

---

# Bexhill Destination Benchmarking Survey 2006

---

December 2006

**Prepared by:**  
**TSE Research Service**  
**40 Chamberlayne Road**  
**Eastleigh**  
**Hampshire**  
**SO50 5JH**

---

# CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 Destination Benchmarking.....	4
1.3 Sample Sizes.....	6
1.4 Statistical Reliability .....	6
1.5 Presentation of Results.....	- 7 -
1.6 Definitions .....	7
<b>2. VISITOR PROFILE.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Visitor Type – Day or Staying .....	8
2.2 Group Size and Composition.....	8
2.3 Part of an organised group? .....	9
2.4 Age.....	9
2.5 Socio-economic Group .....	10
2.6 Origin of Visitors.....	11
2.7 Accommodation .....	13
<b>3. CHARACTERISTICS OF VISIT .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Purpose of visit .....	14
3.2 Length of stay .....	14
3.3 Repeat visit .....	15
3.4 Main form of transportation used.....	15
3.5 Places of interest visited .....	16
<b>4. VISITOR AWARENESS AND PERCEPTION .....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 Promotional Material seen prior to visit.....	17
4.2 Websites consulted.....	17
4.3 Influence of factors on decision to visit .....	18
4.4 Particular likes.....	19
4.5 Dislikes.....	20
4.6 Meeting expectations .....	21
<b>5. VISITOR EXPENDITURE.....</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1 All visitors – by category of expenditure .....	22
5.2 Day visitors – by category of expenditure.....	22
5.3 Staying visitors – by category of expenditure .....	22
<b>6. VISITOR OPINIONS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
6.1 Accommodation .....	24
6.2 Attractions .....	25
6.3 Places to eat and drink .....	26
6.4 Shops.....	28
6.5 Ease of finding way around .....	29
6.6 Parks and streets.....	31
6.7 Public toilets.....	32
6.8 Cleanliness of sea and beach.....	34
6.9 Public seating.....	35
6.10 Choice of nightlife .....	35
6.11 Feeling safe from crime and traffic .....	36
6.12 General atmosphere and feeling of welcome .....	37
6.13 Overall enjoyment of visit/recommendation of visit .....	38
6.14 De La Warr Pavilion .....	39
<b>APPENDIX 1.....</b>	<b>40</b>

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This face-to-face survey of 418 visitors to Bexhill was conducted between July and October 2006 at selected locations around the town.
  - Day visitors accounted for 76% of all visitors, 53% being day visitors from home and 23% being day visitors from holiday bases outside Bexhill. The remaining 24% of visitors were staying overnight in commercial or non-commercial accommodation within the Bexhill area.
  - The average size of all visitor groups surveyed was 2.37 people. 83% of all visitor groups surveyed consisted of adults only, while 17% of all groups included one or more children. The single largest visitor group composition was 2 adults (53%).
  - 95% of visitors to Bexhill were travelling independently, whereas the remaining 5% were part of an organised group. In 2005, 98% of visitors travelled independently.
  - 48% of visitors to Bexhill were aged over 55 years, and 13% were children. Only 10% were aged between 16 and 34 years. The proportions reported in 2005 were also very similar.
  - 68% of visitors fell into the most affluent 'ABC1' socio-economic group, which is a higher figure than that recorded in 2005 as only 57% were found in this socio-economic grouping.
  - Almost 95% of all visitors were domestic visitors, and the remainder were visitors from overseas.
  - The highest proportion of visitors had travelled from homes in Kent (22%), East Sussex (21%), and Greater London (16%).
  - The six main countries of origin of overseas visitors were Australia, Germany, Canada, France, Spain and Sweden.
  - 47% of staying visitors in Bexhill were staying at the homes of friends and relatives and 24% were staying in hotels and B&Bs.
  - The majority of visitors described their visit to Bexhill as a holiday or leisure based visit (59%). 22% were visiting friends or relatives, 15% were visiting the De La Warr Pavilion, 2% were on a special shopping trip and 2% were on business. In comparison, in 2005 77% of visitors were on a leisure pursuit and 21% were visiting friends and relatives.
  - The average length of stay for staying visitors was around 6.28 nights, and for day visitors was 3.02 hours which are similar amounts of time to those recorded in the survey carried out the previous year.
  - Over three quarters of all visitors surveyed had visited Bexhill previously (77%). A similar figure was recorded in 2005 (75%).
  - 79% of visitors had travelled to Bexhill by private car, van, motorcycle or motorhome, whilst 10% of all visitors indicated that they had used the train. The car was also the most popular method of travel in 2005 as 85% reported to have used this mode of transportation.
  - The De La Warr Pavilion was the most popular place to visit whilst in Bexhill, as it was visited by 85% of respondents.
-

- Visitors were most likely to recall seeing De La Warr Pavilion press or media coverage as a form of promotion for Bexhill (12%), and 7% of visitors had used the internet to access information about the town before their arrival.
  - The beaches and seafront (58%), the scenic environment (46%) and the peace and quiet (44%) were the most important factors that influenced the visitor's decision to come to Bexhill.
  - 32% of visitors stated that they particularly liked the promenade and seafront in Bexhill, whereas 23% were not happy about the poor weather they experienced during their visit.
  - 86% of visitors stated that their trip met their expectations, whereas 11% said that it had exceeded them.
  - The average spend per visitor per trip (including spend on all accommodation) was approximately £41. For day visitors (not including expenditure on accommodation), the equivalent spend was £28 and for staying visitors it was £38.
  - Mixed levels of satisfaction were found among visitors to Bexhill on the various indicators which together comprise the 'visitor experience'. The highest scoring indicators related to accommodation, the ease of finding their way around, the upkeep of parks, open spaces and the cleanliness of streets, beaches and the sea, the availability of public seating and the feeling of safety from crime and traffic.
  - The lowest scoring indicators related to the attractions, the eating and drinking establishments, the shops and the quality of the shopping environment, the public toilets and the choice of nightlife in Bexhill.
  - 90% of visitors rated the overall enjoyment of their visit as 'high' or 'very high', and also 90% rated the likelihood of them recommending Bexhill to others as either 'likely' or 'very likely'. Exactly the same percentages were reported in 2005.
  - With regards to the De La Warr Pavilion, the features that the visitors preferred were the events and performances, the information service, and the overall experience. Mixed opinions were offered on the exhibitions, the food and drink establishment and the shopping experience.
-

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

This report presents the findings of a face-to-face survey of visitors to Bexhill conducted between July and October 2006. A random sample of 418 visitors was interviewed at selected locations around the town during this period (see Table 1.2 below).

**TABLE 1.1: MONTHLY SAMPLE OBTAINED**

<i>Month</i>	<i>% of Sample</i>
August	42
September	40
October	18

**TABLE 1.2: LOCATION OF INTERVIEWS**

<i>Location</i>	<i>% of Sample</i>
Seafront	63
Outside De La Warr Pavilion	36
Old Town	1

### 1.2 DESTINATION BENCHMARKING

During 2006, the Regional Tourist Boards conducted surveys in 15 destinations throughout England to obtain visitors' opinions of a wide range of factors or indicators which together comprise the 'visitor experience'.

Each factor or indicator was rated on a range of one to five, where 1= 'very poor' (or the most negative response), 2= 'poor', 3= 'average', 4= 'good' and 5= 'very good' (or the most positive response), allowing an opinion score (out of a maximum of five) to be calculated.

A standardised methodology was used, in terms of the interviewing period, minimum sample size and questionnaire design (see Appendix 1 for an example of the questionnaire). This allows direct comparisons to be made between the results for individual destinations and the average and highest ('max') scores from all surveys conducted as well as the average and highest scores obtained in certain types of destination (e.g. seaside resorts). Due to slight differences in questionnaire content, base size (i.e. number of destinations responding) may alter between questions.

The standard factors used to ensure quality and consistency includes:

- Face-to-face interviewing surveys using trained interviewers over a core period of June/July to September/October, carried out among non-residents.
- Sampling using 400 or more interviews at times which reflect visitor usage.
- Standard core questionnaire.
- Reporting the benchmarking data in a standard format, providing destinations with their own scores, together with average scores for their comparable type of destination – in this case resorts.

Destinations taking part in 2006 are shown overleaf, along with additional destinations that took part in the 2005 and 2004 surveys.

---

This year the average scores are based on all destinations that have taken part in 2004, 2005 and 2006. By introducing this three year 'rolling average', the sample in destination types where participation in the scheme is low will increase, giving a more accurate 'benchmark' with which to compare.

### **Seaside Resorts**

<b><u>2006</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b><u>2004</u></b>
Southport	Southport	Southport
Burnham-on-Sea	Blackpool	Newquay
Bexhill	Falmouth	Cornish Riviera
Southend	Torbay	Bognor Regis
Cleethorpes	Weston-Super-Mare	Margate
	Hastings	Southend
	Bexhill	Great Yarmouth
	Great Yarmouth	
	Bridlington	

### **Historic Towns/Cities**

<b><u>2006</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b><u>2004</u></b>
Lancaster/Morecambe	Colchester	Chester
Tamworth	Oxford	Worcester
Bath	Stratford upon Avon	Durham
Salisbury		Bath
York		Windsor
Norwich		Arundel
Rochester		Salisbury
Colchester		Colchester

### **Large Towns/Cities**

<b><u>2006</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b><u>2004</u></b>
Liverpool	Birmingham	Manchester
St Helens	Coventry	Liverpool
	Walsall	Derby
	Bristol	Newcastle
	Beverley	Gateshead
		Plymouth
		Portsmouth
		Peterborough

In Section 6, the mean opinion scores for Bexhill compared with the mean scores for all resorts and all destinations are provided, and for each indicator, the average percentages of 'very good', 'good', 'fair', 'poor' 'very poor' (or the equivalent) are shown for all destinations and resorts. For Bexhill, the actual percentages are also shown.

---

### 1.3 SAMPLE SIZES

Mean opinion scores and percentages have been calculated using amalgamated data from surveys conducted in the destinations listed above. Each destination has been given an equal weighting.

Sample sizes varied significantly between indicators, (because visitors were more likely to use or experience, and therefore comment on, certain facilities, services or features than others) and also varied between destinations. In almost all cases, sample sizes exceeded 50 respondents, but where the sample size is less, the results relating to these indicators should be interpreted with caution. The average sample size (or 'base') for each indicator has been put into the relevant tables for all resorts and all destinations.

As a general guide when using a five point scale (i.e.: samples of 100 – 1000), there must be a difference of at least 0.2 between two mean scores for this to be significant.

### 1.4 STATISTICAL RELIABILITY

All sample surveys are subject to statistical error that varies with the sample size. The margins of error associated with the sample of 418 interviews in Bexhill are shown in Table 1.3 below.

**TABLE 1.3: MARGINS OF ERROR (%) AT 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL**

		10% or	20% or	30% or	40% or	50%
<i>At 95% confidence interval</i>		90%	80%	70%	60%	
	Sample	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
<b>Bexhill</b>	418	2.9	3.8	4.4	4.7	4.8

This means, for example, we can be 95% certain that if 20% of the sample is found to have a particular characteristic or view, there is an estimated 95% chance that the true population percentage lies in the range of +/-3.8% i.e. between 16.2% and 23.8%.

The margins of error shown above should be kept in mind when interpreting the results contained in this report.

### 1.5 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The key findings in this report are presented under the following headings:

- Visitor profile
- Characteristics of visit
- Visitor awareness and perception
- Visitor expenditure
- Visitor opinions

Key findings generally refer to all visitors, although commentary is provided where there is a significant difference between visitor types (e.g. day and staying visitors).

## 1.6 DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this report, visitors to Bexhill are divided into three main types:

*'Day visitors from home'* – visitors who had travelled to Bexhill from their homes outside the area and were returning there on the same day of the interview.

*'Day visitors on holiday'* – visitors travelling to Bexhill for the day from holiday bases outside the area.

*'Staying visitors'* – visitors staying overnight in accommodation in Bexhill.

---



## 2 VISITOR PROFILE

### 2.1 VISITOR TYPE - DAY OR STAYING

Of the 418 visitors interviewed, 314 (76%) were day visitors. The majority of these (221, 53%) were day visitors from home, while 96 (23%) were day visitors from holiday bases outside Bexhill. The remaining 101 (24%) of visitors were staying overnight in commercial or non-commercial accommodation within Bexhill. This can be seen in Figure 2.1.

**Error! Not a valid link.**

As can be seen in Table 2.1, Bexhill has significantly more day visitors and fewer staying visitors than all resorts and all destinations in 2006. The distribution in 2005 was very similar to this year.

**TABLE 2.1: VISITOR TYPE (ALL VISITORS) (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
DAY VISITORS	76	62	69	75
STAYING VISITORS	24	38	31	25

Base: 418 Bexhill visitors

### 2.2 GROUP SIZE AND COMPOSITION

In Bexhill, visitor groups contained 2.37 persons on average. This is slightly lower than the averages for all resorts and all destinations, and is slightly lower than the figure seen in 2005. Table 2.2 also shows that Bexhill's visitor groups contain slightly less children than the average for all resorts and destinations.

**TABLE 2.2: AVERAGE GROUP SIZE (ALL VISITORS) (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
CHILDREN	0.30	0.56	0.42	0.36
ADULTS	2.07	2.17	2.06	2.20
TOTAL PEOPLE	2.37	2.74	2.48	2.55

Base: 418 Bexhill visitors

83% of all visiting groups to Bexhill contained adults only. Among groups containing children, the most popular group composition was two adults with two or more children (6% of total sample). As can be seen on Table 2.3 below, the group composition has also been broken down by visitor type.

**TABLE 2.3: GROUP COMPOSITION**

	All	Day visitor from home	Day visitor on holiday	Staying visitor
One adult	18%	21%	10%	18%
Two adults	53%	50%	60%	50%
Three adults	8%	9%	10%	4%
Four adults	3%	5%	2%	1%
Five or more adults	1%	0%	1%	1%
One adult & one child	1%	1%	-	-
One adult & two or more children	0%	0%	-	1%
Two adults & one child	5%	4%	5%	6%
Two adults & two or more children	6%	4%	4%	11%
Three adults & one child	2%	0%	3%	3%

Three adults & two or more children	2%	3%	-	3%
Four adults & one or more children	2%	2%	2%	2%
More than four adults & one or more children	0%	-	1%	-

Base: 418 Bexhill visitors

### 2.3 PART OF AN ORGANISED GROUP?

Compared to other resorts and destinations, relatively fewer visitors to Bexhill were part of an organised group (see Table 2.4 below). There has in fact been an increase in the number of people visiting Bexhill as part of an organised group since 2005.

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
YES	5	11	9	2
NO	95	89	91	98

Base: 413 Bexhill visitors

### 2.4 AGE

Given the high proportion of groups containing adults only, it is not surprising to find that only 13% of visitors were children (aged 0 to 15). The age of visitors is largely concentrated towards the older ages with 48% of visitors aged above 55 years. Only 10% of visitors were between 16 and 34 years.

**Error! Not a valid link.**

Table 2.5 demonstrates the split of visitors by age distribution and visitor type and also shows the comparative figures for 2005.

	All	Day visitor from home	Day visitor on holiday	Staying visitor	All (2005)
0-15 years	13	11	10	19	14
16-24 years	2	1	1	3	3
25-34 years	8	5	8	13	4
35-44 years	12	13	9	13	10
45-54 years	17	15	21	17	15
55-64 years	19	22	23	13	19
65-74 years	17	19	21	12	21
75+ years	12	15	8	11	12

Base: 418 Bexhill visitors

### 2.5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUP

The socio-economic profile of visitors to Bexhill is shown in Table 2.6. This profile is based on the occupation of the highest earner in the interviewee's household and takes into account the previous occupation of those who have retired.

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
AB	39	14	22	16
C1	29	29	33	41

C2	22	32	25	28
DE	10	25	20	15

*Base: 365 Bexhill visitors*

A larger proportion of visitors to Bexhill were in the ABC1 profile (68%), than the average for all resorts (43%). Fewer visitors were in the DE profile (10%) than the average for all resorts (25%) and all destinations (20%). A greater proportion of visitors were in the highest AB group in 2006 (39%) in comparison to 2005 (16%).

Table 2.7 below shows the employment status of the respondent's household's chief income earner. It can be seen that nearly all respondents were employed full time or were alternatively retired.

**TABLE 2.7: EMPLOYMENT STATUS (%)**

Employed full time	45
Retired	40
Self-employed	8
Employed part time	4
Unemployed	2
Declined	1
Full-time student living at home	0.5
Full-time living away	0.2

*Base: 411 Bexhill visitors*

## 2.6 ORIGIN OF VISITORS

The vast majority (94.7%) of visitors were domestic. As would be expected the majority of visitors are from the South East region and London. Table 2.8 below shows the most common origin of domestic visitors by county.

**TABLE 2.8: COUNTY OF ORIGIN (%)**

Kent	21.7
East Sussex	20.7
G. London	15.6
Surrey	9.7
West Sussex	4.6
Hertfordshire	3.1
Essex	2.6
Oxfordshire	1.8
Hampshire	1.5
Somerset (including Bristol)	1.5
Staffordshire	1.2
West Midlands	1.2
Cheshire	1.0
Lancashire	1.0
Yorkshire - West	1.0
Berkshire	0.7
Buckinghamshire	0.7
Cambridgeshire	0.7
Nottinghamshire	0.7

Worcestershire	0.7
Yorkshire - South	0.7

*Base: 415 Bexhill visitors*

5.3% of all visitors were from overseas, and the country of origin of these visitors can be seen in Table 2.9 overleaf.

<b>TABLE 2.9: COUNTRY OF ORIGIN (%)</b>	
Australia	17.4
Germany	13.0
Canada	8.7
France	8.7
Spain	8.7
Sweden	8.7
Austria	4.3
Belgium	4.3
Greece	4.3
Republic of Ireland	4.3
Switzerland	4.3
Egypt	4.3
Poland	4.3
South Africa	4.3

*Base: 415 Bexhill visitors*

The majority (93%) of staying visitors who were not staying in Bexhill were staying elsewhere in East Sussex. The remaining 7% were staying in Kent (5%), West Sussex (1%) and Greater London (1%). The actual towns that they were staying in can be seen on Table 2.10 below.

**TABLE 2.10: TOWN STAYING IN (%)**

Eastbourne	23
Hastings	12
Rye	8
St Leonards	7
Pevensey	6
Battle	4
Brighton	3
Camber	3
Heathfield	3
Lewes	2
Winchelsea	2
Sidley	2
Willingdon	2
Little Common	2
Sevenoaks	1
Tenterden	1
Ashburnham	1
Laughton	1
Crowborough	1
Stone Cross	1
Ninfield	1
Coulsdon	1
Crowhurst	1
Northiam	1
Peacehaven	1
Polegate	1
Golden Cross	1
Herstmonceux	1
Folkestone	1
Crawley	1
Maidstone	1

*Base: 90 Bexhill visitors*

## 2.7 ACCOMMODATION

The majority (47%) of staying visitors on holiday in Bexhill were staying at the home of friends or relatives, as they also were in 2005 (66%). Hotels and B&Bs (24%) were the next most popular choice of accommodation, but still represent a relatively low proportion especially in comparison to all resorts (43%) and all destinations (43%). In 2005 this figure was even lower at 15%. This shows that the popularity of hotels and bed and breakfasts has increased in Bexhill over the past year. The specific types of accommodation that were used are shown in Table 2.11.

**TABLE 2.11: TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION USED (ALL VISITORS) (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
HOTEL	13	28	30	6
B&B/GUEST HOUSE	11	15	13	9
PUB/INN	1	0	1	0
RENTED SELF CATERING	4	9	6	8
TOURING CARAVAN	4	5	3	6

STATIC CARAVAN – OWNED	10	5	2	0
STATIC CARAVAN – RENTED	2	8	4	1
CAMPING	2	3	2	1
YOUTH HOSTEL	0	0	2	0
NARROWBOAT/BOAT/ YACHT	0	0	1	0
HOLIDAY CENTRE/VILLAGE	2	7	3	0
LANGUAGE SCHOOL	0	0	0	0
HOME OF FRIEND/RELATIVE	47	19	30	66
TIMESHARE	0	0	0	0
UNIVERSITY	1	0	2	0
SECOND HOME	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
OTHER	1	1	2	3

*Base: 195 Bexhill visitors*

### 3 CHARACTERISTICS OF VISIT

#### 3.1 PURPOSE OF VISIT

A high proportion of visitors (58%) were visiting Bexhill for leisure or holiday purposes; however a significant proportion were visiting friends and relatives (22%) or the De La Warr Pavilion (15%).

**Error! Not a valid link.**

Table 3.1 compares Bexhill with all resorts and all destinations and the results from 2005. In comparison to other resorts and destinations, Bexhill has more visitors that come to see friends and relatives, and fewer that are on a holiday or leisure pursuit. The proportion of those on a leisure visit has actually decreased in Bexhill since 2005.

**TABLE 3.1: PURPOSE OF VISIT (ALL VISITORS) (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
LEISURE/ HOLIDAY	59	88	72	77
VISITING FRIENDS/RELATIVES	22	7	11	21
VISING DLWP	15	n/a	n/a	n/a
SPECIAL SHOPPING TRIP	2	3	12	2
BUSINESS/ CONFERENCE	2	0	2	1
LANGUAGE STUDENT	0	0	1	0
OTHER	0	0	1	0

Base: 402 Bexhill visitors

#### 3.2 LENGTH OF STAY

Table 3.2 below compares the Bexhill visitors' length of stay with all resorts, all destinations and the figures from 2005. Day visitors to Bexhill stayed for fewer hours than visitors to all resorts and destinations. The length of stay of staying visitors is slightly longer than for all resorts and destinations. The 2005 figures are very similar to those recorded in Bexhill in 2006.

**TABLE 3.2: AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (ALL VISITORS) (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
DAY VISIT (HOURS)	3.02	4.89	4.62	3.01
STAYING VISIT (NIGHTS)	6.28	6.02	5.40	6.51

Base: 391 Bexhill visitors

#### 3.3 REPEAT VISIT

Approximately three-quarters (77%) of visitors had visited Bexhill on a previous occasion prior to this visit. The distribution in all resorts (81% visited before), all destinations (75% visited before) and 2005 are similar to Bexhill this year. On average, visitors had 4.96 previous day trips in the last 12 months and coincidentally also 4.96 previous staying visits in the last five years in Bexhill.

**TABLE 3.3: FIRST TIME/REPEAT VISITORS (ALL VISITORS) (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
FIRST EVER VISIT	23	19	25	25
REPEAT VISIT	77	81	75	75

Base: 418 Bexhill visitors

### 3.4 MAIN FORM OF TRANSPORTATION USED

As shown in Figure 3.2, the majority of visitors (79%) to Bexhill travelled by car, van, motorcycle or motor home. 10% of respondents reported to have travelled by train.

**Error! Not a valid link.**

Table 3.4 below compares the transportation used to reach Bexhill with that in all resorts, all destinations and the 2005 figures. Other resorts had more visitors walking and travelling as part of a coach tour than Bexhill. For most destinations, including Bexhill, the car, van, motorcycle or motor-home is the main type of transport used, and was also the most popular back in 2005.

<b>TABLE 3.4: TYPE OF TRANSPORT (ALL VISITORS) (%)</b>				
	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
CAR / VAN / MOTORCYCLE / MOTORHOME	79	65	61	85
BUS/COACH SERVICE	6	8	13	4
COACH TOUR	2	8	6	2
BICYCLE	1	0	0	0
TRAIN/TRAM	10	9	11	9
WALKED	1	7	5	0
OTHER	2	2	3	0

*Base: 418 Bexhill visitors*

### 3.5 PLACES OF INTEREST VISITED

The most popular places to visit whilst in Bexhill were the De La Warr Pavilion (85%), Eastbourne (27%) and Battle (16%). All responses are shown in Figure 3.3 below.

**Error! Not a valid link.**

*Base: 343 Bexhill visitors*



## 4 VISITOR AWARENESS AND PERCEPTION

### 4.1 PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL SEEN PRIOR TO VISIT

Figure 4.1 below displays the promotional material visitors saw prior to their visit to Bexhill. Press and media coverage for the De La Warr Pavilion was the most commonly reported (12%), followed by websites (7%).

**Error! Not a valid link.** *Base: 417 Bexhill visitors*

Other types of features that were seen (3% of total sample) are shown in Table 4.1 below.

**TABLE 4.1: OTHER TYPE OF FEATURE, ADVERTISEMENT OR PROMOTION SEEN**

	<i>Count</i>
Country File	2
Posters	2
English Heritage Information	1
Coach Station Outings	1
Poirot	1
Library book	1
Children of Men film	1
Brighton Biennial	1
Cooden Station leaflets	1

*Base: 11 Bexhill visitors*

### 4.2 WEBSITES CONSULTED

The websites that were viewed prior to the respondent's visit to Bexhill are shown in Table 4.2 overleaf. The most visited websites were Bexhill-on-Sea (by 45% of visitors) and the De La Warr Pavilion (41%). The comparative figures for 2005 are also shown. It can be seen that more people visited the DLWP website prior to their visit in 2006 than they did in 2005, and fewer people visited the 1066 country website in 2006 than they did in 2005.

**TABLE 4.2: WEBSITES SEEN FOR BEXHILL PRIOR TO THIS VISIT (%)**

	2006	2005
Bexhill-on-Sea	45	27
De La Warr Pavilion	41	7
1066 Country	23	40
Visit Hastings	9	20
Visit South East England	9	0
Visit Rye	5	0
English Rose	5	0
Unknown	5	0
Accommodation in Hastings	0	7
Battle Tourism	0	7
Bexhill Chamber of Commerce	0	-
Visit England/Britain	0	7
Visit Sussex	0	20

*Base: 22 Bexhill visitors – 2006; 21 Bexhill visitors 2005*

### 4.3 INFLUENCE OF FACTORS ON DECISION TO VISIT

The most important factors that influenced visitors to come to Bexhill were the beaches and seafront (58%), the scenic environment (46%) and the peace and quiet (44%), as represented by the green bars on Figure 4.2 overleaf.

The factors that were considered not important at all were good evening entertainment or activities (68%), plenty of things for children to see and do (62%) and the availability of special offers (58%), as represented by the yellow bars on Figure 4.2 below. These may be attributed to an older age profile and small proportion of visitors with children in their group. All the influencing factors are displayed on Figure 4.2.

**Error! Not a valid link.** *Base: 416 Bexhill visitors*

### 4.4 PARTICULAR LIKES

Visitors were asked to discuss what they particularly liked about Bexhill. The most commonly mentioned features are shown in Table 4.3 below.

Promenade/Seafront	32
Peace and quiet	22
De La Warr Pavilion	18
The sea	10
Cleanliness/good maintenance	9
Atmosphere/air	8
Good for walking	5
Laid back/relaxed	5
Old fashioned	4
The scenery	4
Unspoilt	4
Uncommercialised	4
Easy to park	3
Visiting family/friends here	3
Shops	2
Friendly people	2
Everything	2
Not crowded	2
No crime/feel safe	2
For older people	1
Greenery/parks	1
Lots to do	1

*Base: 418 Bexhill visitors*

In comparison, in 2005 the most liked aspects of Bexhill were also the peace and quiet followed by the seafront and beach. In third place, the cleanliness and good maintenance of the town was noted where as this year this had dropped to fifth. The DLWP is now the third most liked aspect of Bexhill.

### 4.5 DISLIKES

Similarly, visitors were asked if anything had spoilt their visit to Bexhill. 34% of respondents replied, and all the factors that were mentioned are documented in Table 4.4 below. These are presented as verbatim responses.

Weather	23
DLWP café expensive and poor quality	16
Not enough public toilets + signage	7
Exhibition in DLWP	7
Dogs/dogs mess	6
Cycling on promenade	6
Road system complicated	4
De La Warr Pavilion	4
No TIC	4
Shingles	3
Skateboarders	3
Uneven pavements	2
Football on promenade	2
Not enough pubs	2
Vandalism	1
Lack of entertainment	1
Too many beach huts	1
Open drains	1
Expensive prices on Oxford Street	1
No exhibition at DLWP	1
Not enough litter bins	1
Car drivers	1
DLWP lost its fun – too quiet now	1
Residents complaining about parking on streets	1
Lack of local focus in DLWP	1
No concessions for disabled	1
Not enough seating	1
No tide signs	1
Recycling areas dirty	1
Shops are old fashioned	1
Shabby streets	1
Lack of disabled toilet facilities	1
Red flags meant could not go in café	1
Nothing for children	1
No bus on seafront	1
Not enough greenery	1
Lack of pram-friendly cafés	1
Parking expensive	1
Some shops have gone	1

*Base: 141 Bexhill visitors*

In 2005, the three most disliked aspects of Bexhill were the DLWP being closed, the toilets and eating out. In 2006, the toilets were also mentioned, but no one had visited the town when the Pavilion was closed. The weather was most commonly cited as having a negative impact on their visit this year.

**4.6 MEETING EXPECTATIONS**

Visitors to Bexhill were asked whether their overall visit had exceeded, met or failed to meet their expectations. The results can be seen on Table 4.5 below. Table 4.4 above gives the likely reasons as to why 3% of visitors said that the trip failed to meet their expectations.

---

**TABLE 4.5: EXPECTATIONS (%)**

---

Exceeded expectations	11
Met expectations	86
Failed to meet expectations	3

---

*Base: 391 Bexhill visitors*

## 5 VISITOR EXPENDITURE

Tables 5.1 to 5.3 give the visitor expenditure figures for Bexhill for all visitors, and also split by day and staying visitors.

### 5.1 ALL VISITORS - BY CATEGORY OF EXPENDITURE

The average spend total in Bexhill was lower than all resorts and destinations. The average expenditure on all accommodation is around three pounds higher than that in all resorts and destinations. The amounts spent on eating and drinking and entertainment are lower than the average seen in other resorts and in all destinations. Less money was spent on shopping than it was in other resorts and destinations. This excludes a large purchase (£3,700) recorded for one respondent whilst they were shopping in Bexhill so the average is not skewed. The travel and transportation expenditure is a similar figure to that for all resorts and destinations. The equivalent figures for 2005 were unavailable.

**TABLE 5.1: AVERAGE EXPENDITURE IN BEXHILL PER PERSON (ALL VISITORS)**

<i>Category of expenditure (£)</i>	<i>Average Spend Bexhill 2006</i>	<i>Average spend 'All Resorts'</i>	<i>Average spend 'All Destinations'</i>	<i>Average Spend Bexhill 2005</i>
All accommodation	£23.89	£20.62	£20.98	n/a
Eating/Drinking	£6.67	£7.71	£8.24	n/a
Shopping	£7.43	£8.74	£12.42	n/a
Entertainment	£0.27	£3.50	£3.41	n/a
Travel	£2.66	£2.50	£2.83	n/a
Average spend total	£40.92	£49.87	£57.53	n/a

### 5.2 DAY VISITORS - BY CATEGORY OF EXPENDITURE

Day visitors had a higher average total spend than in other resorts, all destinations and also in comparison to the 2005 figures. The eating and drinking expenditure is very similar to other resorts and all destinations and the amount spent on travel is slightly greater. The shopping expenditure is higher than all resorts but lower than all destinations and also lower than the figure recorded in 2005. The 2006 figure also excludes the £3,700 spent by one visitor on a special shopping trip. The entertainment figure is noticeably low and has even decreased somewhat since 2005.

**TABLE 5.2: AVERAGE EXPENDITURE IN BEXHILL PER PERSON (DAY VISITORS)**

<i>Category of expenditure (£)</i>	<i>Average Spend Bexhill 2006</i>	<i>Average spend 'All Resorts'</i>	<i>Average spend 'All Destinations'</i>	<i>Average Spend Bexhill 2005</i>
Eating/Drinking	£6.69	£7.23	£6.87	£6.60
Shopping	£10.29	£8.88	£12.28	£11.48
Entertainment	£0.18	£3.18	£2.98	£2.51
Travel	£3.60	£2.57	£2.74	£2.58
Average spend total	£20.76	£21.86	£24.87	£23.17

### 5.3 STAYING VISITORS - BY CATEGORY OF EXPENDITURE

Staying visitors had a lower total average spend in comparison to the figures recorded in other resorts and all destinations. Slightly less was spent on commercial accommodation than it was elsewhere and also in 2005. The other four categories of expenditure have also decreased this year in comparison to 2005 (eating and drinking, shopping, entertainment and travel), as well as being lower than in other resorts and all destinations in 2006.

**TABLE 5.3: AVERAGE EXPENDITURE IN BEXHILL PER PERSON (STAYING VISITORS)**

<i>Category of expenditure (£)</i>	<i>Average Spend Bexhill 2006</i>	<i>Average spend 'All Resorts'</i>	<i>Average spend 'All Destinations'</i>	<i>Average Spend Bexhill 2005</i>
Commercial accommodation	£23.89	£27.42	£30.63	£29.62
Eating/Drinking	£6.65	£11.10	£13.09	£12.38
Shopping	£5.11	£8.97	£13.74	£13.79
Entertainment	£0.34	£4.00	£4.72	£4.15
Travel	£1.70	£2.53	£3.39	£3.26
Average spend total	£37.69	£54.02	£65.57	£62.94

## 6 VISITOR OPINIONS

Visitors to Bexhill were asked to score on a scale of 1 to 5 their opinion of various aspects of their trip, where 1= 'very poor' (or the most negative response), 2 = 'poor', 3= 'average', 4= 'good' and 5= 'very good' (or the most positive response), allowing a mean opinion score (out of a maximum of five) to be calculated. The results, and the comparisons with all resorts and all destinations, are provided in this section.

### 6.1 ACCOMMODATION

#### Quality of Service

Visitors were impressed with the quality of service found whilst staying in commercial accommodation in Bexhill, with 85% of all visitors rating the quality of service as either 'good' or 'very good'. This is very similar to the ratings seen in all resorts and all destinations (see Table 6.1). This provides an overall satisfaction mean score of 4.42 and is higher than the all resort and all destination scores (see Figure 6.1). In comparison to 2005, fewer visitors viewed the quality of service as 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.1: ACCOMMODATION RATINGS (%) – QUALITY OF SERVICE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	26	142	102	-
Very good	58	59	54	78
Good	27	27	30	22
Average	12	11	12	0
Poor	4	3	2	0
Very Poor	0	1	1	0

#### Value for money

Visitors were also pleased with the accommodation value for money. 81% of all visitors rated it as either 'good' or 'very good', as can be seen in Table 6.2. The distribution of percentages is similar between Bexhill, all resorts and all destinations. Figure 6.1 shows the mean score as being 4.35 for Bexhill. This is again slightly higher than all resorts and destinations. In comparison to 2005, fewer visitors viewed the value of money as 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.2: ACCOMMODATION RATINGS (%) – VALUE FOR MONEY**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	26	181	117	-
Very good	58	53	48	75
Good	23	30	32	22
Average	15	13	14	3
Poor	4	3	4	0
Very Poor	0	1	1	0

#### **Error! Not a valid link.**

These figures should be interpreted with caution as the sample size for the Bexhill accommodation opinion data is below 50 respondents.

### 6.2 ATTRACTIONS

#### Range

60% of visitors rated the range of attractions and places to visit in Bexhill as either 'good' or 'very good', and 32% rated them as 'average'. This is slightly lower than the rating for all resorts, which showed 77% of visitors choosing 'good' or 'very good'. These are both lower than for all destinations 81% of visitors. These ratings can be seen on Table 6.3 below. The mean score was 3.65, and this was lower than the mean scores for all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.2). In comparison to 2005, fewer visitors rated the range of attractions as 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.3: ATTRACTION RATINGS (%) – RANGE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	270	353	345	-
Very good	12	35	40	25
Good	48	42	41	39
Average	32	19	15	28
Poor	7	4	3	6
Very Poor	0	1	1	1

#### Quality of Service

72% of visitors rated the quality of service at attractions and places to visit as either 'good' or 'very good'. This was lower than all resorts and destinations (81% and 84% respectively). The mean score was 3.80 which is again lower than all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.2). In comparison to 2005, fewer people rated the quality of service as 'very good', but higher numbers rated it as 'good'.

**TABLE 6.4: ATTRACTION RATINGS (%) – QUALITY OF SERVICE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	270	302	307	-
Very good	11	32	36	32
Good	61	49	48	40
Average	26	17	15	24
Poor	2	1	1	2
Very Poor	0	0	0	2

#### Value for Money

Moving on to value for money, 65% of visitors believed that the attractions were either 'good' or 'very good' value for money. This is slightly lower than all resorts and destinations as 75% of visitors rated the attractions as 'good' or 'very good' (see Table 6.5) The mean score was 3.71 and this was also somewhat lower than the score for all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.2). In 2005, a higher percentage of visitors had viewed the value for money as being 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.5: ATTRACTION RATINGS (%) – VALUE FOR MONEY**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	270	324	315	



Very good	9	28	31	27
Good	56	47	44	39
Average	32	22	19	30
Poor	3	3	4	3
Very Poor	0	1	1	1

**Error! Not a valid link.**

### 6.3 PLACES TO EAT & DRINK

#### Range

Visitors were asked their opinions on the available places to eat and drink in Bexhill. When asked to rate their satisfaction with the range of places, 71% of visitors chose 'good' or 'very good', which is slightly lower than the average rating for all resorts (82%) and all destinations (84%) (see Table 6.6).

The mean score of 3.81 was slightly lower than the mean score for all resorts and destinations, as can be seen on Figure 6.3 overleaf, as it is dragged down by the 23% choosing 'average'. In comparison to 2005, slightly more visitors in 2006 saw the range as being 'very good' or 'good'.

**TABLE 6.6: PLACES TO EAT AND DRINK RATINGS (%) – RANGE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	284	369	349	-
Very good	17	40	43	24
Good	54	42	41	43
Average	23	14	12	25
Poor	5	3	3	6
Very Poor	1	1	1	2

#### Quality of Service

The majority of visitors in Bexhill deemed the quality of service in the eating and drinking places as either 'good' or 'very good' (82%), which is very similar to the average scores in all resorts and destinations (82% and 83% respectively). Again the mean score (3.99) was slightly below the opinion score for all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.3). In 2005, more visitors had viewed the quality of service as being 'very good' than they did in 2006.

**TABLE 6.7: PLACES TO EAT AND DRINK RATINGS (%) – QUALITY OF SERVICE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	284	358	336	-
Very good	19	36	36	38
Good	63	46	47	39
Average	16	14	14	21
Poor	2	2	2	1
Very Poor	0	1	1	1

#### Value for Money

75% of visitors rated the value for money in the eating and drinking places as being either 'very good' or 'good'. This is comparable to the scores for all resorts (78%) and destinations (75%). The mean score (3.88) is not dissimilar to the scores for all resorts and all destinations (4.05 and 4.01 respectively – see

Figure 6.3). A similar result was reported in 2005, as 77% of visitors also believed that the value for money was 'good' or 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.8: PLACES TO EAT AND DRINK RATINGS (%) – VALUE FOR MONEY**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
Base	284	358	337	-
Very good	17	32	31	35
Good	58	46	44	42
Average	22	19	20	21
Poor	2	3	3	1
Very Poor	1	1	1	1

**Error! Not a valid link.**

#### 6.4 SHOPS

##### Range

When asked their opinions about the shops in Bexhill, 52% of visitors rated the range of shops as 'good' or 'very good'. This is much lower than the equivalent opinion scores for all resorts (73%) and all destinations (79%). The average opinion score achieved for range of shops was 3.53, which is also lower (see Figure 6.4). The 2006 percentage for the 'good' or 'very good' range of shops opinion in Bexhill is only slightly lower than that recorded in 2005 (55%).

**TABLE 6.9: SHOP RATINGS (%) – RANGE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
Base	246	351	341	-
Very good	12	35	41	21
Good	40	38	38	34
Average	37	21	16	34
Poor	11	5	4	8
Very Poor	0	1	1	3

##### Quality of shopping environment

54% of visitors rated the shopping environment as 'good' or 'very good'. This is lower than in all resorts and destinations (73% and 80% respectively) as can be seen on Table 6.10 overleaf. The mean score for the quality of the shopping environment was 3.52, which (as can be seen on Figure 6.4) is also lower than all resorts and destinations. In 2005, the 'good' and 'very good' scores were slightly more common with 64% of visitors stating this opinion.

**TABLE 6.10: SHOP RATINGS (%) – QUALITY OF SHOPPING ENVIRONMENT**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
--	----------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-------------

<i>Base</i>	246	341	333	-
Very good	9	28	37	23
Good	45	45	43	41
Average	37	22	17	27
Poor	9	4	3	7
Very Poor	0	1	1	1

### Quality of Service

68% of those surveyed during this period considered the quality of service provided in the shops to be either 'good' or 'very good'. This is lower than all resorts (80%) and all destinations (82%). The mean score was calculated as 3.81, which is again lower than all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.4). The number of visitors choosing 'good' and 'very good' has fallen since 2005 when the proportion was higher (74%).

**TABLE 6.11: SHOP RATINGS (%) – QUALITY OF SERVICE**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	246	335	326	-
Very good	15	33	36	26
Good	53	47	46	48
Average	29	18	17	23
Poor	3	2	2	3
Very Poor	0	1	0	0

**Error! Not a valid link.**

## **6.5 EASE OF FINDING WAY AROUND**

Visitors were asked to rate the road signs, pedestrian signs and display maps and information boards that had helped them to find their way around the town.

### Road signs

Of those interviewed that had used road signs during their visit, 83% rated them as 'good' or 'very good'. In comparison, in all resorts the percentage was 86 and in all destinations was 79%. This means that Bexhill fared slightly better than all destinations. The average opinion score for road signs was 4.02 which is also very similar to all resorts and destinations (Figure 6.5 overleaf). In 2005, the rating was higher still with 91% of visitors saying that the road signs were 'good' or 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.12: ROAD SIGN RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	229	343	332	-
Very good	21	38	35	47
Good	62	48	44	44
Average	14	11	14	6
Poor	1	3	5	3

Very Poor	0	1	2	0
-----------	---	---	---	---

### Pedestrian signs

81% rated pedestrian signs as either 'good' or 'very good', in comparison to 84% in all resorts and 81% in all destinations. The mean score for pedestrian signs was 4.01 which is very similar to all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.5). In 2005 the score was also very similar, as 85% rated the pedestrian signs as 'good' or 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.13: PEDESTRIAN SIGN RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	229	342	349	-
Very good	19	34	34	44
Good	62	50	47	41
Average	18	13	15	12
Poor	0	3	3	2
Very Poor	0	0	1	0

Specific complaints were recorded by respondents during the interviewing sessions, as there was criticism that the pedestrian signs between the station and the town were inadequate.

### Display maps and information boards

81% of visitors to Bexhill also considered the display maps and information boards to be 'good' or 'very good'. This is very similar to all resorts (80%) and higher than all destinations (75%). The mean score was 4.00 which is also very close to that for all resorts and destinations. 87% of visitors had opted for 'good' or 'very good' in 2005.

**TABLE 6.14: DISPLAY MAP AND INFO BOARD RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	229	306	309	-
Very good	21	32	31	41
Good	60	48	44	46
Average	17	15	17	12
Poor	2	4	5	2
Very Poor	0	1	2	0

### **Error! Not a valid link.**

As there is now no Tourist Information Centre in Bexhill, the opinion questions that related to this were not included in the questionnaire. This did not stop many respondents from expressing their disappointment that it has gone.

## **6.6 PARKS AND STREETS**

### Upkeep of parks and open spaces

When the visitors to Bexhill were asked their opinions on the upkeep of parks and open spaces, 94% of those interviewed rated this as 'good' or 'very good'. This was higher than the opinions given in all resorts and destinations (88% and 86% respectively). An equivalently high percentage was recorded back in 2005 (96%). The mean score in 2006 was a high 4.40 and is greater than the score for all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.6 overleaf).

**TABLE 6.15: UPKEEP OF PARKS & OPEN SPACES RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	394	367	354	-
Very good	45	40	43	55
Good	49	48	43	41
Average	5	11	12	4
Poor	0	1	2	0
Very Poor	0	0	0	0

### Cleanliness of streets

90% of those interviewed rated the cleanliness of streets as either 'good' or 'very good'. This is much higher than for all resorts (78%) and all destinations (76%). The mean score recorded was 4.27 which is also higher than all resorts and destinations (see Figure 6.6). There has been an improvement since 2005 as the score was then slightly lower (86%).

**TABLE 6.16: CLEANLINESS OF STREETS RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	394	401	399	-
Very good	38	31	31	43
Good	52	47	45	43
Average	9	17	18	12
Poor	1	4	4	1
Very Poor	0	1	1	1

**Error! Not a valid link.**

Altogether, visitors rated highly the upkeep of parks and open spaces and the cleanliness of the streets in Bexhill.

## **6.7 PUBLIC TOILETS**

### Availability

In terms of the availability of public toilets, fewer than half of visitors rated it as 'good' or 'very good' (48%). This is a similar figure to all resorts (49%) and all destinations (50%) but is altogether quite a low opinion score. This is demonstrated on Figure 6.7 overleaf. In 2005 the percentage of visitors choosing 'good' or 'very good' was also very similar (51%).

**TABLE 6.17: AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TOILETS RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	255	320	264	-
Very good	9	18	20	21
Good	39	31	30	30
Average	33	23	22	27
Poor	17	17	17	14
Very Poor	3	11	10	8

### Cleanliness

59% of visitors rated the cleanliness of toilets as either 'good' or 'very good'. In all resorts the equivalent figure was 51% and in all destinations was 54%. This shows that Bexhill appears to have fared slightly better. This can be seen on Figure 6.7 below as the mean score of 3.61 is slightly higher than the score for all resorts and destinations. In 2005, the situation looked slightly more favourable as 60% of visitors commented that the cleanliness of the toilets was either 'good' or 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.18: CLEANLINESS OF PUBLIC TOILET RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	255	310	252	-
Very good	14	18	22	25
Good	45	33	32	35
Average	31	24	24	21
Poor	8	14	13	11
Very Poor	2	10	9	9

### **Error! Not a valid link.**

Even though the calculations carried out above seem to demonstrate that the availability and cleanliness of public toilets in Bexhill is slightly better than for all resorts and destinations, this somewhat masks the true picture that came across during the interviewing sessions. It can be seen above that 20% of visitors believed that the availability of public toilets was 'very poor' or 'poor' and 10% commented that the cleanliness was 'poor' or 'very poor'. Both the interviewers and the interviewees made comments regarding the toilets on the seafront, such as "the toilet at the east end is old but very clean, whereas the one at the west end is not nice and frequently dirty". Other comments were made about the smell and the rubbish that could be found in the toilets and that two public toilets were not enough to serve the resort.

## **6.8 CLEANLINESS OF SEA AND BEACH**

### Sea

The cleanliness of the sea rated very well with 97% stating it was 'very good or 'good'. This is much higher than for all resorts in general (79%) but this data is not comparable with all destinations. The mean score was 4.38 which was also higher than the score for all resorts (see Figure 6.8 overleaf). A similar figure of 96% was recorded back in 2005.

**TABLE 6.19: CLEANLINESS OF SEA RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	348	311	-	-
Very good	42	39	-	62
Good	55	40	-	34
Average	3	15	-	54
Poor	0	4	-	0
Very Poor	0	1	-	0

### Beach

The beach in Bexhill also rated extremely well with 97% rating it as 'very good' or 'good'. This was an identical figure to that recorded in 2005. This figure is also higher than for all resorts (88%) but is again incomparable with all destinations. The mean score (4.47) was also higher than all resorts, as demonstrated on Figure 6.8.

**TABLE 6.20: CLEANLINESS OF BEACH RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	348	315	-	-
Very good	49	50	-	64
Good	48	38	-	33
Average	3	10	-	3
Poor	0	1	-	1
Very Poor	0	0	-	0

### **Error! Not a valid link.**

Further comments were made by the respondents that related to the beach in Bexhill. Many visitors were concerned that the public law which prohibited dogs from being on the beach between May and September was not being adhered to or enforced. Others commented that it was very dangerous to have no cycle lane on the promenade as many cyclists chose to use it to travel around.

## **6.9 PUBLIC SEATING**

Visitors to Bexhill were asked to rate the availability of public seating. 99% of visitors rated it as either 'good' or 'very good' and this is a higher figure than that seen in all resorts (85%) as can be seen on Table 6.21 below. The mean score was 4.65 and is higher than the score for all resorts which was 4.31. In 2005, the number of visitors who believed that the availability of public seating was 'good' or 'very good' was slightly lower at 93%.

**TABLE 6.21: PUBLIC SEATING RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	348	396	-	-
Very good	67	51	-	67
Good	32	34	-	26
Average	1	10	-	5
Poor	0	4	-	1
Very Poor	0	1	-	1

## 6.10 CHOICE OF NIGHTLIFE

This question was adapted slightly for Bexhill, and instead the visitor's opinion on the choice of early evening entertainment was collected.

The ratings for choice of early evening entertainment in Bexhill were varied with 37% stating it was 'good' but 27% rating it as 'poor'. It is important to note that this question features a small sample as many of the respondents chose not to answer this question. The mean score (3.12) was noticeably lower than for all resorts and all destinations (see Figure 6.9 overleaf). In 2005, 24% of visitors stated that they believed that the choice of nightlife was very poor, whereas this year the equivalent figure was only 5%. This may in fact be due to changing the wording of the question to ask about *early evening* entertainment as opposed to *nightlife*.

**TABLE 6.22: CHOICE OF NIGHTLIFE RATINGS (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
Base	73	150	129	-
Very good	7	32	39	28
Good	37	36	37	17
Average	23	17	15	18
Poor	27	8	5	13
Very Poor	5	8	4	24

**Error! Not a valid link.**

## 6.11 FEELING SAFE FROM CRIME AND TRAFFIC

### Crime

Visitors to Bexhill appear to feel very safe from crime, as 95% stated that they either agreed or agreed strongly with this statement. See Table 6.23 below. The mean score was 4.31, and is higher than the scores for all resorts (4.23) and all destinations (4.17). 93% of visitors in 2005 had stated that they feel safe from crime (agree or strongly agree).

**TABLE 6.23: FEELING OF SAFETY FROM CRIME (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
	366	403	406	-
Agree strongly	38	40	37	54
Agree	57	47	48	39
Neither agree/disagree	4	10	11	6
Disagree	1	3	3	1
Disagree strongly	0	1	1	0

### Traffic

Feeling of safety from traffic similarly rated well with 93% agreeing or strongly agreeing that they felt safe as can be seen on Table 6.24 overleaf. The mean score was 4.25 which was again slightly higher than all resorts (4.13) and all destinations (4.12). In 2005, the number of those that agreed or strongly agreed was slightly lower at 88%.

**TABLE 6.24: FEELING OF SAFETY FROM TRAFFIC (%)**

	BEXHILL	ALL RESORTS	ALL DESTINATIONS	2005
--	---------	-------------	------------------	------



<i>Base</i>	366	410	141	-
Agree strongly	35	38	35	52
Agree	58	46	48	36
Neither agree/disagree	5	9	10	9
Disagree	2	6	5	3
Disagree strongly	0	2	1	1

## 6.12 GENERAL ATMOSPHERE & FEELING OF WELCOME

### General atmosphere

The general atmosphere in Bexhill rated highly, as 95% of visitors rated it as either 'very good' or 'good'. This is a similar figure to that recorded in all resorts (93%) and destinations (91%). The mean score was high at 4.34 and was a similar score to all resorts and destinations as can be seen on Figure 6.10. In 2005, the results were very similar as the equivalent figure was 93% for 'good' and 'very good'.

**TABLE 6.25: GENERAL STMPOSPHERE RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	399	412	419	-
Very good	39	51	50	55
Good	56	42	41	38
Average	4	6	8	6
Poor	1	1	1	1
Very Poor	0	0	0	0

### Feeling of welcome

93% of visitors rated the welcome feeling they experienced in Bexhill as either 'very good' or 'good'. The equivalent figures were 92% in all resorts and 89% in all destinations. The mean score for Bexhill (4.29) was fractionally lower than for all resorts and all destinations, which is shown on Figure 6.10 overleaf. A similar figure was recorded in 2005 as 91% of visitors reported a 'good' or 'very good' welcoming feeling.

**TABLE 6.26: FEELING OF WELCOME - RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Base</i>	399	413	418	-
Very good	37	53	48	56
Good	56	39	41	35
Average	8	7	10	8
Poor	0	1	1	0
Very Poor	0	0	0	0

**Error! Not a valid link.**

## 6.13 OVERALL ENJOYMENT OF VISIT/RECOMMENDATION OF VISIT

### Overall enjoyment of visit

90% of visitors reported that the overall enjoyment of their visit to Bexhill was either 'high' or 'very high' (the equivalent figure in 2005 was 88%). This was higher than the figure for all resorts (86%) and all destinations (85%). The mean score was 4.18 and this compares to the benchmark score for overall enjoyment of 4.22 for all resorts and 4.21 for all destinations.

**TABLE 6.27: OVERALL ENJOYMENT OF VISIT (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
Base	414	390	410	-
Very high	29	37	35	35
High	61	49	50	53
Average	10	13	14	11
Low	0	1	1	0
Very Low	0	0	0	0

Likelihood of recommending

90% of all visitors reported that they were 'likely' or 'very likely' to recommend people to visit Bexhill (the figure in 2005 was 88%). This is slightly higher than the figure for all resorts (86%) and all destinations (85%). The mean opinion score for recommending Bexhill was 4.36. In comparison, the score was 4.44 for all resorts and 4.45 for all destinations.

**TABLE 6.28: LIKELIHOOD OF RECOMMENDING RATINGS (%)**

	<i>BEXHILL</i>	<i>ALL RESORTS</i>	<i>ALL DESTINATIONS</i>	<i>2005</i>
Base	401	394	413	-
Very Likely	29	37	35	35
Likely	61	49	50	53
Neither likely/unlikely	11	13	14	11
Unlikely	0	1	1	0
Very Unlikely	0	0	0	0

**6.14 DE LA WARR PAVILION**

In this year's survey, an additional opinion question was asked which related to the De La Warr Pavilion. This is not comparable to last year's dataset but provides a snapshot of visitor's opinions during the summer of 2006. The data relating to the opinions provided can be seen on Tables 6.29 and 6.30 below.

**TABLE 6.29: DLWP RATINGS (%)**

	<i>EXHIBS</i>	<i>EVENTS</i>	<i>PERFOR- MANCES</i>	<i>FOOD &amp; DRINK</i>	<i>SHOPPING</i>	<i>INFO SERVICE</i>	<i>OVERALL EXP.</i>
Base	196	110	62	209	156	186	275
Very good	19	21	23	20	10	17	28
Good	37	58	55	38	41	65	44
Average	21	12	18	21	37	17	23
Poor	15	9	5	15	10	1	3
Very Poor	8	0	0	6	2	1	2

**TABLE 6.30: DLWP MEAN SCORES (%)**

	<i>EXHIBS</i>	<i>EVENTS</i>	<i>PERFOR- MANCES</i>	<i>FOOD &amp; DRINK</i>	<i>SHOPPING</i>	<i>INFO SERVICE</i>	<i>OVERALL EXP.</i>
--	---------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

---

<i>MEAN SCORE</i>	3.45	3.91	3.95	3.50	3.48	3.97	3.92
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

---

When asked about their opinions on the exhibitions on show at the DLWP, 56% of respondents said they were 'good' or 'very good', but on the other hand 23% stated that they were either 'poor' or 'very poor'. This gave a mean score of 3.45. To be more precise, a few interviewees commented that they did not feel that the exhibitions were in keeping with the era of the building, and others expressed their disappointment that they visited between exhibitions and therefore had nothing to see.

With regards to the events held at the DLWP, 79% of respondents felt that they were either 'good' or 'very good'. The mean score was therefore 3.91. Of the 62 respondents that rated the performances, 78% of these rated them as 'good' or 'very good', and the mean score was slightly higher than for the events at 3.95.

58% of visitors to the DLWP rated the food and drink services on offer as 'good' or 'very good'. In contrast, 21% of respondents thought that they were 'poor' or 'very poor'. Around half of the DLWP visitors interviewed made specific comments about the café. In the main these were criticisms. Visitors complained that the café was very overpriced, the choice of food and drinks were limited and also of a poor quality, the service was disorganised, and among visiting parties with children, there were further complaints that there was nothing on offer for children to eat or drink.

57% of respondents rated the shops within the DLWP as 'good' or 'very good'. As a further 37% rated them only as 'average', the mean opinion score was calculated to be 3.48.

The majority of visitors to the DLWP (82%) rated the information services on offer as 'good' or 'very good', producing a relatively high mean score of 3.97.

Finally, visitors to the Pavilion were asked to rate their overall experience. 72% rated it as either 'good' or 'very good' but a further 23% rated it as 'average'. This produced a mean score of 3.92.

---