Clean Air Route Consultation Analysis



Clean Air Route Consultation Analysis

Prepared by: Prepared for:

Steer London Borough of Enfield

28-32 Upper Ground Civic Centre
London SE1 9PD Silver Street
London EN1 3XA

+44 20 7910 5000

www.steergroup.com Our ref: 24225201

Steer has prepared this material for London Borough of Enfield. This material may only be used within the context and scope for which Steer has prepared it and may not be relied upon in part or whole by any third party or be used for any other purpose. Any person choosing to use any part of this material without the express and written permission of Steer shall be deemed to confirm their agreement to indemnify Steer for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Steer has prepared this material using professional practices and procedures using information available to it at the time and as such any new information could alter the validity of the results and conclusions made.



Contents

1	Background 1
2	Consultation responses



1 Background

- 1.1 Steer was commissioned by the London Borough of Enfield to analyse responses to its statutory consultation for the proposed interventions around Grove Street and St John & St James' Church of England Primary School, N18. The scheme includes a School Street, an active travel route and public realm improvements.
- 1.2 The aims of the interventions are improved air quality and road safety, increasing physical activity, including encouraging walking and cycling to school, and improved access to proposed workspaces on Grove Street. The proposal is part of a wider regeneration project around Fore Street, Angel Edmonton.
- 1.3 Following other community engagement activities in 2021 and the publication of a draft traffic order, a statutory consultation was launched on 9th February 2022, and ran until 6th March 2022.
- 1.4 Members of the public could respond online, via a paper copy of the consultation survey, or in writing. In total, ten responses were received to the consultation; eight respondents completed the survey, and two responses were by email.
- 1.5 Due to the small number of responses, this report is a topline summary of responses. It is not possible to explore differences in opinion of the proposal by demographic profile.



2 Consultation responses

- 2.1 Respondents to the consultation were invited to respond to one of two open questions:
 - What representations on traffic order TG52/1489 would you like to make?
 - On what grounds do you object to traffic order TG52/1489?
- 2.2 Of the ten responses to the consultation, seven are representations on traffic order TG52/1489, and three are objections. Two of these objections are the email responses, which have been classified as such based on the comments made.
- 2.3 There are five comments related to the representations:
 - All five mention safety improvements, mostly in relation to children;
 - There are two mentions of improved air quality;
 - Other comments include the positive impact of the project in return of the small investment made, which should be replicated elsewhere; decrease in car traffic; and clean nature for all.
- 2.4 Of the three objections, two are largely queries about the traffic order, while the other one relates to the lack of impact the scheme would have in the broader borough context. There are two mentions of loss of parking, for residents and for users of Edmonton County Court.
- 2.5 In addition, there is a comment about the closure of Grove Street/ Snells Park to motor traffic, which will force traffic to use Langhedge Lane. There is a concern that this change pushes traffic past a different primary school, so while St John & St James' school sees improvements, another school is impacted.

Demographic profile of respondents

- Demographic information was provided by those who responded to the online or paper survey (8 responses in total). All questions were optional.
- 2.7 In overview, the profile of these respondents was as follows:
 - Five respondents live in N18, while two live in N9, and one in EN2;
 - Seven of the eight respondents are female, one is male;
 - No respondents identify as transgender (6 said no, 2 did not answer);
 - Three respondents are married, three are single and two are in civil partnerships;
 - Seven of the eight respondents are heterosexual/ straight, while one does not respond;
 - No respondents consider themselves to have a disability (6 said no, 2 did not answer);
 - No respondents are a Blue Badge holder;
 - Two of the eight respondents are currently pregnant or on maternity leave;
 - All respondents are aged between 27 and 45: one is aged 25-29, three are aged 30-34, one 35-39, two aged 40-44, and one aged 45-49;



- Four respondents are white (two British, one Irish, and one Greek), two Mixed ethnicity (one white and Black Caribbean), and two Black (one Black African, one Black British);
- In terms of religion, six are Christian, one is non-religious, and one did not answer;
- No respondents receive care assistance in their home (one respondent did not answer);
- One respondent is a carer of an elderly or disabled person;
- Respondents' household income is spread across the value bands, with one in each £10k band from £40-50k to £80-90k. Three respondents did not respond.
- 2.8 Respondents of the online version completed a further question as part of the sign-up process. This asked about their connections to LB Enfield. Of the five respondents, two said 'I live in Enfield' and 4 said 'I work in Enfield'.
- 2.9 It is also worth noting that three of the responses were received from St John & St James' school. Two are representations and one an objection (though the comment is a query about the traffic order, rather than negative sentiment).
- 2.10 Due to the small number of responses it is not possible to look at differences in response to the consultation by demographic groups.





Control Information

Prepared by	London Borough of Enfield Civic Centre Silver Street London EN1 3XA		
Steer			
28-32 Upper Ground			
London SE1 9PD			
+44 20 7910 5000			
www.steergroup.com			
Steer project/proposal number	Client contract/project number		
24225201			
Author/originator	Reviewer/approver		
Jo Masini	Helen Bonner		
Other contributors	Distribution		
	Client: Petros Ximerakis Steer: Jo Masini, Helen Bonner, Simon Hollowood		
Version control/issue number	Date		
V0.1	29/03/2022		
V0.2 reviewed	31/03/2022		
V0.3 updated following client comments	26/04/2022		





