



PropTech Engagement Fund Round 2

Final Report

November 2022

London Borough of

Redbridge



Local Planning Authority	London Borough of Redbridge
Date Report Submitted	24-11-2022



Executive Summary

Region	London
LA Rural-Urban Classification Category	Major Urban (MU)
Project summary	<p>In 2021, the Redbridge Growth Commission ‘Growing Redbridge Together’ was established in response to growing pressures to deliver housing against a backdrop of disconnection between the borough’s vision for growth and resident concerns around poor or over-development, alongside worries about infrastructure and change. As part of the Growth Commission’s final report “Growing Redbridge Together” they set out several recommendations to support better growth in the borough, including recommending that the Council offer new mechanisms for resident empowerment and participation.</p> <p>In March 2022, as successful applicants to PropTech Engagement Fund Round 2, the Council used the awarded funding to commission Urban Intelligence to create a tool that digitally assembles land and planning data to steer the Area Assessment evidence base for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The resulting tool uses geospatial and data analytics techniques, combined with geo-tagged community feedback that expresses their lived experiences within their areas, the outcomes of which will shape the ongoing Local Plan review.</p> <p>The focus of the tool is to serve as a simple, visually appealing, and informative forum between the Council and residents – offering part of a response to the Growth Commission’s request for an increase in participatory activity across the Council which embraces the agency, assets, collective wisdom, and diversity of Redbridge’s citizens being built into every area of growth.</p> <p>While the project had initially planned for the outcomes of the Area Assessment analysis to be the basis of the PropTech public engagement, based on user-testing feedback, the project scope was refined into a two-stage process. In line with the Area Assessment process set out by the Greater London Authority, Stage 1 of engagement focuses on information gathering through resident engagement. Stage 2 will follow</p>



	<p>later and will generate different models for growth for community feedback.</p> <p>The resulting consultation tool is dynamic and will evolve over the next three years to respond to feedback loops and LBR's needs.</p>
Funding allocated	£125,000.00
Supplier Appointed	Urban Intelligence
Consultation Topic	Community feedback on Area Assessments
Consultation Outcomes	<p><u>User-Research Consultation Session Outcomes</u></p> <p>In August 2022, a user-research session was held for invited residents to test a beta version of the tool. To meaningfully address participant feedback, the Project Team worked to refine the project scope and purpose of the tool. The project's remit was restructured to work as a two-stage process.</p> <p>Stage 1 (29 September - 9 November 2022): an online map-based resource and consultation open which provided an opportunity for residents to understand more about their area and provide feedback as they desire.</p> <p>Stage 2 (TBC): Web platform intended to test different models for growth distribution across the Borough - affording greater transparency into how competing planning considerations are balanced with a follow-up consultation on emerging proposals.</p> <p>The revised approach and delivery ensured the development of a tool that functions as the Council and our residents wanted it to, and one that will remain useful in the long-term.</p> <p><u>PropTech Stage 1 Outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a longer-term tool that can assist in creating a more transparent planning process where factors defining the delivery and/or distribution of growth are more clearly communicated to residents through visual aids and mapping. • Collected dynamic data regarding residents' lived experiences in their local areas (especially using geotagged responses) through an online tool, which can be integrated into Area Assessment and Local Plan review work. • Reached a wider demographic of Redbridge residents



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a mobile-friendly web tool for community engagement. • Inform LBR, and wider Local Authorities, as to the benefits and lessons learned from implementing an interactive digital platform to better communicate planning considerations.
<p>Consultation Dates</p>	<p><u>Greater London Authority (GLA)</u> Two meetings were held with the GLA to align the project outcomes to the 2021 London Plan’s requirements. The meetings took place at the project outset and during the platform development, following the user research session in August. Discussions with the GLA helped to steer the Project Team towards the resulting two-staged engagement approach.</p> <p><u>User-Research Consultation</u> Date: 4 August 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven King resident participants: 5 • Council staff participants: 3 • Total participants: 8 <p><u>Stage 1 “Go Live”</u> Date: 29 September – 9 November 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of responses:484 <p><u>Stage 2 “Go Live” and in-person event (TBD)</u> Date: when Local Plan review gains traction</p>



Contents Page

1.0 Project Summary	7
2.0 Lessons Learned	5
3.0 Pilot Outcomes	21
4.0 Community Feedback	23
5.0 Conclusions and Policy Reflections	30
6.0 Appendices	31



1.0 Project Summary

Summary

In 2021, the Redbridge Growth Commission 'Growing Redbridge Together' was established in response to growing pressures to deliver housing against a backdrop of disconnection between the borough's [Brave New Towns](#) vision for growth and resident concerns around poor or over-development, alongside worries about infrastructure and change. As part of the Growth Commission's final report [Growing Redbridge Together](#), several recommendations were proposed to support better growth in the borough, including recommending that LBR offer new mechanisms for resident empowerment and participation.

The London Borough of Redbridge (LBR) is at a critical point in its development and growth and is beginning a review of its Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted in 2018).

To address recommendations in the Growing Redbridge Together report, aid in the ongoing Local Plan review, and increase housing delivery while simultaneously gaining a deeper understanding of local concerns and aspirations, LBR proposed to develop an Area Assessment tool as part of the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) Round 2 of the PropTech Engagement Fund.

LBR used the awarded grant funding to commission Urban Intelligence (UI) and their existing PlaceMaker Tool, a digital site assessment tool which uses advanced geospatial and data analytics techniques to appraise development potential and digitises many of the key processes behind establishing an evidence base for a Local Plan. LBR commissioned the tool on a three-year basis and plans to work with UI to digitise the Area Assessment process, as per the London Plan 2021, using geospatial and data analytics techniques to appraise development potential throughout the borough.

While LBR had initially planned for the outcomes of the Area Assessment analysis to be the basis of the PropTech public engagement, following user-testing feedback from the GLA and borough residents in August, the project scope was refined into a two-stage process. In line with the Area Assessment process set out by the GLA, Stage 1 of engagement focuses on information gathering through resident engagement and Stage 2 will generate different models for growth for community feedback.

Stage 1:

Stage 1 engagement was launched on 29 September 2022 and remained live until 9 November 2022. It can be found [here](#).

The online map-based platform used for Stage 1 collates and displays physical and non-physical data (e.g., socioeconomics, heritage, neighbourhoods, social infrastructure, area typologies, and character) under eight themes:

1. Environment
2. Safety
3. Connections
4. Heritage



5. Character
6. Uses
7. Development
8. Your Priorities – i.e., respondents top three priorities for the future

Each theme provides visual representation of data through a combination of GIS mapping layers, touchpoints displaying background information, 3D VU.CITY scenes, and photos to inform users. The tool also allows for community feedback via geo-tagged comments, photo, or video uploads to allow for residents to express their lived experiences throughout the Borough in relation to each of the eight themes.

Stage 2:

Following the Stage 1 consultation period, the Project Team will assess community feedback and develop a second iteration of the tool which appraises growth capacity across the Borough. This will be used in the Local Plan review to:

- Test models for growth distribution with residents.
- Provide supporting information when undertaking site assessments on proposed allocations.
- Inform the most appropriate and effective approach to site delivery and redevelopment (e.g., intensification, infill, comprehensive redevelopment) in different contexts.
- Develop policy priorities and prioritise interventions specific to localities and neighbourhoods.
- Inform the development of design codes.
- Provide background information to Neighbourhood Forums.

In the long-term, both Stages 1 and 2 are intended to offer a response to the Growth Commission's request for an increase in participatory activity across the council which embraces the agency, assets, collective wisdom, and diversity of Redbridge's citizens being built into every area of growth. The resulting consultation tool is dynamic and will evolve over the next three years to respond to feedback loops and LBR's needs.

Status Quo Consultation pre-PropTech

LBR's approach to consultation in the past has been traditional. The key methods that have been employed are as follows.

Planning development application consultation:

- Prior to digitisation of the planning application process, which occurred between 2008 – 2010, paper copies of applications were sent to libraries and/or Council buildings for public viewing. Additionally, surveys were sent to residents with all planning decisions. It was found that survey responses were always extremely low, and responses were predominantly from disgruntled applicants on refusals.
- Post digitisation, instead of paper copies of applications, PCs were deployed to libraries and/or Council buildings for public use and all planning applications were scanned and made available online. This process is largely



the same to date and is now managed by an online facility which is part of the Council's back-office system.

- A noted limitation of this system, and something which has been an aspiration of LBR for many years, is the lack of map functionality in this process. Unless a resident received a letter, saw a site notice or an advert in the press, they would not necessarily know the details of a planning application and therefore would not be able to search for it online.

Planning policy consultation:

- LBR's approach to consultation on planning policy development has also been very traditional. In the past the process typically involves draft planning policy documents and plans being presented to the public for feedback, and then the feedback is analysed in a resource intensive way by policy staff.
- In preparing the current Local Plan (2015 – 2030), the Council carried out several rounds of public consultation between 2011 and 2016. The Council consulted on the following:
 1. 'Help Shape the Growth in Redbridge' (Regulation 18): 12 September - 28 October 2011
 2. Preferred Options Report (Regulation 18): 7 January - 22 February 2013
 3. Preferred Options Report Extension: Alternative Development Strategies (Regulation 18): 7 November - 22 December 2014.
 4. Stakeholders were given opportunity to be heard as the Pre-Submission Plan proceeded through Neighbourhoods Service Committee on the 26 May 2016, Cabinet on the 7 June 2016, and Full Council on 21 July 2016 (all public meetings).
 5. Pre-Submission Plan consultation (Regulation 19): 28 July 2016 - 30 September 2016.
 6. Prior to the submission of the Local Plan, meetings were held with several consultees to help clarify issues raised and inform the production of Statements of Common and Uncommon Ground between consultees and the Council.

Outcomes

The key outcomes of the project were to engage and involve a larger, more representative group of Redbridge residents in the planning process by engaging them earlier on and promoting their contributions through the Area Assessment tool.

The below provides a summary of our target outcomes:



- Development of a long-term tool that can assist in creating a more transparent planning process where factors defining the delivery and/or distribution of growth are more clearly communicated to residents through visual aids and mapping.
- Collection of dynamic data regarding residents' lived experiences in their local areas (especially using geotagged responses) through an online tool, which can be integrated into Area Assessment and Local Plan review work. A more efficient & dynamic process – Integrating technical constraints and public knowledge / feedback.
- Reaching a wider demographic of Redbridge residents, and a more representative group.
- Developing a mobile-friendly web tool for community engagement, that LBR can continue to further iterate and improve beyond the PropTech Engagement Fund timeframe.

Refer to section '3.0 Outcomes' where these targets are revisited.

Opportunities

Overall, the funding allowed for the development of a new forum for place-based feedback from residents. The development of this tool would not have been capable without the funding as the expertise, experience, resources, and capacity were not available within LBR. More specifically it allowed for:

- The development of a web-based engagement tool that conveys complex information in a visually appealing way to inform individuals regarding the various factors and considerations for the delivery of growth across the borough.
- The tool has been developed to be mobile friendly and targets a sub-5-minute completion time. Users are guided through a series of themes, which are communicated on the platform as representing the factors which the Council balances when modelling options for growth distribution.
- The tool can continue to be added to and refined over the three-year licensed period. The back-end allows for easy upload, review of responses and sharing of datasets with consultants preparing our Local Plan evidence bases and council colleagues working on place-based schemes beyond the immediate remit of Planning Policy.

Funding Review – Bid



Funding Theme	Amount Bid
Software Licence	£50,000
Product Development	£50,000
Additional Capacity	£20,000
Consultation	£5,000
TOTAL	£125,000

Funding Review - Spent

PlaceMaker Tool Funding		Spent
Full PlaceMaker Package (including all available Modules)		£125,000*
	Sites Assessment Database	£40,000
	Viability Module	£10,000
	Engagement & Consultation Module	£20,000
	Interactive Web Map Module	£5,000
	Setup, Hosting & Storage	£5,000
	Digital Area Assessment Toolkit	£50,000
	Additional Years License and hosting @ £25k per year	£75,000
	Full PlaceMaker Package including all currently available Modules	£205,000
	Discount for early adopter, direct procurement, and front-loaded payment	-£80,000
Consultation		£247.75
	Food	£80
	Venue Booking	£87.75
	Thank-you gifts to participants	£80
TOTAL SPEND		£125,247.75

**Price is for a three-year contract with UI and excludes VAT. It is subject to Indexation (Rates will rise annually upwards only during the Term in line with CPI+3.5%).*

Funding Reflections



As mentioned, the development of the tool would not have been feasible without the awarded funding. However, to help inform other Local Authorities who may be undertaking their own digital engagement work, LBR Project Team offers the following reflection and lessons learned regarding funding allocation and spending (continued on following page):

- Despite the expertise and resources that UI were able to contribute to the development of the tool, the project team acknowledge that too much of the budget was spent on consultant fees which left limited flexibility/funding for other elements of the project, including additional internal resourcing. More funding should have been allocated to internal resourcing.
- However, the benefits of spending all the budget on consultant fees have allowed for a three-year project which provides longer-term benefits as the Local Plan review has just begun. This has also given the Project Team the opportunity to use the PropTech Engagement Fund period as a genuine 'pilot'/Stage 1 of a longer-term project. Working in this way has meant that we could take greater risks by testing new approaches, reflecting on our outcomes, and taking the lessons learned from this process into a second iteration of the platform for our Local Plan.



2.0 Lessons Learned

Summary

- Clarity of scope - A detailed project plan that outlines the project scope and priority aims is critical as it will provide direction throughout project development and will aid when balancing competing demands.
- User-research with residents - Test the developing tool with a group of residents at an early stage and compensate them for their time. The feedback received from residents during the project development was critical in shaping the final output. Feedback at various development stages ensures your final product is usable by your target audience. Avoid using planning-jargon/industry language so not to alienate interested community responders. Test the language, questions posed and whether your scope and aims feel relevant to the communities you are reaching out to.
- Ring-fence funds for internal resource - Do not allocate all the funding to the development of the platform/consultant fees unless there is sufficient internal capacity. Furthermore, requesting the contractor to take the lead on project management would have been beneficial given their experience and expertise of similar projects.
- Requesting feedback – Feed-back is often provided when encountering an issue. This is valuable, offering insight and opportunities for improvement. It is however equally important to recognise a job well done. Without explicitly requesting feedback on a tool's functionality, you are only notified when issues arise.
- Collate equalities monitoring data for all engagement - The lack of baseline data against which to benchmark the project compromised our ability to fully evaluate its impact. Information gathered as part of Stage 1 PropTech engagement will now form LBR's baseline and has provided new access to demographics/community data to inform wider Local Plan review.
- Supplement digital engagement with in-person outreach - This is particularly critical for reaching disenfranchised communities. Regrettably, we did not have the capacity or resource to do this within the programmed time.



Overall, we did not reach as broad a demographic as intended. Despite having invited specific community groups and targeted areas of the borough with higher proportion of minority ethnic groups through our comms campaign, 65% of participants were white, only 20% from BAME background and 3% under 25 years. This falls short where benchmarked against census data for Redbridge - 42% white and 52% BAME and 20% under 25 (refer to Appendix K).

Ensure you have allocated sufficient funds and time to supplement digital engagement with in-person sessions.

Communities who do not typically participate in planning consultations may require additional support to do so. This cannot be achieved through digital engagement alone. Meet in person to build capacity and trust. This also helps to address issues of community digital access and competency.

- Simplify the interface – Accept that a digital planning tool cannot (and need not) convey the full breadth and complexity of factors underlining planning policy. Design the interface for capturing responses in a way that allows people to respond intuitively. This is unlikely to align with the parcelling-up of planning policies.
- Multiple routes to engagement – Provide alternative opportunities to respond and do not assume that everybody can read a map or is digitally-literate.

Project Stage or Milestone	Approach	Lessons Learned
<p>2.1 Getting started <i>Developing the business case/gaining organisational buy-in to apply for Round 2 funding.</i></p>	<p>As there was pre-existing appetite within Council for new and innovative forms of community engagement, the project team developed an internal business case that had to be approved only by departmental Directors.</p> <p>Given the existing support within the Council, the type of project being bid for, and the amount of money being sought, the project was not considered contentious and the overall approach to getting buy-in was not difficult.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To always write things down and detail the process. Given that there was existing buy-in and approval within LBR for this project, limited briefing materials needed to be developed which saved time initially but made reporting difficult. ● The development of briefing materials may have delayed initial timelines, but they could have benefited the overall



	<p>Furthermore, there was early collaboration with innovators in the digital engagement field which allowed for a tailored procurement bid to be developed which will be further discussed below.</p>	<p>work programme by encouraging the team to develop a more focused project scope and thus avoiding later issues during the programme development phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additionally, the development of these early products would have aided in final report writing.
<p>2.2 Procurement <i>Developing supplier brief and project budget.</i></p>	<p>The development of the supplier brief was a very collaborative process between LBR Project Team, DLUCH, and perspective suppliers. Project Team members had not commissioned this type of work before and significantly benefited from the guidance suppliers could offer. However, it was a lengthy and complicated process that required constant communication to ensure clarity on next steps.</p> <p>Thanks to engagement and advice from DLUCH's Procurement Advisor and LBR's Procurement Team, the Project Team were advised to use the National model (short form) contract.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall timeline for procurement (i.e., developing the supplier brief, going out to tender, and appointing a supplier) needs to be longer. Addressing complications in the development stage required more time and capacity than was anticipated. • Despite initial buy-in from senior management, throughout the brief development there was a lot of differing directions and competing priorities between various management levels. This required time to address, which there was limited of, and was an unforeseen barrier. • A positive lesson was learning about the "restricted" procurement route which allowed for certain processes to be skipped and significant time to be saved.



<p>2.3 Procurement <i>Finding and appointing a supplier.</i></p>	<p>As the project budget was under the £176k threshold, and there was a short procurement timeline, the tender went through a "restricted" procurement route. This allowed the project team to seek quotes from only three invited suppliers who were previously known by Council officers to be active in projects that involved geographic analysis for planning or real estate purposes.</p> <p>Due to internal capacity constraints, the project team lead the contract development and signoff. LBR Legal Team were informed of the procurement and raised no objections in principle with the contract process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall timeline for procurement (i.e., developing the supplier brief, going out to tender, and appointing a supplier) needs to be longer to permit for divergent opinions to be addressed. • Many barriers were unknown and could not be properly planned for/mitigated and thus the team needed to be agile to respond quickly to meet timeline requirements. • As noted above, the importance of scribing conversations with perspective suppliers throughout the interview and negotiation process helped to swiftly resolve miscommunications with regards to scope and cost.
<p>2.4 Onboarding <i>PropTech suppliers, additional consultants, and internal teams.</i></p>	<p>To manage the project, as a first step a Working Group was established with representatives from across LBR's Regeneration and Culture Division.</p> <p>Communication channels for the Working Group were then established – a Microsoft Teams channel and a Miro Board page to share documents, materials, and ideas and to structure our inception workshop.</p> <p>The Working Group then held an inception virtual meeting with UI, facilitated through the Miro Board page, to determine and outline common</p>	<p>As this was a new type of project for all those on the Working Group, there was some uncertainty in the outset as to what materials were needed. On reflection, the following would have been useful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting a representative from LBR Communication Team on board as early as possible. • Establishing a Resident Panel at the outset to have community ambassadors inputting into the project



	<p>objectives and priorities for the project.</p> <p>Additionally, a meeting with GLA on the potential of the tool and alignment with the London Plan was held to ensure that the characterisation study can be held on the digital Area Assessment tool. The meeting concluded that it was feasible so long as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are separate layers where the characterisation information can be pulled out and easily reviewed (and updated if required). ● The format enables the ability to agree the places where growth can happen (setting area visions). ● The format supports DM colleagues to push back on the pressure for tall buildings. 	<p>at various points – at the brief writing stage, during the platform’s development, and at its launch. This would have given the Working Group an earlier steer on what the project should achieve from a resident’s perspective and ultimately saved us from undertaking abortive work in the lead-up to the user research session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Despite our best efforts, our original iteration of the project was too complex and used too much planning-jargon/industry language and was ultimately of limited interest to residents. ● Successful resident on-boarding throughout the project development would have required us to remunerate residents for their time to make sure the process was equitable and the invitation genuinely open to everybody – not only to those who could afford to volunteer their time.
<p>2.5 Campaign Development <i>Developing marketing and engagement strategies, including developing survey questions, platform content, and user research.</i></p>	<p>Developed core project management materials that led to the further development of campaign specific materials and actions which included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Work chart with key milestones 	<p>Programme development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Outline the project scope and priority aims from the outset so to provide direction throughout when balancing competing demands.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Team actions log ● The Project Team prepared all communication assets and messaging, and developed the Communication Strategy, which was commented on by LBR Communication Team. ● Project Team made use of existing relationships with residents through LBR Community Hubs colleagues. ● Terms of Reference were written to clarify the scope of engagement for residents participating in the user-research session. ● Stakeholder mapping exercise was undertaken to identify specific groups across the borough that we wanted to engage. This covered cohorts within areas of the Borough that are more frequently excluded from Planning consultations. ● To support this approach, UI offered to pay for social media promotions which would be hosted through LBR channels – specifically targeting these areas of the Borough. ● Continued to use resources established during the onboarding process and ideas were signed off on Miro Board before 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Having a user testing session on a beta version of the tool was very helpful as it forced the team to refine the scope of the project and focused the objectives on information gathering and community engagement, also better aligning the project with London Plan objectives. ● If less of the funding had been dedicated to the development of the platform/paying the consultants, then additional funding could have been used to increase internal capacity and on-board residents to co-design the tool. ● The scale of this project required extensive communication across teams, material development, file management, etc. and additional internal resources would have been very useful. ● It was helpful that the team timed the release of the tool with LBR Cabinet approval of the proposed indicative timeframe for the Local Plan review. If Cabinet had not approved consultation activities, the language within the tool would have needed to be more vague
--	--	--



	<p>being web-developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly meetings were held between the LBR working group and UI to maintain project momentum. • The user research feedback quite fundamentally changed the project direction. 	<p>and likely less useful. The user research session in August was prior to Cabinet approval for the Local Plan review, and it was difficult for the team to be transparent regarding the use of the tool and its planned release date, despite resident’s interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficial to conduct an innovative approach prior to pre-statutory consultation, as it has given the team greater flexibility to investigate a broader range of themes. • Furthermore, it has been helpful to frame the release of the tool as a pilot, as the team benefited from more leeway to allow for things to be tested as Councils are often risk adverse. • The LBR team managed the project. Requesting the contractor to take the lead on project management would have been beneficial given their experience and expertise of similar projects and to stop LBR from ‘second-guessing’. <p>Engagement & marketing materials:</p>
--	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Ensuring LBR's Communications Team are fully engaged throughout the development of the tool could have provided clarity on Council content standard (e.g., graphic standards).● Resource constraints limited the time dedicated to editing materials and ensuring there was a clarity of voice. Although these are critical elements that were addressed, more time and resources should have been allocated.● Youth engagement – lack of clarity on the process to engage with young people outside of an organised youth group / forum meant that we missed out on involving young people in the user group stage, which would have been invaluable. The Project Team have since clarified the process for engaging with young people from a safeguarding perspective and have circulated this more widely to prevent future missed opportunities. <p>Platform development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Lack of clarity regarding Area Assessment development (now a two-staged process) within brief meant that a lot of abortive work was
--	--	---



		<p>undertaken. Crossed wires across Project Team/Working Group – expectation for analysis to be undertaken as part of this scope which was not in line with GLA guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● LBR spent significant time and resource being overly prescriptive / designing every page of the website on the Miro Board – very little of which was integrated into the final website. While this helped to focus our thinking, this could have been streamlined through more regular communication with UI at this point in the project.● Lots of clearance internally regarding accessibility and General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) – The project team had to get sign-off from multiple internal stakeholders and brief consultants of the Council’s guidelines and standards. The requirements were quite technical and not communicated easily in writing. Everyone would have benefited from a workshop with all the relevant parties at the outset.● We couldn’t use the Council’s paid community panel for our user group session as staff absences and GDPR
--	--	---



		<p>protection meant we couldn't access the panel list. More resilient internal systems could have prevented this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of learning about web accessibility and making maps more accessible for disabled users (e.g., those who are colourblind, those who are unable to use a mouse), but not able to integrate all of it. • Development of simple and engaging questions to integrate on the platform, which would be both compelling to residents and useful to LBR proved challenging, especially on a mobile-based application. This took numerous iterations to get right. A key lesson from the user research session was to avoid too many levels to click through before making a comment, or asking too many questions, or having unclear technical questions.
<p>2.6 Campaign Launch and Management <i>Working with suppliers to 'go live', attending in person / hybrid events, and troubleshooting tech issues.</i></p>	<p>On 29 September 2022, Stage 1 of the tool went live. As with the development of the tool, its launch was also coordinated online through Teams and other platforms, e.g., emails and Miro Board.</p> <p>Although in the end the launch was successful and kept close to the team's targets, the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As was an issue in previous stages of the project, the lack of an overall and task specific project management tools made meeting milestones challenging. A common lesson learned throughout has been the importance of project management to steer the project throughout. For example, the lack of an



	<p>approach could have been more thought-out.</p> <p>Meeting the ‘Go Live’ date was challenging, as amendments were being made to the scope and look of the tool up until launch. The process was ad-hoc rather than planned, which made it difficult to fully align the comms campaign.</p> <p>The Project Team was able to view a final version of the tool a week prior to launch, however, this left little time for incorporating comments and securing final sign-off.</p> <p>Once the tool was live, to market it to as many residents as possible, the Project Team leveraged existing communication channels within the Council. The following was done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A stakeholder mapping exercise was undertaken – targeting the North-East and South of the Borough where consultation response rates are typically lower, this focused on cohorts that are more frequently excluded from Planning discussions. Direct invitations were issued to the following people and organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One Place East ○ Diocese of Brentwood / Goodmayes ○ Hainault / Chigwell Muslim Association ○ Hainault Youth Centre ○ Awaaz Voice for Women 	<p>Actions Log meant that LBR had to provide comments in an ineffective and time-consuming manner to UI, further delaying the finalisation of the tool. This is a lesson that has now been incorporated into many other ongoing projects within LBR Planning Policy Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The resulting agile approach to the launch was only feasible due to the high-level of support from UI and LBR. There was almost constant communication between the Project Team and the broader Working Group in the lead up and after the launch – a very collaborative, helpful, and conducive approach. ● Additional time should have been allocated for troubleshooting issues with the website before and after launch. It was time consuming, and resource hadn’t been allocated for the task. ● While the paid communication had a high reach (refer to Appendix K) which was equivalent to a nine-fold increase compared to the non-paid comms over the same time period, this nonetheless
--	---	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Redbridge Disability Consortium o Panjabi Centre o New City College o Child Friendly Redbridge o Young people in SK co-design group (19 children / teenagers + their parents) o User research resident group o Citizens UK Redbridge o Frenford Youth Group o Redbridge Community Land Trust <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Internal communications and demos were held with the LBR Regeneration & Culture Directorate and LBR Engagement Network. ● Paid communications campaign to supplement LBR non-paid channels (via Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor, LinkedIn, LBR e-newsletter) - the cost of which was covered by UI (amounting to £1,500) <p>The launch of Stage 1 was an online only event. Although it is acknowledged that an in-person event would have been beneficial to supplement the work we were able to successfully complete, given resourcing and time constraints, an in-person event has been delayed until the next engagement cluster as part of Stage 2.</p>	<p>translated into a low conversion rate.</p> <p>To boost numbers, UI and LBR created two short videos to replace previous assets on our social media channels. See links below:</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GbERyWJLu3E</p> <p>https://www.instagram.com/reel/Ckif1PtolaI/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link</p> <p>https://www.tiktok.com/@redbridgecouncil/video/7159539730873437445?is_from_webapp=1&sender_device=pc&web_id=7010688288462571014</p> <p>Curiously, there doesn't appear to be a strong correlation between social media push and reach with a relatively steady stream of responses logged throughout the 42-day period. The video comms assets' impact is nonetheless greater, given that paid social media reach was effectively halved in the latter stages of the consultation process.</p>
--	--	--



<p>2.7 Campaign Wrap-up <i>Closing campaigns, running analysis, agreeing next steps.</i></p>	<p>LBR Project Team created a spreadsheet which logged responses, UX feedback, clicks and views in relation to different communication outlets used.</p> <p>UI set out a spreadsheet which captured responses with filtered categories for ease of analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The log was added to incrementally throughout the engagement period and allowed the Project Team in collaboration with LBR Comms and UI to tailor the comms outputs accordingly and to rectify bugs as and when these came up.
<p>2.8 Feedback Loops <i>For example, developing opportunities for ongoing feedback from the community, following up with people who responded to the consultation, sharing consultation insights with key stakeholders.</i></p>	<p>The user group that tested a beta version of the tool in August were contacted at the time of the launch of Stage 1 with a summary of their feedback and how it had shaped the development of the tool.</p> <p>Both internal LBR feedback on UX of the launched product and key social media feedback was incorporated into the honing of the tool in the week after launch. Social media post was responded to once the point raised had been addressed.</p> <p>Feedback log created for LBR and UI to review for next engagement iteration</p> <p>Members of the public are asked to sign-up to the Local Plan data base: ‘If you are interested in being added to the Local Plan database so you are contacted with further information and updates regarding the Local Plan, and this and future Local Plan consultations, send us an email (hyperlink to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline plans for in-person training on how to use the tool/second round of clustering in the new year with feedback loops. • Information gathered as part of Stage 1 PropTech engagement will now form the Council's baseline and has provided new access to demographics /community data to inform wider Local Plan review.



	mailto: here)'	
--	----------------	--

Final Reflections

How did you conduct community outreach (digital and/or in person)? What approach, including timelines, budget, and tools were adopted?

User-Research Session (4 August 2022):

- Representatives from the Project Team, including a representative from UI, conducted an in-person user-research group testing on a beta tool at Redbridge Central Library with invited attendees.
- The invited attendees were residents from the Borough's Seven Kings area and contacted through existing LBR community outreach channels - i.e., The Seven Kings Co-Design Network.
- As per our funding table in Section 1 of this report, £5k was requested for consultation activities, but was instead spent on UI. Funds for the user-research session then had to be secured from other LBR streams.
- The user-research session was outlined in the Consultation Plan developed by LBR Project Team and commented on by LBR Communication Team, however most of the work was completed by the Project Team members.

Stage 1 Campaign Launch (29 September 2022):

- Paid marketing - UI paid £1.5k for social media marketing on a borough-wide scale.
- Council communication channels and networks for additional internal and external marketing (e.g., e-newsletters) – please see Appendix K for further information.
- Promoted the tool on LBR twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Next Door, and LinkedIn.
- Sent personalized community emails to neighbour organisations and groups, emails included communication packages and asked recipients to distribute the information to their wider communities.
- UI gave individualised tracking URLs to see who came through which channels.



Looking back at this project, was there additional guidance or support from DLUHC or other stakeholders that would have been helpful to work through these and other stages of delivery?

- The availability and information DLUHC were able to provide the team was greatly appreciated, especially during the procurement stage.
- However, the frequency and length of check-in meetings throughout the entirety of the project was somewhat overwhelming for the small team to manage and we would suggest that meetings should be more focused on status reporting.
- Overall, the team would like to emphasize how helpful DLUH has been throughout the project, especially during procurement, user group testing, and providing guidance and flexibility during scoping changes.

Were there any wider surprises which surfaced through undertaking the project?

- Developing the tool to be mobile friendly was an unforeseen challenge, especially given that the platform is map-based, and it was difficult to have everything visible on a mobile screen.
- Graphic design, user experience, and user design are specific skills that were not commissioned as part of the brief and should have been.
- The overall timeframe was surprisingly short, in addition to not anticipating complications and mitigating their impact early on, which resulted in more reactionary project development (e.g., tool platform edits being done very last minute). This was due to several factors, including the newness of such a platform development and the lack of experience the Project Team had with developing innovative consultation products (which is likely a case across the profession at this time).
- GIS data not being as malleable as expected and thus a specialised member was required to be brought onto the Working Group to manage and edit the data which was not graphic friendly.
- Faulty accessibility assumptions, as a map is not an accessible format for all community members.
- The level of resource intensity was much higher than expected and stretched the small team. Due to capacity constraints across all departments, and not just Planning Policy, other departments were not as involved in developing communication materials as expected.



3.0 Pilot Outcomes

Proposed Outcomes

- *Measurement 1: Delivery of the module / tool that meets the brief within the required timeframe. This will be assessed in accordance with the tender specification and the usefulness of the tool.*
 - The broader aspiration of informing residents about planning constraints and how decisions are balanced will be more closely addressed within the next module / phase 02 of the Area Assessment tool. Refer to 2.0 Lessons Learned summary – the user research session helped us to identify how residents wished to interact with the platform in a more intuitive manner, which helped to streamline our approach.
- *Measurement 2: A survey and structured reflection session will be undertaken at the start of the project, asking community participants about their experiences and perceptions of the planning process and their understanding of how strategic decisions are made in their local area. This will be repeated at the project's conclusion to assess the impact of the tool in achieving those key outcomes.*
 - This structured reflection session was undertaken as part of the user research session with Seven Kings residents. The following questions were posed at the start and end of the session:
 - *Do you trust the council to make decisions about the type and location of development that is right for Redbridge and its communities?
Rate 1-5 and explain your answer. 1: no trust; 5: full trust*

At the start of this session, resident participants scored on average 2.5/5 for this question. This changed to 4/5 at the session completion.

- *Do you know how these decisions are made and what factors are taken into account?
Rate 1-5 and explain your answer. 1: not at all; 5: completely understand*

At the start of this session, resident participants scored on average 2/5. This changed to 3/5 at the session completion.

While this provided useful insight into resident's understanding of planning processes and their relationship with the council, we made the decision not to include these on the digital tool to avoid an additional set of registration questions to those already being posed



for equality monitoring purposes - which already felt relatively onerous to complete.

- o Feedback was provided to all user research participants, highlighting how their comments had tangibly shaped the final output.
- o As we enter the project's second phase, we will feed-back on how options for growth distribution have incorporated the responses provided at stage 1.
- *Measurement 3: Comparison of demographics of engagement in Planning both before and after the project - revisited at 6-, 12- and 18-month intervals.*
 - o Refer to 2.0 Lessons Learned summary, the council does not hold equalities monitoring data on previous planning consultations. As such, this project serves as our baseline dataset against which to benchmark future Planning engagement processes.

Outcomes Achieved

- *Develop a tool that can assist in creating a more transparent planning process where factors defining the delivery and/or distribution of growth are more clearly communicated to residents through visual aids and mapping.*
 - o Refer to Measurement 1 note above and 2.0 Lessons Learned summary.
- *Collect dynamic data regarding residents' lived experiences in their local areas (especially using geotagged responses) through an online tool, which can be integrated into Area Assessment and Local Plan review work. A more efficient & dynamic process – Integrating technical constraints and public knowledge / feedback.*
 - o Yes, the tool provides an invaluable database of place-based feedback which will underpin our Local Plan.
- *Reach a wider demographic of Redbridge residents and a more representative group that includes young people.*
 - o Refer to 2.0 Lessons Learned summary and Appendix K. A more targeted outreach programme is necessary. A key lesson is the need to devise an agile strategy that uses both digital and non-digital methods in complementary ways.
- *Develop a mobile-friendly web tool for community engagement.*



- o Yes, objective achieved.

Please see attached spreadsheet “LBR_PropTech Engagement Fund Round 2 – Outcomes” and Appendix K for additional data.

Baseline Data

As noted, we had limited demographic data regarding existing resident engagement in the planning process, because of equalities monitoring information not being collected.

However, there was a general perception that people responding to plan-making and planning application consultations were whiter, older, and more likely to be homeowners than the average borough resident. This also had an effect on which types of planning application were commented on, and where those applications were.

For example, a planning application for a 42 storey build to rent residential tower, on the site of the former Bodgers department store in Ilford town centre, received only 7 written objections. This number of objections has been exceeded by proposals for individual family sized houses in the wealthier western part of the borough, often proposed on side gardens or replacing garages.



Image of an approved scheme at One Station Road, Ilford, which received fewer objections than some single dwellings. (Collado Collins Architects)

Measurement Challenges

How did you measure the impact of your outcomes? Did you have any challenges assessing the impact of your project? If so, in what ways?



We had limited demographic data regarding existing resident engagement in the planning process because of equalities monitoring information not being collected. Therefore, it was challenging to assess the impact of our project on a comparative basis.

Demographics

How did you collect demographic data as part of your consultation? If so, please share any demographic breakdown of consultation respondents (e.g., age, gender etc). How does the demographic of your PropTech funded consultation compare with previous consultation responses?

We developed an equalities monitoring form that was anonymised and ‘detached’ from their response for data protection purposes. This was specially adapted to include housing tenure as a characteristic.

For a demographic breakdown of our Stage 1 consultation responses, please see Appendix K.

As addressed in the ‘Lessons learned’ summary in section 02, we believe that the relatively low response rates from minority groups was partly due to our campaign being entirely digitally led without providing in-person support.

Cost Effectiveness

Digital engagement approach did not save time or resources over this time period, as this was a new approach to consultation which needed to be developed from scratch. However, despite the scale and resource intensity of the project, the Council has been able to create a new tool for engaging with residents that will be part of a larger and more impactful consultation process for the development of the new Local Plan, and other planning consultations. Over the full course of the project, this approach will have brought cost savings to the Council.

4.0 Community Feedback

Seven Kings in-person user-research group testing (4 August 2022)

Focus:

The following explanation was provided to user group attendees:

“We want our tool and questions to be as clear and simple to use as possible. To do that, we need your help. We want to test how successful the tool is in explaining factors that inform where development should happen. We want to understand the impact the tool would have on your future ability and interest in engaging.”

Questions:

The following questions were provided to all attendees in a workbook for them to complete and return to the project team.



- *Do you trust the council to make decisions about the type and location of development that is right for Redbridge and its communities? Rate 1-5 and explain your answer (1: no trust; 5: full trust).*
- *Do you know how these decisions are made and what factors are taken into account? Rate 1-5 and explain your answer (1: not at all; 5: completely understand).*
- *What is your experience using the tool?*
- *What do you like about the tool?*
- *What do you dislike about the tool?*
- *How easy or hard is it to navigate around the platform?*
- *How does it feel in terms of the 'look' and 'feel' of the images and language used?*
- *How could we improve the survey questions and the overall tool?*
- *How do you feel about the length of the survey?*
- *Would you be likely to complete the questions online? As opposed to on paper.*
- *Are you more likely to use this on your phone, tablet or on a computer?*
- *Was what the tool should achieve clear? What needs to change to achieve this?*
- *Would the tool encourage you to get more involved in conversations around planning and development? Why? Rate 1-5 and explain your answer (1: not at all; 5: Yes, completely).*
- *Would the tool discourage you from getting involved in conversations around planning and development? Why? Rate 1-5 and explain your answer (1: not at all; 5: Yes, completely).*
- *Having now tested the tool, do you trust the council to make decisions about the type and location of development that is right for Redbridge and its communities? Rate 1-5 and explain your answer (1: no trust; 5: full trust).*
- *Having now tested the tool, do you know how these decisions are made and what factors are taken into account? Rate 1-5 and explain your answer (1: not at all; 5: completely understand).*

Surprises:

- The project purpose was unclear to participants - both the consultation and how the feedback would be used. Furthermore, participants felt that the website was a resource and consultation exercise for the Council's use rather than a tool that is useful for residents to understand more about their area. The use of the term 'tool' felt misleading.
- Having a user testing session on a beta version of the tool was very helpful as it forced the team to refine the scope of the project and focused the objectives on information gathering and community engagement, also better aligning the project with London Plan objectives.
- To meaningfully address participant feedback, the Project Team worked to refine the project scope and purpose of the tool. The project's remit was restructured to work as a two-stage process.



Summary of Community Responses:

- The maps were difficult to decipher.
- The maps did not clearly relate to the supporting information or questions.
- The language was too technical / with too much planning jargon.
- There was too much text in general.
- The key was difficult to understand.
- Lack of contrast across the webpage made the map difficult to read.
- User interface/experience (UI/UX) clarity of direction (i.e., “what am I being asked to do?”) was unclear using the application.
- The project purpose was unclear - both the consultation and how the feedback would be used.
- The website was a resource and consultation exercise for the Council’s use rather than a tool that is useful for residents to understand more about their area. The use of the term ‘tool’ felt misleading.
- Preference for a free-roam map approach with improvements to zooming and panning functions for legibility.
- Preference to engage with the map as one normally would.
- The use of photographs worked well and found these easier to interpret than the map. Although services visualised on the map was a positive factor
- Preference for seeing more about prospective developments and plans in the borough.
- Preference to jump straight in and feed opinion on elements of interest.
- Preference for pinning comments to the map.
- Preference to integrate an option for uploading images/videos content.

Delivering on Feedback:

- Simplified the app, targeting sub-5-minute completion time to participate.
- Made the navigation more legible with clearer ‘calls to action.’
- Broken data and questions into themes such as ‘heritage’ so that users can jump to topics they are most interested in.
- Made better use of images so that they relate more clearly to points on the map.
- Offered the opportunity to jump straight into an area of interest and to upload content, with a pin-comment functionality.
- Used simpler language with fewer questions.
- Included a ‘development’ section where you can find out about recent granted planning permissions and view 3d screenshots of these.
- Embedded an interactive key where users find out information by clicking on the map.
- Reduced the number of questions to those most meaningful and useful for the future stages of the planning process.
- Re-designed the app to enable the functional accessibility on a mobile device and tablet.

Stage 1 PropTech Engagement (29 September - 9 November 2022)

Focus:

Feedback on the places in Redbridge where people live, work, or visit to help shape the Council’s plans for the future.



The online map-based platform collates and displays physical and non-physical data under eight themes which correspond to some of the factors that the Council balances when deciding where growth could happen and what it might look like. For each theme, the information shown on the map changes and users can click on objects to see more information and drop a pin or draw an area to let the Council know how they feel, as outlined below:

- *Environment: this section is about the natural environment and open spaces. The map highlights green spaces and water ways.*
- *Safety: the map highlights the number of crimes on or near a point in 2020 and 2021. The larger the point, the more crimes it indicates.*
- *Connections: the map highlights rail, tube, bus, cycling, and walking routes.*
- *Heritage: this section is about heritage features. The map highlights conservation areas, residential precincts – areas worthy of conservation but not satisfying the stricter legal tests applied to a conservation area, listed, and locally listed buildings.*
- *Character: the map highlights character types - groupings of common buildings, including their scale, function, density, and the look and feel of the area.*
- *Uses: the map highlights the different non-residential places and services available. For example, town centres, GPs, and libraries.*
- *Development: the map shows major planning permissions (these are proposals to build more than 10 homes, or over 1,000sqm of floorspace for non-residential applications) granted in the last 10 years, and 360 panoramic images of key locations provided by VU.CITY where planning permissions have been granted or new buildings are currently being built.*
- *Your Priorities: here respondents are given the opportunity to express their top three priorities for the future of development and growth.*

Equalities Questions:

When a new user accesses the PropTech tool, to submit any feedback they are first required to set-up an account. The following information and questions are asked:

As part of this consultation exercise, the Council is collecting information on participation to help us understand who is involved in the planning process. The questions are not compulsory, but they will help us to reach more people to be more inclusive with planning processes. The information you share will be anonymised for analysis and not shared.

Which of the following describes your relationship with Redbridge? Please tick all that apply.

- *I live in Redbridge*
- *I work in Redbridge*
- *I learn in Redbridge (school, college, adult education)*
- *I visit Redbridge for work or leisure*

Please enter the first five digits of your postcode, without spaces, to help us



understand which part of Redbridge you live, work, play or learn in. For example, if your postcode is IG1 1NY then you would enter IG11N.

What is your gender identity?

- *Male*
- *Female*
- *Non-binary*
- *Intersex*
- *Other*
- *Prefer not to say*

If you have a different gender identity, please specify below.

Is the gender you identify with the same as your gender registered at birth?

- *Yes*
- *No*
- *Prefer not to say*

What is your ethnicity?

- *Asian or Asian British*
- *Black, African, Caribbean or Black British*
- *Mixed or multiple ethnic group*
- *White*
- *Other ethnic group*
- *Prefer not to say*

What is your age group?

- *Under 25*
- *25 - 34*
- *35 - 44*
- *45 -54*
- *55 - 64*
- *65 and over*
- *Prefer not to say*

Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

- *Yes, limited a lot*
- *Yes, limited a little*
- *No*
- *Prefer not to say*

Does your household own or rent your accommodation?

- *Owns outright*
- *Owns with a mortgage or loan*
- *Part owns and part rents (shared ownership)*
- *Rents from the council (local authority)*
- *Social Rented (Other e.g. Housing Association)*
- *Rents from private landlord or letting agency*
- *Other (including living rent free)*
- *Prefer not to say*



If you are interested in being added to the Local Plan database so you are contacted with further information and updates regarding the Local Plan, and this and future Local Plan consultations, send us an email.

Consultation Questions:

Environment

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What element of the environment in this area makes you feel this way?

- *Planting*
- *Wildlife*
- *Play facilities*
- *How it's maintained*
- *How it's used*
- *Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.*

Safety

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What about this area makes you feel this way in relation to safety?

- *Crime levels*
- *Lighting*
- *It is busy*
- *It is quiet*
- *How overlooked it is*
- *Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.*

Connections

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What is it about transport and connections in this area that makes you feel this way?

- *Speed*
- *Convenience*
- *Public transport*
- *Car routes*
- *Pedestrian routes*
- *Cycle routes*
- *How it's maintained*
- *Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.*

Heritage

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What about the heritage features in this area make you feel this way?

- *History*
- *Style*
- *Attractiveness*
- *Uniqueness*
- *Condition and maintenance*
- *Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.*



Character

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What is it about the character of this area that makes you feel this way?

- Types of buildings
- Landscape
- Attractiveness
- Uniqueness
- How its maintained
- Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.

Uses

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What about the types of uses in this area make you feel this way?

- Affordability
- Diversity of uses
- Quality of uses
- Inclusivity of different people
- Job opportunities
- Socialising opportunities
- Maintenance
- Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.

Development

What is your experience of this area? 😄 😊 😐 😞 😡

What about development in this area makes you feel this way?

- Scale
- Attractiveness
- Services and Community Use
- Landscape
- Condition
- Something else? Leave a comment, upload a photo or video.

Your Priorities

We're ambitious for the future of Redbridge. To deliver positive change in the Borough, we need to prioritise our actions. Please let us know your three priorities for our future.

- To be a green, healthy, and sustainable place
- To be a safe place for all
- To have a well-connected transport system
- To protect the history and heritage of the place
- To be beautiful and to have character
- To have the right mix of places and services to support residents, workers, and visitors
- To develop more affordable housing to support new and existing residents
- Something else? Leave a comment.

Please see Appendix K for supporting information and graphics.



Surprises:

- Unclear correlation between comms push and response rates – refer to note 2.6 and Appendix K.
- More responses (albeit from fewer people) logged via the Google form (offered as an alternative way of providing feedback on the website) than on the map itself. This is partly because people responding via the Google form were required to complete a response on every theme to submit their entry. This differed from the map, where users could jump straight to the theme of their choice. On the Google form, we received 303 comments from 33 individuals, whereas the map functionality generated 160 responses from 45 individuals. This suggests that maps are not as accessible as initially assumed. In line with previous commentary raised, a key lesson learned from this project is the necessity to use digital and non-digital methods in complimentary ways to maximise the reach and impact of an engagement process. This also highlights the benefits of offering multiple ways for people to respond.
- The 'Environment' category attracted the most comments.
- The tool drew in a greater proportion of people whose day-to-day activities were somewhat limited owing to a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months – than benchmarked in the Redbridge Census data.
- The 'draw an area' tool was less used / effective than the pin a point functionality. As noted, streamlining the functionalities and avoiding too many levels to click or scroll through before making a comment feels key.

Summary of Community Responses:

- 27,299 reach; 98,260 impressions; 2,457 clicks; 484 responses; 78 people over 42 days.
- Overall, 36% comments were negative, 24% positive, 10% neutral and 1% left blank.
- The quality and breadth of comments covered was impressive. While wide-ranging, they were equally specific and useful.
- Refer to Appendix K for full summary of responses.

Community Testimonials

"[The tool] is a really useful to help feed into the objective setting and understanding resident thoughts on a location/locality when we are looking at our specific regeneration and development schemes - help shape the approaches/priorities/local wants, etc. Hence why I feel a continuous tool would be helpful." - User-research group testing participant

"Could be useful to have pop ups that shown when you hover over sections of the page - either more description/instructions comments etc" - User-research group testing participant

"This is a really useful map. Can see a few applications in the health engagement work we are doing"

"There's a useful tutorial when you sign up to the platform" – LBR Officer

This is really useful, especially for me as a LBR Planning Policy Officer that lives in another borough. It will help me to better understand the areas of Redbridge that I am not so familiar with. – Asia Pineau, Project Team Member



5.0 Conclusions and Policy Reflections

If you could re-start this project what, if anything, would you do differently?

Develop a detailed project plan that outlines the project scope and priority aims is critical as it will provide direction throughout project development and will aid when balancing competing demands.

What longer-term changes, if any, do you expect to make as a result of this pilot? If not, why? What barriers are preventing long-term adoption?

We had limited demographic data regarding existing resident engagement in the planning process, because of equalities monitoring information not being collected.

Information gathered as part of Stage 1 PropTech engagement will now form the Council's baseline as this process has provided LBR with access to demographics/ community data that will now inform the wider delivery of Stage 2 of the tool and the overarching Local Plan review.

What (if any) other stakeholders (outside of those who responded to consultations) do you think should be involved alongside LPAs to support long term adoption of digital planning?

Engaging with young people to meet the Child Friendly Redbridge Place Badge. Youth Ambassadors should be consulted as well as utilising the Community Voice Panel (a diverse group of committed residents) next year from March 2023.

Did any existing planning policies limit your ability to achieve your goals for this project?

Existing planning policies did not limit our ability to achieve our goals, however, the user research session in August was prior to Cabinet approval for the Local Plan review and it was difficult for the team to be transparent regarding the use of the tool and its planned release date, despite resident's interest.

Despite these limitations, it was beneficial to conduct an innovative consultation approach prior to pre-statutory consultation, as it has given the team more flexibility and freedom to investigate various topics and themes.

Furthermore, it has been helpful to frame Stage 1 release of the tool as a pilot, as the team benefited from more leeway to allow for things to be tested as Councils are often risk adverse.

Are there any policies (national and local) you'd like to see changed in the future? If so, how?

Within the scope of this project, shifting towards more map-based Local Plans is key, especially if this includes an "interactive" policies map. Current practice with Local Plan examination is focussed on static PDFs and evidence base documents,



whereas map based consultation and analysis toolkits may allow for a more streamlined approach to Local Plan production.

Where do you think further guidance is required, either for local authorities or the wider PropTech sector?

Differences in ways of working between Councils and tech companies. Often the public procurement process is seen as slow and cumbersome, especially for smaller projects.

An overview of what providers are in the market, and what their areas of focus are, would be beneficial for local authorities. This is important as developers and landowners are increasingly using digital tools to assess development potential.

How could DLUHC better support LPAs in the future with the further adoption of digital citizen engagement tools, best practice guidance, or other support?

DLUHC can provide guidance and direction to promote confidence within Project Teams to test tools with community members throughout the development of the tool/while the tool is unfinished. Our Project Team found this feedback invaluable and felt it underscored the importance of feedback influencing our actions.

Additional clarity could be provided from the onset to ensure projects have realistic scopes/push back when LPAs present cope and objectives that seem too ambitious or not fully developed.

If additional funding was available - what do you think future PropTech Fund rounds should focus on delivering / achieving?

Accessibility – including digital exclusion, and making spatial / diagrammatic information more accessible to those with different visual impairments

Building life cycles – helping planners and developers triage the competing options of refurbishment and replacement from an economic and sustainability perspective

Project Team Quotes

- *The PropTech Engagement Fund Round 2 has provided a fantastic opportunity to pilot new approaches and to learn through doing. This is particularly welcomed in a Local Authority context which is more typically risk-averse. This project has upskilled the team and highlighted opportunities for collaboration and learning across the council, beyond the remit of the Planning Policy team. – Niamh Lincoln, Placemaking and Community Engagement Officer*
- *Councils have a wealth of information at their disposal relating to their places and people, but can struggle to utilise it effectively. The PropTech*



Engagement Fund has allowed us to look at how we combine the experience of a place with the information we hold, to help understand whether our assumptions from the data are reflected by people's experiences, and to understand where the difference between the two lays.
– Christopher Waller, Planning Policy Officer

- *This DLUCH funded programme has provided an invaluable opportunity to work closely with a software developer to innovate technology to support the Council's Local Plan Review and up-skill Redbridge Council's Planning Policy team so that we are able to integrate digital tools and engagement into the future. Whilst the process has been challenging and resource intensive, we are optimistic that it will catalyse a shift to digital ways of working that can increase impact and efficiency.* - Sarah Cook, Strategic Urban Design Coordinator



6.0 Appendices

For all appendices, please see separately attached documents.

Appendix A: Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 Statement of Consultation

Appendix B: PropTech Supplier Brief

Appendix C: PropTech Consultation Strategy

Appendix D: Presentation to LBR Engagement Network

Appendix E: Raw Data Captured from PropTech User Research Session

Appendix F: PropTech Engagement Stage 1 Outcomes Reporting

Appendix G: PropTech Communication and Engagement Tracker

Appendix H: Raw Data Captured from PropTech Engagement Stage 1 Consultation

Appendix I: Screenshots of PropTech Stage 1 Consultation Tool

Appendix J: PropTech Structure and Data

Appendix K: Outcomes