



SaveEkinRoad@gmail.com  
www.SaveEkinRoad.co.uk

24<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### **Save Ekin Road response to November 2023 JLL report**

To the Cambridge City Council,

In November 2023 you released a Community Survey report from Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL), herein referred to simply as “the report”, in which they presented their data and analysis of the resident survey of the Ekin Road estate, conducted by Marengo from October-November 2023.

For the avoidance of doubt, we refer to the JLL report found at the following site:

<https://ekinroad.co.uk/news/ekin-road-survey-report-amended/>

with a direct url to the pdf of the report being this:

[https://ekinroad.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Cambridge-Ekin-Road\\_Stage-2-Survey-Report-19\\_12\\_2023\\_Amended.pdf](https://ekinroad.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Cambridge-Ekin-Road_Stage-2-Survey-Report-19_12_2023_Amended.pdf)

We have read the report, and are now in a position to provide some of our own written representations on its contents and conclusions, which we present here. We use all section numbering as per the report. In our response, we reserve the use of double quotation marks “ ” to denote quotes from the report, lifted verbatim.

We kindly request that these be passed on to JLL, and that Cambridge City Council and JLL take the full gamut of these written representations into account in the next stage of their work on this project.

At the end of this document we provide a conclusion, summarising our key concerns and laying out our requests for action by the Cambridge City Council and JLL. We kindly request written responses to all points and requests listed in the conclusion, by either the Cambridge City Council or JLL.

We again ask for the opportunity to liaise directly with JLL prior to their publication of a preferred option(s) for the estate, as we believe that would be the best way for us to communicate our concerns to them. This has been routinely denied to us in the past.

We would be happy to engage further with the Council on these matters, and can always be contacted at our main email address: [SaveEkinRoad@gmail.com](mailto:SaveEkinRoad@gmail.com) . If the Council would prefer a phone conversation to discuss this, we can arrange for our spokesperson to phone one of your representatives at a mutually convenient time.

Kind regards,  
Save Ekin Road

## List of written representations

- Our written representations regarding the November 2023 Options Analysis report from Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL), herein referred to simply as “the report”, can be found below.
- We use all section numbering as per the report. In our response, we reserve the use of double quotation marks “ ” to denote quotes from the report, lifted verbatim.
- We underline all direct requests for action, and collate these together and repeat them in the conclusion of this document.

### Section 1.2

1. In reference to the statement “The Council’s Code of Best Practice on Consultation and the Local Government Association’s Gunning Principles were maintained throughout by:”, and subsequent list of bullet points, we believe there were deficiencies in this process, and that list of bullet points is not a fair description of what transpired during the survey. We discuss these deficiencies throughout this written response. To signpost them clearly here:
  - “Using appropriate consultation methods such as online and paper versions of the survey and door knocking sessions;” Not done. See our response to Section 1.2 part (2), and to Section 3.2 part (2).
  - “Ensuring the survey was well publicized and accessible to all resident so they can voice their thoughts;” Not done. See our response to Section 3.1 parts (1) and (2).
  - “Ensuring the residents are provided with sufficient and accessible information regarding the shortlisted options;” Not done. See our response to Section 4.3 Question 8 part (1).
  - “Allowing a reasonable and appropriate amount of time to complete the survey;” Not done. See our response to Section 3.2 part (2).
  - “Providing the opportunity for follow-up one-to-one sessions for residents if required.” Unclear if this was done. The report does not provide any statistics as to how many households requested such follow-up sessions, or how many sessions were held.
2. In reference to the statement “The survey went live from 24th October 2023 to 20th November 2023, bolstered by four door knocking session running during this period.”, four sessions would have been nowhere near enough time to engage on the doorstep with every household. Our understanding was that Marengo visited from 10am-4pm on those days. Even assuming that the team took no meal or rest breaks, that is at most 24 hours of doorstep time. With 122 dwellings on the street, that would still be under 12 minutes per household. 12 minutes is not sufficient time to discuss a matter as significant as the potential demolition of someone’s home. In our experience as a resident group engaging with residents on the street, it took an average of 30-45 minutes to have a proper ‘doorstep chat’. Moreover, many of our members who spoke to Marengo reported that their discussions lasted over 30 minutes. Thus, by design of the engagement process, there was never time for the Marengo representatives to properly engage on the doorstep with all residents.  
Our concern is therefore that Marengo would have exercised some degree of choice in which doors they knocked on, which doors they returned to if no-one was home, the time of day they knocked on each door, etc. This choice could have therefore had an impact on which residents were encouraged to participate in the survey, and which did not ‘by omission’.  
The fact that Marengo did not allow sufficient time to meaningfully engage with every household must be taken into account when analysing the survey data, and that it should be referred to more as qualitative data, rather than quantitative, and we ask that JLL acknowledge this and take it into account.

### Section 1.3

1. In reference to the list of bullet points:
  - “- Many residents are experiencing issues relating to the condition of their homes;
  - Some residents are having accessibility and overcrowding problems;
  - There are differing personal experiences living on the estate with some enjoying living there while others have experienced instances of conflict with neighbours and anti-social behaviour;

and

- A minority of residents have family/support networks in the area.”, we ask for clarification on the uses of the terms “many”, “some”, “a minority”, and “others”. These are vague terms, with no absolute or relative values. For example, is “some” more, or less, than “a minority”? In addition, the term “some” is used quantitatively in the second bullet point, but used qualitatively to mean ‘more than none’ in the third bullet point. This makes understanding the analysis extremely difficult, obfuscating the data that was collected. In addition, we are concerned here (and later in the report) with how words are used to describe positive, or negative, aspects of the street. For example, in the above bullet point list, “many” is used to describe how many people articulated a negative aspect of the street (poor home quality), whereas “a minority” is used to describe how many people articulated a positive aspect of the street (nearby family/support networks); it may well be that both “many” and “a minority” correspond to 49%. This use of language serves to emphasise negative experiences of residents, while at the same time belittle positive experiences. While it is certainly true that there are aspects of the street residents are unhappy with, it is also true, and shown in the raw data of this survey, that there are aspects of the street that residents **are** happy with; the language used in this analysis serves to hide the latter of these two facts.

We ask that JLL clarify how it uses the terms “many”, “some”, “a minority”, “others”, and to use these consistently when describing positive or negative aspects of the estate.

2. Throughout this section, and indeed the entire report, expressions of the form ‘X% of residents said Y’ are used repeatedly. However, there were specific instructions that only one survey was to be filled out per household (see page 32 of the report where it is specified on the paper survey, and page 35 where it is specified on the online survey). It is therefore completely misleading to use any terminology in the analysis of the form ‘X% of residents said Y’. What could be used is ‘X% of **households** said Y’, because data was only collected on a per-household basis, and residents were explicitly instructed not to submit multiple surveys per household (though it is acknowledged in the report that some did, which skews the analysis as the data represents neither ‘households’ nor ‘residents’, but rather some hybrid unstated combination of the two). If the survey was carried out ‘per household’, then all statistics, percentages, proportions, etc should be stated in relation to households, not residents. If the survey was ‘counting’ the views of individual residents, then that should have been part of the instructions. This should also always be prefixed with ‘Of the X% of households who completed the survey, Y% said Z’.  
We ask that JLL present these statistics in a way that reflects who the responding entities were, and develop a clear and justified way of analysing the differing respondent types (some were households, some were individual residents).
3. In reference to the statement “57% of resident expressed support for redevelopment on the estate with a minority in opposition (41%). 49% of residents voiced a preference for complete redevelopment,”, once again the term ‘minority’ is used inconsistently. If 41% is “a minority in opposition”, then surely “49% of residents voiced a preference for complete redevelopment” should also be described as ‘a minority’, given that 49% is less than half. Again, this use of language serves to emphasise resident concerns about the estate, and belittle any expressions of contentment by residents.

#### Section 1.4

1. In reference to the statement “it is clear from conversations, that the current state of many of the buildings is poor with cracks, mould, condensation, and limited accessibility for those with mobility issues being the primary issues that need resolving.”, did these conversations reveal which building types contained such problems? Were these issues uniform across all building types on the estate, or were there higher (or lower) instances in some types compared with others? This is important information, as the estate contains 4 different building types (flats, houses, bungalows, maisonettes) which cannot be treated with a ‘one size fits all’ approach to analysis.  
We request that JLL reveal what statistics were collected regarding the breakdown of living conditions by budding type, and moreover collate and release whatever statistics were collected.

## Section 2.3

1. In reference to the statement “The total number of homes on the estate would increase from 122 to between 209 and 217.” as part of the description of partial redevelopment, where did this range of “209 to 217” come from? In the JLL Options Appraisal report<sup>1</sup> from August 2023, it categorically states that Option 6 in the longlist would “increase from 122 to 217 units.” (page 34 of that document). Is there also a corresponding range for total redevelopment, which in this section states “would increase the number of homes on the estate from 122 to 239 homes.” Stating uncertainty in the partial redevelopment option, but only giving the upper bound for the total redevelopment option, is once again an example of selective presentation of data that serves to favour one decision over other(s); in this instance, making it sound like there is much more housing gain for full redevelopment than for partial redevelopment.  
We ask that JLL reveal all uncertainty estimates in the number of total dwellings for each longlist option.
2. In reference to the statement “The road will be realigned to provide new green routes”, we are not familiar with the term ‘green route’, and request that it is explained more clearly what is meant.
3. In reference to the statement “Homeowners would have their homes bought by the Council at a better price than they would achieve on the market”, this is a totally unfalsifiable assertion. There is no way to know what price a homeowner would achieve from selling their home on the market, unless that actually occurs, in which case the Council will not have made a purchase for above that price. The correct description here might be something like ‘Homeowners would have their homes bought by the Council at more than the price determined at a valuation’. But it is also well-known that homes can often sell for a price **above** a valuation they have received, a fact that is particularly true of the Cambridge housing market. So this, along with the unfalsifiable nature of the assertion, makes it a very misleading statement.
4. In reference to the statement “Homeowners would have their homes bought by the Council at a better price than they would achieve on the market, so that they could buy a new house elsewhere.”, this is false, for several reasons. Firstly, it is well known that ‘new’ homes are often rather more expensive than older homes (such as those on Ekin Road) of the same dimensions in the same vicinity; saying that homeowners can “buy a new house elsewhere” is very misleading. There may be new, smaller houses nearby they could buy. There may be new houses of the same size, a long way away. But a new house, near Ekin Road, will cost much more than an existing house on Ekin Road; the 3-bed ‘new houses’ in the nearby Marleigh estate cost **double** what 3-bed houses on Ekin Road are currently valued at.  
This statement also overlooks the fact that Ekin Road contains some of the cheapest houses in Cambridge. So placing the term “new” aside, it is unlikely homeowners on Ekin Road would be able to buy *any* house (of a similar size) in Cambridge with the money paid to them by the Council; new or old. They would need to downsize, and/or move further away from Cambridge, and/or spend more on their new home than what they receive from the Council.  
This statement also overlooks the fact that, in many cases, not all of the money paid to the homeowner by the Council will actually be received by them. Some homeowners will need to pay off their mortgage, and given the recent tightening of mortgage lending criteria in the UK they may not be eligible for the same mortgage on another property, or even any mortgage at all. Some will have capital gains tax to pay, and so will be left with less than the value of their original house, but still needing to buy another house.  
Overall, the simplicity with which this statement is made completely overlooks all aspects of the housing market, and of the commonplace personal finance situations many of the homeowners may find themselves in.
5. In reference to the statement “Those living in Council-owned rented homes would be moved to other Council properties.”, this does not address what would happen to those living in privately-rented homes, nor those living in housing association homes. In each of these cases, it

---

<sup>1</sup> See

<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s63524/HSC%20Ekin%20Road%20Report%20Appendix%201%20JLL%20Report.pdf>

is our understanding that there are no legal requirements on the Council to assist such households; they would in effect be ‘out on the street’ and have to sort out their own alternate accommodation with no assistance or compensation from the Council. We are aware of several households on Ekin Road in such positions, and clarity on the process and potential timelines would be most welcomed.

### Section 3.1

1. In reference to the statement “This ensures all residents’ voices are listened to”, is it the case that feedback was solicited from every voice on the street? Our understanding, from what has been outlined in this report, is no; only 63 households returned their survey, and Marengo held only 57 doorstep conversations (with presumably significant overlap between these two sets, though the amount of overlap was not revealed in the report). Moreover, by design, the survey was ‘one per household’, not ‘one per resident’. It is therefore completely untrue to say “all residents’ voices are listened to”. What might be true is that ‘each household was given *some opportunity* to have its (aggregated) voice heard’; whether this opportunity was sufficient has not been demonstrated (there are no statistics as to whether any surveys were distributed in large print, braille, any foreign languages, or how many attempts were made to doorknock households with residents who are known to the council to have learning difficulties or are vulnerable). Our interpretation of this survey is that ‘*some households were given some opportunity to have some of their voices heard in aggregate*’.

We ask that JLL properly acknowledge and articulate the engagement that was, and wasn’t, had on the estate, and detail exactly how many households it engaged with by describing the overlap between the 63 household surveys and 57 doorstep conversations.

2. In reference to the statement “All residents were made aware of the survey through sufficient publication through four door knocking sessions (held at different times of the day and week), the Ekin Road website ([www.EkinRoad.co.uk](http://www.EkinRoad.co.uk)) and three letters sent from the Council”, the only one of these methods where the Council can be sure that engagement was had, was door knocking (the others are all passive forms of engagement). Yet only 57 households answered their door. This is unsurprising, as 3 of the 4 door knocking days were weekdays (as outlined in section 3.2). And our understanding is that this door knocking occurred only between the hours of 10am-4pm. The only way the statement “All residents were made aware of the survey” can be made confidently, is if Marengo kept returning to each household until someone answered the door, or for the households that did not, a survey was received from them. This survey and engagement is repeatedly being presented throughout this report as being total and definitive; it is not. It might be indicative, with a significant number of responses and feedback obtained, but it is not total. For something as significant as redevelopment, with the associated harms caused by forced rehousing, this is simply an unacceptable level of engagement. If the Council is considering evicting every household, they might want to start by speaking with every household first.

We request that the Cambridge City Council refrain from making any decisions about the estate until they can confirm that they have meaningfully engaged with every single household, or received confirmation from those it has not engaged with that they do not wish to engage.

### Section 3.2

1. In reference to the statement “for the purposes of question 8 and 9 which relate to the proposed options, only one survey per household has been counted to ensure every household is treated equally and larger households are not given an outsized voice as part of the consultation.”, this can easily be reinterpreted as ‘for the purposes of question 8 and 9 which relate to the proposed options, only one survey per household has been counted, which means individual residents are not treated equally, and those in larger households are given a diminished voice as part of the consultation.’; the original statement, and the reinterpretation, are logical equivalents. Every standard surveying method, from official democratic processes right down to simple straw polls, would involve one ‘voice’ per person, which this survey does not achieve. Not only is this the case for questions 8 and 9, but it happens more generally throughout the survey seeing as residents were explicitly told to only fill out one survey per household. If the argument as to

why this ‘counting’ method (one survey per household) was chosen was because each household ‘either stays or goes’, then, as this project involves redevelopment of structures, the survey could have instead been ‘one survey per physical structure’ (that is: one per pair of semi-detached houses, one per pair or quad of attached bungalows, one per 8-maisonette block, and one per 12-flat block), as each structure ‘either stays or goes’. If this is a project about residents, then it should have been one survey per resident. If, on the other hand, this is a project about structures, then it should have been one survey per structure. No reasonable justification has been given within this report as to why this particular, peculiar system of “one survey per household” was used. One can only conclude that this was done out of political convenience, producing statistics that are more supportive of the Council’s aims and objectives for the estate which are, and always have been, evident as total redevelopment.

We ask JLL and the Cambridge City Council to provide a justification as to why the “one survey per household” rule was used, or acknowledge that it is a non-standard methodology that introduces significant bias in the survey process.

2. In reference to the statement “every household received an information sheet and paper copy of the survey, including a freepost envelope, on or before 11th November 2023.”, given that the deadline was (originally) 17th November 2023, that would have hardly been time for a household to read, think about, respond to, post back, and have arrive at the destination address - we believe this was an unreasonable expected turnaround time. Firstly: we ask whether any surveys were received via post after the (extended) deadline of 20th November 2023? Second, we ask whether any verification or checks were done to see if any surveys had been lost in the post? Thirdly, given that the deadline was only extended by a letter dated 14th November (see Appendix C - Survey Letter 3, of the report), and that letter did not reach residents until 15th November or later, some residents may have simply ‘given up’ on filling out the paper survey. The paper survey should have been delivered, by hand, to every address on the estate, at the very beginning of the surveying process on the first door knocking day by Marengo on 26th October 2023; not two weeks later on 11th November with only 6 days before the (original) closing date of the survey. This would have impeded the ability of those who relied on paper surveys to fill them out on time, if at all. Such impedance would have disproportionately affected those who are not regular internet users, in particular the elderly. So not only is the survey not a ‘total’ survey of the estate, but it likely has a distinct bias in responses towards younger, more internet connected residents. Given that dwellings such as the houses (which the survey shows have a strong desire to keep their home) house an older demographic, and dwellings such as the flats (which the survey shows have a strong desire to have their home redeveloped), such a bias will quite obviously lead to overall statistics for the estate that favour redevelopment. The survey was simply more accessible to those who want to go , than those who want to stay , again producing statistics that are more supportive of the Council’s aims and objectives for the estate which are, and always have been, evident as total redevelopment.

We ask JLL to acknowledge the shortcomings of the survey distribution method on the estate, to acknowledge that the statistics therefore collected have a bias towards younger internet-connected residents who are predominantly in flats, and to undertake that in any future surveying paper copies will be circulated by hand at the beginning of the survey process.

### Section 4.3

1. In reference to the list of questions posed in the survey (see also Appendix E and Appendix F in the report), one observes that the questions are, by and large, asking about ‘negative’ things. For example: Question 2 asks about “issues with your home”, and Question 3 asks to expand on that. Question 4 asks about “your health and wellbeing”. Question 5 asks about ways the estate can be improved (somewhat implying that it is currently ‘bad’). None of the questions asked respondents about aspects of the estate that they liked, or about aspects of their home and lifestyle that they liked, or about any other part of life on the estate that they found positive. The survey was completely geared towards uncovering negative sentiments about the estate, hence why most of the data collected seems to show that a lot of respondents hold negative views about the estate (supporting a case for full redevelopment). Had all the questions been about ‘positive’ aspects of the estate, the data collected would have strongly supported retaining most,

if not all, of the estate. Neither of these approaches is appropriate here; the survey should have been balanced in soliciting feedback that outlined the positive, and negative, aspects of life on the estate, which could be then compared and contrasted to see what needed to be preserved, and what needed to be fixed or replaced. That was simply not done in this survey.

We ask that, in any future surveying of the estate, JLL ensures that questions are posed in a balanced way that solicit both positive and negative sentiments about the estate from residents.

#### Section 4.3 Question 5

1. In reference to the bar graph in this section, only one item is shown with an abridged description compared to how it was phrased in the survey. Question 5 in the survey gave an option for residents to select titled “Improving sustainability and help with heating/energy bills” (see pages 33 and 39 of the report), yet this item was only described as “Improving sustainability” in the report. This gives the false impression that residents’ top priority for the estate was an environmental concern, whereas in reality their top priority (from that list) is an issue of affordability of energy bills; a totally different concern to the one portrayed in the graph.

#### Section 4.3 Question 6

1. In reference to the statement “ ‘other’ was selected 42 times by eleven respondents as a top priority”, it is not at all clear how 11 respondents could have selected ‘other’ 42 times. This statistic needs to be reviewed, as it is mathematically nonsensical as currently written.  
We ask that JLL clarify how eleven respondents selected ‘other’ 42 times in Question 6 of the survey.
2. In reference to the statement “ ‘other’ was selected 42 times by eleven respondents as a top priority with a key theme being the need to preserve the houses and community on the estate by making improvements to the accommodation instead of redevelopment. This was a common theme across those living in the houses.”, this highlights an overarching theme in the survey questions: that they were geared towards the issues and concerns of those in the flats, and totally ignored the issues and concerns relevant to those in the houses. This is made abundantly clear here, where the house residents needed to go to great lengths in the ‘other’ category as few, if any, of the list of potential concerns in Question 5 were relevant to them. This is surprising, given how much feedback the Council has received over the past 18 months from house residents and, more generally, from Save Ekin Road.

#### Section 4.3 Question 8

1. This question (“Would you support proposals to redevelop the Ekin Road Estate?”) was very poorly worded, which is unfortunate given it is one of the most important questions of the survey. To begin, the question makes use of the word “redevelop”, which we maintain is not well-understood by the general public, and can often be misinterpreted to mean ‘repair or fix up’. The question should have used clearer language such as ‘demolish and rebuild’, and/or included a full definition of what redevelop means.  
We ask that JLL and the Cambridge City Council cease all use of the word ‘redevelop’ in future resident engagement material, and instead replace it with a term such as ‘demolish and rebuild’. Moreover, the question asks whether respondents would “support proposals to redevelop the Ekin Road Estate?”, without any mention or reference to the three shortlisted options being presented by JLL. The options are listed on the survey, but with only very short descriptions (and no reference to where residents can find fuller descriptions containing, say, details of which structures would be preserved or demolished in each option). But neither the written survey, nor online survey (see pages 34 and 42 of the report) make any connection between Question 8 and the list of options. The question (perhaps) should have read ‘Would you support proposals to redevelop the Ekin Road Estate *as per redevelopment options 2 or 3 listed above?*’ That simple addition to the question would have made it abundantly clear that the question referred to the listed redevelopment options, rather than ‘redevelopment in the abstract’. As things are currently written, residents could have easily felt ‘I want to see some form of redevelopment on Ekin Road estate’ and thus voted ‘Yes’ to Question 8, even if they did not like either of the redevelopment options being investigated by JLL. JLL will need to acknowledge that some



respondents may have interpreted the question as ‘Would you support proposals to redevelop the Ekin Road Estate *as per redevelopment options 2 or 3 listed above?*’, but others may have interpreted it as ‘Would you support proposals to redevelop the Ekin Road Estate *in the abstract, with no reference to any of the shortlist options?*’. Unfortunately, no further data in this survey question was collected to clarify this, so the responses to this question need to be taken qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, and should in no way be interpreted as a ‘vote’ by households. Rather, it gives perhaps a broad understanding of the desires of households.

We ask that JLL restrict their use of the responses to Question 8 qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, and in no way interpret them as a ‘vote’ by households.

2. In reference to the statement “There is a clear tenure and building divide in terms of support, but it is worth noting one survey commented “You have been greatly misled by the residents of the houses” regarding the future of the Ekin Road Estate.”, it is completely unclear from the report what the “worth” of this statement is. No further information is provided, nor any additional context given. It is simply a disparaging comment by a respondent towards those who live in houses. And not only is repeating such a comment in the report somewhat meaningless without any additional context, it is also a grossly irresponsible thing to do. Within the statement itself are the words “There is a clear tenure and building divide in terms of support”; this obviously means there is clear disagreement between those of differing tenure or building types. Unfortunately, on Ekin Road, this disagreement between residents has now manifested as tension and conflict on the estate, which the Council is well aware of. A statement like this should never have been published in the public domain, as it only serves to inflame tensions on what is already a very tense estate.  
We insist that JLL reissue the report, removing the survey quote “You have been greatly misled by the residents of the houses”, and undertake not to publicly repeat any disparaging remarks made by residents about other residents in any subsequent publications relating to the estate.
3. In reference to the title of the graph in this section, “Resident preference in relation to Redevelopment”, this is a misleading title. It suggests that the statistics in the graph count the number of *residents* expressing certain opinions. However, this is really the number of households expressing those opinions, as residents were clearly informed that it was “One survey per household”.
4. Throughout this section, the term ‘respondents’ is used when describing proportions, number of responses received, etc. However, in reality, the survey is counting *households*, not respondents (in the individual human sense). All descriptions and references to counts, proportions, etc, should be described in *households*, not *respondents* or *residents*. For example, if 49% of responses are of a particular type, then that should be interpreted as ‘49% of *households* responded in that way’, though this still leaves the problem that JLL counted multiple survey responses from the same household (except for Questions 8 and 9). It is not made clear in the report how JLL will account for these mismatched statistics.

#### Section 4.3 Question 9

1. Given the wording of this question “Of the redevelopment options, which would you prefer to see? Complete redevelopment or partial redevelopment.”, respondents who answered ‘No’ to Question 8 were placed in an impossible situation. As there was no further explanation or caveats on the question, in either the written or online version (see pages 34 and 42 of the report), there was no clear way for such people to answer this question. They could give no response, or they could give a ‘least bad’ response of complete or partial redevelopment, but that was in no way made clear in the survey text. Indeed, looking at the analysis in the report, the statement “It is clear complete and partial redevelopment are favoured by council tenants.” shows that those analysing the data have interpreted a vote of “complete redevelopment” or “partial redevelopment” here as a vote for that option. However, this is a nonsensical conclusion, as only 29 council tenants voted for redevelopment in Question 8, yet in Question 9 we see that 24 council tenants voted for complete redevelopment, and 14 for partial redevelopment (making 38 in total). This is a clear case of misuse of statistics.  
For the data in this question to be interpreted sensibly, a ‘preference breakdown’ bar graph needs to be produced with three bars labelled:



- 1) 'Those who voted 'yes' in Question 8, and then voted 'complete redevelopment' in Question 9;
- 2) 'Those who voted 'yes' in Question 8, and then voted 'partial redevelopment' in Question 9;
- 3) 'Those who voted 'no' in Question 8.

This would then serve as *some* indicator (however coarse) for which of the three options households preferred. Indeed, looking at the bar graph in question 8, we already know that 26 households voted 'no' in Question 8, so we just need to see the preference breakdown of the 36 who voted 'yes'.

We ask that JLL provide a preference breakdown for the data collected in Question 9 of the survey, by producing a bar graph with three bars labelled:

- 1) 'Those who voted 'yes' in Question 8, and then voted 'complete redevelopment' in Question 9;
- 2) 'Those who voted 'yes' in Question 8, and then voted 'partial redevelopment' in Question 9;
- 3) 'Those who voted 'no' in Question 8.

2. In reference to the statement "nearly half of residents were more in favour of complete redevelopment (49%)", there is again a striking bias in the use of language. On page 4 of the report, "41% of respondents" is described as "a minority"; one could also describe 49% as 'a minority', as both are under half. One could also describe 41% as 'nearly half'. This intriguing use of language suggests that certain options or responses are being portrayed in a stronger light than others. Namely, statistics supporting more redevelopment are being presented with inflated importance over statistics which support less redevelopment. This is but one such example, and this phenomenon is strikingly clear throughout the report.

We ask that JLL be consistent in its reporting of statistics in any future publications, and avoid using unnecessary and unclear terms such as "nearly half" or "a minority".

3. In reference to the title of the graph in this section, "Resident preference in relation to Redevelopment", this is a misleading title. It suggests that the statistics in the graph count the number of *residents* expressing certain opinions. However, this is really the number of households expressing those opinions, as residents were clearly informed that it was "One survey per household".
4. In reference to the statement "There was one response categorised as 'other', where a respondent wrote 'refurbishment', thus showing their preference against any form of redevelopment.", it is somewhat unfair to present that statistic in that way, as "writing" was not possible on the online version of the survey. There may well have been many other households which wanted to not vote for either option but write "refurbishment", but were unable to on account of their use of the online version of the survey. A more balanced interpretation, uniform across survey types (written, or online) would be that any household providing no answer to this question was implicitly showing a preference against any form of redevelopment.  
We ask JLL to interpret the statistics collected from Question 9 as follows: any household providing no answer to this question is implicitly showing a preference against any form of redevelopment.
5. Throughout this section, the terms "residents" and "tenants" are used when describing proportions, number of responses received, etc. However, in reality, the survey is counting *households*, rather than any individual human responses. All descriptions and references to counts, proportions, etc, should be described in *households*, not *residents* or *tenants*. For example, if 49% of responses are of a particular type, then that should be interpreted as '49% of *households* responded in that way'.

#### Section 4.3 Question 10

1. In reference to the statement "There is a strong majority for either not returning or unsure.", this is the most nonsensical statistical analysis within the entire report. By the same methodology, there is also 'a strong majority for either returning or unsure.' as a combined 60% of households selected either "Yes" or "Unsure". Again, this is an example of the statistics being presented in a way that favours more redevelopment, though in this case not only is it totally unnecessary, it is also totally nonsensical. How can two different 'categories' both have a strong majority of support?

It would have been best to simply leave out that (misleading) analysis, and present the pie chart and the (substantiated) commentary “it is clear there is a strong sense of uncertainty in terms of if residents would want to return to the Ekin Road Estate following refurbishment or redevelopment.”

We request that JLL either explain how to interpret the statement “There is a strong majority for either not returning or unsure.” regarding their analysis of Question 10 (given that there is also ‘a strong majority for either returning or unsure.’), or remove it from a revised version of the report.

2. Throughout this section, the term “residents” is used when describing proportions, number of responses received, etc. However, in reality, the survey is counting *households*, rather than any individual human responses. All descriptions and references to counts, proportions, etc, should be described in *households*, not *residents*. For example, if 49% of responses are of a particular type, then that should be interpreted as ‘49% of *households* responded in that way’.

#### Section 4.3 Question 11

1. In reference to the statement “the flats in particular being in a “poor condition” ”, the specifics of this observation seem to have been under-emphasised throughout the report. Obviously the survey data contains the property type, as surveys required an address from which the property type (flat, house, maisonette, bungalow) can be deduced. The analysis done, and statistics presented, should have been more thorough in showing exactly where the concerns were on the street about the condition of housing. In particular, the report should have provided more detailed statistics regarding negative feedback, and positive feedback, about housing condition, broken down by housing type. Such comments, of the general form ‘flats are in poor condition’, and ‘houses are in good condition’, appear throughout the report; these should be substantiated with strong statistical evidence, as they are crucial factors for the decision makers to take into account. That being said, it is perhaps politically inconvenient for the Council to draw much attention to the shocking condition of many of the Council-owned dwellings on the estate, especially of some of the flats which are near-uninhabitable. But for a project of such importance, such political self-interest by the Council should be set aside, in favour of getting the right job done for the residents. The wider public would respect a courageous admission such as that, in particular if it led to a better outcome for the residents.

We ask that JLL provide more detailed statistics regarding negative feedback, and positive feedback, about housing condition, broken down by housing type.

#### Section 4.4

1. In reference to the title “Informal Feedback” of this section, this should be re-labeled to something like ‘non-survey data’, or ‘additional data’, or ‘in-person data’. To call this “informal” somewhat diminishes the quality or importance of the data collected. However, as it is observed that “canvassers had a total of 57 individual conversations with residents on the estate, some of whom have also filled in surveys, and others who have declined to do so”, it is clear that for some households, these individual conversations were had *in lieu* of filling out a (formal) survey. Even a title such as ‘additional feedback’ would more accurately describe this dataset.
2. Again, it is clear from the table in this section that the number of “Residents to want move, so support redevelopment” (11), and the number of “Residents don’t want to move, so oppose redevelopment” (9) are again very similar, broadly matching the proportions seen in the survey data (for brevity, we omit here the repeated critique of the use of the word “residents” rather than “household”). This should be highlighted in the analysis.
3. In the table in this section, it would have again been useful if the data could also be presented broken down by tenancy type (as was done in Section 4.2 of the report), as well as by property type (as was done in Addendum 2 of the report). Ekin Road is not a homogeneous street, and so for the purposes of statistical analysis should never be treated as such. It has many different households, in different circumstances and thus with different concerns. That fact needs to be respected in the presentation of these statistics.

We ask that JLL break down the data presented in Section 4.4 by tenancy type, as well as by property type.

4. In reference to the item in the table labelled “The Council has already made their decision” (with 3 responses), this is extremely interesting, and should be expanded on. Clearly it is an incorrect interpretation, as there has been no final vote by the Cambridge City Council on the future of Ekin Road. Thus, decision makers should seek to understand why such an erroneous interpretation of the situation is so prevalent on the estate. If 3 households responded with this (presumably unprompted) from 57 conversations, then one might assume the sentiment is also felt by several others on the estate. The Council may wish to review its consultation process to date, to understand why some households have interpreted the situation as “The Council has already made their decision”.

We ask the Cambridge City Council to investigate why there is such a prevalence on the estate of the belief that “The Council has already made their decision”, and review its engagement and communication methodology accordingly so that such misinterpretations do not persist.

## Section 5

1. In reference to the statement “The resident consultation was conducted in alignment with the Council’s Code of Best Practice on Consultation as well as the Local Government Association’s Gunning Principles.”, we do not believe that the consultation has been fully conducted according to the Gunning Principles<sup>2</sup>. We list these here, and explain why they were not followed:
  - Gunning 1: “Proposals are still at a formative stage.” While it is true that no formal decision has been made, there has certainly been a strong push throughout the consultation to lead residents, and data collection, towards a foregone conclusion by favouring full redevelopment of the estate.
  - Gunning 2: “There is sufficient information to give ‘intelligent consideration’.” Residents were not given sufficient information, nor sufficient time to respond to the survey. And the survey was at times misleading and difficult to interpret.
  - Gunning 3: “There is adequate time for consideration and response”. The survey and door knocking process should have run for the standard 12 weeks, as is commonplace for consultations, rather than the 4 weeks that it ran for which was brutally short.
  - Gunning 4: “‘conscientious consideration’ must be given to the consultation responses before a decision is made.” While no decision has been made, we refer back to our previous comments that the consultation process has been somewhat of a forgone conclusion. Strong data *has* been collected by the Council which presents a compelling case *against* full redevelopment of the estate, and against *any* redevelopment of the houses on the estate, while at the same time presenting a compelling case for full *and rapid* redevelopment of all the flats on the estate. It remains to be seen whether the Council will act on this data accordingly, or whether residents will be subjected to an unwanted full redevelopment that will inevitably take much longer than a redevelopment of just the flats.
2. In reference to the statement “The survey was well publicized through a press release, website, three direct letters, and four canvassing sessions. It was also accessible to all resident through the online and paper versions as well as the aid of canvassers to complete survey on behalf of tenants if required.”, we do not believe that the survey was accessible to all residents. Door knocking was inadequate to have meaningful contact with all on the estate, the paper version was delivered far too late for residents, and no foreign language or large print versions were made available.
3. In reference to the statement “It can be concluded many residents particularly those in the flat blocks are currently not happy with their living conditions, living in buildings that are not fit for purpose. Many are experiencing issues with mould, condensation, damp as well as accessibility issues and overcrowding.”, it is abundantly clear that those within the flats wish to go, and wish to see their flats demolished. Any final, preferred option for the estate needs to reflect this, in a plan that takes down the flats and that can be executed quickly; not one that is over-ambitious in

---

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/The%20Gunning%20Principles.pdf>

its scale and thus introduces unnecessary delays in project completion due to resident opposition.

4. In reference to the statement “it must be noted the strong preference for redevelopment originates from the leasehold flats and council tenants. Among the freehold houses, there is a high level of opposition to redevelopment (72%)”, this needs to be interpreted in the context of the statistics presented in Addendum 2 of the report, where it is very clear that it is not tenure type that is the key factor, but rather property type. Those in the flats are overwhelmingly supportive of redevelopment of their dwellings; those in the houses are overwhelmingly opposed to redevelopment of their dwellings.

To highlight this in greater detail: one sees from the graph on page 17 of the report that the council tenants are split roughly 60:40 in favour of redevelopment. But on page 48, flat residents are split 70:30 in favour. Similarly, the (relatively small number of) freehold houses are split 70:30 against redevelopment (seen on page 17), but when one looks at all houses on the estate, that ratio is even more pronounced: 74:26 against redevelopment (seen on page 48).

This analysis needs to be re-done for property type, as that is where there is the clearest indication of the wishes of the estate.

5. In reference to the statement “Ultimately, it is clear for many there are sub-standard living conditions on the estate from a health and wellbeing perspective which highlights the need for these issues to be properly addressed either through refurbishment or redevelopment. Though, it is clear there a strong community feeling among resident especially those in the house who do not wish to move. Therefore, this must be considered during the evaluation process conducted by JLL.” we feel that, on balance, and with the understanding that the substandard living conditions occur primarily within the flats, this is a fair and reasonable conclusion from the data collected. The flats need to be redeveloped, urgently, and with very good reasons. The houses need to remain, in totality, with very good reasons. To follow this conclusion and produce a plan for the estate that realises these two mutually-compatible objectives is now the only fit and proper outcome for the estate; to leave the flats, or demolish the houses, would be a gross and unnecessary injustice.

We call on JLL to produce a preferred option that demolishes all the flats and retains all the houses. And we call on the Cambridge City Council to disregard any preferred option(s) presented by JLL which do not achieve both these goals.

## Section 9

1. The “Resident engagement to date” diagram on pages 29 and 31 of the report is illegible.

## Section 13

1. The use of the term “residents” in reference to response rates is again misleading, given that both the paper and online surveys requested only one response per household. These statistics, and analyses, should be rephrased in terms of ‘number/proportion of *households*’
2. In reference to the statement “It must be noted while the figures have been corrected, the proportions of residents expressing these concerns and the priorities identified remain unchanged as the error of double counting was consistent across all options.”, this “double counting” is a significant error in the statistical analysis. Let us be clear: this analysis will have a significant impact on a project that may cost the Cambridge City Council upwards of £100,000,000 , and may result in the (in many instances forced) eviction of 122 households. Such mathematical errors should not be happening when the stakes are so high. We therefore request that an independent audit is carried out of all data and statistics collected by Marengo during their survey and resident consultation. For the conclusions of this report to be valid, the statistics need to be properly tallied and checked. Fortunately the errors on the graphs for Questions 2 and 5 were detected, but there may be additional errors within the statistics of the report which may not be as obvious as the “double counting” that has happened here. An independent audit of all the statistics must be done if the report and its conclusions are to be relied upon during this consultation and subsequent optioneering for the estate.

We ask that JLL commission an independent audit of all data and statistics collected by Marengo during their survey and resident consultation, as there have already been several significant

errors in its reporting by Marengo so far.

#### Section 14

1. In reference to the statement “it is clear the majority of respondents in flats and maisonettes are in support for some form of redevelopment. Half of bungalow respondents also support the redevelopment of the Ekin Road Estate. It was only those in the houses who were in majority opposition to some form of redevelopment with over 60% responding ‘No’.”, the language used here has been misleading. If the proportion of flat, maisonette, and bungalow households in favour of redevelopment is stated, then for consistency the proportion of houses in favour should also be stated; in this case, 26% of houses were in favour of redevelopment (a very small minority). Instead, the proportion of houses in opposition was stated, which skews the statistics as some number of houses did not reply. Marengo, JLL, and the Council, should not be selectively picking when to measure ‘amount of support’ and ‘amount of opposition’; status quo is that the estate remains untouched, and so it is the responsibility of those running the consultation to measure how many households are *in favour* of various options, not how many are opposed.
2. In reference to the graph relating to Question 9, and mirroring our earlier concerns about the lack of clarity surrounding this question (See Section 4.3 Question 9 part (1) ), this graph should be redrawn with the data from only those households who voted “Yes” to Question 8. To include the data from those who voted “No” to Question 8 skews the statistics, as those people are voting between two choices, neither of which they desire.  
We ask that JLL re-draws the Section 14 graph relating to Question 9, by producing a bar graph with three bars labelled:
  - 1) ‘Those who voted ‘yes’ in Question 8, and then voted ‘complete redevelopment’ in Question 9;
  - 2) ‘Those who voted ‘yes’ in Question 8, and then voted ‘partial redevelopment’ in Question 9;
  - 3) ‘Those who voted ‘no’ in Question 8.

## Conclusion

We provide here a summary of our main concerns about the report, and then a list of actions we propose that the Cambridge City Council and/or JLL carry out.

### Summary:

The report has been prepared with a clear objective in mind: to provide a case for full redevelopment of the estate. From the composition and phrasing of the survey questions, to the way the data was presented and described, to the language used to refer to various statistics, everything was geared to the sole outcome of full redevelopment of the estate. This is not just disappointing, but it is also a missed opportunity as this survey and subsequent analysis could have properly revealed all the genuine concerns, and genuine affinity, various residents had for the estate.

Throughout the report, the use of language repeatedly serves to emphasise and amplify resident concerns about the estate, yet at the same time belittle and dismiss any expressions of contentment by residents. Negative aspects of the estate, and the statistics supporting those, were described with emphatic language (eg: “nearly half”, describing 49%). Positive aspects of the estate, and the statistics supporting those, were described with understated, unpronounced language (eg: “a minority” describing 41%). Both are nearly half; both are a minority.

There were several instances of selective use of data and statistics, or even blatant misuse of statistics, to argue the case for full redevelopment. This occurred in the survey, when data was presented to respondents in a leading way by stating the uncertainty in the total number of homes in the partial redevelopment option (209 to 217), while at the same time stating an ‘exact’ total number of homes in the full redevelopment option (239). This also occurred in the report, such as when the analysis interpreted answers to Question 9 as responses in favour of various redevelopment options when there was no possibility to select a choice such as ‘no redevelopment’.

When addressing the potential compensation package for any freeholders or leaseholders, the report completely overlooked all aspects of the housing market, and of the commonplace personal finance situations many of the homeowners may find themselves in. It made no mention of the fact that homes on Ekin Road were some of the cheapest in Cambridge (thus, moving would be a forced price upgrade). Nor did it make mention of any difficulties homeowners would find themselves in with relation to securing a new mortgage (some may no longer qualify for a mortgage) or with relation to tax liabilities that might eat into any payout made.

The survey and subsequent analysis failed to adhere to one of the most basic tenets of surveying: every voice is counted. Those running the survey imposed, without justification, a rule of “one survey per household”, going against every standard surveying method, from official democratic processes right down to simple straw polls. Individual residents were not treated equally, as those in larger households were given a diminished voice as part of the consultation. One can only conclude that this was done out of political convenience, producing statistics that are more supportive of the Council’s aims and objectives for the estate which are, and always have been, evident as total redevelopment.

The survey itself was not distributed uniformly; those who were internet connected had access to it weeks before those who weren’t, the latter receiving their paper copies a mere 6 days before the stated deadline (and needing to deal with the delay of postage). In addition, door knocking was done on an ad-hoc basis, with no stated methodology as to how unanswered doors would be returned to, if at all. These factors, combined with the “one survey per household” rule, leads to the conclusion that this was not an inclusive survey. One could describe it as ‘*some* households were given *some* opportunity to have *some* of their voices heard in aggregate’, but nothing more definitive than that.

The questions posed in the survey were, by and large, asking about ‘negative’ things, such as “issues

with your home”, “your health and wellbeing”, “ways the estate can be improved”. None of the survey questions asked respondents about aspects of the estate that they liked, or about aspects of their home and lifestyle that they liked, or about any other parts of life on the estate that they found positive. The survey was completely geared towards uncovering negative sentiments about the estate, hence why most of the data collected seems to show that a lot of respondents hold negative views about the estate (supporting a case for full redevelopment). Had all the questions been about ‘positive’ aspects of the estate, the data collected would have strongly supported retaining most, if not all, of the estate. Neither of these approaches is appropriate here; the survey should have been balanced in soliciting feedback that outlined the positive, and negative, aspects of life on the estate, which could be then compared and contrasted to see what needed to be preserved, and what needed to be fixed or replaced. That was simply not done in this survey.

Within the report it is often mentioned that some of the housing is in poor condition, yet the specifics of this observation are under-addressed. The analysis done, and statistics presented, should have been more thorough in showing exactly where the concerns were on the street about the condition of housing. The report should have provided more detailed statistics regarding negative feedback, and positive feedback, about housing condition, broken down by housing type. Comments of the general form ‘flats are in poor condition’, and ‘houses are in good condition’, appear throughout the report; these should be substantiated with strong statistical evidence, as they are crucial factors for the decision makers to take into account.

It is abundantly clear that those within the flats wish to go, and wish to see their flats demolished. Any final, preferred option for the estate needs to reflect this, in a plan that takes down the flats and that can be executed quickly; not one that is over-ambitious in its scale and thus introduces unnecessary delays in project completion due to its complexity and/or resident opposition.

It is also abundantly clear that those within the houses wish to stay, and do not wish to see their houses demolished. Any final, preferred option for the estate needs to reflect this, in a plan that retains all the houses on the street; not one that is overly-focused on delivering the maximum quantity of housing at the expense of the wellbeing of residents who will be forcibly removed.

On balance, and with the understanding that the substandard living conditions occur primarily within the flats, the report makes a fair and reasonable conclusion from the data collected: those in the flats wish to go, and those in the houses wish to stay. The flats need to be redeveloped, urgently, and with very good reasons. The houses need to remain, in totality, with very good reasons. To follow this conclusion and produce a plan for the estate that realises these two mutually-compatible objectives is now the only fit and proper outcome for the estate; to leave the flats, or demolish the houses, would be a gross and unnecessary injustice.



## **Actions we request:**

We collate and repeat here all direct requests for action by the Cambridge City Council and/or JLL. These were already underlined throughout the document.

1. Marengo did not allow sufficient time to meaningfully engage with every household must be taken into account when analysing the survey data, and that it should be referred to more as qualitative data, rather than quantitative, and we ask that JLL acknowledge this and take it into account.
2. We ask that JLL clarify how it uses the terms “many”, “some”, “a minority”, “others”, and to use these consistently when describing positive or negative aspects of the estate.
3. We ask that JLL present these statistics in a way that reflects who the responding entities were, and develop a clear and justified way of analysing the differing respondent types (some were households, some were individual residents).
4. We request that JLL reveal what statistics were collected regarding the breakdown of living conditions by budding type, and moreover collate and release whatever statistics were collected.
5. We ask that JLL reveal all uncertainty estimates in the number of total dwellings for each longlist option.
6. We ask that JLL explain what a “green route” is, seeing as this term is used in the report.
7. We ask that the Cambridge City Council clarify what the decant process and potential timelines would be for private tenants, and housing association tenants, on the estate.
8. We ask that JLL properly acknowledge and articulate the engagement that was, and wasn’t, had on the estate, and detail exactly how many households it engaged with by describing the overlap between the 63 household surveys and 57 doorstep conversations.
9. We request that the Cambridge City Council refrain from making any decisions about the estate until they can confirm that they have meaningfully engaged with every single household, or received confirmation from those it has not engaged with that they do not wish to engage.
10. We ask JLL and the Cambridge City Council to provide a justification as to why the “one survey per household” rule was used, or acknowledge that it is a non-standard methodology that introduces significant bias in the survey process.
11. We ask JLL to acknowledge the shortcomings of the survey distribution method on the estate, to acknowledge that the statistics therefore collected have a bias towards younger internet-connected residents who are predominantly in flats, and to undertake that in any future surveying paper copies will be circulated by hand at the beginning of the survey process.
12. We ask that, in any future surveying of the estate, JLL ensures that questions are posed in a balanced way that solicit both positive and negative sentiments about the estate from residents.
13. We ask that JLL clarify how eleven respondents selected ‘other’ 42 times in Question 6 of the survey.
14. We ask that JLL and the Cambridge City Council cease all use of the word ‘redevelop’ in future resident engagement material, and instead replace it with a term such as ‘demolish and rebuild’.
15. We ask that JLL restrict their use of the responses to Question 8 qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, and in no way interpret them as a ‘vote’ by households.
16. We insist that JLL reissue the report, removing the survey quote “You have been greatly misled by the residents of the houses”, and undertake not to publicly repeat any disparaging remarks made by residents about other residents in any subsequent publications relating to the estate.
17. We ask that JLL provide a preference breakdown for the data collected in Question 9 of the survey, by producing a bar graph with three bars labelled:
  - 1) ‘Those who voted ‘yes’ in Question 8, and then voted ‘complete redevelopment’ in Question 9;
  - 2) ‘Those who voted ‘yes’ in Question 8, and then voted ‘partial redevelopment’ in Question 9;
  - 3) ‘Those who voted ‘no’ in Question 8.
18. We ask that JLL be consistent in its reporting of statistics in any future publications, and avoid using unnecessary and unclear terms such as “nearly half” or “a minority”.
19. We ask JLL to interpret the statistics collected from Question 9 as follows: any household providing no answer to this question is implicitly showing a preference against any form of

redevelopment.

20. We request that JLL either explain how to interpret the statement “There is a strong majority for either not returning or unsure.” regarding their analysis of Question 10 (given that there is also ‘a strong majority for either returning or unsure.’), or remove it from a revised version of the report.
21. We ask that JLL provide more detailed statistics regarding negative feedback, and positive feedback, about housing condition, broken down by housing type.
22. We ask that JLL break down the data presented in Section 4.4 by tenancy type, as well as by property type.
23. We ask the Cambridge City Council to investigate why there is such a prevalence on the estate of the belief that “The Council has already made their decision”, and review its engagement and communication methodology accordingly so that such misinterpretations do not persist.
24. We call on JLL to produce a preferred option that demolishes all the flats and retains all the houses. And we call on the Cambridge City Council to disregard any preferred option(s) presented by JLL which do not achieve both these goals.
25. We ask that JLL commission an independent audit of all data and statistics collected by Marengo during their survey and resident consultation, as there have already been several significant errors in its reporting by Marengo so far.
26. We ask that JLL re-draws the Section 14 graph relating to Question 9, by producing a bar graph with three bars labelled:
  - 1) ‘Those who voted ‘yes’ in Question 8, and then voted ‘complete redevelopment’ in Question 9;
  - 2) ‘Those who voted ‘yes’ in Question 8, and then voted ‘partial redevelopment’ in Question 9;
  - 3) ‘Those who voted ‘no’ in Question 8.