

Consultation Results

Streetscene Customer Satisfaction Focus Groups 06/07

Purpose of consultation:	<p>The purpose of the consultation was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inform Business Planning ▪ To engage residents and develop customer focussed services ▪ To evaluate communications to residents ▪ To ascertain resident's priorities for the future – e.g. expenditure 																												
Methodology:	<p>Six focus groups held with Haringey residents between 12 July and 17 August 06. 10 residents were invited to each group; these were selected from a contact list drawn from the annual (2005) Residents' Survey, according to age profile/ residency within the borough. All were invited by telephone 2 weeks prior to the groups.</p> <p>The group profile was as shown in the table below:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Date</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Age range</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Area of residence</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">No of attendees</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>12 July 06</td> <td>60+</td> <td>Borough wide</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 July 06</td> <td>25-44</td> <td>East</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13 July 06</td> <td>45-64</td> <td>East and Heartlands</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 Aug 06</td> <td>Under 25</td> <td>Borough wide</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 Aug 06</td> <td>25-44</td> <td>West</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 Aug 06</td> <td>45-64</td> <td>West</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Age range	Area of residence	No of attendees	12 July 06	60+	Borough wide	6	12 July 06	25-44	East	6	13 July 06	45-64	East and Heartlands	9	15 Aug 06	Under 25	Borough wide	6	16 Aug 06	25-44	West	5	17 Aug 06	45-64	West	6
Date	Age range	Area of residence	No of attendees																										
12 July 06	60+	Borough wide	6																										
12 July 06	25-44	East	6																										
13 July 06	45-64	East and Heartlands	9																										
15 Aug 06	Under 25	Borough wide	6																										
16 Aug 06	25-44	West	5																										
17 Aug 06	45-64	West	6																										
Findings:	<p>Waste management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waste situation greatly improved since introduction of wheelie bins. However, following issues mentioned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wheelie bins returned in a slap-dash fashion, sometimes blocking entrances ○ For some, there is a capacity issue with wheelie bins, especially in houses of multiple occupation ○ Bin men won't take bags left outside wheelie bins, but will put them back inside the bin once it's emptied ▪ Feedback on strike: people generally pragmatic, but mention that it shouldn't have happened, public health issue ▪ Improvement noticed in collection of trade waste – mention of daily collections ▪ Not enough public bins thought to exacerbate littering, especially to cover the number of fast food outlets. Suggestion that each fast food restaurant sponsor a bin ▪ On-going communications thought be required to meet the needs of a more transient population mentioned <p>Recycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents not aware that service provision differs within the borough, but those with limited service would like more materials collected ▪ Need a bigger recycling box (East and West), to combine smaller numerous receptacles (West only) ▪ Widespread confusion about recycling process, especially mixed collections. Causing some dissatisfaction when 																												

	<p>people see separated items thrown in together. Residents would welcome more communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Not clear of where closest bring sites and R&R centres are – some residents are travelling to neighbouring boroughs to deposit their recycling▪ Positive feedback on recycling initiative in schools. Suggest that more can be done to engage parents this way, e.g. bring sites near schools <p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Lack of parking provision thought to be a major problem due to multiple occupation, with mention of high density developments being built with inadequate parking provision – such as New River Development, Bounds Green (former Middlesex University site).▪ Parking pressures mentioned in:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Muswell Hill and Crouch End○ Seven Sisters since introduction of red routes○ Turnpike Lane, thought to be a result of the Wood Green CPZ area too large▪ Requests for more public car parks, with very little awareness of where car parks are available▪ Speed cameras are seen to be an effective deterrent to speeding, rather than speed bumps which seem to be inconsistently placed/ non-standard height▪ Perceived inconsistency in parking enforcement – mention that some get tickets and others don't when all appear to be illegally parked▪ Disproportionate enforcement mentioned, particularly clamping and removal when just illegally rather than dangerously parked▪ Improvement in removal of abandoned vehicles noticed by all, very positive▪ Mention of inconsistent communication, e.g. where CPZ consultation has been carried out but no further feedback on progress/ what the outcomes were▪ CPZ permit fees seen as another tax – suggestion that 1 free permit per household would challenge cynicism▪ Mention of prolific blue badge misuse/ dangerous parking on yellow lines <p>Highways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Requests for more cycle lanes, to encourage cycling and counter people riding on the pavement▪ Most feel that condition of roads has improved, but pavements seen to be deteriorating.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Aside from trip hazards, there is complaint of “Council policy” of replacing broken slabs with tarmac.○ Repair of potholes thought to be ineffective, as potholes reopen. Seen to be shoddy workmanship▪ Awareness that reinstatement of roads and pavements following utilities works leaves the roads and pavements in a worse condition than before – it should be left better. Also mention that planning gain for new developments
--	---

	<p>should include resurfacing of pavements likely to have been damaged by development works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some awareness that the road works are being carried out by utility companies, but it is not widely noticed: some are not interested who is carrying out work, others say it's not clear ▪ 'Road closed' signs used, but are often positioned part-way along road. Should be marked at entrance to road. ▪ Suggestion that more can be done to inform residents of road works upcoming. No awareness of interactive maps provided on website ▪ All aware of improvement in street lighting over past 5 years, with mention that it reduces crime and improves perception of safety. However, back streets are still dim, particularly mention of Seven Sisters/ Highgate. ▪ Around half aware of how to report street light faults
What does this mean for us?	Suggestions from these focus groups to be considered along with other satisfaction data when developing services. Where additional budgets are required, these have been included in the business planning process, which are subject to member's approval.
For further information, please contact:	Salome Simoes/ Caroline Humphrey
Dates of consultation:	12 Jul-17 Aug 06
Ward/ neighbourhood affected?	Borough-wide