
Views from and along the railway line
Open space along Green Dyke Lane/Long Lane/'Mucky' Lane.
View of the Mowbray Oak

Respondents were able to name many views which they enjoyed around the parish and often highlighted the many views in multiple directions which they treasure. For example:

"360 views from the Sports Field to Fryton, Slingsby Heights and The Lawns and Church."

"The open views at all points of the compass. It is a massive part of what makes Slingsby wonderful."

In the 'other comments' section at the end of the survey one respondent did pick up on a negative aspect of the village design statement stating:

"I feel the Supplementary Planning Document should be revisited with a more open mind. In places it is too narrow and loses credibility by its use of language in criticising some homes within the Parish. It tries to dictate a very specific style, whereas the village actually has many different styles developed over centuries."

13.   The Parish Council

Table Sixty-Seven: Perception of Community Spirit			
	Yes	No	Not sure
Is there a community spirit in the parish?	100 (82%)	5 (4%)	17 (14%)

Over 80% of respondents felt that there was community spirit within the parish. One assumption which could be made is that those who have community spirit will have been more likely to complete the survey and therefore in the total parish population this may be lower. In the 2009 survey 64% (132 households) responded Yes to the same question suggesting a significant increase in perceived community spirit since 2009.

However, in the final question of the survey ('other comments') one respondent mentioned that they felt the community spirit was limited to some people stating:

"There are people living here who never ever support anything."

Additionally one respondent in the final other comments section suggested that some organisations in the village didn't have community spirit as they didn't offer discounts rates to the school/local groups etc.

Table Sixty-Eight: Awareness of Parish Councillors			
	Yes	No/Not sure	I know who some of them are
Do you know who your parish councillors are?	46 (38%)	22 (18%)	53 (44%)

Most respondents stated they knew who some of the parish councillors are although some people were not sure. In 2009 approximately 47% of respondents stated they knew who the parish councillors were. This suggests that less people know who their parish councillors are than in 2009, but given that the question in 2009 did not offer a 'I know who some of them are' it may be that the numbers are similar in 2022.

Table Sixty-Nine: Awareness of the Role of the Parish Council			
	Yes	No	Not sure
Do you know what the parish council does?	89 (74%)	11 (9%)	21 (17%)

Most respondents were confident in knowing what the parish council does. In 2009 approximately 68% of respondents said they understood the work of the Parish Council. This suggests that in 2022 more people are confident about their knowledge of what the Parish council does.

Table Seventy: Attendance at Parish Council Meetings					
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Do you attend parish council meetings?	47 (39%)	27 (22%)	30 (25%)	11 (9%)	6 (5%)

The most common response regarding attending the parish council was never (see Table Seventy).

Table Seventy-One: Reasons for Non-Attendance at Parish Council Meetings	
If you do not attend parish council meetings, why not?[36]	Number of mentions
Dominated by residents discussing particular issues	2
Uncertain of what the Parish Council does	1
Parish Council fails to take the lead on matters/does not have influence/is powerless/does not list to people in the village	7

---

[36] NB Where a respondent has mentioned multiple reasons these are noted as separate mentions.

Old age prevents attendance/involvement and/or health issues	5
Lack of time/family commitments/other commitments	11
Clash with work	4
Depends on what is on the agenda	1
Don't believe I would contribute anything useful	3
I thought the meetings were only for members of the committee/uncertain of welcome	3
Not aware of the location, date or timings of meetings	10
Parish Council have not helped with issues in the past	1
Would attend if on weekends	1
I read the minutes instead	3
Rely on councillors to make the right decision	1

While lack of time and other commitments are noted as the most significant barrier to attending the Parish Council meetings, not being aware of the location, date or timings of the meetings comes a close second. This alongside contribution and welcome could be communicated further by the Parish Council.

The final question in the survey asked for any other comments. Where the comments received fit into one of the above sections they have been included there- either an additional counted 'mention' and/or as a comment.
Other comments or themes which emerged here were related to:
- The School - well attended but mostly by children outside of the parish meaning that there is a lot of traffic at school drop off/pick up times and that the school cannot group;
- Parish Council - a concern was raised that recent new parish council members were not subject to election. Suggestion that a parish council election would bring in new voices;
- Speed of Parish Council in responding to development issues;
- Concern over the destruction of village life;
- Worry about the neglect of Castle Howard properties;
- Appreciation for the mobile library van which visits Slingsby;
- Sadness over remaining farms in the parish disappearing;
- Concern that the survey is not anonymous[37];
- Thanks- for the survey and allowing the community's voice to be heard.

---

[37] NB- the survey results have been presented in aggregate form meaning that individuals are not identifiable and the survey data remains anonymous.

14.   Key Findings

The Executive Summary on pages 1-4 provides an overview of all sections on the survey. This section pulls together a few key issues across the survey pulling out some key themes and areas which are highlighted for further discussion or where key issues are highlighted throughout the survey.

In the last 10+ years since the last survey the digital landscape has changed significantly with higher levels of broadband use and increased levels of home working (and higher use of digital information sources). It is likely that over the next 5-10 years that levels of home working may increase and if the parish wants to attract and maintain home workers it will have to ensure it is providing the right environment for them. Given that the survey reported poor mobile signal this is an initial concern (not just for home workers but emergency and day to day situations) and some concern over broadband speeds and reliability this is something the community may need to seek improvement of and could become more problematic over time.

Across the survey it is clear that residents treasure the village hall, sports club, religious facilities etc. It is also clear that they see these as important in supporting the school and as important places for socialising. A number of respondents suggest that better synergy between the village hall and sports club would be welcomed with one suggesting: *"To emmolgimate the several village commuters into one 'village community committee' and look at a less structured/formal way of getting others involved and included."*

While a number of people were not aware of the proposed Path for Everyone, respondents were supportive of it and also highlighted the importance of all the paths available to them in the parish. The path north from Green Dyke lane was highlighted as needing remedial work in particular and it was felt this would open up a lovely circular walking route. Regarding the Path for Everyone one resident highlighted how it could be more ambitious: *"It would be even more amazing if the Path for Everyone could be extended and/or safer bike riding or walking could be provided in the direction of Malton, so we could venture all the way into town without relying on a vehicle."*

The most dramatic response in the survey was for a permanent Slingsby shop to replace the one that had closed with residents also suggesting that this could be part of a cafe/tea rooms and could provide facilities for those both within and beyond the parish.

Dog fouling continues to be perceived as a problem in the parish but with high levels of dog ownership in the parish it was also suggested that the parish could be more dog friendly, perhaps including a wider dog exercise area.

Flooding, drainage and sewerage are perceived to be a problem in the parish which a number of respondents highlight the need for this to be improved as further development and building takes place.

Speeding in the arish is considered a problem with residents supporting a 20mph zone and/or flashing 'slow down' signs. The results highlight that the bus service is not seen as fit for purpose in terms of reliability, timings and destinations.

The majority of respondents feel that there has been (or with current developments will have been) enough development in the parish with worries about development effects on the environment, traffic, views, village life and community feel.

While most residents understand the role of the parish council a number are confused about when the parish council is, whether they can attend and/or how they can take part. Further communication from the parish council could seek to improve this understanding.

15. Suggested amendments/updates Slings, Fryton and South Holme Action Plan 2010-2105

From the 2009 village survey an action plan was developed to 2015. It is up to the parish council to determine whether they would like to update this and to assist relevant aspects of the survey results are added in Table Seventy-Two to guide any updates.

Table Seventy-Two: Slingsby, Fryton and South Holme Action Plan Updates		
Section	Action and Notes 2010-2015 Plan	Suggested updates/amendments 2023
Local Transport	Look into possibility of early/late/weekend direct bus to York	The 2022 survey highlights that the bus service is not fit for purpose (reliability,timings and routes), and because of this many residents simply do not consider using it. With further development taking place and Singsby's status as 'service village' a cost effective, shared transport resource is extremely important and should be supported. Unlike in the 2009 survey there was more interest in routes to Helmlsy and for improving the reliability and timings into/out of Malton.
Traffic and Road Safety	Installation of flashing 'slow down' signs. Request for police speed	Respondents continue to highlight problems with speeding and would welcome traffic calming measures such as flashing 'slow down' signs and a 20mph speed limit.

	checks on a regular basis.	
Pavements and Footpaths	Improvements to paths: ● Railway Street - Brookfields to end of village. ● Path widening High Street (top end) ● Exposure of footpath (overgrown) FRyrton to B1257 Apply to LEADER for funding for formal path and cycleway Slingsby to Fryton (line of formare railway is only a public footpath)	There was only a small amount of concern about pavements within the parish but a number of respondents did highlight that some footpaths needed remedial action (in particular the path north from Green Dyke Lane and the path north to Slingsby woods). In addition the respondents showed significant support for the proposed Path for Everyone.
Housing and Future Development	Do a VDS (village design statement)	A VDS was written in response to the 2009 survey. This survey contains updated questions which could be used to update, or provide an appendix to the current statement.
Crime, Policing and other Emergency Services	Regular visible patrols and presence	Respondents would welcome further patrol and visual elements of policing in the parish.
Village Hall	Secure funding for improvements including a new kitchen	The village hall is still considered an asset to the community but there should be consideration of whether there could be better synergies between this and the sports club.
Youth Club	Recruit Activity leaders Funding for New activities	There was no specific request for a youth club from respondents although one respondent highlighted the need for events/groups for underrepresented groups which could be explored further.
Communication	Improve mobile coverage in the parish. Put together an information pack. Start a website and newsletter.	Mobile coverage continues to be a significant problem in the parish and should be a priority, alongside improvements in broadband. This may become more significant for home workers which are expected to increase. A website and The Triangle have been welcome additions to the village since the last survey. Digital communications have become more prominent and ways in which this could be utilised could be explored further.
Post Office	Lobby for reinstatement of village post office	The post office van is well used in the village and is a particular lifeline for some residents

		who use it for banking, in a additions to postal services. There is no suggestion that the proposed village shop should include a post office (only mentioned by a couple of respondents) but the post office van could be relocated to the site of a village shop if it were to come into existence to ensure synergy between services.
Environment	Identify land suitable for allotments.	Since the 2009 survey land for allotments have been identified and set up. The survey suggests this is working well and that those who wish to have an allotment have one.
Street lighting	Improve arrangements for lighting repairs when faults occur. Look into implementing improvements to street lighting in Slingsby (on-going)	Street lighting was not considered a significant issue in the 2022 survey suggesting improvements and investment have been successful since the last survey. These should obviously be maintained as needed.
Surface Drainage	Look into implementing improvements to reduce surface water. Regular cleansing of road rains in Slingsby and Fryton.	Flooding, drainage and surface water issues are perceived to be an issue in the parish especially in light of potential further development adding stress to the water system.
Church	Ensure it remains open (prepare separate detailed plan)	The church is a valued resource in the village, alongside the chapel. Suggested improvements were highlighted including kitchen and toilet facilities.
Village Activities	Identify/recruit leaders for older people/young/all. Encourage wider groups of helpers to form and make things happen.	As noted above in the youth club section there was little mention of further youth activities needed although there was a call for further activities for some underrepresented groups. It is clear that people attend and enjoy the regular events in the parish as these were regularly mentioned in survey responses.
Castle	Clearance of trees etc to make it more visible. Install Information Boards.	Respondents suggested that they would like to see further development at the castle, including an information board. However there was uncertainty about what level of work would be welcomed with many suggesting it should be left as a haven for wildlife.
Home working		Although no figures are available for 2009 the 2022 survey suggest the number of home workers (either full or part time) is increasing and the parish should consider how it wants to support and/or encourage

		them (see also communication above).
Shop		It is clear that residents would welcome a permanent Slingsby shop in the parish.
Dog fouling		Dog fouling is considered to be an issue across the Parish. As there are a large number of dog owners there was also a call for the parish to provide more dog facilities, especially an enclosed area for dogs to exercise in.
Parish Development		Most residents felt that the parish had had enough development and would not welcome further houses. It was considered important that amenities/infrastructure were improved to support any further development. A planning group ws supported.
Village survey Frequency		The Parish council should consider how frequently they would like a village survey and set the next date for a village survey.

16.   Survey 2025/2030?

The last survey took place in 2009 with a gap of 13 years to the 2022 survey. Surveys at regular intervals allow us to track changes in the parish and respond to these with a background of evidence. It would be worthwhile for the parish council to decide when they would like to have the next village survey and the frequency of following village surveys. Given the length of the survey a significant gap would be warranted but shorter interim surveys could be designed and used on keep aspects.

In analysing the survey it became clear that some elements could be added to a future survey such as a question about the mobile library, including Hybrid vehicles and a question about attendance at village events. Any additions/changes should be carefully considered when the next survey is designed. The 2022 survey has been designed in an attempt to allow it to be replicated mostly in the next survey interaction but small changes will be required.

Unfortunately less respondents filled in the survey this time than in 2009. It would be useful to consider ways in which a greater level of completion could be encouraged in the next survey. Ways this could be done are through a prize for completion (for example a meal at the pub), an open day to get people to fill in the survey in one place, door to door communication and collection of surveys etc. The survey results suggested that the younger the respondents the more likely they are to complete the survey online as as the population ages there should be less requirement for paper copies in future surveys but they should still be made available. Completing the

survey online ensures more accurate data collection, quicker analysis and is more sustainable.