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## Introduction

- This report presents a summary of findings from the 2008 National Noise Survey, conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of Environmental Protection UK.
- The objectives of the research were to explore people's experience of and attitudes towards neighbour and neighbourhood noise.
- This survey follows two previous surveys, conducted by Ipsos MORI in spring 2006 and 2007. Where appropriate, comparisons have been made with results from these surveys.
- Questions were placed on the Ipsos MORI Public Affairs Monitor - an omnibus survey of c.2,000 adults aged 16+ across Great Britain. A total of 2,131 interviews were conducted face-to-face in people's homes, across 198 sampling points, between 17-22 April 2008.
- Data are weighted to the known national profile of the population of Great Britain.


## Introduction

- Interpreting the data
- It should be noted at all times that a sample, and not the entire population has been surveyed. As such, all results are subject to sampling tolerances, which means that not all differences are statistically significant. A guide to the statistical reliability of the findings is appended.
- Publishing the data
- As with all our studies, these findings are subject to Ipsos MORI's Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract. Any press release or publication of findings requires the advance approval of Ipsos MORI. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misrepresentation.


## How much does noise affect people at home?

- Survey participants were asked to what extent they are affected by noise when they are in their homes.
- One in six (17\%) are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by noise from neighbours inside their homes - a similar proportion to that found in 2007 (18\%).
- One in five people are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by noise from their neighbours outside their homes - significantly fewer than in 2007 (20\% and $25 \%$ respectively).
- Just over a quarter of people are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by their neighbours either inside or outside their homes (26\%), compared to $30 \%$ in 2007.
- One in ten are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by noise from pubs/clubs/entertainment venues (9\%) and commercial premises (10\%), as in 2007 (10\% and 9\% respectively).


## Noise from neighbours inside their homes

To what extent, if at all, are you personally bothered, annoyed or disturbed by neighbours (inside their homes) when you are in your home?
$\square 2008 \%$ - 2007\%


Base: 2,131 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 2,138 British adults, April 2007

## Noise from neighbours outside their homes

To what extent, if at all, are you personally bothered, annoyed or disturbed by neighbours (outside their homes) when you are in your home?

- 2008\% - 2007\%


Base: 2,131 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 2,138 British adults, April 2007

## Noise from pubs/clubs/entertainment venues

To what extent, if at all, are you personally bothered, annoyed or disturbed by pubs/clubs/entertainment venues when you are in your home?

- 2008\% ■ 2007\%


Base: 2,131 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 2,138 British adults, April 2007

## Noise from commercial premises/activities

To what extent, if at all, are you personally bothered, annoyed or disturbed by commercial premises/activities when you are in your home?

- 2008\% - 2007\%


Base: 2,131 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 2,138 British adults, April 2007

## Sub-group differences

- The following groups are more likely to say they are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by neighbour noise, inside or outside their homes:
- Young people aged 15-34 (32\%, compared with 26\% overall).
- Londoners (33\%) and those in the North East (40\%).
- People living in private or social rented housing (31\% and $35 \%$ respectively, compared with $23 \%$ of owner occupiers).
- Those living in Wales are more likely to say they are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by noise from pubs/clubs/entertainment venues whilst at home (14\%, compared with 9\% overall).
- The following groups are more likely to say they are bothered, annoyed or disturbed by noise from commercial premises whilst at home:
- Londoners (16\%, compared with $10 \%$ overall)
- Private renters (14\%, compared with $10 \%$ overall).


## Sources of noise

- Participants were asked about the sources of noise that bother them in their neighbourhood*.
- As in 2007, 'cars/motorbikes' was the source cited most frequently (18\%). This is followed by 'car/burglar alarms' (12\%), 'fireworks' (12\%) and 'children' (12\%).
- Significantly fewer people say they are bothered by noise from any of these sources than in 2007 ( $61 \%$ and 70\% respectively).
- Reflecting this, there has been a significant drop in the proportion bothered by aeroplanes, fireworks and house parties (down 3 percentage points), car/burglar alarms and shouting/arguments (down 5 percentage points), and loud music - excluding parties - (down 8 percentage points).

[^0]
## Sources of noise (1)

Thinking about any noise or noises that bother you in your neighbourhood, which of the following, if any, is the source or sources of the disturbance?


Base: 1,053 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 1,060 British adults, April 2007

## Sources of noise (2)

Thinking about any noise or noises that bother you from your neighbours, which of the following, if any, is the source or sources of the disturbance?


Base: 1,078 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 1,078 British adults, April 2007; 1,962 British adults, March 2006

## Sub-group differences

- Those in the South of England are more likely to say that areoplanes are the source of noise disturbance ( $10 \%$, compared with $8 \%$ overall).
- People in Wales are more likely to be disturbed by animals such as sheep, cows, ducks and geese (5\%, compared with $1 \%$ overall).
- Those living in the South of England are most likely to identify one or more of these sources of noise (65\%, compared with 61\% overall).


## The effect of noise on quality of life

- Following an increase in the proportion whose quality of life was affected by noise in general between 2006 and 2007, the overall proportion who say their quality of life suffers from noise has fallen from $45 \%$ to $39 \%$.
- The proportion who say their quality of life suffers a great deal or a fair amount remains in line with findings from 2006, but is significantly lower than findings from 2007 (10\%, compared with $12 \%$ in 2007 and 10\% in 2006).


## Suffering from noise

Overall, to what degree, if at all, does your quality of life suffer from noise when you are at home?
$■ \%$ A great deal $\quad$ \% A fair amount $\quad \%$ Not very much ■ \% Not at all ■ \% Don't know


Base: 2,131 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 2,138 British adults, April 2007; 1,962 British adults, March 2006 Ipsos MORI

## Sub-group differences

- Those with children in their household are more likely to say their quality of life suffers from noise when they are at home (44\%, compared with $37 \%$ without children).
- Those living in England are more likely to say their quality of life suffers from noise than those in Scotland (41\% and 31\% respectively).
- Londoners are most likely to say their quality of life suffers from noise (50\%, compared with 39\% across Great Britain overall).
- Council tenants are also more likely to say their quality of life suffers from noise (46\%, compared with $39 \%$ overall).


## The effects of neighbour noise

- Whilst 4\% of the public say they have argued with a neighbour about the noise they were making, only $2 \%$ say that a neighbour has argued with them about the noise they were making. These findings are in line with those from 2006 and 2007.
- Most people (by default) do not think they make more or less noise than their neighbours (72\%), whilst 17\% think they make less noise than their neighbours and $11 \%$ think they make more noise.
- One in eight (13\%) say they have been woken up by noise caused by neighbours in the past year and one in 12 (8\%) say they have been kept awake by neighbour noise.
- A small but substantial number of people have moved house because of noisy neighbours (1\%), reflecting the serious impact that neighbour noise can have on people's quality of life.


## The effects of neighbour noise

## Thinking about the past year, which, if any, of the following apply to you?

- 2008\% - 2007\% - 2006\%


Base: 2,131 British adults, 17-22 April 2008; 2,138 British adults, April 2007; 1,962 British adults, March 2006 Ipsos MORI

## Sub-group differences

- Reflecting the bigger impact that noise has on council tenants, this group are more likely to say that they have been woken up by noise caused by neighbours (19\% vs. $13 \%$ overall), kept awake by noise from neighbours ( $16 \%$ vs. $8 \%$ overall), and argued with a neighbour about the noise they were making ( $9 \%$ vs. $4 \%$ overall).
- Private tenants are more likely to say they have moved because of noisy neighbours, (4\% vs. 1\% overall) perhaps reflecting the greater ease with which they are able to do so.


## Quiet places

- Only $1 \%$ say there are no quiet areas where they live.
- Over half (57\%) have a quiet garden
- Around a third consider nearby countryside (38\%) or their local park (32\%) to be quiet, while $35 \%$ say their street is quiet.
- However, fewer people this year consider the following places near to where they live to be quiet: nearby countryside ( $38 \%$, compared with $44 \%$ in 2007), woods ( $28 \%$, compared with $32 \%$ in 2007), local park ( $32 \%$, compared with $36 \%$ in 2007), churchyard ( $17 \%$ compared with $26 \%$ in 2007), waterway ( $12 \%$, compared with $18 \%$ in 2007) and beach ( $6 \%$, compared with $10 \%$ in 2007).
- In addition, fewer people say their street is quiet ( $35 \%$, compared with $38 \%$ in 2007).


## Quite areas

Using this card, which, if any, of the following open outdoor areas near to where you live do you consider to be quiet?

- 2008\% ■ 2007\%



## Sub-group differences

- Older people (aged 55+) are more likely to have access to a quiet garden (69\%), churchyard (23\%), woods (32\%), and countryside (45\%).
- Those in the managerial and professional social classes (A\&B) are also more likely to have access to quiet places, including a quiet garden (63\%), local park (35\%), churchyard (21\%), woods (38\%), countryside (49\%), beach (9\%), and waterway (18\%). They are also more likely to live on a quiet street (39\%, compared with $35 \%$ overall).
- Council tenants are most likely to have no access to quiet places ( $3 \%$, compared to $1 \%$ overall say there are no quiet areas where they live and one in eight (12\%) do not have access to a quiet garden, local park, street, churchyard, wood, countryside, beach or waterway).


## Appendices

## Technical Details

## Sample Design

There are 628 Parliamentary Constituencies in Great Britain. From these, around 210 are selected to be used as the main sampling points on the Social Issues Omnibus. These are chosen to be representative of the whole country by region, class, voting patterns and other variables. Within each constituency, a ward or ward-sized area containing between 3,500 and 8,000 addresses is selected to represent the socio-demographic makeup of the constituency. Interviewers approach a different set of addresses each time, with the mapped area ensuring representativeness. Within each point, ten respondents are interviewed. Respondents are selected by means of a 10 -cell quota with which the interviewer has been provided.

Quotas are devised by an analysis of the 2001 Census and RegistrarGeneral's mid-year estimates. In each area, quotas represent the makeup of that area. Overall, quotas ensure that the demographic profile of the sample matches the actual profile of the country. The sample is thus representative of all adults in Great Britain aged $15+$. The total sample set is $10 \times 210$ sample points $=2100$. From this we interview around 2,000 adults. The data is then weighted to ensure a representative sample.

## Fieldwork

Fieldwork is carried out by Ipsos MORI using CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing). All interviews are conducted face-to-face, in the home - one interview per household. No incentives are offered to respondents.

## Weighting and Data Processing

Data entry and analysis are carried out in-house by Ipsos MORI. The data are weighted using 6 sets of simple and interlocking rim weights for social grade, standard region, unemployment within region, cars in household, and age and working status within gender. This is to adjust for any variance in the quotas or coverage of individual sampling points so that the sample is representative of the UK adult population.

## Questionnaire Design

Questions were developed by Ipsos MORI in consultation with Environmental Protection UK. A marked-up questionnaire is appended.

## Statistical Reliability

Because a sample, rather than the entire population, was interviewed the percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances - which vary with the size of the sample and the percentage figure concerned. For example, for a question where $50 \%$ of the people in a (weighted) sample of 2,131 respond with a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that this result would not vary more than two percentage points, plus or minus, from the result that would have been obtained from a census of the entire population (using the same procedures). An indication of approximate sampling tolerances is given in the table below.

| Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or <br> near <br> these levels (at the $95 \%$ confidence level) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ or <br> $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ <br> $\pm$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ or $\mathbf{7 0 \%}$ <br> $\pm$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ <br> $\pm$ |
| Size of sample or sub-group <br> on which survey result is <br> based |  |  |  |
| 2,131 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 1,078 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |

Strictly speaking the tolerances shown here apply only to random samples; in practice good quality quota sampling has been found to be as accurate.

Tolerances are also involved in the comparison of results between different elements of the sample. A difference must be of at least a certain size to be statistically significant. The following table is a guide to the sampling tolerances applicable to comparisons between sub-groups.

| Differences required for significance at the 95\% confidence level <br> at or near these percentages |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ or $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ or $\mathbf{7 0 \%} \%$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |
| 1,000 (men) vs. 1,131 (women) | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 491 (social class AB) vs. 613 (social <br> class C1) | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Source: Ipsos MORI |  |  |  |

## Definition of Social Grades

The grades detailed below are the social class definitions as used by the Institute of Practitioners in Advertising, and are standard on all surveys carried out by MORI (Market \& Opinion Research International Limited).

|  | Social Class | Occupation of Chief Income Earner |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Upper Middle <br> Class | Higher managerial, administrative or <br> professional |
| B | Middle Class | Intermediate managerial, administrative <br> or professional |
| C1 | Lower Middle <br> Class | Supervisor or clerical and junior <br> managerial, administrative or <br> professional |
| C2 | Skilled Working <br> Class | Skilled manual workers |$|$| D |
| :--- |
| Working Class |
| Semi and unskilled manual workers |

Ipsos MORI


[^0]:    *To allow for tracking since 2006 and to add new sources of noise to the showcard list, two versions of this question were asked to each half of the total sample.

