

## RESULTS & ANALYSIS

1. Put a Subheading [this is the Survey Name]

### Quality of Life Survey

2. Add the data

	2016 results	2017 results
<b>Centenary Square (Lib)</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>Millennium Point</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>85%</b>

In 2016, QoL was judged to be 6% higher at MP, possibly suggesting regeneration had been more effective. MP scored better than CS on ....., whereas CS scored better (if it did – check!) on ..... By 2017 both locations had improved their scores. This could suggest that it takes time for the benefits of regeneration to be more widely felt. However, the results might not be truly comparable because the survey was q? and carried out by ?

3. Based on this data, is the regeneration socially? economically? environmentally successful?

## RESULTS & ANALYSIS

1. Put a Subheading [this is the Survey Name]

### Sustainability Scorecard

2. Add the data

	2016 results	2017 results	Diff
<b>Centenary Square (Lib)</b>	<b>60/140</b>	<b>80/140</b>	<b>+20</b>
<b>Millennium Point</b>	<b>95/140</b>	<b>110/140</b>	<b>+15</b>

In 2016, Sustainability was judged to be ?? points higher at MP, possibly suggesting regeneration had been more effective. MP scored better than CS on ....., whereas CS scored better (if it did – check!) on ..... By 2017 both locations had improved their scores, ?? slightly more. This could suggest that it takes time for the benefits of regeneration to be more widely felt. However, the results might not be truly comparable because the survey was q? and carried out by ?

3. Based on this data, is the regeneration socially? economically? environmentally successful?

## RESULTS & ANALYSIS

1. Put a Subheading [this is the Survey Name]

### Questionnaire

2. Add the data

	2016 results	2017 results	Diff
<b>Centenary Square (Lib)</b>	<b>9/14</b>	<b>9/14</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Millennium Point</b>	<b>13/14</b>	<b>9.5/14</b>	<b>-3.5</b>

In 2016, questionnaire respondents were more positive about regeneration at ?>? In 2017 .....

Respondents were most positive about ? [check out plus scores] and least positive about ? [check out the minus scores]

3. Based on this data, is the regeneration socially? economically? environmentally successful?

## RESULTS & ANALYSIS

1. Put a Subheading [this is the Survey Name]

### EQS

2. Add the data

	<b>2016 results</b>	<b>2017 results</b>	<b>Diff</b>
<b>Centenary Square (Lib)</b>	<b>12/28</b>	<b>10/28</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Millennium Point</b>	<b>19/28</b>	<b>21/28</b>	<b>+2</b>

In 2016 EQS was judged to be better at ??, in fact there was a ? point difference. By 2017 the gap had increased/decreased. This might suggest that regeneration was working best at ??. CS scored lowest in the building design/traffic/open space category/categories. This might be because .....

3. Based on this data, regeneration appears to be more socially?/economically?/environmentally successful? at ?? Location. However, as both locations gained a positive score we can conclude that regeneration is/isn't successful overall.