## **APPENDIX F – CONSULTATION ANALYSIS**

This appendix sets out in detail the following items:

- Describes stage 1 of the consultation process (informal consultation) and in further detail stage 2. (The ETMO process)
- Consultation publicity
- Consultation methodology
- Analysis of the responses received per scheme
- Analysis of all 32 themes

**Stage 1 - 4-week informal public consultation:** the purpose of the 4-week informal consultation exercise was to seek the views of the relevant stakeholders particularly schools on the proposed schemes under ETMOs. This further provides council officers an opportunity to amend the schemes in response to feedback received at the end of the 4-week informal public consultation period to better the schemes before they are recommended for implementation under ETMOs as this report does. The informal public consultation stage has been split into two, the first being consultation with internal stakeholders within the council and the second being an external public consultation. Both methods have been explained in further detail below:

<u>Internal consultation</u> – officers will share the proposals and seek feedback from the following before the consultation is made public:

- The Cabinet Member for Streets & Environment
- Local Ward councillors
- Director of Education
- Highways and Parking Service Teams
- Transport Strategy Service
- Communications & Engagement Team
- Head Teachers of affected schools

<u>External consultation</u> – amendments following feedback at the internal stage will be made and the final public consultation leaflets will be published and shared with the following:

- Local Member's of Parliament
- The Cabinet Member for Streets & Environment
- Local Ward councillors
- Director of Education
- Highways and Parking Service Teams
- Transport Strategy Service
- Communications & Engagement Team
- External partners such as Transport for London, Trams & Buses
- All affected school, the staff and parents
- All affected residents and businesses located within 250m of the school street
- Local groups and associations located within 250m of the school street
- Places of worship located within 250m of the school street

- Emergency Services
- On all council digital platforms
- Through council press release and newsletter

**Consultation method:** The council delivered a consultation leaflet per HSS explaining the schemes in detail to all residents, businesses and organisations located within 250 metres from the extents of the proposed school street. The consultation leaflets sent out for all 13 proposed Healthy School Street schemes have been included with this report.

## 250 metre consultation boundary:

To fully understand and appreciate the consultation analysis as presented in this report, it is important to note the consultation boundary, its definition and categorisation.

- 250 metre boundary: the council has chosen to consult properties that fall within 250 metres of the extents of the proposed healthy school street scheme by sending them a consultation leaflet. This is consistent with the method use previously when consulting on the existing 24 school streets.
- The distance of 250 metres is measured as road length from the various entry points to any one scheme.
- For analysis purposes those properties that fall within 250 metres from the extents of the school street proposal that would have received a consultation leaflet are categorised as responses from properties "Within the area". Those responses received from persons beyond the 250 metre consultation boundary are categorised as responses from "Outside the area", this could be responses from those live, work, study anywhere in Croydon and beyond it is an undefined area as anyone who feel that they may be impacted by the proposals can respond.

Analysis of responses from those **within** the consultation boundary and those from **outside** is important because depending on how close they live, work or study to the proposals, the impacts you feel or perceive could vary, therefore the feedback given will be different.

For example, those who live, work or study beyond the 250 metre consultation boundary may have a greater reliance on the use of a private motor vehicle to pick up and drop off their children to the school and will see the proposal as being restrictive to their movements, whereas those who live within the 250metre boundary may find it easier to walk, cycle or scoot because they are closer, so will be less affected by the proposal.

Furthermore, those within the 250 metre boundary are likely to live, work, study closer to the school so may be more appreciative of the issues experienced by residents at school drop off/pick up times.

## **Consultation publicity:**

The consultation launched on 28 September 2022 and expired at midnight on 19 October 2022. It was published on all digital platforms in tandem with announcements made about the consultation through a council press release and newsletter. The response rate is based on the number of leaflets delivered to those within the consultation area (250 metre boundary) and responses received from the same only. In total 10,645 leaflets were delivered, and 1,020 responses were received from those within the consultation area, representing a response rate of 9.6%, the average response rate from consultations in Croydon is around 10%. In line with good practice the council installed street notices in the vicinity of the school.

The council has an active internal communications and engagement team that made announcements and publications in relation to the consultation via various means these have been detailed below with links to the relevant publications:

- 1) Your Croydon: <u>Have your say on proposals for new Healthy School Street</u> <u>schemes – Newsroom (lbc-app-w-newscroydon-p.azurewebsites.net)</u>
- 2) I Love Croydon Facebook page
- 3) I Love Croydon Instagram page
- 4) I Love Croydon Twitter Account:
- 5) The council has a dedicated Healthy School Streets website (<u>www.croydon.gov.uk/school-streets</u>), where the consultation material was published along with background information on the councils Healthy School Street programme
- 6) A dedicated Healthy School Streets email was set-up for enquiries only relating to the consultations <u>healthyschoolstreets@croydon.gov.uk</u>

**Stage 2 implementation of schemes under ETMO (statutory consultation):** this stage will only apply to those 10 schemes being taken forward for implementation if the recommendation made to the Executive Mayor of Croydon is agreed. The 10 schemes will be implemented under ETMO's for a maximum period of 18 months of which the first 6 months is a period of 'statutory consultation' during which anyone affected by the experimental scheme can write in objection.

All the objections received during that 6-month statutory period are considered along with the council's own assessment on how the scheme has performed before taking a decision to either remove the scheme in its entirety or make the scheme permanent after the 18 month period. The reasons for implementing schemes under ETMO's are as follows:

- Enables an extended consultation period (6 months)
- Enables those affected to appreciate the true impact of the schemes and submit objections in real time.
- Enables the council to monitor the schemes and its impacts on air pollution and traffic.
- Enables the council to make amendments to the schemes in response to objections received during the first 6 months of the 18-month ETMO period.
- Enables decision makers to review experimental feedback and data before a decision is made to retain or remove schemes.

Analysis of informal public consultation: the council created an online consultation survey form for each scheme, published on the council's "Get Involved" website. An opportunity for those that do not have access to the internet or who required the consultation material in another format did exist and where able to submit their response in writing. The benefit of using an online survey platform for response submission was that it made submitting a response easier, convenient for users and allowed officers to monitor and analyse responses received in real time using the tool available on the online platform.

The surveys had the ability to provide the user with an automatic acknowledgement of their response being received along with a link with useful information. Each response has been assigned a consultation ID number generated by the 'Get Involved' online platform, full analysis of the consultation responses received has been appended to this report and key findings of the said consultation have been summarised in the report.

The surveys were designed by colleagues in the council's Communications & Engagement team, based on their knowledge and expertise of similar surveys carried out by the council. The surveys were relatively short and simple and asked the following 5 questions:

- 1) Please provide your address including post code this question was set as a mandatory response for officers to determine if the person responding falls from within the 250m consultation boundary or outside it, as explained above.
- 2) Please provide your full name
- 3) Please provide your email address this was requested in the event officers would like to contact the respondent about their response and/or to keep them informed about the outcome of the consultation.
- 4) How strongly do you agree or disagree with the council's proposal to introduce this Healthy School Street? A scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Strongly Disagree, Disagree and No Opinion. This was used to determine the strength of support or opposition to any given scheme.
- 5) Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Question 5 was used largely to review any suggestions made and formed the basis for officer's assessments on the 10 schemes recommended for implementation, but with proposed amendments to 2 because of the feedback given.

Officers have categorised the responses as follows:

- Within the 250-metre consultation boundary
- Outside the 250-metre consultation boundary
- Merged "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" as responses in support of the proposals
- Merged "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree" as responses opposed to the proposals
- "No opinion"
- Analysis of top 10 themes only this will be the most common feedback given by most respondents.

	HOW STRONGLY DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE COUNCILS PROPOSALS TO INTRODUCE THIS HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET?										UCE	z		%ag				
HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET	AGREE					DISAGREE						o. Post	No. R	e of Co				
	Stro Ag No.		Ag No.	ree %	TOTAL	Within Area	Outside Area	Stro Disa No.			igree %	TOTAL	Within Area	Outside Area	No Opinion So	No. Posted To Consultation Area	Returned From Within Consultation Area	%age of Consultation Returned From Within Area
	NO. 37	™ 12	NO. 13	% 4	50	27	23	NO.	70	No.	70				NO.			Ĕ
Melville Avenue – Coombe Wood School	01	12					20	232	75	24	8	256	75	181	5	287	102	36
Rockmount Road – Rockmount Primary School	87	31	26	9	113	59	54								3	1150	155	13
								152	54	15	5	167	96	70				
Linner Deutsk Hill - All Ceinte Drivern, Cebert	47	21	16	7	63	21	42								4	005	72	
Upper Beulah Hill – All Saints Primary School								142	64	16	7	158	51	106	1	885		8
	50	50	13	12	69	31	38											
Windsor Road - St James The Great Primary School	56	50	13	12	09	31	30	35	32	6	5	41	14	27	1	974	45	5
								00	02	Ű	Ŭ							
Normanton Road - St Peters Primary School	47	18	22	8	69	38	31				1	1			1	938	156	17
,								159	61	30	12	189	118	71				
	30	28	9	8	39	16	23								_ 2			
Lodge Road - Elmwood Primary School				-				61	56	7	6	68	35	33		1052 5	51	5
		1						1										
Kensington Avenue - Kensington Avenue Primary School	52	39	10	7	62	32	30				1			1	1	877	55	6
								66	49	5	4	71	23	48				
Spurgeon Road, Harris Academy South	29	23	9	7	38	16	22											9
Norwood						<b>.</b>		77	62	8	6	85	44	41	1	637	60	
St David's, Oasis Academy Byron	16	23	11	15	27	13	14	38	54	6	8		40	20	0	220	31	14
								38	94	6	•	44	18	26				
Spring Park Road, St Johns CoE Primary	36	16	21	9	57	22	35								0	265	68	26
School								146	66	19	9	165	46	119	U	205	00	
	59	44	12	9	71	42	29											
Warrington Road -The Minister, Nursery and Infant School	55	-++	12			72	25	55	41	7	5	62	18	44	0	1024	60	6
Lawrend David Line in the state	8	21	1	3	9	4	5								0	1000	15	
Lennard Road -H arris Academy Invictus								26	67	4	10	30	11	19	0	1062	15	1
Sylvan Road -Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	54	23	17	7	71	48	23								2	1140	141	12
i alaot								142	59	25	10	167	93	74				

HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET		Cause congestion in street / side roads (1)	Scheme will not change travel behaviour (2)	Permit area should be increased (3)	Allow CPZ permits to use the School Street (4)	Review your proposals/restric tion times (5)	Impacts deliveries/traders (6)
Melville Avenue – Coombe Wood School	TOTAL	80	51	1		15	4
Rockmount Road – Rockmount Primary School	TOTAL	89	3	7			8
Upper Beulah Hill – All Saints Primary School	TOTAL	103	23	4		19	3
Windsor Road - St James The Great Primary School	TOTAL	25	7	2		8	3
Normanton Road - St Peters Primary School	TOTAL	96	6	2		18	8
Lodge Road - Elmwood Primary School	TOTAL	30	2	2		1	
Kensington Avenue - Kensington Avenue Primary School	TOTAL	33	7			5	3
Spurgeon Road, Harris Academy South Norwood	TOTAL	28	1	1			10
St David's, Oasis Academy Byron	TOTAL	22	10	5		5	1
Spring Park Road, St Johns CoE Primary School	TOTAL	45	2		1	4	2
Warrington Road -The Minister, Nursery and Infant School	TOTAL	1			4		2
Lennard Road -H arris Academy Invictus	TOTAL	10		1		2	1
Sylvan Road -Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	TOTAL	81	27			25	19
		643	139	25	5	102	64

HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET		Make it safer to go to school (7)	More trees / seating in area (8)	Consider additional traffic calming in area (9)	Provide health benefits (10)	Social/environmenta I benefits from scheme (11)	Social/environmenta I disadvantages from scheme (12)
Melville Avenue – Coombe Wood School	TOTAL			2	4	17	27
Rockmount Road – Rockmount Primary School	TOTAL	18		11	4	6	13
Upper Beulah Hill – All Saints Primary School	TOTAL	3		5	10	3	5
Windsor Road - St James The Great Primary School	TOTAL	10				3	1
Normanton Road - St Peters Primary School	TOTAL	9		2	1	3	16
Lodge Road - Elmwood Primary School	TOTAL			3	4	10	5
Kensington Avenue - Kensington Avenue Primary School	TOTAL	12			7	2	1
Spurgeon Road, Harris Academy South Norwood	TOTAL	3		5		1	7
St David's, Oasis Academy Byron	TOTAL	1		1		1	2
Spring Park Road, St Johns CoE Primary School	TOTAL	4		3	2	1	2
Warrington Road -The Minister, Nursery and Infant School	TOTAL	4		1	5	21	5
Lennard Road -H arris Academy Invictus	TOTAL						10
Sylvan Road -Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	TOTAL	3		3	3	4	24
		67	0	36	40	72	118

				C	OMMENTS ANALY	'SIS		
HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET		Review parking practices in area (13)	Extend scheme extent (14)	Make restrictions obvious/clearly marked/more signage (15)	Exemption for disblaed people (16)	Scheme affects EV charging point in restricted road (17)	Scheme will cause additional pollution in side roads (18)	Scheme will provide no additional safety benefits (19)
Melville Avenue – Coombe Wood School	TOTAL	5	7		3		18	20
Rockmount Road – Rockmount Primary School	TOTAL			3		1	22	2
Upper Beulah Hill – All Saints Primary School	TOTAL	5	10	4			36	5
Windsor Road - St James The Great Primary School	TOTAL		1	2	1		7	
Normanton Road - St Peters Primary School	TOTAL	9	16	5	2		3	5
Lodge Road - Elmwood Primary School	TOTAL		5				6	12
Kensington Avenue - Kensington Avenue Primary School	TOTAL		1	2	1		8	2
Spurgeon Road, Harris Academy South Norwood	TOTAL	1		1			8	3
St David's, Oasis Academy Byron	TOTAL	4	7		1		11	2
Spring Park Road, St Johns CoE Primary School	TOTAL	10	4	1	6		4	
Warrington Road -The Minister, Nursery and Infant School	TOTAL	1	1	1	1			1
Lennard Road -H arris Academy Invictus	TOTAL						4	
Sylvan Road -Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	TOTAL		31	2	1		31	2
		35	83	21	16	1	158	54

				c	OMMENTS ANALY	SIS		
HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET		Consider 'no entry' / 'one way' etc as an alternative to propsal (20)	Cash Cow (21)	Scheme Unnecessary (22)	Spend the money somewhere else (23)	Scheme creates unsafe surrounding roads (24)	Difficulty for working parents/residents/vi sitors (25)	Some schools will be less attractive (26)
Melville Avenue – Coombe Wood School	TOTAL	3	13	27	4	6	57	4
Rockmount Road – Rockmount Primary School	TOTAL		13	13			6	1
Upper Beulah Hill – All Saints Primary School	TOTAL	1	26	8	5	8	32	
Windsor Road - St James The Great Primary School	TOTAL	12	5	3	1	1	20	
Normanton Road - St Peters Primary School	TOTAL	3	15	9	3	7	74	
Lodge Road - Elmwood Primary School	TOTAL		15	7			11	
Kensington Avenue - Kensington Avenue Primary School	TOTAL	4	8	3	3	1	3	
Spurgeon Road, Harris Academy South Norwood	TOTAL		8	6	2	1	6	
St David's, Oasis Academy Byron	TOTAL		4	2		16	20	
Spring Park Road, St Johns CoE Primary School	TOTAL	2	5	2		7	20	
Warrington Road -The Minister, Nursery and Infant School	TOTAL	1	2	5			13	
Lennard Road -H arris Academy Invictus	TOTAL	1	7	6		1	7	
Sylvan Road -Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	TOTAL	2	16	25	1	11	44	
		29	137	116	19	59	313	5

				COMMENT	S ANALYSIS		
HEALTHY SCHOOL STREET		No IDLING signs (27)	Impacts Surrounding Schools (28)	Better enforcement of existing restrictions (29)	Waste of Money (30)	Loss of income due to inacessible driveway by visitors (31)	Parking Problems (32)
Melville Avenue – Coombe Wood School	TOTAL	4	3	12	1		40
Rockmount Road – Rockmount Primary School	TOTAL						8
Upper Beulah Hill – All Saints Primary School	TOTAL	1	2	7	2		15
Windsor Road - St James The Great Primary School	TOTAL			3			13
Normanton Road - St Peters Primary School	TOTAL			16			6
Lodge Road - Elmwood Primary School	TOTAL			1	2		24
Kensington Avenue - Kensington Avenue Primary School	TOTAL						5
Spurgeon Road, Harris Academy South Norwood	TOTAL				1		2
St David's, Oasis Academy Byron	TOTAL			8			10
Spring Park Road, St Johns CoE Primary School	TOTAL	1	11	6	1		21
Warrington Road -The Minister, Nursery and Infant School	TOTAL			3	1		3
Lennard Road -H arris Academy Invictus	TOTAL		1		2		1
Sylvan Road -Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	TOTAL	1		7	4		12
		7	17	63	14	0	160