

HLE Security Questionnaire Summary Report December 2020

The HLEC conducted a questionnaire on security in November 2020 of residents of the estate. Where available, or in the course of the process, obtained e-mail addresses for residents, a unique link was issued per plot or flat.

Participation was exceptionally high. Almost all of the responses were received via the online system, which supports a high degree of tracking. Primary concern was to maintain the integrity of the process as this was being used to facilitate the feedback and a show of hands that might otherwise have happened at the annual November half-yearly general meeting.

This provides a summary overview, based on a review of all the individual responses; tagging those responses as (a) seeking more security, (b) reduced patrols and security, or (c) either supporting present arrangements or otherwise not calling for change. Some indication is also provided for the number of people who expressed an interest in changing the gates arrangements or specifically adding cameras.

Participation

248 people responded—although not all completed every part and that will lead to some small anomalies in the arithmetic of what follows (in the table below). 75% at least opened the e-mail inviting them to respond—the overwhelming majority, so that there is no silent, uncontacted or hidden majority. Slightly fewer than 50% at least looked at the questionnaire and about 40% responded, considered larger than normal for similar methodologies.

Although the system doesn't do this automatically, a visual check will show that the majority of inward facing plots responded, and in many areas, with a significant majority.

A careful review, therefore, of the responses allows HLEC members to claim to know the views of the plot owners, even if less comprehensively than the residents of the flats.

Security

The responses were tagged as favouring MORE or LESS security only if there was some comment to that effect in their response about the use specifically of patrols (e.g., patrols every night, or we shouldn't have the parking attendant) and NONE for no change if they had any comment that either wasn't really a call for change or covered something else (so they hadn't called for change). Responses were additionally tagged specifically calling for CCTV and those calling for changing how the gates are currently managed (times, access to remote openers). There were also some individuals calling for more lighting, which were mainly in and around the flats.

The overall outcome is detailed in the table below. *The simple observation would be that the majority of residents are happy to entrust the committee to take appropriate decisions along the lines of what we are already doing.* However, there are some important qualifications to place on this:

- The closer to the top of the estate, the more the call for increased security to the point where it is in fact the majority.
- Those opposing Parking Attendant (PA) / parking and security are a very small minority—it is clear that PA is in that mix.

- Looking at the details, the least controversial actions would be to expand the PA’s cover (or similar) to every night and potentially slightly longer hour—in fact, one might argue a mandate for that from the upper estate, which would be broadly accepted by the lower estate—and changing from PA “parking-cum-security” to “security-cum-parking”, as long as it had the same friendly presentation.
- A more controversial step would be introduction of cameras—as the numbers show, there are fewer people calling for these, although limited opposition as well.
- Other actions/issues to be considered would be increased lighting and patrolling around the gardens, changing the hours or making permanent the closing of the top gate—although neither of these seem to be strong demands.

Preliminary Breakdown by Category						
Area (percentages)	Overall Security			Cameras	Gates	Total
	% More	% Same	% Less	%	%	<i>Actual Count</i>
HLG	56	44%	0%	25%	13%	16
Top Hillway	59	38	0	28	3	30
Mid Hillway	30	70	0	4	22	23
Bm Hillway	17	72	11	6	6	18
Robin Grove	0	67	33	33	0	3
Oakeshott W	12	76	12	12	12	18
HL Mansions	24	71	0	18	6	18
Makepeace W	4	96	0	17	9	25
Makepeace M&E	18	82	0	7	11	31
Langbourne W	24	62	14	0	0	21
Langbourne E&M	11	83	6	6	6	19
Bromwich	9	73	18	9	0	11
Swains Lane	50	50	0	0	0	4
Highgate West Hill	33	67	0	0	0	6
Plot Owners only Zones	29	65	6	13	8	171
Flats Plus Zones	17	79	2	10	8	63
Total Overall	25%	69%	5%	12%	8%	236

Other issues

Other issues that emerged as important to residents included cyclists’ use of Hillway for training, whether or not non-residents should have access to the gardens and a number of comments on the maintenance of the blocks, from security to cleanliness, which are not an HLE responsibility but should be summarised and shared with Camden.

And in conclusion

This exercise has proven very useful and effective. With exceptionally wide participation, and, irrespective of individual views, it can be seen that there is support, broadly, for what the Committee has been doing and addressing security and ASB as part of its remit, so long as it is done with consultation.

We intend to continue this process with an Internet meeting for all residents in January. After that meeting, at which we will share more details from the survey, answer any questions and update the residents on what the Committee has been doing this year regarding security, we will formulate a longer-term strategy and share this with the residents.

We recognise that while there will never be 100% (estate-wide) support for any specific strategy of measures, there is more support for sensitive, explained intervention than reducing that intervention.

**The HLEC
December 23rd 2020**