

ASSESSING COMMUNITY DEMAND FOR THE LANGWORTHY HOTEL APRIL 2004

Submitted by:

Martin Halton
Community Researcher
Social Research & Development
Seedley and Langworthy Trust
(0161) 737 9918
martin.halton@sali.org.uk



SRD Social Research &
Development

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	3
METHODOLOGY	
Langworthy Hotel questionnaire	4
Participatory Appraisal (PA) Tools	5
RESEARCH FINDINGS	6
Levels of demand for a community space in the development	6
Needs analysis – is there a need for the hotel to be developed, if so, why and what for?	6/7
Cost element – is there a willingness and ability to pay for the use of common space if the hotel is developed?	7
Participatory Appraisal (PA) Tools	8
-Tool 1 : “H-form”	8
-Tool 2 : “Bean-Voter”	8
-Tool 3 : “Spider Diagram”	8/9
-Tool 4 : “Criteria Ranking”	9/10
APPENDICES	
*Appendix 1 : Langworthy Hotel Questionnaire	

* = see attachment

INTRODUCTION

The following piece of community based research was carried out by the Seedley and Langworthy Initiative (SALI) to assess community demand for the potential redevelopment of the Langworthy Hotel on Langworthy Road, Langworthy, Salford. The findings would form part of a wider, more qualitative-based external study that focused on interviews with major stakeholders involved in the SRBV programme of regeneration for the Seedley and Langworthy area of Salford. This external piece of work used consultation to provide a detailed evaluation of all potential users and subsequent formation of a realistic business plan showing how the building can have a self-sustaining future without further public subsidy and intervention

Identified in the Research Brief for the community based consultation regarding assessment of community demand for the Langworthy Hotel was a need to assess:

- Levels of demand for a community space in the development
- Needs analysis – is there a need for the hotel to be developed, if so, why and what for?
- Cost element – is there a willingness and ability to pay for the use of common space if the hotel is developed?

A structured postal questionnaire and a number of Participatory Appraisal (PA) tools and techniques were used and will be explained in greater detail within the methodology section of this report.

METHODOLOGY

The major research tools used for this consultation were a structured postal questionnaire and a series of Participatory Appraisal (PA) tools and techniques. The questionnaire acted as the main 'tester' of community opinion, with the PA tools important vehicles in the verification process.

LANGWORTHY HOTEL QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire was administered over a 2 week period, (30/3/04-14/4/04) with questionnaires being sent out to every household in the area. A total therefore of 1,816 were sent out, with 75 completed and returned, resulting in a response rate of 4.1%.

The questionnaire administered to local residents asked a number of questions, (see Appendix 1 for a sample copy and full breakdown of questions). Namely,

- Have or do you visit (use) any of the community venues in Seedley and Langworthy?
- What are the reasons you visit community venues?
- In what capacity do you use these venues?
- Do you have to pay to use these venues?
- Would a new facility be something that you would be interested in attending/using?
- If there was a cost attached to using a new community venue would you be prepared to pay?
-if yes, what do you consider to be an affordable amount for a group/individual?
- Do you feel there is a need for a new community venue in Seedley and Langworthy?
- Do you see the Langworthy Hotel as a possible additional community venue?
- What would be your preferred possible uses for the hotel from a prescribed list?

PARTICIPATORY APPRAISAL (PA) TOOLS

Used predominately in this research as a verification tool, Participatory Appraisal (PA) was used at the SALI shop as a further means of questioning the community on the key issues relating to the possible redevelopment of the hotel such as demand, need and cost.

The tools asked a number of questions, namely:

- Do you see the Langworthy Hotel as a possible additional community venue?
- Can you identify your preferred possible top 3 choices for redevelopment of the hotel from a prescribed list of options?
- Can you identify opportunities and barriers for each option measured against certain criteria? (e.g. needs to the community, impact, popularity and viability)
- Can you rank each hotel option against the same criteria?

RESEARCH FINDINGS

RESPONSE RATE

During the period of which this research took place there were a total of 1,816 questionnaires posted out to local residents with 75 completed and returned by the cut-off date. This represented a response rate of 4.1%. The summary of findings from the questionnaires were analysed in terms of key criteria such as demand, need and cost.

LEVELS OF DEMAND FOR A COMMUNITY SPACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT

From the first 2 questions on the questionnaire regarding community venues and their usage, (see Appendix 1), it appeared that respondents were actively using community venues in the area and that the reasons for usage were mainly to attend meetings and to develop hobbies, interests and to meet/visit friends.

With reference to question 6, just over two thirds indicated they would be interested in attending a new venue/facility. In addition, question 3 showed over half of respondents use community venues in an individual as oppose to group capacity.

NEEDS ANALYSIS – IS THERE A NEED FOR THE HOTEL TO BE DEVELOPED, IF SO, WHY AND WHAT FOR?

This aspect of the research brief was tested mainly through questions 8, 9 & 10 on the questionnaire. In response to questions 8 and 9;

- well over two thirds indicated a need for a new community venue in Seedley and Langworthy
- with similar numbers highlighting the Langworthy Hotel as a possible additional community venue

With reference to the ranking of possible preferred options for the hotel from a prescribed list on question 10, residents' choices produced the following list in order of preference;

- 1st choice – being redeveloped as a centre for voluntary/community enterprises
- 2nd choice – a combination of some of the above
- 3rd choice – being redeveloped as shared office space for community/voluntary groups/agencies
- 4th choice – being demolished to allow a new development
- 5th choice – being redeveloped as affordable, rented live-work apartments

COST ELEMENT – IS THERE A WILLINGNESS AND ABILITY TO PAY FOR THE USE OF COMMON SPACE IF THE HOTEL IS DEVELOPED?

In relation to the issue of cost, only a small number of residents currently pay to use community venues. In response to question 7a.), just over two thirds expressed a willingness to pay if there was a cost attached to using a new community venue. Regarding the issue of the ability to pay for use of a new community venue, only just over half of respondents answered this part of the question, with small contributions of between £1-10 common suggestions as affordable amounts for both groups and individuals.

PARTICIPATORY APPRAISAL (PA) TOOLS

As an additional consultation method, certain PA tools were used at the SALI community resource shop with residents over a 2 day period.

Tool/technique 1: "H-Form"

"Do you see the Langworthy Hotel as a possible additional community venue?"

The general response from residents who participated in this activity was a positive one in terms of seeing the hotel as an additional and worthwhile community venue in the area. Generalised comments such as "give the kids somewhere to go" and "will bring the community together" were shown within this exercise, with people "scoring/ranking" their positive choices highly.

Tool/technique 2: "Bean-Voter"

"Can you identify your preferred possible top 3 choices for redevelopment of the hotel from a prescribed list of options?"

This tool asked residents to rank their most preferred 3 choices out of the list of the prescribed options, their 1st/most preferred choice receiving 3 points, their 2nd 2 and their 3rd 1. The list in order of preference was as follows;

- 1st choice – being redeveloped as a centre for voluntary/community enterprises
- 2nd choice – being redeveloped as shared office space for community groups/agencies
- 3rd choice – a combination of some of the above
- 4th choice – being demolished to allow a new development
- 5th choice – being redeveloped as affordable, rented live-work apartments

Tool/technique 3: "Spider Diagram"

"Can you identify opportunities and barriers for each option measured against certain criteria?" (e.g. needs to the community, impact, popularity and viability)

Responses were very much of a qualitative nature, but to summarize their responses, as it was only a relatively small number who took part in the exercise, it would appear that options 2, 3 and 5 ranked most consistent in terms of residents choosing them to assess them and identify potential opportunities and barriers.

The table below provides a brief overview of the highlighted options and the responses that were given;

	Need(s)	Impact	Popularity	Viability
Option 2	-for provision for youngsters -groups or agencies need to work closer together	-high : will give a community base for the young and old -will bring people closer together	- would generate interest throughout community -awareness of building could generate high level of interest	- awareness of need to be self-sustaining -largely dependent on groups willingness to pay
Option 3	-encourage local business -need more local community enterprises	-good : create local jobs	- has potential – depends what's on offer -needs to cater for everyone's needs	-is there target markets for the proposed enterprises? -depends on the product they 'sell'
Option 5	- Cornerstone doesn't serve the community -'one-stop' shop would be useful	-would be positive -bring different groups together	-would be popular as it could reflect changes in local community	-would take commitment from 'partner' organisations

Tool/technique 4 : "Criteria ranking"

"Can you rank each option against the same criteria?"

Participants were asked to rank each hotel option against the criteria from the previous exercise and score each option and criteria set on a 3/2/1 scale, 3 being very positive with high benefit, 2 positive with some benefit and 1 not positive with little or no benefit.

The results from this final PA exercise, showing how people ranked/scored each hotel option against set criteria are shown in the following table;

	Need(s)	Impact	Popularity	Viability	Total =
Option 1	11	12	15	15	53 (4)
Option 2	19	15	16	14	64 (2)
Option 3	25	21	21	21	87 (1)
Option 4	13	13	13	14	53 (4)
Option 5	15	16	15	13	59 (3)

The purpose of this final exercise was to try and choose a preferred list of hotel options after having gone through the process of using the different participatory tools to hopefully come to a more informed set of choices. Shown below is the preferred list of choices as a result of using the 4 different PA tools;

- 1st choice – option 3 : being redeveloped as a centre for voluntary/community enterprises
- 2nd choice – option 2 : being redeveloped as shared office space for community/voluntary groups/agencies
- 3rd choice – option 5 : a combination of the above
- 4th choice – option 4 : being demolished to allow a new development
option 1 : being redeveloped as affordable, rented live-work apartments