Budget Engagement
Income Generation

Respondents were asked three questions either through either online survey application SurveyMonkey, or during group conversations, as follows:

Q1   *Do you agree or disagree with the following proposals?*

Income Generation	Response Count	Agree	Disagree
Increases charges for letting out council buildings (£50,000)	792	77%	23%
Introducing charges for community bedding plants (£145,000)	768	61%	39%
Raise charges for out of school care clubs (up to £2.50 per session)	787	58%	42%
Traffic calming and speed reduction measures to be paid for by re-implementing car parking charges across Aberdeenshire (£250,000)	785	51%	49%
Transferring funding from roads budget to increase investment in walking and cycling (£50,000)	787	34%	66%
Investing in renewable energy and solar panels which could generate (£50,000)	788	82%	8%
Revisiting the charging structure for sport and physical activity from 2017 (£650,000)	784	66%	34%
An increase to burial charges (£350,000)	787	43%	57%

Q2   *If you <u>disagreed</u> with any of the proposals, please tell us why.*

A total of 440 respondents provided feedback. **Key themes** included:

- **Roads maintenance** – Almost 48% (including cyclists) felt that Aberdeenshire should not reduce roads maintenance expenditure. The rural nature of Aberdeenshire means that the majority of travel is by car or bus. Increased availability of public transport would be welcomed.
- **Burial charges** – 28% were against any increase in burial charges.
- **Parking charges** – 24% were against increasing/re-implementing parking charges as it was felt the result would be a move to online shopping or loss of business to larger towns and cities. Traffic calming and speed reduction measures were not felt to be a priority.
- **Out of school care clubs** – 24% or respondent felt that increasing out of school care clubs would lead to financial hardship for working parents.
- **Sport and leisure facilities** – 20% of respondents recognised the need for access to sport and leisure facilities for the health and wellbeing of communities. It was felt that reducing the costs of access might be more beneficial and could increase attendance.

There were requests for more detailed information to enable the respondents to make more informed decisions, along with impact assessments to identify who would be affected by the proposals.

Q3   ***Which other services would you be willing to pay an increased charge for?***

A total of 271 respondents answered this question. **Key themes** included:

- **A lack of specificity** –36% didn't specify a service for which they'd be willing to pay a higher charge. Instead, respondents tended to offer various suggestions as to what the council could do to save money (generally become more efficient, cut extraneous costs, etc.) or how it should apportion funds.

- **Council Tax** – Approximately 1 in 4 of those who didn't specify a service also mentioned Council Tax, usually in the context of their willingness to pay a higher rate as opposed to picking and choosing specific services.

- **Unwilling to pay** – Approximately 16% of respondents were unwilling to pay a higher charge for services. Approximately 1 in 4 also mentioned that the council should seek to save money (generally become more efficient, cut extraneous costs, etc.).

- **Top 5 Services** – Generally speaking, the top 5 services that respondents were willing to pay a higher charge for are as follows:

General Services	% of Respondents
Leisure facilities/services	10.0%
Waste disposal/recycling/re-generation	10.0%
Parking	6.6%
Library services	6.6%
School-related costs (dinners, stationery, transport, education generally)	5.5%

As a general point of observation, it was not always clear whether the respondent was personally willing to pay a higher charge for a particular service or if they simply believed people generally should be charged for the service they specified.