INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND

Greater Whitewell Community Surgery

Peace Walls Attitudinal Survey
Summary of Results
October 2017

CONTENTS

The terms PUL and CNR are commonly used in Northern Ireland when referring to both communities. They have been used in this report:
PUL Protestant Unionist Loyalist
CNR Catholic Nationalist Republican

COVER IMAGE:
Site 2 Serpentine Gardens/ Gunnel Hill.

MAIN IMAGE:
Site 2 Gunnel Hill/ Serpentine Gardens.

Foreword

Today, almost 50 years since the first Peace Wall was built, more than 100 physical structures remain as visible symbols of continued division and segregation. The IFI Peace Walls Programme is currently working with local communities impacted by approximately 66 of these barriers. There should be no place for physical separation barriers in a truly reconciled society but we have not yet reached that stage and, given that the risks associated with barrier removal processes lie almost exclusively with those residents and communities most impacted by their presence, it is right that we prioritise their views and concerns while supporting them to bring about positive change if and when they decide the time is right.

The vast majority of physical barriers are located within communities that have suffered disproportionately during the conflict. These interface areas continue to endure high levels of multiple deprivation including educational under-achievement, mental and physical health inequalities, inadequate facilities, poor delivery of public services, physical blight and neglect. Investment potential remains limited with significant Agency and political collaborative will and effort required to change this negative dynamic. At this stage in our Peace Process, and four years since the Together Building a United Community (TBUC) pledge on the removal of barriers by 2023, local communities deserve to know what is planned in terms of delivery, how they will be involved in the decision-making and what protections will be offered to them.

This Greater Whitewell Community Surgery (GWCS) baseline attitudinal survey report is one of six carried out in local communities impacted by physical barriers as part of the International Fund for Ireland's Peace Walls Programme. Unlike other studies, these surveys concentrate on the views of those most affected by change to the barriers, the people who live closest to them and who would be taking the biggest risks. The surveys show that fear continues to be a key issue for many, yet most want to see physical change in place for future generations. Positive change will only be enabled when agencies work together to ensure local voice is prioritised and after-care protection of life and property is in place and effective.

The findings from GWCS include:

• Real need for shared space and relationship building. No shared spaces in the area other than GWCS offices. Only 26% contact with those directly on other side of wall, 56% rarely or never had contact on those directly on other side of wall.

- Despite 89% of respondents feeling very safe or fairly safe security concerns were the key concern. 83% felt main function of peace wall was to provide safety and security. GWCS have strong working relationships with PSNI which could help alleviate fears and build stronger community infrastructure.

These results are significant and indicate that communities are willing, with support, to work towards positive change. While challenging, it underscores that if progress is to be realised, community goodwill and ambition must be met in full by tangible action from relevant statutory authorities backed by strong political leadership. Ring-fenced resources and funding is part of delivering change as is the need for a detailed and considered strategy that aligns the efforts of those who own the physical structures, including the Department of Justice, local authorities, Northern Ireland Housing Executive and others. Without this, we may ultimately be taking communities to a place where they cannot advance any further, causing frustration and anger and effectively negating progress made.

Adrian Johnston
Chairman, International Fund for Ireland

GWCS Foreword

GWCS carried out this baseline survey as it was important to gauge the views of the community most affected by the peacewalls structures and ensure they had their say if decisions are to be made regarding the removal, reduction or reimaging of the peace walls. We will be revisiting those who participated in the survey to share the findings and thank them for their input without which our future planning process would have been made much more difficult. We were pleased to find that the local participants appreciated being asked for their views and concerns about community issues as well as being given a voice on peace walls issues.

The study noted key areas for GWCS to work with the community on, including security/safety fears, low interaction levels with those living directly on the other side of the barrier and the need for shared community spaces. The findings suggested that 16% of the CNR community interact regularly with those on the other side of the peacewall compared to 45% of the PUL community. We identified that many of the PUL respondents were in the older age-group while many of the CNR respondents were from younger families, some of whom were single parents. Their differing experience of the legacy of the conflict may well have contributed to the difference in views. It also indicates that the PWP must do more to engage with young families and work to alleviate their fears and concerns. One of the most concerning findings was the perception that the PSNI lacked adequate resources to deal with any potential upsurge in interface violence.

GWCS will develop further community engagement programmes to build community confidence and capacity on an inter-generational basis. We will also continue to collaborate with the relevant statutory agencies, including the PSNI, and other stakeholders including our politicians, to ensure better services and resources for our community.

We have recently set up a 16-24 year olds young adult project as their lack of voice/opinion was identified by the survey with only 6% response from that age-group. One of our …….
To end of para

We will continue to deliver regular information leaflets/Newsletters to our 1500 households to keep you informed of our work and ensure that you are aware of our open-door policy at the offices – call at any time. We will also ensure that our website is regularly updated about our events, activities, courses and group meetings.

We are working towards a safer environment where the whole community can move freely without fear of intimidation and we will continue to increase relationship building with the aim to improve the quality of life for all in our community.

Geraldine O'Kane
Project Manager

Introduction

Since the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, considerable progress has been made to address the legacy of division with successive Northern Ireland Life & Times (NILT) surveys signifying public approval of improved community relations and a desire to move towards a fully-realised shared society.[1]

However, Northern Ireland remains a society dominated by the existence of the 'Peace Walls' with such structures providing a constant physical reminder of the divisions that remain.

The Peace Walls Programme (henceforth PWP) is an initiative developed and funded by the International Fund for Ireland (The Fund) since 2011/2012 to assist communities most impacted by the peace walls and physical barriers due to their proximity to these structures.

It aims to empower these residents to reach a position where they feel safe and ready to begin the dialogue necessary for the successful dismantling of interface barriers and have confidence in and a positive attitude to barrier reduction and/or removal.

The PWP operates within a policy context dominated by the 'Together Building a United Community' (TBUC) Strategy' (NIE, 2013). Central to this strategy is a policy commitment to remove all interface barriers by 2023 in consultation with those most affected (i.e. those living closest to the barriers) and the implementation of an 'Interface Barrier Support Package' to enable this to happen.

Gormley-Heenan et al. (2015) have highlighted that the TBUC strategy faces a number of difficulties regarding its capacity to realise this commitment. This is in part due to the continuing inconsistency as regards what constitutes a 'peace wall' with the figures differing between 53 (Department of Justice figures, 2013) and 116 (Belfast Interface Project figures, 2017).

Moreover, there is a lack of clarity in relation to the role communities can actually play in the process, how their viewpoints can be measured over time and how 'confidence' and 'consensus' can be considered to have been met.

Naming a deadline has raised a concern within some communities that implementation of

the strategy will occur from the 'top-down' and be acted on without relevant consultation and input from those most affected.

Additionally, as of June 2017, the NI Executive has failed to agree on the value of an 'Interface Barrier Support Package' which underscores scepticism within communities that resources will not be made available for change to occur.

These concerns are strengthened by the current political instability within Northern Ireland as a result of the absence of a power-sharing administration at Stormont.

Map 1: GWCS Engagement Zone

Engagement with the PWP occurs through grassroots programmes aimed at developing and delivering a range of confidence and relationship-building interventions within and between interface communities. These are facilitated by community representatives in collaboration with relevant statutory agencies.

The Programme has been in operation in the Greater Whitewell area – an area typified by communities that have historically disengaged from positive cross-community interaction – since 2012 and is facilitated by the Greater Whitewell Community Surgery (henceforth GWCS).

To date, GWCS has reported the transformation of two sites within the engagement area; one of which has eradicated incidents at the interface on Arthur Bridge and the other which has created a major shared space at the Valley Leisure Centre.

The second phase of the Programme focuses on a further four identified peace wall sites at Serpentine Road/Navarra; Graymount/Lower Whitewell; Hazelwood/Throne; and Serpentine Gardens/Gunnell Hill.

Despite commitments in both the Programme for Government (2011-2015) and within the TBUC strategy document (2013) that change to the barriers will only happen in consultation with communities most affected, there remains limited quantitative data on residents' views to such change.[2]

In order to aid planning and development of the second phase of the programme and deliver the wider outcome of the PWP, GWCS gathered survey data from 88 of the most impacted residents at these four identified sites.

This is a continuation of work undertaken by GWCS to promote engagement between and within communities and to provide opportunities for residents to voice their concerns about barrier removal, ensure any future alterations are resident-led and move towards overcoming the psychological barriers that hinder change.

The objective of the survey is to baseline attitudinal positions from residents of both community backgrounds in order to establish an area-specific profile and provide PWP staff with information to aid the development of future initiatives from an evidence base.

This research briefing paper outlines some of the key findings from the survey in relation to residents' key concerns about the peace walls, and their current attitudes towards the 'other' community and the future status of the barriers. These findings are discussed in greater detail below and indicate both the opportunities and challenges that GWCS face in meeting the aims and objectives of the PWP within this area.

Community Safety: Perceptions, Fears & The Role of the Peace Walls

Despite 89% of all respondents reporting that they feel safe living in this area, a key finding within the data is that safety and security concerns in relation to the barriers remain uppermost in residents' minds.

Eight of the thirteen identified key concerns at the barriers are linked directly or indirectly to safety and/or security issues which implies that the current high reported levels of 'feeling safe' living in the area is in part reliant on the continuing existence of the peace walls.

Of these, only three (10% of all respondents views) can be linked directly to 'actual' safety and security issues that may need addressed in the area, namely ASB, attacks on property and trouble or fighting at the interface.[3] These concerns are much more predominant within the PUL community (17%) than within the CNR community (4%).

The remaining five can only be linked indirectly to safety and security factors as they are concerned with 'fears' of future violence at the interface or concerns about the possible impact on community safety should the barriers be removed.

Safety and security remains the central issue of concern in the area but there is wide ranging disagreement between the two communities on such concerns
43% of all respondents had lived in the area for over twenty-five years.
89% of all respondents felt 'very safe' or 'fairly safe' living in the area.
54% of all respondents expressed safety and/or security issues as their key concern.
83% of all respondents felt that the peace walls main function was to provide safety and security.
88% of all respondents felt that the key positive aspects of the peace walls were that they 'made people feel safer' (59%) and acted to protect residents and property from attacks (29%).
59% stated that retention of the peace walls would have a positive impact on community safety.
Better policing and improved safety measures were ranked as the primary and secondary factors that could influence positive attitudinal change to the removal of the peace walls.
Apart from a share concern regarding 'youth loitering at the interface (14%) the two communities differed regarding their safety concerns.
The CNR community had concerns with personal safety (25%), fears of future violence (16%) and attacks on property (4%). They were also concerned with the barriers being removed or altered (6%). These issues all elicited a zero response rate from their PUL counterparts.
Conversely the PUL community had concerns about ASB (14%) and trouble at the interface (3%).
52% of the PUL community had no concerns about the interface compared to 23% of the CNR community

Forty-four percent of all respondents report that they hold these concerns. The strength of this finding is unsurprising when taken in the context of the historical legacy of the 'Troubles', the

Site 4 Graymount
Crescent /
Whitewell Road &
Catherine Court.

oft reported violent experiences that are part of living at interfaces and the long-term residency of most of the respondents in this area.

As long-term residents, they have both experiences and memories of extreme sectarian violence. It is natural then that residents remember the fear that this violence engendered and thus understandable why they hold onto a fear of change and the unknown.

However, this finding also presents a significant challenge to GWCS in delivering the PWP. The current reality is that widespread inter-community violence is not a feature of daily life in this area, nor has it been for some time but it is clear that there remains an apprehension that history could repeat itself and a perception that changes to the barriers would result in a negative impact on personal and community safety.

Moreover, apart from a shared concern relating to 'youths loitering or gathering' at the barriers (PUL & CNR =14%), these fears of what 'might' happen exist solely within the CNR community.[4] They report fears for their personal safety (25%), fears of future violence (16%) and concerns regarding the walls being altered (6%) and by implication fear of what this change could bring.

Comments from CNR respondents also associate these fears with certain times of year, especially during the 'marching season'.

This implies that the CNR community would welcome greater movement towards the resolution of parading issues at a macro-level prior to committing fully to the removal of interface barriers.

That such perceptions exist almost exclusively within the CNR community presents a further challenge to the PWP. It indicates that future work undertaken will need to particularly address the reasons underpinning these fears and provide greater reassurance and evidence to this community that removal of the peace walls will not lead to deteriorating community safety.

This need for greater reassurance is confirmed by residents naming 'better policing' and 'improved safety measures' as the primary and secondary factors that could influence positive attitudinal change to the removal of the peace walls.

Further data from the research supports the view that residents continue to consider the peace walls in terms of their initial reason for construction, namely to prevent large-scale inter-community and sectarian violence in the area, even though this is no longer occurring.

83% of all respondents currently feel that the main function of the peace walls is their safety and security mechanisms. A larger 88% reported that the key positive aspects of the barriers are that they make people 'feel safer' (59%) and act to protect residents and property from attacks (29%).

In relation to the function of the barriers, there is consensus between the two communities that the barriers help 'keep the peace and prevent trouble' (PUL=29% and CNR=28%) but

Site 3 Hazelwood Integrated Primary School/ Throne Estate.

the PUL community believe more strongly that they exist to prevent attacks on properties (25%) in comparison to their CNR counterparts (4%).

Both communities report that the main function and main positive aspect of the peace walls is to make people 'feel safer' (PUL=36%/67% and CNR=44%/55%). Once again this emphasises the strong psychological impact the barriers exert on residents in this area in regards to community safety and security.

This is supported by 59% of all respondents reporting that retention of the peace walls would have a positive impact on community safety.

However, it should be noted that when this figure is stratified by community background, there is a stark difference between the two communities. Almost four in every five (78%) respondents from the CNR community report that retention of the walls would have a 'positive' impact on community safety. Only 22% of PUL respondents agree. This particular statistic reinforces the findings above that the CNR community has particular issues of trust relating to barrier removal and also strongly indicates that they view the peace walls as their only protection.

As shown by the statistics highlighted above, a number of key safety concerns were named by one community but not at all by the other and the differences between both communities regarding having 'no concerns' was marked with a difference of almost thirty percentage points.

This suggests that the PWP first needs to consider the reasons behind each concern being reported so prominently in one community over the other before they can consider what needs to be done to address them. This may mean GWCS prioritising different factors within the two communities and across the four identified sites rather than a 'one size fits all' approach in order to progress the work of the programme.

As the PWP is facilitated at a grassroots level, GWCS are in a position to gauge how and when they can most effectively address these concerns. Should they be able to highlight security alternatives to the peace walls and the potential positive outcomes of their removal, the CNR community in particular may become less concerned about these safety and security issues over time and more welcoming to change as regards the barriers.

Overall, this data highlights the challenges the PWP face in moving into the second phase of their programme and towards the eventual removal of all barriers in this area. Feelings of safety are both subjective and open to influence and any willingness to remove the barriers may ebb and flow depending on external factors. However, as the PWP is facilitated at a grassroots level, GWCS in a position to gauge how and when they can most effectively address these safety fears and security concerns.

Building greater trust in the positive aspects of barrier removal is essential for progress but the pace of change must also take cognizance of the years of violence, hurt and fear experienced within both communities and not easily forgotten.

This challenge becomes greater in that the key factor identified as potentially contributing most to 'positive attitudinal change' (better policing) has been subject to funding cuts so the resources wanted by the community to address their prevalent safety and security concerns may not be available. This again underscores the necessity for the TBUC Barrier Interface Support Package to be agreed and put in place as soon as possible.

Longlands/
Valley

Interaction and Community Relations

Although the peace walls were first constructed to address safety and security concerns, such structures also need to be considered in relation to how they perpetrate segregation and division of communities by reaffirming territorial 'no-go areas' and subsequent beliefs that there is no need for communities to interact with each other or build better community relations.

Research by Ulster University (2012, 2015) indicates that interaction with the 'other community' remains lower at interface areas. Data from this survey shows that interaction levels with the 'other community' are regular overall but that such interaction is significantly lower in relation to those living on the 'other side' of the peace wall.

There is a sharp contrast between interaction with the 'other' community as a whole and the community on the 'other side of the peace walls' in this area and reported interaction with the community on the 'other side' of the barriers is significantly poorer within the CNR community
68% of all respondents stated they had contact with the 'other' community on a regular basis (very/fairly often) whilst 11% stated that this rarely or never happened.
This declined sharply to 25% of all respondents reporting regular contact with the community on the 'other side of the peace wall' with 56% stating that such contact rarely or never happened.
83% of all respondents reported that interaction was 'always' or mostly positive with only 1% responding that interaction was 'always' negative.
79% agreed that no change to the barriers would have a negative impact on community relations.
More community facilities were named as the tertiary factor that could influence positive attitudinal change to the removal of the peace walls.

Males have dramatically lower levels of interaction with the 'other' community in comparison with females.
The CNR community (16%) is significantly less likely to interact regularly with those on the 'other side of the peace walls than the PUL community (45%).
This stark difference continued with 30% of the CNR community reporting that such interaction never occurred compared to only 7% of the PUL community.
These stark differences exist despite the CNR reporting slightly higher levels of interaction with the community as a whole (71%) than their PUL neighbours (66%).
There are similar levels of positive experiences regarding interaction between the two communities.

This is particularly true amongst males. Whilst 15% of males state that interaction with those on the other side of the peace walls is regular, a dramatic 74% report that it 'rarely' or 'never' happens in comparison to 28% and 48% of females respectively.

When stratified by community background, the CNR community has higher levels of regular interaction with the 'other community as a whole' (very/fairly often= 71%) and lower levels of non-interaction (rarely/never= 9%) compared to 66% and 17% of those in the PUL community.

However, when considering interaction with those living 'on the other side of the barriers', there is a significant decline in regular interaction within both communities and a dramatic decline within the CNR community.

Now only 16% of this community report regular contact compared to 45% of PUL residents. Moreover, there is a significant increase in the CNR community reporting that interaction is rare or non-existent. Over two-thirds (64%) report this to be the case in comparison to just over one-third (35%) of those in the PUL community.

Given the extensive safety and security concerns voiced by CNR residents, a correlation may exist between these key concerns and poor interaction levels so should the PWP address the first issue, it may have a follow-on positive impact on the second.

However, it is also important to consider such poor contact as an issue in itself. Avoidance of the 'other' community can only act to exacerbate current mistrust and fears and if unaddressed could lead to the progress of the PWP being undermined within this area.

These findings indicate challenges for the PWP. Education remained segregated despite the presence of two integrated schools in the local area. Higher levels of interaction do happen at choice-based meeting places such as community centres and community events (41% and 51% respectively) but there is an inference that these facilities and activities are not widespread.

A future focus of the PWP is the need to address the significant percentages of respondents who have little or no contact with the community on the other side of the barriers.

Site1
Serpentine Road/
Navarra Place.

Relationship-building and greater understanding of the 'other' will increase the potential for positive change in attitude to peace walls.

GWCS may wish to address these significant findings by considering what factors are underpinning such low interaction levels and increase relationship-building measures between the two communities with a specific emphasis on increasing male and CNR involvement in the Programme.

Such measures may lead to greater understanding of the 'other'. This is supported by data from the research which shows that when interaction does happen, 83% of residents consider it an overwhelmingly positive experience.

Furthermore, there is awareness in the area that the retention of the peace walls is an obstacle to improved community relations with 80% stating that such retention would have a negative impact on these. Thirty-one percent of all respondents also identify a negative aspect of the barriers as being that it maintains division and segregation by 'keeping the two communities apart'

It is important that residents and their children access opportunities to meet each other at sporting, educational, capacity building or social activities. Development of greater community facilities and shared spaces could act as a catalyst towards the removal of the barriers.

More community activities and events aimed at bringing people together with a view to building good relations and reducing levels of fear and suspicion is within the capacity of GWCS and can only aid the potential for positive change in attitudes towards the removal of the peace walls.

Looking to the Future

The final key finding from the survey is in relation to what residents' imagine the future holds for the barriers and the potential for reducing or removing them. This is an extremely important finding for the PWP in that 80% of respondents want to see some change to the barriers be that reimaging, reclassification or removal.

The data shows that there is not an overwhelming desire for removal of the walls immediately with only 12% of all residents in this area favouring the total removal of the walls 'now'. However, 38% report that they would favour removal of the walls at an unspecified time in the future and an additional 31% favour change at some level (declassification, greater accessibility and/or reimaging).

Residents are open to future change and clearly do not wish to pass this issue to another generation with 87% stating they do not want their children or grandchildren to continue living with the barriers.

Political volatility (as is currently happening) can often cause greater levels of anxiety within segregated communities and lead to greater concerns about changing the status quo but this does not seem to be happening in this area. Positively, this community does not seem to have allowed it to impact on its hopes for the future. The 'Public Attitudes to Peace Walls Survey (Ulster University, 2015) found that 41% of respondents could envisage a time without the peace walls which increases to 49% of all respondents in this area.

The majority of residents favour change to the barriers in some form but the CNR community have greater concerns about the pace of change towards the eventual removal of the peace walls
12% of respondents wanted the barriers to be removed 'now', 38% wanted this to happen 'sometime in the future' and 31% were content to see them reclassified, reimaged or providing greater accessibility. 18% wished to maintain their current status.
49% of residents could envisage a time when the barriers did not exist with a further 21% stating they 'did not know'.
87% of residents were strongly in favour of the barriers being removed within the lifetime of their children or grandchildren.
Excepting community safety, residents stated that retention of the barriers would have an overwhelmingly negative impact on improved living conditions in the area.
31% of Catholic respondents reported that they believed the barriers had no negatives. This contrasted with only 12% of the Protestant community.
20% of the CNR community reported that they wanted to retain the status quo for now compared to 11% of PUL respondents.
15% of CNR respondents wanted the walls to be removed now, 40% wanted them removed 'sometime' in the future and 24% were content to see declassification, re-imaging and/or provision of greater access. This compared to 7%, 37% and 41% within the PUL community.

78% of the CNR community reported that retention of the peace walls would have a positive impact on community safety compared to only 20% of PUL respondents.

Marginally more CNR respondents wanted to see the barriers removed within the next generation (89%) compared to 83% of the PUL community.

When stratified by community identity, the data indicates that the CNR community is more in favour of the peace walls being removed now (15%) in comparison to their PUL neighbours (7%) but that they are also more in favour of retaining the status quo (CNR=20% and PUL=11%). The PUL community is more in favour to change to the barriers (41%) than the CNR community (24%).

As regards the future, both communities favour removal of the barriers at 'sometime in the future' and this is supported by similar responses to believing this could happen (CNR=52% and PUL=48%) and a desire for it to happen within the next generation (CNR=89% and PUL=82%).

The data from the survey overall indicates that the CNR community value a slower pace of change than the PUL community. This is supported by the findings above regarding the need to address fears of future violence and low interaction levels and also the belief in this community that the barriers have 'no negatives' (CNR=31% to PUL =12%).

Furthermore the PUL community report more strongly that they have 'no concerns' about the barriers (53%) in comparison to their CNR counterparts (23%). Although this cannot be assumed to mean the PUL community instinctively favour the removal of the walls, it certainly indicates that the barriers have much less impact on their day-to-day lives and thus they place less importance upon them than their CNR neighbours.

This data is extremely important for GWCS as it provides the baseline of current attitudes to the overarching aim of the PWP. Taken in totality, it indicates that hope for future removal of the peace walls exists with continuing fears of what this may bring. This may be addressed by the PWP with practical steps to address safety and security concerns and interaction levels to lessen fear of the 'other' but there is also a need for greater political leadership and input from statutory agencies to provide a realistic alternative to the barriers.

This finding once more underpins the importance of the approach taken by the PWP towards removal of the interface barriers, in that it can only move forward with community support and involvement and at a pace dictated by those communities most affected.

Conclusion

The survey data provides clear challenges for the GWCS PWP in developing their work in this area but also offers a clear baseline position to both extend their work and measure future attitudinal change as a result of targeted initiatives developed by them and other key stakeholder agencies to deal with the pressing concerns raised by residents in the area.

The greatest challenges for the PWP in the Greater Whitewell area are the continuing safety and security fears in particular within the CNR community. Moreover, poor interaction levels with those living directly beside them but on the 'other side' of the barriers needs to be addressed and, again, with a focus on engagement of the CNR community

It should be acknowledged that the baseline data also highlights opportunities for development and progress. The most important of these is that, despite their lived experiences, hope still exists within this area that change to the barriers will happen in the foreseeable future and that this is a matter they want to see addressed in their lifetime rather than passing it onto the next generation to resolve.

However, this is tempered with the reality that any such change will require greater inter-agency collaboration and support for peace walls work alongside cross-party political support and engagement.

Continuation of the PWP's work to build greater community confidence is essential to the process of building belief and local consensus that change to the barriers can and will bring positive outcomes for the communities most affected.

The findings outlined in this research briefing concur with the view forwarded by Nolan (2014) that removal of the peace walls will not be a seismic change but will result from 'incremental' progress by developing a 'balancing act' between encouraging hope and addressing safety and security concerns.

References

Belfast Interface Project. (2017) Interface Barriers, Peacelines and Defensive Architecture. Belfast: BIP, p.5. Available from: https://www.belfastinterfaceproject.org/publications [Accessed 21st June 2017]

Byrne, J., Gormley-Heenan, C., Morrow, D., and Sturgeon, B. (2015) Public Attitudes to Peace Walls (2015) Survey Results. Belfast: Ulster University

Byrne, J., Gormley-Heenan, C., and Robinson, G. (2012) Peace Walls, Public Attitudes and Impact on Policy. Belfast: ARK, p.2. Available from: http://www.ark.ac.uk/peacewalls2012/PeaceWallsBrief.pdf [Accessed 7th April 2017].

Gormley-Heenan, C., Morrow, D., and Byrne, J. (2015) Removing Peace Walls and Public Policy Brief (1): the challenge of definition and design. ESRC, p.5. Available from: http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/ documents/raise/knowledge_exchange/briefing_papers/series5/byrne071015.pdf [Accessed 06th April 2017].

Gormley-Heenan, C., Morrow, D., and Byrne, J. (2015) Removing Peace Walls and Public Policy Brief (2): the challenge of delivery. ESRC, p.4. Available from: http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/raise/ knowledge_exchange/briefing_papers/series5/byrne071015.pdf [Accessed 06th April 2017].

Morrow, D., Robinson, G., and Dowds, L. (2013) The Long View of Community Relations in Northern Ireland: 1998 – 2012, Research Update 87. Belfast: ARK p.1. Available from: http://www.ark.ac.uk/publications/updates/ update87.pdf [Accessed 05th April 2017].

Nolan, P (2014) Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report. Belfast: Community Relations Council p.67. Available from: https://www.community-relations.org.uk/sites/crc/files/media-files/Peace-Monitoring-Report-2014.pdf [Accessed 06th April 2017].

Northern Ireland Executive (2011) Programme for Government 2011-2015. Belfast: NIE p.10. Available from: https://www.northernireland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/nigov/pfg-2011-2015-report.pdf [Accessed 06th April 2017].

Northern Ireland Executive (2013) Together: Building a United Community Strategy (TBUC). Belfast, NIE, p.62. Available from: https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/ofmdfm_dev/together-building-a-united-community-strategy.pdf [Accessed 06th April 2017].

Footnotes

1. Morrow, D. et al. The Long View of Community Relations in Northern Ireland: 1998 – 2012 (2013) p.1.

2. Ulster University have carried out such studies in 2012 and 2015.

3. This figure includes 'attacks on property' as comments indicate that this is a reality rather than a perception.

4. CNR refers to the Catholic/Nationalist/Republican community and PUL to the Protestant/Unionist/Loyalist community.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND