Annex 3: Analysis of the responses received including further statistics and comments
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Introduction and methodology

Introduction
The Council aims to tackle the twin challenge of climate change and poor air quality together by putting in place a combined Air Quality and Climate Change Action Plan. The two main aspects of the Plan being:
- the aims and objectives for the next five years to tackle poor air quality and climate change
- a dynamic list of actions to meet these aims and objectives which will be reviewed throughout the Plan’s lifetime.

Methodology
A copy of the draft Action Plan was placed on the Council’s website and was made available in hard copy. Consultation of the draft was carried out in the following ways:
- a short survey covering the key aspects of the draft action plan. 36 responses were received.
- a dedicated email box for people to provide ideas or concern about the draft plan.
- opportunity to participate in public engagement sessions. 12 people attended the events held at Muslim Cultural Heritage Centre, the Ecology Centre and Brompton Library.
The majority of respondents agreed that more integration between climate change and air quality policies is the right way forward (20 strongly agreed and 9 agreed). Five respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with a further two respondents disagreeing with the statement.
Survey Findings: Overall

Just over three quarters (28) of respondents indicated that they thought it is appropriate to join climate change and air quality action plans together in one plan. Three respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, with a further five individual’s disagreeing.

Q2 Do you agree or disagree that it is appropriate to join climate change and air quality action plans together in one plan?

- Strongly agree: 16
- Agree: 12
- Neither agree nor disagree: 3
- Disagree: 4
- Strongly disagree: 1
Survey Results: Overall

Pro integration

Seems very sensible to combine the two. However you must be careful that the serious local issues of air quality (lack of it) is not diluted by the wider issue of climate change, which tend to be linked to global issues.

As long as climate change action (long term, universal) and air quality action (short-term, local) do not get in each others' way and slow down the latter, then it must be right to combine.

Important thing is to have clear and strong action to improve air quality and reduce damaging omissions. No view as to best way to do that re policy although logic says they should complement not contradict and if resources are limited best to pool them.

Against integration

They should be separate issues although there is some relation between them.

Air quality should be the priority as this is killing residents. Climate change is generally a longer strategy.

I attended one of the public sessions ...and came away feeling as follows: London air pollution is a specific known problem that must be solved. It stands on its own. It does not need to be allied with any other issue and doing so might dilute, delay or even derail the whole effort. I am not expert on either but there may be no good to come of linking this specific problem and its handling, treatment and resolution with the far wider issue of climate control.
Survey Findings: Section 1

Three quarters of respondents also agreed with the proposed policy on climate change and air quality, whilst three neither agreed nor disagreed and a further six disagreed.

Q4 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy on climate change and air quality?

- Strongly agree: 12
- Agree: 15
- Neither agree nor disagree: 3
- Disagree: 4
- Strongly disagree: 2
Twenty five respondents agreed with the aims outlined for the next five years, whilst four neither agreed nor disagreed and seven disagreed with the aims.
Three quarters of all respondents indicated that they agreed with the objectives over the next five years, three gave a neutral response whilst a further five respondents disagreed with the objectives.
The council should not waste time with policies about climate change. They should concentrate entirely on improving the air we breath, especially for those of us that live near the Westway. Reducing CO2 emissions, the crux of climate change policy, will do nothing to achieve this.

Generally, there are many good ideas, but more could be done to ensure some ideas are adopted. E.g. encouraging schools to have better travel plans, discouraging car owners from leaving their engines on while waiting, etc. Such issues need to be combined with better traffic enforcement.

Ambitious but necessarily so, given the priority of keeping our streets and homes healthy.

Good to see that tackling fuel poverty and improving quality of council homes are included in 5. Objectives.

I find the policies around cycling and car use 'tame'. There is a real opportunity to reduce the high level of air pollution from cars by doing everything possible to:
1. Encourage local residents to use public transport/cycle/walk.
2. Discourage people from coming to RBKC in cars.
3. Discourage people travelling through the area to other end destinations using cars...

These measures are insufficient to provide clean air in RBKC. Much more must be done to address emissions from vehicles and this should include pedestrianising streets, building cycle lanes and reducing car parking to get people out of their cars.
**Survey Findings: The Action Plan**

All but one respondent indicated that they agreed that the Council should keep a ‘live’ list of actions that can be added to as new actions are identified (35 respondents). One respondent neither agreed nor disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than three quarters of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the actions in the consultation document, a further four respondents neither agreed nor disagreed and three respondents disagreed.

**Q9 Do you agree or disagree with the actions?**

- Strongly agree: 11
- Agree: 17
- Neither agree nor disagree: 4
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly disagree: 2
Survey Results: Ideas and other comments

Respondents were given a final opportunity to comment, ten respondents did.

Introducing times during the day when no cars are allowed on to main roads to reduce traffic and car trips - particularly during school run times and on football match days. Using traffic enforcement to encourage shifts in behaviour.

Forget about reducing CO2 which is harmless to humans when breathed. Concentrate on reducing emissions we know are harmful when breathed by humans.

Be bold and do more!

Again, traffic needs to be addressed urgently!

I suggest that the actions could, in the case of vehicle emissions be strengthened e.g. the cost of residents' permits could be significantly increased, particularly for second permits.
Feedback from Public Engagement Sessions

Summary of comments from Environment Round Table meeting 7th September 2015

• The discussions at the ERT were positive and there was widespread support of the Council joining air quality and climate change policies and actions.

• The attendees had many technical questions and comments fielded by officers. The attendees also raised concerns over the costs to implement the proposed actions.

• There were also a number of suggested actions which have been shared with the relevant internal stakeholders.
AQCCAP Consultation: Drop-in session at Muslim Cultural Heritage Centre, Wednesday 23 September; 4 attendees.

- The first public session held at the Muslim Cultural Heritage Centre was attended by at least two residents from the Grenfell Action Group who voiced their significant dissatisfaction with the Council for allowing the KALC development and the associated public use of the multi use games areas and football pitches by the Westway.

- These residents felt there was a lack of Councillors’ engagement and that the action plan was a formality that would not result in any real change or improvement for residents. Another attendee wanted to see more improvement to housing stock through regulation.
Feedback from Public Engagement Sessions Cont’d

AQCCAP Consultation: Drop-in session at the Ecology Centre (Holland Park), Saturday 3 October; 4 attendees.

• The second session was held in the Ecology Centre in Holland Park and the conversation centred around how greening measures could be used and required by the Council to tackle climate change and air pollution as well as improve drainage and general amenity.

• One resident was concerned that “there are not enough greening plans for such a polluted borough” although there is “a massive scope, especially in the Westway area”. Residents at this session were generally supportive of the joint plan and had recommendations on how to raise awareness of the issues to the general public.

• The majority of the conversation addressed how tree planting should be part of the action plan as well as how electric vehicles and their infrastructure could be promoted.
Feedback from Public Engagement Sessions Cont’d

AQCCAP Consultation: Drop-in session at Brompton Library, Wednesday 06 October; 4 Attendees.

• The Brompton Library held the last session attended by a resident who does not believe that climate change is man-made and strongly voiced his opinion that the plan to tackle air quality should not be joined with climate change.

• Another resident strongly voiced her concerns over the impacts of development in the borough, particularly those associated with demolition and construction traffic.

• There was support from attendees that the joint sources of poor air quality and greenhouse gases should be targeted and that the Council should take whatever actions necessary to protect its residents.
Demographic information of respondents

- 27 respondents were answering the survey ‘as a resident’
- 1 respondent was responding on behalf of a business
- 1 respondent was answering as a statutory consultee
- 2 respondents were responding on behalf of a community group or voluntary organisation
- 3 respondents indicated that they were responding to the survey in an ‘other’ capacity.