

Annex 3

Insights of Consultation Analysis

This Annex presents insights to the Bowes Primary Quieter Neighbourhood Consultation Analysis Interim Report prepared by ITP, dated 17 May 2021. The Interim Report presents a detailed analysis of the online survey. An update to the report will incorporate the findings of the email analysis.

1. 1325 responses from unique respondents were received, of which 71% were from within the Quieter Neighbourhood (QN) area, including the primary roads forming the boundary. The 2011 Census recorded 25,256 residents within the QN area, suggesting that this consultation received responses from approximately 4% of the local population within the QN area.
2. The demographic information of respondents to the main consultation survey was compared to Census 2011 data to identify areas of over and under-representation. It is acknowledged there are limitations of comparing to 2011 census data, however in the absence of more up to date and reliable data, this is considered appropriate.
3. The proportion of responses from people with disabilities were slightly lower than what might be expected from the 2011 Census data (8% of respondents reported they have a disability, compared to 14% of residents in the area in the 2011 census). There was a strong trend of respondents with disabilities showing negative perceptions of the project (75 respondents (equivalent to 76% of respondents who said they have a disability) rated the scheme's impact of 'very negative' or 'somewhat negative', compared to 15 (equivalent to 15% of respondents who said they have a disability) 'somewhat positive' or 'very positive').
4. It is noted further engagement was carried out which targeted people with disabilities. Initial insights from this engagement identified respondents raising impacts on access to some locations, such as a GP and/or pharmacy, however some respondents referred to no locations being difficult to access. Both negative and positive impacts were reported, however the number of negative comments was greater than positive comments. Outcomes of this engagement is ongoing and will be reported on in more detail in the final report.
5. There was a strong pattern of those receiving care and carers showing negative perceptions (23 care recipients (equivalent to 100% of respondents who receive care assistance in their home) and 98 carers (equivalent to 84% of respondents who provide care to an elderly or disabled person) rated the scheme's impact as 'very negative' or 'somewhat negative'). Care recipients and carers were approached as part of further engagement to explore underlying reasons for these reported impacts, however at the time of writing detailed external analysis on this engagement is not complete. Initial insights from this engagement identified similar reflections from carers to those observed from people with disabilities. Outcomes of this engagement is ongoing and will be fully reported on in the final report.

6. There were slightly more female respondents (43%) than male respondents (36%), however 19% of respondents left this question blank. Perceived impacts of the scheme were very similar between males and females, however males were very slightly less likely to report negative impacts, and very slightly more likely to report positive impacts.
7. The proportion of responses from people of Christian, Hindu and Muslim religion are lower than what might be expected from the 2011 Census data (22%, 1% and 2% of respondents identified with these religions respectively, compared to 49%, 6% and 13% in the 2011 census). The proportion of responses of those who identified as having no religion (and those who chose not to answer the question) is a much higher percentage than that captured in the 2011 census. Targeting future engagement activities with these communities will be investigated, which may include at places of worship.
8. The proportion of responses from Asian and Black respondents are lower than what might be expected from the 2011 Census data (5% and 1% of respondents identified with these ethnicities respectively, compared to 14% and 14% in the 2011 census), with respondents of Mixed ethnicity slightly under-represented. Targeting future engagement activities with these communities will be investigated, which may include at community centres. Respondents of these ethnicities were more likely to report negative impacts of the project, with this trend most notable in Asian respondents.
9. Respondents aged 16-29 and 30-39 make up 25% and 21% of all age groups respectively, yet only 4% and 16% respectively of respondents were of these age groups. In older people, the opposite trend can be seen. Targeting future engagement activities with younger people will be investigated, which may include at schools, leveraging social media, and reflection on Enfield Council's Empowering Young Enfield plan. Based on the representation of older people in the survey in all age groups except for 80+ (which was very slightly under-represented), it is likely that the primary means of engagement being in digital form, did not result in a lack of engagement from older people. Those in the age ranges above 60, were more likely to report negative perceptions of the scheme.
10. Respondents in the highest income bracket (over £100,000 household income) were the largest group of respondents, however there is not comparable data for the 2011 census. There was no particularly strong pattern of positive/negative perceived impacts of the scheme, however lower income groups showed higher proportions of negative perceptions.
11. Car owner respondents were largely over-represented, making up 83% of respondents, compared to 68% across Enfield, and 53% within the consultation area. Car owners were much more likely to report negative impacts on the scheme than non-car owners. Conversely, non-car owners were much more likely to report positive impacts than car owners. Therefore, the overall responses are influenced by the higher proportion of car owners who have participated in the survey. The following table shows the responses to the question (after respondents provide demographic information), "Considering the protected characteristic groups outlined above ('above'

refers to the demographic questions respondents were asked about), from an equalities point of view, how has do you think the trial has impacted you?”

	Non-car owners	Car owners
Very positively or somewhat positively	53%	20%
Very negatively or somewhat negatively	28%	56%
Neutral	19%	23%

12. Respondents from outside the scheme area (27% of total respondents) generally rated the schemes impacts more negatively than those inside the scheme area. For positive aspirations of scheme (such as feeling safe to walk and cycle, or air quality in the area), respondents outside the scheme area were less likely to rate as ‘very important’ or ‘important’, with this trend most notable in ratings of ‘feeling safe to walk and cycle in the area’. Similarly, for aspects of effectiveness of the project (such as the project’s impact on enabling more walking and cycling, or improved air quality), respondents inside the scheme area were more likely to rate as ‘very effective’ or ‘somewhat effective’, with the exception of maintaining resident/visitor access which was rated similarly by respondents both within and outside the project area.

13. In addition to generally supportive comments about the project, positive feedback includes:

- Perception of feeling safer or easier for pedestrian or cycle movement
- Perceived improvement in traffic and/or air quality and/or noise pollution
- Improved mental health
- Improved physical health and/or being more active

14. A number of respondents suggested changes, or alternative designs including suggestions of:

- Relocating the existing filters to the A406 to enable access to the south
- Implementing a one-way system, traffic calming such as speed bumps, or a 20mph zone instead of the scheme
- Re-opening various closure points, or changing them to other restrictions, such as width/weight restrictions
- Removing banned turns at junctions (A406 / Bounds Green Road, Bounds Green Road / Brownlow Road, A406 / Brownlow Road)
- Resident only access, such as via ANPR
- Improving signage

The suggestions and alternative designs will be fully reviewed as the trial continues and commented on in the final reporting on the trial. Furthermore, they will be reviewed as part of the process investigating an alternative area wide design alongside Haringey Council.

15. A number of respondents provided generally negative comments about the project, including:

- Perception of traffic increasing / traffic displaced onto other roads in the area, including the primary boundary roads, and increased journey times
- Perception of increased air pollution
- Reduced mobility, access within the scheme or to locations outside the scheme, including concern for emergency vehicles, disabled people, elderly, tradespeople, deliveries and taxis
- Perception that safety had worsened / scheme being dangerous in relation to traffic
- Negative impact on mental health
- Community division, or feeling trapped or isolated
- Unwillingness to use the A406 (as this is the only entry point for motor vehicles accessing several roads within the project area)

As with the suggestions and alternative designs, these themes will be fully reviewed as the trial continues and commented on in the final reporting on the trial. Furthermore, they will be reviewed as part of the process investigating an alternative area wide design alongside Haringey Council.

16. Other feedback included

- Perceived lack of, poor or limited consultation / communication / transparency
- Co-ordinating better with neighbouring boroughs
- Improving other infrastructure, such as cycling, pedestrian or electric vehicle infrastructure / measures to encourage uptake
- Perceived lack of suitable alternatives to travel by car, or being unable to use alternatives including in the context of Covid-19

17. This community feedback, including suggestions of change, will now be considered further as part of the design development work ongoing with Haringey Council. The views provided will be reviewed alongside the feedback that Haringey Council has received as part of their own engagement and consultation. Bringing together these views will enable Officers to explore design alternatives, such as enabling greater access to and from the South, which could address some of the concerns raised. The feedback from the consultation on a potential bus gate for Brownlow Road will also be considered during this design work. Any alternative designs that are developed will be subject to further engagement. With lockdown restrictions continuing to lift (subject to government guidelines), a wider range of engagement opportunities will be explored.