Appendix B – Feedback Analysis methodology: Uncovering what we heard

The engagement process was designed with inclusivity and broad outreach in mind. Grounded in the West End Community Plan (2013), the project aimed to engage diverse groups to shape the final design based on the following principles:

1. **Reaching a representative demographic**: The engagement utilized online and in-person channels to ensure accessibility for different communities. This included open house events, social media campaigns, and direct mail outreach. Over 13,000 postcards were distributed to homes nearby, and three open houses were hosted at different times of day in venues near Davie Village.
2. **Reducing barriers to participation**: By providing surveys in both digital and printed formats, participation was made easier for different groups. Paper surveys were distributed at the open house events. Key design details were presented in an interactive webpage, allowing people to review and understand the design prior to providing feedback.
3. **Accommodating preferences**: Feedback was solicited through multiple channels, including surveys, emails, and one-on-one business and stakeholder meetings, to ensure the widest range of responses from different community members.

The public survey garnered substantial input, with 1,093 individual survey responses and over 3,000 social media engagements. The open-ended feedback formed the foundation for the coding and analysis approach set out in this appendix.

Feedback codification methodology

In analyzing the feedback from the public survey, we employed a codification system to categorize and interpret responses. This section details the methodology behind this coding process. The objective was to create a clear and precise set of categories to structure our analysis.

Part 1: Determining supportive or opposing sentiments

Part one of the public survey asked respondents to share their **level of support** for the proposed design, as a quick and simple multiple-choice question[i].

The table below shows how answers to this question then led people to **different follow-up questions**. These were designed as written response questions, allowing respondents to give a fuller written response to elaborate on their answer to the multiple-choice question above. In other words, they could provide **further details or reasons behind** their level of support or opposition. Analysing these responses in detail helped the design team understand how respondents felt about the design. For example, which parts of the design were considered important, unimportant, beneficial, or presenting potential issues. This helped the design team take the next steps in the detailed design process.

Primary Question	Answer	Follow-up question	Sentiment
Do you support what is proposed in this design?	Yes, I fully support it (547 respondents)	What are you most excited about? (467 responses)	Positive
	I like most elements (183 respondents)	What do you like about it? (152 responses)	Positive
		Are you concerned about anything in particular? (160 responses)	Negative
	I like some elements, but I have some concerns (186 respondents)	What do you like about it? (169 responses)	Positive
		What are you concerned about? (182 responses)	Negative
	I don't like it (170 respondents)	Tell us why (159 responses)	Negative
	I don't know (5 respondents)	Tell us why (4 responses)	Neutral
Totals	Respondents: **1,090** (3 skipped)	Written responses: **1,289*** (173 either skipped or partially incomplete) *Excludes four neutral responses	Positive: **788** Negative: **501** Neutral: **4** (173 either skipped or partially incomplete)

Across the 1,093 unique survey responses, there were 1,289 written responses to the open format follow-up questions, in which people raised a total of 2,546 sentiments. This means that each survey respondent shared (on average) two or three different comments in response to each follow-up question.

Of the 1,289 written responses from 1,093 respondents:

788 written responses have been characterised as 'positive'. This is because they were provided in response to the "What are you most excited about?" and "what do you like about it?" follow-up questions.

501 written responses have been characterised as 'negative'. This is because they were provided in response to the "Are you concerned about anything in particular?," "What are you concerned about?" and "[if you don't like it] Tell us why" follow up questions.

References to 'positive sentiments/comments' and 'negative sentiments/comments' in this report follow this definition above.

Part 2: Written response coding

Coding is the process of categorising and labeling written responses collected from surveys. This process involves defining a set of codes. These are thematic or categorical labels, which are applied to the responses. This is done to organize the data into meaningful groups.

We applied this methodology to capture multiple sentiments raised by individual respondents, and capture answers to follow-up written response question that touched on multiple different aspects of the design. This allowed us to collect the full richness of the feedback received and carry out more detailed analysis.

1. **Experience codes**

The first set of codes captured respondents' experience of the urban environment, either now or with the proposed design in place.

- **Accessibility (A)**: Feedback about ease of access, including seniors or people with disabilities.
  Example: "I'm worried about how elderly residents will navigate the street" (Code: A).
- **Equity (B)**: Feedback focused on fairness and the distribution of benefits across demographic groups.
  Example: "This hurts those of us with disabilities" (Code: B).
- **Community (C)**: Feedback on the potential effects on the neighborhood or local businesses.
  Example: "Businesses will thrive if this is implemented well" (Code: C).
- **Space for People (D)**: Comments on the creation of usable, comfortable public spaces.
  Example: "I like the idea of more seating and areas for people to gather" (Code: D).

2. **Project Objective based codes**

The second group of codes analyze written responses with the three project objectives in mind.

- **More *Space to Stroll***:
    - **Walking space (Code: W)**: This code was applied to feedback specifically focused on the widening of the sidewalks along Davie Street. Comments about increased walking space, smoother surfaces, pedestrian crossings, and overall walkability were categorized under this code. For example, "We need wider sidewalks to make it more pedestrian-friendly" was coded as **W**.
    - **Transit (Code: TT)**: Feedback concerning public transportation, including bus stop locations, transit speed, and accessibility, was assigned this code. An example would be "The bus stop needs to stay near Davie Street".
- ***Support for Local Businesses***:
    - **Vehicle parking (Code: P)**: This code captured feedback related to the access and availability of parking spaces for vehicles in Davie Village. Comments like "There is not enough parking for customers" were categorized as **P**.
    - **Patios (Code: PT)**: Any feedback concerning outdoor dining spaces or patios, such as "More outdoor seating will attract more customers," was coded as **PT**.
- ***Welcoming and Vibrant Street***:

- **Greenery (Code: G)**: This code was assigned to comments about trees, plants, and other green infrastructure. For example, "More trees will make the street more attractive" was coded as **G**.
- **Public seating (Code: PS)**: Feedback related to benches or other forms of public seating was categorized as **PS**, such as "We need more benches along the street."
- **Social issues (Code: S)**: This code was used for comments addressing concerns about homelessness, drug use, public safety, or similar social challenges. Comments like "The project should address the homelessness issue" were captured under this code.
- **Public realm (Code: PR)**: This broader code included feedback about the general design of public spaces. For instance, "The public realm improvements will make the area more enjoyable" was coded as **PR**.

These **project objective based codes** allowed us to analyse feedback in connection to the project's objectives, and therefore assess the extent to which the design is delivering on these objectives.

3. **Transportation codes: categorizing mobility feedback**

Given the prominence of written feedback related to transportation, we developed **transportation codes** to categorize comments related to vehicular and non-vehicular mobility.

- **Traffic (Code: TR)**: This code was used for feedback related to car traffic, congestion, and the allocation of space for vehicles. Comments like "Too much space is being given to cars" were coded as **TR**.
- **Active transportation (Code: AT)**: This code captured feedback about non-motorized forms of transportation, such as cycling, skateboarding, or using e-scooters. For example, "There should be more bike lanes" was categorized as **AT**.

By applying these **transportation codes**, we were able to capture feedback that related to mobility and transportation infrastructure, providing valuable insights into how respondents viewed the project's transportation implications.

4. **Other feedback**

To capture additional details and specific suggestions, we implemented **descriptive codes** that applied to more granular feedback.

- **Other (Code: X)**: This code was used for feedback that didn't fit into any other category but still provided relevant information and these comments were categorized under **X**.
- **Specific Suggestions (Code: 0)**: Any feedback that offered location specific and detailed suggestions was coded as **0**. For example, "Add a crosswalk between Thurlow and Burrard streets" would be categorized as **0**.

These codes helped capture finer points that could easily be overlooked if we focused only on the broader thematic codes.

5. **Sentiment codes: Determining supportive or opposing sentiments**

*This step was not needed for the responses in part 1 of the public survey, because public sentiment was already established for these questions. Once respondents shared their **level of support** for the proposed design, they were led to different follow-up questions, with sentiment already determined. See part 1 above for further details.*

For the open-ended questions in part 2 of the public survey[ii], an additional coding step was needed to capture the level of support or concern expressed in the written responses. We applied **sentiment codes** to do this. These simple codes allowed us to measure whether respondents were in favour of the design move being discussed; if they wanted more of a particular feature; or if they wanted to see less of a particular feature.

- **'+'** : This code was used for feedback indicating strong support for expanding or adding more of something, such as "We need more pedestrian space."
- **'-'** : Feedback that expressed a desire to reduce or scale back a feature such as "There should be fewer parking spaces."
- **'='** : This code indicated support for the current approach without major changes. For example, "The current design works well" was coded as **=**.

Response coding process – examples

In practice, multiple codes were applied to single responses. This was to capture the complexity of sentiments expressed. For example:

- **Response 1**: "Love the wider sidewalks but concerned about losing parking spots."
    - Codes applied: W (Walking Space), P (Parking)
- **Response 2**: "More patios will bring people together but traffic is already bad."
    - Codes applied: PT (Patios), TR (Traffic)

Summary Table

Below is a table summarizing the different codes used in the analysis, their definitions, and examples of how they were applied:

CATEGORY	CODE	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE
URBAN EXPERIENCE CODES	A	Accessibility: Ease of access for all groups, especially vulnerable populations.	"It's easier for people with mobility issues."
	B	Equity: Fair distribution of benefits or impacts across demographic groups.	"This design overlooks low-income residents."
	C	Community: Impact on local community, neighborhood, and businesses.	"The design gives a great feeling of community."

	D	Space for People: Comfort, gathering areas, and public life.	“More places for people to gather and socialize.”
DESIGN FOCUSED CODES	W	Walking Space: Pedestrian experience and amenities.	"The sidewalks are too narrow, especially on weekends."
	TT	Transit: Public transportation access, stop locations, and service quality.	“Keep the bus stops; they’re crucial.”
	P	Vehicle Parking: Availability of parking spaces and impact on business access.	"There isn’t enough parking for visitors, and this will make it worse."
	PT	Patios: Outdoor seating areas for businesses.	“More patios would attract customers.”
	G	Greenery: Trees, green spaces, and environmental enhancements.	"We need more trees and greenery along the street to make it inviting."
	PS	Public Seating: Availability of benches and seating areas.	“Add more seating near the shops.”
	S	Social Issues: Concerns about homelessness, safety, or public behavior.	"There are issues with homelessness and drug use in the area."
	PR	Public Realm: General design and quality of public spaces.	“The wider sidewalks are a must to improve the public realm and unleash Davie's potential as an outdoor living room for the West End community and queer community in Vancouver.”
MOVEMENT CODES	TR	Traffic: Vehicular flow, congestion, and space for cars.	“There’s too much traffic.”
	AT	Active Transportation: Non-vehicular travel like bikes and scooters.	“We need more bike lanes.”
SUPPLEMENTARY CODES	X	Other: Miscellaneous feedback not covered by the main categories.	“Specific concerns about event disruptions.”
	0	Specific Suggestions: Location-based or detailed suggestions.	“Add a bike lane near Davie St.”
ACTION CODES	+	Do More: Desire for more of a particular feature or element than that which is indicated in the proposed design.	“Increase the amount of public seating.”
	-	Do Less: Desire for less of a particular feature than that which is indicated in the proposed design.	“Reduce the amount of space allocated for cars.”
	=	Maintain the same level: Support for the approach taken in the proposed design.	“The current design is perfect as it is.”

[i] Response options to the question “Do you support what is shown in the proposed design?”:

“Yes, I fully support it!”, “I like most elements", “I like some elements, but I have some concerns”, “I don’t like it”, and “I am not sure”

[ii] See *Appendix A – Paper Survey* (February 2024), questions 5 (public seating), 8 (transit) and 10 (curbside space).