

London Borough of Enfield

Annex 3: Consultation and engagement findings

A1010S to North Middlesex Hospital Cycle Route

February 2022

Table 1: Full combined code frame from statutory consultation and engagement survey

Code Theme	Code	Number	Combined percentage of all respondents
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is reassigning traffic to nearby roads and causing congestion	14	34%
Cyclists	Concern that the number of cyclists in the area is not sufficient to justify the changes in the scheme	12	29%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing longer journeys due to the need for detours	11	27%
Pollution	Concern that the scheme reduces air quality / causes excess pollution	10	24%
Consultation	Concern about lack of consultation / undemocratic method for consultation	9	22%
Consultation	Concern about quality/lack of information provided (i.e., past/existing data collection) / suggest more information should be provided (e.g. via email, post, website, social media)	7	17%
General	Concern that the scheme is a money-making tool for the Council	6	15%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for residents	4	10%
Cyclists	Concern that cyclists do not use dedicated cycle infrastructure and continue to use pavements/roads	3	7%
General	Oppose scheme - general, no further detail provided	3	7%
Car Parking	Concern that the scheme has made parking/loading more difficult for residents	3	7%
Traffic	Concern that the signage is unclear	3	7%
General	Concern that the scheme has not achieved the stated objectives (i.e., Increasing cycling journeys)	3	7%
Consultation	Concern about phrasing of question / question unclear / leading questions	2	5%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for emergency vehicles	2	5%
Accessibility	Suggestion that residents should continue to have access	2	5%
Amendment Requests	Suggestion to amend one-way system	2	5%
General	Concern that the scheme is unnecessary (e.g., not a congestion / safety issue in the scheme's area)	2	5%
General	Concern that the scheme / changes are confusing	2	5%
Equality - Disadvantage	Concern that the scheme disadvantages older people	2	5%
General	Concern about time of implementation during the pandemic (e.g., due to inaccurate data, low traffic levels, added stress)	2	5%
General	Concern about the impact of the scheme on local residents (e.g., stress/frustration/anxiety/not specified)	2	5%
Safety	Concern that the scheme reduces safety (non-specific)	2	5%
General	Concern that the scheme is poorly thought out / not responding to the area's problems	1	2%

Annex 3: Consultation and engagement findings

Code Theme	Code	Number	Combined percentage of all respondents
General	Concern that the scheme is not sufficiently enforced (i.e., vehicles contravene restrictions)	1	2%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for health care professionals / carers / to health care facilities, impacting on older and/or disabled people	1	2%
Accessibility	Opposition to the use of cameras	1	2%
Pedestrians	Concern that the scheme makes it difficult for pedestrians to cross the road	1	2%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is reassigning traffic to unsuitable roads (e.g., residential / narrow roads)	1	2%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing an increase in road rage	1	2%
Equality - Support	Support the scheme due to improvements for older people/young families and/or those with mobility issues who rely on the use of car/taxi	1	2%
Support - Consultation	Effective consultation (method / communication)	1	2%
Other	Comment unclear	1	2%
General	Concern about the cumulative impact of other schemes (e.g., combination with Streetspace schemes, road closures)	1	2%
Consultation	Concern that the scheme is illegal	1	2%
Equality - Disadvantage	Concern that the scheme disadvantages disabled people	1	2%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for visitors, tradespeople, refuse collection	1	2%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing increased congestion in some areas, while other areas benefit from reduced traffic	1	2%
General	Concern about negative impact on local businesses	1	2%

Table 2: Full code frame from statutory consultation

Code Theme	Code	Number	Percentage of respondents to statutory consultation
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing longer journeys due to the need for detours	9	45%
Pollution	Concern that the scheme reduces air quality / causes excess pollution	6	30%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is reassigning traffic to nearby roads and causing congestion	5	25%
Consultation	Concern about lack of consultation / undemocratic method for consultation	5	25%
Cyclists	Concern that the number of cyclists in the area is not sufficient to justify the changes in the scheme	4	20%
General	Concern that the scheme is a money-making tool for the council	4	20%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for residents	3	15%
General	Concern that the scheme has not achieved the stated objectives (i.e., increasing cycling journeys)	3	15%
Traffic	Concern that the signage is unclear	2	10%
General	Concern about time of implementation during the pandemic (e.g., due to inaccurate data, low traffic levels, added stress)	2	10%
General	Concern about the impact of the scheme on local residents (e.g., stress/frustration/anxiety/not specified)	2	10%
Safety	Concern that the scheme reduces safety (non-specific)	2	10%
General	Oppose scheme - general, no further detail provided	1	5%
Car Parking	Concern that the scheme has made parking/loading more difficult for residents	1	5%
General	Concern that the scheme is unnecessary (e.g., not a congestion / safety issue in the scheme's area)	1	5%
General	Concern that the scheme / changes are confusing	1	5%
Equality - Disadvantage	Concern that the scheme disadvantages older people	1	5%
Other	Comment unclear	1	5%
General	Concern about the cumulative impact of other schemes (e.g., combination with Streetspace schemes, road closures)	1	5%
Consultation	Concern that the scheme is illegal	1	5%
Equality - Disadvantage	Concern that the scheme disadvantages disabled people	1	5%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for visitors, tradespeople, refuse collection	1	5%

Annex 3: Consultation and engagement findings

Code Theme	Code	Number	Percentage of respondents to statutory consultation
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing increased congestion in some areas, while other areas benefit from reduced traffic	1	5%
General	Concern about negative impact on local businesses	1	5%

Table 3: Full code frame from engagement survey

Code Theme	Code	Number	Percentage of respondents to engagement survey
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is reassigning traffic to nearby roads and causing congestion	9	43%
Cyclists	Concern that the number of cyclists in the area is not sufficient to justify the changes in the scheme	8	38%
Consultation	Concern about quality/lack of information provided (i.e., past/existing data collection) / suggest more information should be provided (e.g., via email, post, website, social media)	7	33%
Consultation	Concern about lack of consultation / undemocratic method for consultation	4	19%
Pollution	Concern that the scheme reduces air quality / causes excess pollution	4	19%
Cyclists	Concern that cyclists do not use dedicated cycle infrastructure and continue to use pavements/roads	3	14%
General	Oppose scheme - general, no further detail provided	2	10%
General	Concern that the scheme is a money-making tool for the council	2	10%
Consultation	Concern about phrasing of question / question unclear / leading questions	2	10%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for emergency vehicles	2	10%
Accessibility	Suggestion that residents should continue to have access	2	10%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing longer journeys due to the need for detours	2	10%
Car Parking	Concern that the scheme has made parking/loading more difficult for residents	2	10%
Amendment Requests	Suggestion to amend one-way system	2	10%
General	Concern that the scheme is unnecessary (e.g., not a congestion / safety issue in the scheme's area)	1	5%
General	Concern that the scheme is poorly thought out / not responding to the area's problems	1	5%
General	Concern that the scheme / changes are confusing	1	5%
General	Concern that the scheme is not sufficiently enforced (i.e., vehicles contravene restrictions)	1	5%
Equality - Disadvantage	Concern that the scheme disadvantages older people	1	5%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for residents	1	5%
Accessibility	Concern that the scheme reduces accessibility for health care professionals / carers / to health care facilities, impacting on older and/or disabled people	1	5%
Accessibility	Opposition to the use of cameras	1	5%
Pedestrians	Concern that the scheme makes it difficult for pedestrians to cross the road	1	5%

Annex 3: Consultation and engagement findings

Code Theme	Code	Number	Percentage of respondents to engagement survey
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is reassigning traffic to unsuitable roads (e.g., residential / narrow roads)	1	5%
Traffic	Concern that the signage is unclear	1	5%
Traffic	Concern that the scheme is causing an increase in road rage	1	5%
Equality - Support	Support the scheme due to improvements for older people/young families and/or those with mobility issues who rely on the use of car/taxi	1	5%
Support - Consultation	Effective consultation (method / communication)	1	5%