

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **SECTION A: CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 1.1 In order to develop the West End Project proposals for consultation, officers worked with local residents' groups and businesses, Transport for London, Crossrail, Camden Cycling Campaign, Inmidtown and the Fitzrovia Partnership Business Improvement Districts, London First and the City of Westminster.
- 1.2 Pre-consultation engagement was held with local groups and businesses and at the Bloomsbury Area Action Group during March 2014 to give people the opportunity to comment on draft proposals for consultation. During the pre-consultation stage, it became clear that local people would like a greater say in the design of some of the public spaces, including Alfred Place, Whitfield Gardens and Princes Circus. Following on from the pre-consultation meetings, three further meetings were held with local groups to help develop the design of the public spaces, with the assistance of the architects commissioned by the Council.
- 1.3 The public consultation period ran from 9 June until 18 July and was then extended until 1 August to provide additional time for people to provide comments. Due to the size and complexity of the project, the decision was taken to present the information on-line, rather than in paper format, but a paper version of the documents was available on request. A media launch was held prior to the start of the public consultation to generate interest in the project and make people aware of the forthcoming consultation. Media coverage included ITV and BBC London news. A consultation launch was also held for local groups and stakeholders who had been involved in developing the project.
- 1.4 A total of 7990 consultation flyers were distributed in Camden to local residents and businesses in the area (the consultation area is shown on the plan below), with a short summary of the project and a link to the on-line consultation. 32 local groups and 44 statutory organisations and Ward Councillors were emailed the link to the on-line consultation. In addition 235 flyers were distributed to residents and businesses in Westminster, and 9 local groups and Ward Councillors were informed of the consultation.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion



- 1.5 Publicity to raise awareness of the project and encourage residents and businesses to take part in the consultation included a two page article in the July issue of the Camden resident magazine, adverts in the Camden New Journal, and posters in the area.
- 1.6 All consultees were also offered a paper copy of the consultation material on request. In order to encourage responses, a follow up summary leaflet and reduced questionnaire was sent out to all residents and businesses in the area on 18 July 2014.
- 1.7 In addition the Council's community researchers carried out 579 face to face on-street and doorstep surveys in the area. The community researchers are

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

local people employed by the Council from a cross-section of the community to engage and access the views of local people. The community research project aims to involve local people in service delivery and empower them so that their voices are heard, their views valued and their rights respected.

- 1.8 A public exhibition of the proposals was held in the Building Centre on Store Street from 9 June until 11 July, and then in Holborn Library from 14 July until 1 August. Members of staff were available to answer questions for one daytime and one evening session. A total of 80 people attended the sessions.
- 1.9 During the consultation period, officers attended meetings as requested such as a public meeting with Gordon Mansions Residents' Association, meetings with representatives of the Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association and the Charlotte Street Association, and other residents and businesses including from Ridgmount Gardens and from Percy Street. In addition, officers met with taxi groups to discuss the proposals. Officers were also challenged to improve the proposals for walking and cycling, and so a working group was set up and a number of meetings were held to address specific issues such as the cycling facilities proposed for Gower Street, the access to Endell Street (as a key route to Waterloo Bridge) from Gower Street via Princes Circus, and improving east-west cycle routes including a possible new link from Capper Street to Howland Street, across Tottenham Court Road. The working group included representatives of the Camden Cycling Campaign, Living Streets, Travelwatch, Campaign for a Liveable London, urban design consultants and walking and cycling bloggers. The results of the discussions held with the working group on the issues above are included under the relevant questions below.
- 1.10 The consultation material can be viewed at [www.camden.gov.uk/westendproject](http://www.camden.gov.uk/westendproject) .

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### SECTION B: OVERALL CONSULTATION RESULTS

1.1 Of the 8310 consultation flyers and leaflets distributed to local residents, businesses, local and statutory groups and organisations, a total of 1357 responses were received, which represents a response rate of 16%. The consultation results are shown in tables 1 to 19, with the tables of comments in Appendices C and D. The response rate is above the average of 10% for similar consultation exercises. This is likely to be due to the level of interest in the proposals, pre-engagement work carried out by officers and the use of community researchers to conduct face- to-face surveys.

1.2 The 1357 responses are broken down by source as follows:

Response type	Number of responses	Percentage of total
Face-to-face surveys	579	43%
Online	576	42%
Post	144	11%
Letter or Email (this last group did not answer the yes/no questions.)	58	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1357</b>	<b>100%</b>

1.3 In terms of type of respondent, the composition is as follows:

Type of respondent	Number	Percentage
Resident	492	36%
Business	241	18%
One person identified as both resident and business	3	0%
Individual	223	16%
Visitor	209	15%
Local student	117	9%
Local group*	14	1%
Organisation*	16	1%
Statutory group*	12	1%
Other - cycling campaigner*	1	0%
No answer*	29	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1357</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*these groups are not included in the numerical analysis below (which covers the remaining 1285 responses) but their comments are summarised in Appendix C and are included in the discussion of the results for each question in this Appendix.

1.4 Of all respondents, only 38 people (3%) reported that they consider themselves to be disabled, 638 (47%) said they did not, and the remaining 681 individuals and groups (50%) did not answer the question.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

- 1.5 Tables 1a to 18 below provide a summary of the results for each proposal, followed by the responses from local and statutory groups and organisations, the most frequently mentioned comments from individuals and the officers' responses and recommendations.
- 1.6 A full list of comments from individuals is included in Appendix B and a summary of comments from local groups, statutory groups and organisations is included in Appendix C. Comments from individuals and local groups are listed by question. Comments from statutory groups and organisations are listed under their group or organisation name.

### SECTION C: CONSULTATION RESULTS BY QUESTION AND OFFICERS' RESPONSES

#### Q1a: Do you agree with the traffic and public space proposals of the West End Project?

- 1.1 Of those who answered this question, 1221 respondents, 54% supported the proposals:

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	661	54%
No	461	38%
No opinion	99	8%

- 1.2 Of those who answered, and stated an opinion (1122 respondents), 59% supported the proposals and 41% did not.
- 1.3 When the results are broken down by types of respondent, the majority of people in all categories except those classifying themselves as "individual", i.e. businesses, residents, visitors and students, are in support.
- 1.4 The responses show there is overall support for the West End Project traffic and public space proposals.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Q1b: Do you agree with removing the one-way system, making Tottenham Court Road two-way (for buses and cyclists), and Gower Street two-way (for all other traffic)?

- 1.5 Of those who answered this question, 1223 people, 54% support the removal of the one-way system, making Tottenham Court Road two-way for buses and cyclists and Gower Street two-way for all traffic:

<b>Table 1b: Do you agree with removing the one-way system, making Tottenham Court Road two-way (for buses and cyclists), and Gower Street two-way (for all other traffic)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	664	54%
No	465	38%
No opinion	94	8%

- 1.6 Of those who answered and stated an opinion, 1129 respondents, 59% were in support and 41% against.
- 1.7 When the results are broken down by types of respondent, all categories support the proposals, with the exception of businesses; of those businesses that expressed an opinion, 49.8% were in favour and 50.2% were against.
- 1.8 The results show there is also support for removing the one-way system, making Tottenham Court Road two-way (for buses and cyclists), and Gower Street two-way (for all other traffic).

### Comments received on overall proposals and removal of one-way system (question 1) and officers' responses

- 1.9 A total of 1041 comments were received from individuals in response to question 1. The comments below are grouped by topic and include those raised by at least 20 individuals (the name or number of respondents is shown after the comment) and also by local and statutory groups and organisations.

#### Positive comments:

- Support overall objectives (Transport for London (TfL), City of Westminster, Freight Transport Association (FTA), Living Streets, London Travelwatch, Metropolitan Police, Transport for All, Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC), London Cycling Campaign (LCC), London First,

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

University College London Hospital (UCLH), University College London (UCL), Unite the Union, Sustrans, Inmidtown, the Fitzrovia Partnership, English Heritage, London Assembly Liberal Democrats, Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, The Bedford Estate, Bedford Court Mansions, Ridgmount Gardens Residents Association, South Bloomsbury Tenants' and Residents' Association)

- Support better pedestrian crossings, wider pavements, improvements for pedestrians (Living Streets, Camden Green Party, Ridgmount Gardens RA)
- Welcome prioritisation of cycling / more space for cyclists / improved cycling accessibility / safer cycling / and impact on reducing congestion (35 individuals, Living Streets, Camden Green Party)
- Support improved permeability for cyclists (TfL)
- Support simplification of bus routes and improved journey times (TfL, London Travelwatch, The Fitzrovia Partnership (TFP))
- Support restricting taxi access to TCR (Met Police, London Cycling Campaign (LCC), Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC), London Travelwatch, Camden Green Party, Charlotte Street Association)
- Proposals will reduce congestion and improve safety (Metropolitan Police)
- Support removing gyratory (TfL, Living Streets, London Travelwatch, Camden Civic Society, TFP, Camden Green Party)
- Support public / green space, trees and places to sit (34 individuals, Living Streets, Inmidtown, The Fitzrovia Partnership, London First, English Heritage, Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association (FNA))
- Support reduction in traffic lanes (FNA)
- Proposals will improve the environment in the most unpleasant area around Centre Point (Ridgmount Gardens RA).

### **Officers' responses**

1.10 Officers note these comments in support of the proposals.

### **Comments on cycling**

- Proper segregation is needed for cyclists, not armadillos, including on Tottenham Court Road (40 individuals)
- Proposals could be improved / more space for cycling (38 individuals, TfL, Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC), London Cycling Campaign (LCC), Brent Cyclists, Cycling Embassy of Great Britain (CEGB), Sustrans, Camden Green Party, London Assembly Liberal Democrats)
- Concerned that light segregation would be a hazard to pedestrians (London Travelwatch)
- Cycle lanes would be blocked by taxis (London Taxi Drivers' Association (LTDA))

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.11 On the issues raised in relation to cycling, a number of options were considered that included fully segregated cycle facilities on Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street, these were assessed alongside the consultation proposal and it was concluded that the consultation proposals provided the best balance of benefits in relation to the Council's road user hierarchy of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Further details on the cycling options that have been considered are included in Appendix E.
- 1.12 The provision of two 4.5m lanes on Tottenham Court Road would allow sufficient space for buses and cyclists to safely overtake each other. As a result of the public consultation, it is proposed that the cycle lanes on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street be widened from 1.5m to between 1.75m and 2m and installed as "stepped tracks" (similar to Old Shoreham Road, Brighton), which would provide some level of protection and priority for cycling, and encourage more people to cycle. This increase in width would not reduce the pavement width in most locations from the consultation proposals, as the road lanes would be made slightly narrower in order to accommodate the wider cycle lanes. The tracks would be widened to 2m to allow overtaking, where the footway would not be reduced below acceptable standards, such as northbound between Torrington Place and Grafton Way (on Gower Street) and northbound between Bedford Avenue and Store Street (on Gower Street and Bedford Square). It is also proposed that the cycle lanes on Shaftesbury Avenue be installed as stepped tracks of 1.75m width. The designs of the cycle tracks and carriageway width on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street would be subject to detailed design and a safety audit.
- 1.13 Experience from Royal College Street has not identified that light segregation is a problem for pedestrians. The proposed use of stepped tracks, rather than light segregation, may provide some benefit to pedestrians by increasing the effective pavement width, when not in use by cyclists.
- 1.14 Taxi ranks would be provided on some side streets adjacent to Tottenham Court Road as well as on Tottenham Court Road itself in sections that would be open to general traffic. Loading bays would also be provided on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street to allow taxi drop-offs.

### **Comments on buses**

- Concerned about predicted delays to route 38 (London Travelwatch)



## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.15 If the proposals were to go ahead and the predicted delays to route 38 buses were to become a reality, further discussions would be held with Transport for London to explore opportunities to mitigate those delays.

### **Comments on taxis and private hire vehicles**

- Taxis need more access to TCR / for residents / will use residential side streets and Gower Street instead / form of public transport (50 individuals, LTDA, Camden Civic Society, Unite the Union, GMB Drivers' Branch, The Fitzrovia Partnership, Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association, Gordon Mansions RA, Ridgmount Gardens RA)
- Restricting taxis will affect disabled people, older people and people with luggage / consider the effect on these people (26 individuals, Transport for London (TfL), Camden Civic Society, Unite the Union, LTDA)
- Will affect local businesses including hotels (25 individuals)
- Taxis should be allowed the same access as buses (20 individuals).
- Including taxis on TCR would not affect air quality but if taxis were restricted, there would be more congestion and pollution (LTDA)
- Taxi journeys would be longer and fares more expensive (LTDA)
- Need larger taxi rank for TCR station / more information about size and location of ranks (TfL, LTDA)
- Private hire vehicles have been ignored (GMB Drivers' Branch).

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.16 The comments made on taxis including in relation to congestion and pollution are addressed under question 8.
- 1.17 With regard to the length and cost of taxi journeys, the traffic modelling predicts that traffic across the project area would go down and traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation, if the proposals were to go ahead. Where adverse effects were identified, attempts would be made to mitigate those effects, where possible and appropriate.
- 1.18 In response to the consultation, the taxi rank for TCR station is proposed to be moved from the east side of TCR to the west side, to improve access to taxi drivers and increased in size from three to four spaces. More information about the size and location of ranks would be provided at the detailed design stage and it is proposed that further discussions take place with Transport for London regarding the hours of operation of the taxi ranks in the area.
- 1.19 Private hire vehicles have not been ignored in drawing up the proposals, but for the purposes of this scheme, they have been treated as general traffic. The proposals include a large number of areas where private hire vehicles could pick up or set down passengers, including on TCR. Except for sections

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

of TCR that were bus and cycle only, private hire vehicles would continue to be allowed to pick up or set down passengers:

- on single and double yellow lines;
- in places where loading is prohibited (shown by markings on the kerb);
- in parking bays; and
- in bus lanes.

### **Comments on air quality**

- There will be more pollution including in side streets, Gower Street, Torrington Place, Ridgmount Gardens, Bedford Avenue, from narrowing roads, taxis, HS2, because similar to Oxford Street and cycling is not safe enough (57 individuals, FTA, LTDA, GMB Drivers' Branch)
- Support improved air quality (20 individuals, University College London Hospital)

### **Officers' responses**

1.20 The traffic modelling shows that the volume of traffic in the area would go down and therefore the air quality would be likely to improve. The Council would monitor air quality in terms of nitrogen oxides before and after implementation at sites within the project area in order to assess the change as a result of the proposals, were they to go ahead. In addition, an air quality model would be commissioned to predict the impacts of the change in traffic on air quality.

1.21 The comments supporting improved air quality are noted.

### **Comments on accessibility**

- Need taxis / private car access for disabled people, people with prams and heavy luggage (28 individuals, Transport for All)
- Ensure streetscape is fully accessible (Living Streets)

### **Officers' responses**

1.22 Regarding the issue of accessibility to disabled people, people with prams and heavy luggage, the proposals would still allow taxis to operate in the area with taxi ranks and stopping locations provided at key locations. On TCR 60% of the street would be open to taxis in one or both directions from 8am to 7pm. The equalities impact assessment included as Appendix J to this report shows that the majority of older people and disabled people use public transport, rather than taxis.

1.23 The proposals may cause some inconvenience to some people in terms of accessibility by taxi. However, the pavements on Tottenham Court Road would be wider, which would benefit those disabled people using mobility scooters, more seating would be provided on TCR at Bedford Avenue mini-park, north and south of Stephen Street as part of the development, at Bayley

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

Street mini-park, between Percy Street and Windmill Street, between Store Street and Chenies Street, and at Capper Street mini-park. Existing seating is provided at Whitfield Gardens. The seating would benefit people who cannot walk long distances without resting, and air quality in the area as a whole would improve which would benefit everyone living in, running a business or visiting the area. The longest distance that would be inaccessible by taxi would be 60m, but access to key destinations such as the Dominion Theatre, Habitat / Heals, Goodge Street Underground station, the Grafton Hotel, Warren Street Underground station, UCLH (and other medical treatment centres), UCL, British Museum, Bedford Square, Charlotte Street, St Giles Hotel, MyHotel, and the Shaftesbury Theatre would be maintained. The project would also involve unnecessary street furniture which would help to make the area more accessible to people with visual impairments.

- 1.24 Regarding the comment on the accessibility of the streetscape, our standard design approach ensures that streets are as accessible as possible.

### **Comment on vehicle access**

- Concerned about access to Fitzrovia (City of Westminster, Camden Civic Society).

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.25 Access to Fitzrovia would be maintained.

### **Comments on traffic flow**

- Proposals will increase congestion including in: Central London and wider, Torrington Place, Gower Street/Bloomsbury Street, Grafton Way, side streets, Tottenham Court Road, Great Portland Street/Portland Place, Chenies Street, Bedford Avenue, Tavistock Place, Woburn Place/Upper Woburn Place, Regent Street, Grafton Way, Huntley Street, Shaftesbury Avenue, Charlotte Street, Ridgmount Gardens, Russell Square and Newman Street (152 individuals, City of Westminster, LTDA, University College London Hospital (UCLH), London Ambulance Service, Camden Civic Society, GMB Drivers' Branch).
- Concerned about traffic being displaced onto side streets in Fitzrovia (FNA)
- Do not support gyratory removal (Brent Cyclists, CEGB)
- Concerned about impact on emergency response times (London Ambulance Service)

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.26 In response to comments about the proposals leading to an increase in congestion, traffic flow would be monitored before and after implementation and where negative impacts were identified, mitigation measures would be investigated where possible and appropriate.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- 1.27 Detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken to assess the impact on central London and also side streets of restricting taxis on TCR. The modelling does not show wider displacement across central London. In terms of the amount of traffic on side streets, the modelling shows that there was no significant difference between allowing taxis to use the full length of TCR and restricting their use of TCR. However, restricting taxis on TCR would reduce traffic levels on TCR by up to 160 vehicles an hour (a 23% reduction compared to allowing taxis full access). Officers propose to work with local businesses on Tottenham Court Road, Gower Street and New Oxford Street, local residents and Transport for London on a quiet out of normal hours delivery trial, including consideration of loading from 5am to 7am, 10am to 12pm and 7pm to 10 pm, subject to further analysis of loading requirements, residents' concerns and a review six months after implementation. If the trial were to go ahead, this would help to reduce the number of vehicles servicing on residential streets.
- 1.28 Information on the options that were considered for cycling, including retaining the gyratory is included in Appendix E.
- 1.29 The traffic modelling predicts that traffic in the area as a whole would reduce and therefore it would be highly unlikely that emergency response times would increase within the area. However, traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation as mentioned in paragraph 1.26.

### **Comments on loading**

- Ensure business servicing needs are incorporated (Inmidtown).
- Provide more and longer loading bays (Express Networks Forum).
- Too many different restrictions – make all 7am to 8pm (Express Networks Forum).

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.30 Officers recognise the business servicing needs should be incorporated into the project. In response to the consultation, it is proposed to undertake a quiet out of normal hours delivery trial including examination of hours and provision of bays across the area to ensure business servicing needs are incorporated, as mentioned under paragraph 1.27. This proposal would have benefits for traffic congestion and air pollution during peak times, improve cycle safety, assist businesses, and would help to reduce loading vehicles on side roads which would benefit residents.

### **Comments on public space**

- Improve public realm at key historic locations including Bedford Square, St Giles Church, UCL, and Denmark Street. (English Heritage).
- Do not support creation of public space (GMB Drivers' Branch)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- Support design elements and greening proposed, and in particular more trees, but less hard landscaping and more greening should be included in the design (Fitzrovia Community Centre)

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.31 The proposals would make significant improvements to the public realm surrounding Bedford Square, St Giles Church, UCL and Denmark Street, in terms of reducing and slowing traffic, improving paving materials, raising the road to the level of the pavement and increasing pedestrian priority.
- 1.32 There is a lack of open space in Fitzrovia for the number of residents and workers in the area. This was clearly identified in the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan and therefore the creation of new public space is considered necessary and is a key element of the West End Project.
- 1.33 Trees and greenery have been proposed where possible and appropriate. Although further greening of public spaces would be considered at the detailed design stage, if the proposals were to go ahead, it may not be feasible due to maintenance and funding constraints and concerns regarding anti-social behaviour.

### **Other comments**

- Waste of money (23 individuals, Camden Civic Society, GMB Drivers' Branch)
- Consultation not sufficiently comprehensive (Camden Civic Society)
- Gower Street and TCR should be exemplary streetscape design like Malet Street and Montague Place (Bloomsbury Association)
- Detailed comments on streetscape design including in relation to the importance of kerbs and tactile paving, logical layouts and removal of street clutter, the consideration of the use of tactile guidance paths and visual contrast, audible signals at tactile cones at pedestrian crossings (Guide Dogs for the Blind).

### **Officers' responses**

- 1.34 The comments regarding the scheme being a waste of money, the consultation not being sufficiently comprehensive and exemplary streetscape design are noted.
- 1.35 The comments regarding streetscape design made by Guide Dogs for the Blind would be considered and taken into account, as appropriate, at the detailed design stage, should the proposals be taken forward.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Recommendations on overall proposals and removal of one-way system (question 1)

1.36 Removing the one-way system would lead to significant benefits for walking, cycling and people using buses. Given the benefits, the level of support for the proposals and taking on board the comments received above, the following recommendation is made regarding the removal of the one-way system:

**Approve making Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street / Bedford Square / Bloomsbury Street two-way and widening pavements on Tottenham Court Road.**

1.37 Changes to other proposals are set out under the questions below.

### **Q2a: Do you agree with the proposal to make a new pedestrianised plaza by Centre Point (this will require closing part of St Giles High Street, moving buses to Earnshaw Street and moving some bus stands to Earnshaw Street and Great Russell Street)?**

2.1 A total of 1064 people answered this question and 68% supported the proposals for the St Giles area.

<b>Table 2a: Do you agree with the proposal to make a new pedestrianised plaza by Centre Point (this will require closing part of St Giles High Street, moving buses to Earnshaw Street and moving some bus stands to Earnshaw Street and Great Russell Street)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	734	68%
No	222	21%
No opinion	118	11%

2.2 Of those who answered and stated an opinion, 956 respondents, 77% were in support and 23% against. When the results are broken down by type of individual, all categories support the proposals.

2.3 The proposal to make a new pedestrianised plaza by Centre Point, including the closure of part of St Giles High Street, moving buses to Earnshaw Street and moving some bus stands to Earnshaw Street and Great Russell Street is supported.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Q2b: Do you agree with the proposal to make Denmark Street better for pedestrians (some parking spaces would be removed)?

2.4 Some 937 people answered this question and 68% supported the proposals:

<b>Table 2b: Do you agree with the proposal to make Denmark Street better for pedestrians (some parking spaces would be removed)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	636	68%
No	178	19%
No opinion	123	13%

2.5 Of those who answered and stated an opinion, 814 respondents, 78% were in support and 22% against.

2.6 When the responses are broken down by type of individual, all categories supported the proposals.

### Comments received on the St Giles Area proposals (question 2) and officers' responses

#### Comments

2.7 There were a total of 177 comments from individuals on the St Giles area proposals.

2.8 The comments mentioned most often (mentioned by at least 10 respondents) were:

#### Positive comments

- Support as improvement for pedestrians (15 individuals)
- Support proposals and links between new plaza and church (St Giles in the Fields Church)
- Support diagonal crossing at St Giles Circus (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)

#### Officers' response

2.9 The positive comments in relation to the proposals are noted.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Comments on pedestrians**

- No need for diagonal crossing at St Giles Circus (GMB Drivers' Branch)

### **Officers' response**

- 2.10 Regarding there being no need for diagonal crossings, when Crossrail opens, the station is expected to be busier than Heathrow Airport. There will be large numbers of pedestrians who need to disperse across the area and introducing a diagonal crossing would allow this dispersal to take place efficiently and in a more comfortable and safer manner.
- 2.11 A specific request was made by one individual for the crossing on Denmark Street to be retained as part of a pedestrian route from St Giles High Street to Covent Garden. Although officers are of the opinion that a crossing would not be necessary here as traffic flows would be reduced significantly, and so informal crossing would be easier as a result, if the proposals were to be taken forward, the need for crossing facilities on Denmark Street would be reassessed as part of the future review of the scheme.

### **Comments on cycling**

- Support plaza but allow cycle access (Sustrans)

### **Officers' response**

- 2.12 The comment regarding allowing cycle access through the proposed St Giles plaza is noted. However, with the very large pedestrian numbers expected to use the proposed plaza, introducing cycle access is not recommended as this would create conflicts.

### **Comments on buses**

- Buses / bus stands will cause congestion and pollution on Earnshaw Street / Great Russell Street (15 individuals, Unite the Union, St Giles in the Fields Church)
- Do not support bus stands outside St Giles in the Fields Church (Camden Civic Society, St Giles in the Fields Church)

### **Officers' response**

- 2.13 The Council enforces against buses idling at bus stands as well and also educates drivers on the effects of engine idling. This has helped to reduce idling. It is also Transport for London's policy that drivers switch off their engines at bus stands. The new arrangement for buses is not expected to lead to additional congestion.



## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

2.14 The creation of the public plaza requires the relocation of bus stands to Earnshaw Street. Unfortunately, there are no alternative feasible locations for bus stands in response to these comments, the size of the bus stand outside the church is proposed to be reduced to a space for one bus, rather than two buses and the size of the bus stand increased on Earnshaw Street to allow space for three, rather than two, buses.

### **Comments on traffic flow**

- Proposals will increase congestion (21 individuals)

### **Officers' response**

2.15 The traffic impact of the proposals have been assessed using an approved Transport for London traffic model which predicts that the proposals would lead to an overall reduction in traffic in the area as well as quicker bus journeys. As a result there is likely to be less congestion and better air quality.

### **Comments on parking and loading**

- Support Denmark Street proposals but remove more or all parking in the area / all parking except loading bay (15 individuals)
- Concerned about lack of loading proposed on Denmark Street for the Consolidated Development (Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA), Seven Dials Trust, St Giles in the Fields Church)

### **Officers' response**

2.16 The proposed parking on Denmark Street aims to balance the needs of different users including residents, disabled drivers and cyclists, as well as contributing to the economic vitality of the area by providing loading and pay and display bays. The allocation of space is based on extensive parking and loading surveys. The proposed parking layout has been altered following public consultation, to allow more loading for the Denmark Place (Consolidated) development, as set out in Appendix F.

### **Other comments**

- Do not make changes (13 individuals)
- Concerned that proposals are not coordinated with development and do not take into account listed status (St Giles in the Fields Church)
- Would like Stacey Street and Phoenix Street to be included (St Giles in the Fields Church)
- Remove all kiosks in the area including outside the Dominion Theatre (Bloomsbury Association).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Officers' response

- 2.17 On the comment that no changes should be made, the arrival of the Crossrail station at TCR, it will be busier than Heathrow Airport. More space will be required to provide a safe and welcoming environment for people to arrive and leave the area. In addition, traffic in the area has reduced by 30% since Charing Cross Road was closed in 2007 (for the Crossrail works) and the Council would like to retain this level of traffic reduction to achieve long term air quality, road safety and public realm benefits.
- 2.18 The proposals would incorporate all proposed permitted developments in the area. The project does not currently include proposals to change smaller streets, such as Stacey Street and Phoenix Street, but this could be considered in the future.
- 2.19 Regarding kiosks in the area, the existing kiosks would be replaced with a more attractive design. In some locations, the kiosks would be considered for relocation.

### Recommendations on the St Giles Area proposals (question 2)

- 2.20 The creation of the plaza at St Giles Circus along with better crossings would help to provide a safe and welcoming environment for the large increase in passengers expected from the arrival of Crossrail. Given that the overall proposals are supported, but that there are objections from a number of local groups about the bus stand outside St Giles in the Fields Church, and there being insufficient loading on Denmark Street, the following is recommended:

**Approve proposals with amendments to: the layout of the bus stands on St Giles High Street and Earnshaw Street** so that a bus stand with capacity for three buses is provided on Earnshaw Street and for one bus on the western section of St Giles High Street **and waiting and loading arrangements on Denmark Street** to provide more space for loading for businesses and for the "Consolidated development" (St Giles Circus site including: 138-148 (even) Charing Cross Road; 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 20-28 Denmark Street; 1-6, 16-23 Denmark Place; 52-59 St Giles High Street; 4 Flitcroft Street; and 1 Book Mews), as set out in Appendix F.

- 2.21 The need for crossing facilities on Denmark Street would be reassessed as part of the future review of the scheme, if proposals were to be taken forward.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Q3: Do you agree with the proposal to create a public space at Princes Circus with planted areas and seats (the road between the Shaftesbury Theatre and Grape Street would be closed)?

3.1 A total of 1035 people answered this question and 68% supported the proposals for Princes Circus:

<b>Table 3: Do you agree with the proposal to create a public space with planted areas and seats (the road between the Shaftesbury Theatre and Grape Street would be closed)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	710	69%
No	211	20%
No opinion	114	11%

3.2 Of those who expressed an opinion on this question, 921 respondents, 77% supported the proposals and 23% did not. All categories of respondent supported the proposals.

### Comments received on the Princes Circus proposals (question 3) and officers' responses

3.3 A total of 169 comments were received from individuals on this question.

#### Comments

3.4 The most common comments (with over 10 responses) were:

- Support for proposals (33 individuals)
- Proposals will cause congestion (27 individuals)
- Concerned that reducing access into Covent Garden will lead to more congestion (GMB Drivers' Branch)
- Need left filter from Shaftesbury Avenue into Charing Cross Road south to improve traffic flow on Shaftesbury Avenue and reduce amount of traffic using Monmouth Street as a rat-run (Covent Garden Community Association, Seven Dials Trust).
- Need more trees / greenery including dividing the public space from the road (14 individuals)
- Need a route for cyclists through the public space from Coptic Street to Endell Street southbound (12 individuals, CCC, LCC, Sustrans)

#### Officers' responses

3.5 The comments supporting the proposals are noted.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

- 3.6 Regarding the comments on congestion, the traffic impacts of the proposals have been assessed using an approved Transport for London traffic model which predicts that the proposals would lead to an overall reduction in traffic in the area as well as quicker bus journeys. As a result there is likely to be less congestion.
- 3.7 The proposed changes at Princes Circus would not prevent vehicle access to Covent Garden via Endell Street. However, access would be more difficult and only permitted via High Holborn.
- 3.8 The introduction of a left filter from Shaftesbury Avenue into Charing Cross Road south has been considered as part of the traffic modelling for Cambridge Circus. Due to the predicted split of traffic travelling straight ahead and turning left, the introduction of a left filter would be unlikely to provide any benefit in terms of reducing queue lengths on Shaftesbury Avenue and so has not been included.
- 3.9 Regarding the request for more trees in the Princes Circus public space, it is unlikely that further trees would be added to this public space. Princes Circus already has a number of large mature trees which can make the space dark and uninviting. The existing tree canopies would be lifted to increase sunlight into the space.
- 3.10 Following comments in the public consultation and in response to the working group to improve facilities for walking and cycling, improvements to cycle routes around Princes Circus are proposed. A new high quality cycle route has been included with a new cycle crossing of New Oxford Street at Coptic Street to Grape Street this would link with the cycle crossing of High Holborn to provide access to / from Endell Street. This would provide a direct link from Bloomsbury Way / New Oxford Street to Endell Street. Providing a cycle route through the public space would create unnecessary conflict with pedestrians.
- 3.11 As well as the comments set out above, during the public consultation, the Bloomsbury Central Baptist Church asked if a loading bay for funerals could be incorporated into the proposals and this change, including relocation of the residents' parking bays, has been proposed.
- 3.12 There are also issues with large vehicles overrunning the footway on Bucknall Street as it is too narrow for two-way traffic and so it is proposed that Bucknall Street be one-way eastbound between Earnshaw Street and Dyott Street with two-way cycling, and with access to Shaftesbury Avenue from Dyott Street and so it is proposed that Dyott Street be one-way northbound from Shaftesbury Avenue, and then two-way at the northern end towards its junction with Bucknall Street, to allow access for servicing. Both of these proposed changes are shown in Appendix F.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

3.13 Engagement has taken place with residents, businesses and other stakeholders on the design of the public space at Princes Circus through a series of public meetings. Comments received from the meetings would feed into the final design for the space, if the proposals were to be taken forward.

### Recommendations on the Princes Circus area proposals (question 3)

3.14 The proposals for a new public space at Princes Circus would help make the area more attractive for residents, businesses and visitors. Given the support for the proposals and the comments set out above, the following is recommended:

**Approve the public space and traffic proposals, with several amendments** set out in Appendices F and G. These include:

- The addition of a new cycle link and crossing between Coptic Street and Grape Street.
- Improved access for cyclists between Shaftesbury Avenue and Endell Street
- Providing stepped tracks, rather than light segregation, at a width of 1.75m, subject to detailed design and a safety audit. This would be likely to result in the loss of two existing trees, which would be replaced elsewhere in the public space.
- A new loading bay on Bucknall Street (between Dyott Street and Shaftesbury Avenue) for the Bloomsbury Central Baptist Church and relocation of the residents' parking to Bucknall Street between Earnshaw Street and Dyott Street.
- Making Bucknall Street one-way eastbound between Earnshaw Street and Dyott Street with two-way cycling to prevent vehicles overrunning the pavement.
- Making Dyott Street one-way northbound from Shaftesbury Avenue, as it would not be possible to turn left into Shaftesbury Avenue, under the new arrangement, and then two-way at the northern end towards its junction with Bucknall Street, to allow access for servicing.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

**Q4: Do you agree with the proposals to create a park in Alfred Place with grassed areas and seats (some parking spaces would be removed, the cycle hire station would be moved to Windmill Street and loading would be allowed in certain areas from 7am to 10am)?**

4.1 Of those who answered this question, 1030 people, 71% supported the proposals:

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	730	71%
No	187	18%
No opinion	113	11%

4.2 Of those who expressed an opinion on this question, 917 respondents, 80% supported the proposals and 20% did not. All categories of individual supported the proposal to create a park at Alfred Place.

### **Comments received on Alfred Place proposals (question 4) and officers' responses**

#### **Comments**

4.3 Of 187 comments from individuals, the most common (with over 10 responses) were:

- Support for the proposal (37 individuals, Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, FNA)
- Support as need green spaces in West End but must be maintained (23 individuals)
- Concerned about maintenance of park (CoL)
- Maintain through cycling (19 individuals, Sustrans)
- Do not remove cycle hire – incorporate it into the park (12 individuals)
- Support proposed relocation of cycle hire station (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)
- Oppose proposals and impact on the estate including access and servicing (Corporation of London, CoL).
- Maintain access for servicing (TFP)
- Would like to see public toilets (TFP)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- Need event space and link to Whitfield Gardens (TFP)
- Relocate listed war memorial to enhanced setting / central location in the park or south of Chenies Street (English Heritage, Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)

### **Officers' responses**

- 4.4 Officers note comments supporting the proposal and acknowledge the need for ongoing maintenance, subject to available funding.
- 4.5 A final recommendation on cycle access through Alfred Place would be made when the details of the design were completed.
- 4.6 Maintaining the cycle hire station in the park has not been proposed as it would reduce the extent of the planted areas.
- 4.7 Officers have been working with local residents, businesses and the Fitzrovia Partnership Business Improvement District to develop designs for the park. Further negotiation and consultation would be required with the Corporation of London who are the landowners of Alfred Place, and with their leaseholders, to take forward the construction of the park, regarding issues such as access and servicing. The current proposals seek to maintain access for servicing at specific times.
- 4.8 There are no proposals to introduce toilets in the public space. The ongoing maintenance and operational costs are outside the scope of the project.
- 4.9 The management and use of different areas of public space for events, for example, would be discussed further if the project were approved. Whitfield Gardens and Alfred Place would be linked by a pedestrian route.
- 4.10 The proposals for Alfred Place would relocate the memorial into a more central setting, subject to the necessary consents.
- 4.11 Engagement has taken place with residents, businesses and other stakeholders on the design of Alfred Place through a series of public meetings. Comments received from the meetings would feed into the final design for the space, if the proposals were to be taken forward.

### **Recommendations on the proposals for Alfred Place (question 4)**

- 4.12 The proposals for a new park in Alfred Place would provide much-needed open space in Fitzrovia. Given the level of support for the proposals, the recommendation is as follows:

<b>Approve the overall concept of introducing a park on Alfred Place.</b>
---

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

4.13 Further, detailed design work would be required including soft and hard landscaping, vehicle access and loading restrictions. The details would be discussed with the Corporation of London (as the landowner), and local stakeholders. The final design would be determined by a separate decision report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning, subject to achieving funding to proceed with implementation of the park.

**Q5: Do you agree with the proposals for Huntley Street to widen the pavements, provide seats and plant trees (parking would be moved to streets nearby and this section of Huntley Street would be one-way southbound for all traffic except cyclists)?**

5.1 Of those who answered this question (1022 people), 59% supported the proposals:

<b>Table 5: Do you agree with the proposals for Huntley Street to widen the pavements, provide seats and plant trees (parking would be moved to streets nearby and this section of Huntley Street would be one-way southbound for all traffic except cyclists)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	608	59%
No	255	25%
No opinion	159	16%

5.2 Of those who expressed an opinion, 863 people, 70% were in favour of the proposals and 30% were against. All categories of individual supported the proposal:

**Comments received on the proposals for Huntley Street (question 5) and officers' responses**

### **Comments**

5.3 Individuals made 250 comments on the proposals. The following comments were made by at least ten respondents:

### **Positive comments**

- Support for proposals (16 individuals)
- Support proposals to improve environment on corner of Huntley Street and University Street (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)



## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' response**

5.4 The comments in support of the proposals are noted.

### **Comments on cycling**

- Install segregated cycle lanes including 2m width in each direction and clearly signed at least northbound / contra-flow (18 individuals)
- Do not support two-way cycling / Confusing for drivers and pedestrians as will have to watch out for two-way cyclists (16 individuals, Gordon Mansions RA)
- Support proposals but clearly mark contra-flow cycling (Sustrans).

### **Officers' response**

5.6 Officers are of the view that traffic flows at this location are sufficiently low that segregated cycle lanes would not be necessary. However, this would be monitored, should the proposals be implemented. If traffic levels were to increase significantly, protected cycle lanes would be considered as part of the future funding allocation process.

5.7 In order to encourage sustainable forms of transport the proposals seek to allow two-way cycling on as many one-way streets as possible. The width of Huntley Street should enable sufficient manoeuvring space between vehicles and oncoming cyclists. There is also no evidence from similar two-way cycling streets that there is an increased safety risk and proposals would be subject to a safety audit.

5.8 The cycle lane would be clearly marked.

### **Comments on traffic flow**

- Will result in more congestion (11 individuals)
- Concerns that the proposed change in direction of the one-way in Huntley Street would make travel between sites more difficult (UCLH).
- Would like before and after traffic flows for Huntley Street to assess the impacts (The Charlotte Street Association).

### **Officers' response**

5.9 The proposals would continue to allow through traffic southbound on this section of Huntley Street and should not therefore contribute to congestion.

5.10 Following comments received in public consultation from residents and institutions, Huntley Street is proposed to remain one-way southbound. The direction of flow on Huntley Street would be reviewed at a later date should the project be approved.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

5.11 The traffic model from Transport for London does not include smaller connecting streets and there is no data currently available for Huntley Street. If the proposals were to go ahead, traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation and attempts would be made to mitigate any negative impacts identified, where possible and appropriate.

### **Comments on parking and loading**

- Do not reduce residents' parking (19 individuals)
- Would like assurances that parking proposals on Huntley Street take account of recent UCLH permitted development including access and servicing vehicle arrangements (UCLH)
- There are issues with the parking of UCLH Patient Transport Ambulances in Huntley Street, which need to be resolved. (Gordon Mansions RA)

### **Officers' response**

5.12 The proposals for Huntley Street would result in the loss of eight pay and display parking spaces. There would be no loss of residents' parking bays.

5.13 The proposals in the public consultation do not conflict with UCLH permitted development access.

5.14 The Council is aware that Patient Transport Ambulances regularly park in the area and is working with UCLH to reduce the impacts on residents.

### **Other comments**

- No changes should be made (17 individuals)
- Extend proposals south to junction with Chenies St (TFP)
- Would like more greenery next to 30-40 Grafton Way (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)

### **Officers' response**

5.15 The comments that no changes should be introduced are noted.

5.16 As part of any future UCLH development proposals the Council would look at the scope for extending proposals further along Huntley Street.

5.17 Regarding the comment about more trees outside 30-40 Grafton Way, additional trees and greenery would be included where feasible and subject to available funding.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Recommendations on the proposals for Huntley Street (question 5)

5.18 The proposals for Huntley Street would provide a more attractive environment for hospital patients, workers and residents. Given the support for the proposals for Huntley Street and the comments above, the following is recommended:

**Approve the implementation of the public space**, with detailed design to take into account access arrangements for UCLH and UCL sites.

### Q6: Do you agree with the proposals for Whitfield Gardens to have more seats and plants?

6.1 Of those who answered this question, 997 people, 80% agreed with proposals:

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	797	80%
No	75	7%
No opinion	125	13%

6.2 Of those who expressed an opinion, 872 people, 91% agreed with the proposals and 9% did not. All categories of individual agreed with the proposals for more seating and planting at Whitfield Gardens.

### Comments received on Whitfield Gardens (question 6) and officers' responses

#### Comments

6.3 A total of 167 comments were received on this question. The most frequently mentioned topics (by at least ten respondents) were:

- Generally positive comments (32 individuals)
- Support more plants and tree planting (21 individuals)
- Support more and comfortable seating (19 individuals)
- Space must be maintained and cleaned (17 individuals, Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)
- Close Gardens at night (TFP)
- Support restoration of the mural (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

- Surfaces in the gardens need to be replaced with better quality paving (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, TFP).
- The memorial stone should also be properly repaired (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Should install a large tree on the southern section to shield the gardens from TCR (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- The American International Church needs to be encouraged to work with the local community so the space can be used by all (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).

### Officers' responses

- 6.4 Officers note the positive comments and the need for maintenance and cleansing.
- 6.5 The proposals would retain the existing trees while introducing new planting and seating into the space. The project team would work alongside the Council's Parks team to ensure that the space would be regularly serviced and cleaned.
- 6.6 At this stage, there is insufficient revenue funding to close Whitfield Gardens at night and this situation is unlikely to change.
- 6.7 The proposals would improve all surfaces and the memorial stone and installation of a tree in the southern section would be considered as part of the detailed design.
- 6.8 The comment regarding the American International Church is noted.
- 6.9 Engagement has taken place with residents, businesses and other stakeholders on the design of Whitfield Gardens through a series of public meetings. Comments received from the meetings would feed into the final design for the space, if the proposals were to be taken forward.

### Recommendations related to Whitfield Gardens (question 6)

- 6.10 The proposal for the concept of changes to Whitfield Gardens is supported and so the following is recommended:

<p><b>Approve the overall concept of changes to Whitfield Gardens</b> including new seats, plants, restoring the mural and the memorial stone.</p>
--

- 6.11 The final design would be determined by a separate decision report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Q7: Do you agree with the proposals for "Windmill Square" (on Tottenham Court Road between Percy Street and Windmill Street) with new trees, seats and plants?

7.1 Of those who answered this question (998 people), 78% agreed with the proposal:

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	775	78%
No	94	9%
No opinion	129	13%

7.2 Of those who expressed an opinion, 869 people, 89% of people were in favour and 11% were against. Again, all categories of individual supported the proposal:

### Comments received on Windmill Square (question 7) and officers' responses

#### Comments

7.3 There were 85 comments from individuals on this question. The most common comments (mentioned by at least 10 respondents) were:

- Generally positive comments (21 individuals)
- Welcome proposals for improved public realm, greenery, seating, and removal of telephone boxes. Area would benefit from less street clutter (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)
- Waste of money (12 individuals)
- Would like Windmill Street to be converted to a shared surface pedestrian priority space, creating an extension from Whitfield Gardens as well as strengthening the pedestrian and cyclist link between Charlotte Street and Store Street (TFP).

#### Officers' responses

7.4 The positive comments and those stating that the proposals are a waste of money are noted.

7.5 Street clutter would be removed as part of the proposals for Tottenham Court Road.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

7.6 The proposals for Windmill Street, Windmill Square and Whitfield Gardens would provide a high quality environment for pedestrians that linked the streets and spaces together. The proposals for Windmill Street would also encourage pedestrian priority whilst keeping this street open for access following a shared space concept.

### Recommendations for Windmill Square (question 7)

7.7 Given the support for the proposals and the comments above, the following recommendation is made:

**Approve the implementation of the Windmill Square public space as consulted on.**

**Q8a: Do you agree with the proposals for Tottenham Court Road to widen pavements, plant new trees, provide better pedestrian crossings and make the street two-way for buses and cyclists only from 8am-7pm, Monday to Saturday (general traffic would not be allowed during this time except for access and loading in certain areas)?**

8.1 Of those who answered this question (1179 people), 56% supported the proposals:

**Table 8a: Do you agree with the proposals for Tottenham Court Road to widen pavements, plant new trees, provide better pedestrian crossings and make the street two-way for buses and cyclists only from 8am-7pm, Monday to Saturday (general traffic would not be allowed during this time except for access and loading in certain areas)?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	659	56%
No	458	39%
No opinion	62	5%

8.2 Of those who expressed an opinion on this question, 1117 respondents, 59% supported the proposals and 41% did not. For all categories of people who responded, except “individual”, more were in favour than against.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

**Q8b: The proposal would only allow loading on Tottenham Court Road in certain areas between 7am-8am and 7pm-8pm, Monday to Saturday. Should loading be allowed at other times?**

8.3 Of those who answered this question (1167 people), there was a small margin of responses (1%) in favour of the proposal to allow loading at other times:

**Table 8b: The proposal would only allow loading on Tottenham Court Road in certain areas between 7am-8am and 7pm-8pm, Monday to Saturday. Should loading be allowed at other times?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	439	38%
No	435	37%
No opinion	293	25%

8.4 When the results are broken down by category of individual, the majority of businesses are in favour of allowing loading at other times, residents are evenly split, visitors are marginally against and individuals are strongly against.

**Q8c: If you answered yes, which time slot would you prefer?**

8.5 Of those who answered (470 people), 44% said 10am-12pm (208 people), 17% said 2pm -4pm (80 people), and 39% said 'other' (184 people). Of those who specified 'other' (121 people), the most frequently mentioned times periods were:

- At all times (36 individuals)
- early morning (20 individuals);
- morning (20 individuals)
- early morning and evening (17 individuals)
- middle of the day (14 individuals)
- evening (10 individuals).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

**Q8d: Do you agree with the proposal to restrict access for Taxis on Tottenham Court Road, Monday to Saturday 8am-7pm? Taxis will still be able to cross Tottenham Court Road via side streets but won't be able to drive the length of Tottenham Court Road.**

8.6 Of those who answered this question (684 people, N.B. this question was not included in the on-line survey), the majority of respondents (58%) were against the proposals to restrict taxis:

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	226	33%
No	394	58%
No opinion	64	9%

8.7 All categories of respondent were against the proposal to restrict taxi access to Tottenham Court Road:

### **Comments received on the proposals for Tottenham Court Road (question 8) and officers' responses**

8.8 A total of 530 comments were received on this question. The most common comments (mentioned by at least ten people) were:

#### **Positive comments**

- Generally positive comments (14 individuals)
- Support widening pavements and improvement for pedestrians (10 individuals)
- Welcome the proposals to improve air quality, to reduce speed of traffic and make the bus routes more logical (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)

#### **Officers' responses**

8.9 The comments in support of the proposals are noted.

#### **Comments on pedestrians**

- Need more pedestrian crossings on TCR (Metropolitan Police, Sustrans)



## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- No need to widen pavements (Camden Civic Society, GMB Drivers' Branch)
- Welcome the proposed pavement widening on TCR but concerned about raised tables and informal crossing points. Would rather see traditional kerbs clearly marking the pedestrian surface and the vehicle surface (FNA)
- Would welcome wider pedestrian crossings, longer crossing times and clear accessible pavements (FNA).
- On Tottenham Court Road, controlled pedestrian crossings with dropped kerbs and tactile paving should be provided at regular intervals, and particularly near bus stops and key destination points. Crossings should be provided with audible and tactile signals (i.e. rotating cone). Controlled crossings should be provided at the beginning and end of pedestrian zones and shared spaces and, (for large areas or long streets) at key points where people need to cross areas. Informal crossing points may also be provided at strategic points to supplement controlled crossings, but they should not replace them (Guide Dogs for the Blind).

### **Officers' responses**

- 8.10 Pedestrian crossings would be provided on each arm of each signalised junction on Tottenham Court Road, with the exception of Hanway Street at its junction with Tottenham Court Road, where it would not be possible due to large vehicles overhanging the pavement as they turn into Hanway Street to service businesses there. In addition, a pelican crossing would be provided south of Store Street, and informal crossing would be possible on the raised tables along sections of the street. Pedestrian crossing facilities would be reviewed following implementation, if the proposals were taken forward, to assess whether additional formal crossings were required.
- 8.11 Regarding the need to widen pavements, a detailed assessment of pedestrian numbers and pavement width has been undertaken. This showed that the expected increase in pedestrians when Crossrail opens will require wider pavements at key locations on TCR and St Giles Circus in order to safely accommodate them.
- 8.12 Raised areas have been proposed on Tottenham Court Road to encourage safe informal crossing of the street as well as encouraging slower driving speeds. The area of the pavement would be clearly defined to avoid confusion.
- 8.13 Wider pedestrian crossings and longer crossing times would be provided at St Giles Circus, to cope with the increased number of pedestrians when Crossrail opens. Crossing times would be maximised where possible but have to be balanced with other demands such as keeping cyclists, buses and other

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

traffic moving in order to reduce congestion. All pavements would be designed to be accessible and street clutter would be removed where possible and appropriate.

- 8.14 Controlled pedestrian crossings are proposed at all signalised junctions on Tottenham Court Road and at regular intervals. No pedestrian zones are proposed. All crossings would be fitted with tactile cones. Audible signals are not fitted as standard to controlled crossings in Camden. Further consideration needs to be given as part of detailed design as to whether audible signals would be appropriate at this location, subject to environmental health considerations.

### Comments on cycling

- Proposals are in line with recommended standards (TfL)
- Do not mix buses and cycles to encourage older people, children and women to cycle (25 individuals, Metropolitan Police, Camden Green Party)
- Install 2m wide kerb-segregated cycle lanes in both directions on either TCR or Gower Street, with floating bus stops or raised bus platforms (17 individuals)
- Install two-way segregated cycle lanes on TCR and or Gower Street with one-way system including request for this to be modelled again (13 individuals)
- Install full kerb-segregated cycle lanes (12 individuals)
- Allow cycle crossing from Capper Street to Howland Street (CCC)
- Eliminate left-turning conflicts at all junctions on TCR and Gower Street (CCC, LCC)
- Reduce traffic more on TCR to improve safety for cycling (CEGB)
- Introduce green wave for cycling at 15mph, and bus stop bypasses (Sustrans)
- No need for cycle lanes on Gower Street if TCR is bus and cycle only (GMB Drivers' Branch).
- Ban HGVs 7am-7pm (GMB Drivers' Branch).
- Concerned about the safety of cyclists on Tottenham Court Road turning right into Torrington Place (and other streets) after heading north up TCR (FNA).
- Opposed to the siting of a bus stop just south of Howland Street as it conflicts with cycle traffic on the east-west route through the area (FNA).
- Concerned that excessive cycle speeds in TCR with only buses would be dangerous to pedestrians (RGRA).

### Officers' responses

- 8.15 The comment regarding compliance with recommended standards is noted.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

- 8.16 Providing separation between buses and cycles or 2m-wide kerb-segregated cycle lanes on TCR would require pavements to be narrowed below acceptable standards. With the increase in pedestrians the pavements would not be able to effectively cope and therefore reducing pavement widths to accommodate segregated cycle lanes is not considered to be appropriate.
- 8.17 Installing two-way segregated cycle lanes on TCR and or Gower Street with the existing one-way system was not taken forward to public consultation as one-way systems have some undesirable impacts, e.g. speeding, longer journey times and difficulty crossing the road. To provide two 2m wide cycle lanes, two 3m traffic lanes, and a 0.5m separation between cyclists and other traffic would require a road width of at least 10.5m. In some sections Tottenham Court Road has a width of 9m. Therefore, this option would require losing up to 1.5m of pavement and this would be unacceptable due to the very large number of pedestrians on the street.
- 8.18 If only one traffic lane were provided there would be sufficient space but traffic modelling shows that buses would be delayed by other traffic, by up to 15 minutes per journey, as there would be no space for overtaking. Delaying buses and the high number of bus passenger journeys to this extent would not be acceptable. Further details on options that have been considered for cycling are included in Appendix E.
- 8.19 Regarding the creation of a cycle link between Capper Street and Howland Street, following public consultation and in response to the working group to improve proposals for walking and cycling, a detailed examination has been undertaken looking at all east / west options from Torrington Place to Maple Street. This study has highlighted that the route from Torrington Place to Howland Street would be safe and attractive with protected cycle lanes on Torrington Place and safer junctions. It also links with routes into Westminster and provides connectivity as part of the London Cycle Grid. In addition, the route via Huntley Street to Capper Street would also be facilitated.
- 8.20 With respect to the comments on eliminating left-turning conflicts on Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street, junctions on TCR would separate north / south cycles from east / west traffic in time using different traffic signal phases to reduce conflicts with turning vehicles. Similarly the proposal for Euston Circus removes all left turning conflicts for cyclists on TCR, as does the proposal for Grafton Way / Gower Street. For Gower Street, Bloomsbury Street and Shaftesbury Avenue, where left turning movements are higher and where possible, such as at Torrington Place and at Princes Circus, the proposals separate, in time, left-turning traffic from cyclists travelling straight ahead, using different traffic signal phases. Northbound cyclists would be encouraged through routing to turn left at Grafton Way / Gower Street to

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

reduce the incidence of conflicts. There are also a number of junctions with side streets on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street where the left turn would be banned and therefore the conflicts would not occur.

- 8.21 In terms of reducing traffic more on TCR, the proposals would prevent all general traffic from using TCR as a through route from 8am-7pm Monday to Saturday. Reducing traffic further would require reducing bus frequency (which would be a matter for Transport for London to consider) and / or reducing through traffic on east / west routes, which is being considered as part of a trial on the Torrington Place / Tavistock Place corridor (see Appendix H).
- 8.22 The Council does not currently have powers to set speed limits below 20mph. The speed limit would therefore be 20 mph on all roads although on TCR the proposal includes a series of raised areas to encourage slower driving speeds. Introducing bus stop bypasses would require reducing pavement widths by at least 1.5m. The volumes of pedestrians combined with the number of bus passengers would mean that the cycle lanes would be almost continuously blocked for cycling leading to conflicts.
- 8.23 It is Council policy to make all streets safe and attractive for cycling making the area permeable for cycling and allowing all destinations to be accessed safely and conveniently.
- 8.24 It would not be practical for a daytime ban on HGVs to be included as part of this project; it would require a wider strategic initiative involving a number of partners led by Transport for London and including other neighbouring local authorities. However the proposal for a quiet out of hours delivery trial is likely to significantly reduce HGVs during the daytime.
- 8.25 The proposal to restrict TCR to buses and cycles only would provide frequent gaps for cyclists to safely turn right into side streets.
- 8.26 Following comments in the public consultation the bus stop on the west side of Tottenham Court Road, south of Howland Street, has been relocated south closer to Goodge Street station to provide shorter distances between bus stops.
- 8.27 The design of TCR would encourage all vehicles including cycles to drive at slower speeds to make it safer for pedestrians to cross the street.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Comments on buses**

- Concerned about volume of buses on TCR (Living Streets, TFP, FNA)
- Need bus stops near Goodge Street station (TfL)
- Retain four stops in each direction with one by Goodge Street station (TFP, Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, Charlotte Street Association, the Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association, Gordon Mansions RA, Ridgmount Gardens RA)
- Buses should be cleanest, least polluting possible (Camden Green Party)
- Buses could still serve Gower Street as makes sense to local people and spreads impact (FNA)

### **Officers' responses**

- 8.28 The frequency of buses is determined by Transport for London (TfL). With the arrival of Crossrail combined with the bus benefits of these proposals further discussions will be held with TfL about bus frequency on TCR.
- 8.29 Following comments in the public consultation, the bus stops have been relocated to provide a bus stop nearer to Goodge Street.
- 8.30 Three bus stops in each direction were proposed as part of the consultation and it is recommended that this proposal is taken forward as decreasing the number of bus stops from four to three would reduce journey times and improve journey time reliability.
- 8.31 As part of Transport for London's proposed ultra-low emission zone, an integral element would be introducing standards for the vehicles for which TfL is responsible; it is proposed that all double decker buses serving Central London would be hybrid and all single deckers would be zero emission by 2020. This would include all buses in the area.
- 8.32 Officers considered keeping one route on Gower Street but it was considered that this would be confusing for bus passengers and would provide slower journeys for bus passengers. In addition, bus passenger surveys showed that the majority of passengers wanted to start or end their journeys in Tottenham Court Road rather than Gower Street.

### **Comments on taxis**

- Allow taxis (128 individuals, Camden Civic Society, Unite the Union)
- Allow taxis for a larger part of the day (TFP)
- Older people and disabled people need to be able to access TCR by taxi (41 individuals, RGRA)

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

- Taxis need full access because it is a busy shopping street / people need to carry bulky goods (28 individuals, Charlotte Street Association, South Bloomsbury T&RA)
- Taxis should be allowed in Tottenham Court Road at all times, because that is where people will need and expect them, and to avoid them using the (residential) side streets (GMRA).
- Taxis should be allowed unrestricted use of TCR as taxis are part of the public transport system (Charlotte Street Association).
- If taxis were allowed on TCR, the problem of increased traffic and pollution in residential streets would be reduced, in particular on Charlotte Street, Newman Street, Cleveland Street, Torrington Place and possible Huntley Street (Charlotte Street Association, FNA, RGRA).
- Need taxi rank to serve TCR station (Unite the Union)
- Support restricting taxis / restrict taxis further in evenings / do not allow taxis at all (15 individuals, CCC, LCC)
- Agree with the principle of taking highly polluting taxis off Tottenham Court Road but retain some concerns about access for some residents to UCLH in emergency situations (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)
- Propose allowing hybrid taxis or those which are low carbon emitters to encourage future innovation by 2018 (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)
- Remove the taxi rank on Tottenham Court Road between University Street and Grafton Way as this is used primarily by people visiting the sex establishment and is of no benefit to the local community (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Even with allowing taxis on TCR it would appear that a large amount of delivery vehicle traffic will be displaced into the side streets (FNA).

### Officers' responses

- 8.33 Allowing taxis to use the whole length of TCR would increase traffic congestion, worsen air pollution and decrease road safety. Taxis would be permitted to use the full length of Tottenham Court Road before 8am and after 7pm and to use 60% of Tottenham Court Road in at least one direction, and permitted cross-movements, between 8am and 7pm. Traffic modelling shows that allowing taxis to use TCR would not significantly reduce traffic on most side streets. Further assessment of taxi access is included below.
- 8.34 The vast majority of people accessing TCR do so by London Underground and bus services and not taxis. Allowing taxis to use TCR would increase traffic congestion, worsen air quality and worsen road safety.
- 8.35 Access to UCLH by taxi and other vehicles would not be affected by the traffic restrictions on TCR and traffic could access UCLH via Gower Street and

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

Grafton Way. Emergency vehicles (in an emergency) would be permitted to use TCR.

- 8.36 It would not be possible to permit more environmentally friendly taxis to access to TCR and restrict all other taxis and this is not possible to enforce. If the project were approved taxi access would be reviewed following the implementation of the ultra-low emission zone assessing impacts on air quality, traffic congestion and road safety. The Mayor of London is proposing to create an ultra-low emission zone where almost all the vehicles running during working hours are either zero or low emission. A public consultation has recently taken place on proposals to introduce a vehicle emissions charging scheme in central London, alongside proposals for buses and revised taxi and Private Hire Vehicle licensing requirements.
- 8.37 According to TfL, the taxi rank on TCR between University Street and Grafton Way is well-used and there are no proposals to remove the rank at this stage.
- 8.38 A recommendation to undertake public consultation on proposals to reduce through traffic on Torrington Place has been included (Appendix H).
- 8.39 In response to the comment that even with allowing taxis on TCR it would appear that a large amount of delivery vehicle traffic will be displaced into the side streets, detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken to assess the impact on side streets of restricting taxis on TCR. For Torrington Place, Charlotte Street, Cleveland Street and Newman Street there would be no significant difference between allowing taxis to use the full length of TCR and restricting their use of TCR. On Grafton Way there would be an increase of 77 vehicles an hour if taxis were allowed to use TCR. In addition, restricting taxis on TCR would reduce traffic levels on TCR by up to 160 vehicles an hour (a 23% reduction compared to allowing taxis full access).excluding taxis from some sections of TCR would increase traffic on some streets, compared to allowing taxis to use the full length of TCR. Regarding displacement of delivery traffic onto side streets, officers propose to work with local businesses on Tottenham Court Road, Gower Street and New Oxford Street, local residents and Transport for London on a quiet out of normal hours delivery trial, including consideration of loading from 5am to 7am, 10am to 12pm and 7pm to 10 pm, subject to further analysis of loading requirements, residents' concerns and a review six months after implementation. If the trial were to go ahead, this would help to reduce the number of vehicles servicing on residential streets.
- 8.40 Due to the complexity of the issue, the text box below sets out the policy context for the recommendation on taxi access to Tottenham Court Road.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Discussion of policy context for restricting taxi access to Tottenham Court Road**

#### **Consultation results**

Concerns have been raised in the public consultation about the proposed taxi restrictions on Tottenham Court Road by the taxi trade as well as some residents and businesses. 43% of the questionnaire surveys were carried out face to face and a specific question on taxis was included in these surveys. Of these, 58% of respondents did not support restricting taxis on Tottenham Court Road.

#### **Proposals for taxis**

The proposals would restrict taxi access to Tottenham Court Road on certain sections and at specific times. However, it is proposed that from Monday to Saturday, 8am-7pm (these are the times when restrictions would apply) taxis would have access to the unrestricted sections of the street which account for 60% of the whole street. At all other times including the evening, early morning and all day Sundays, taxis would have unrestricted access to the whole street benefitting the night time economy and assisting safer travel home at night. The restrictions to taxis would have no impact on the ability of taxis to serve a number of key destinations on Tottenham Court Road including the Dominion Theatre, Habitat / Heals, Goadge Street Underground station, the Grafton Hotel, and Warren Street Underground station. In addition the proposals would also not impact on taxi access to other key destinations in the area including UCLH (and other medical treatment centres), UCL, British Museum, Bedford Square, Charlotte Street, St Giles Hotel, MyHotel, YMCA and Shaftesbury Theatre.

All taxi ranks would be retained, with the exception of the rank north of Grafton Way, which would be moved to the western end of Grafton Way, and the rank on High Holborn, outside the Shaftesbury Theatre which would be moved to the southern side of High Holborn. Additional ranks would be provided on Store Street and Goadge Street. Following consultation, it is proposed that the rank outside the Dominion Theatre on the east side of Tottenham Court Road be moved to the west side in order to make it more accessible to taxi drivers, and increased in size from three to four spaces, and an additional rank be provided on the eastern section of Grafton Way to improve taxi access to UCLH.

#### **Traffic levels**

Taxis currently make up 23% of the traffic on Tottenham Court Road and the inclusion of taxis on the full length of Tottenham Court Road would significantly increase traffic on the street compared to the proposed consultation option and would worsen the environment for walking and cycling and remove some or all of the bus journey time benefits. The inclusion of taxis on Tottenham Court Road would lead to a predicted increase in traffic on Tottenham Court Road of up to 24% compared to excluding taxis and only a reduction in traffic on Gower Street / Bloomsbury Street of up to 5% (as shown in the table below), when compared with the consultation proposal.



## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

In addition, it would slightly reduce the traffic on Torrington Place (by 9% or 18 vehicles an hour) and it would worsen the traffic on other streets such as Grafton Way, which would see an increase of 64% rather than 38% under the consultation proposals. Therefore the benefit lost by allowing taxis onto the whole of Tottenham Court Road is considered disproportionate to the benefit delivered to other streets.

**Table 8.1: Comparison of the traffic flows in the morning peak hour under the proposals, and if taxis were included on the full length of Tottenham Court Road.** \*Please note that “existing” flows are the current flows factored up to expected levels for 2016.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

Streets	Existing* traffic flows	Traffic flows for public consultation proposals (option 1)	Percentage change between existing traffic flows and option 1 traffic flows	Traffic flows for public consultation proposals including taxis on TCR (option 2)	Percentage change between existing traffic flows and option 2 traffic flows	Difference in number of vehicles between option 2 and option 1	Percentage difference in number of vehicles between option 2 and option 1
TCR north of Bedford Avenue	621	167	-73%	319	-49%	152	24%
TCR north of Grafton Way	572	295	-48%	387	-32%	92	16%
TCR north of Oxford Street	699	175	-75%	335	-52%	160	23%
TCR north of Torrington Place	727	474	-35%	593	-18%	119	16%
TCR south of Store Street	775	197	-75%	340	-56%	143	18%
Gower Street south of Grafton Way	757	553	-27%	561	-26%	8	1%
Gower Street south of Torrington Place	723	513	-29%	474	-34%	-39	-5%
Torrington Place	205	414	102%	396	93%	-18	-9%
Grafton Way east of TCR	296	409	38%	486	64%	77	26%
Charlotte Street	183	217	19%	189	3%	-28	-15%
Goodge Street	259	140	-46%	141	-46%	1	0%

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Road safety

The Council prioritises sustainable transport i.e. walking, cycling and public transport, and the CTS has established objectives and targets to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists and increase levels of walking and cycling in the borough. Providing a safe environment is crucial to enabling walking and cycling as well as achieving these targets, particularly for new cyclists and for whom the perception of safety is a major barrier.

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents has demonstrated that there is clear link between the amount of traffic on a street and the number of casualties on it (Delivering Accident Prevention at local level in the new public health system, RoSPA, 2013). As a result, it would be expected that allowing taxis to use the whole length of Tottenham Court Road would lead to an increase in casualties, particularly involving pedestrians and cyclists. The recent Mayor's Cycle Safety Action Plan (2014) shows that taxis and private hire vehicles are involved in a large number of collisions with cyclists when they are killed and serious injured, compared to the number of taxis and private hire vehicles on the road, with a ratio of involvement to proportion of traffic of 4.0. The Plan notes that, where the ratio is above 1, these modes are overrepresented in casualty statistics. This means that they are involved in a large number of collisions resulting in a cyclist killed or seriously injured *relative to their traffic share* – with taxis having the highest involvement relative to their share. While fatalities more commonly involve Heavy Goods Vehicles, taxis are more frequently involved in casualties categorised as 'serious'. It is therefore considered that allowing unrestricted taxi access on Tottenham Court Road would also increase the potential for conflict with cyclists and the likelihood for an increase in serious casualties which would undermine Council objectives to encourage cycling and to improve road safety.

### Air quality

In relation to taxis and air pollution, the Council has a responsibility under the Environment Act 1995 to reduce all pollutants and despite the reductions in the majority of the pollutants, levels of PM10 and NO2 continue to exceed the national air quality standards and objectives in some areas of London. In 2011, Tottenham Court Road was recorded as one of the worst sites in the borough (after Euston Road) for NO2 concentrations.

Road transport is the dominant source of PM10 emissions in London, contributing 79%, with exhaust emission and tyre and brake wear and dust from road surfaces being the main factors. Particulate matters are most associated with mortality and it is estimated that over 4,000 Londoners die prematurely as a result of long-term exposure to these particles (Improving the Health of Londoners, Transport Action Plan, TfL, 2014). There is a specific indicator (indicator 3.01) in the Public Health Outcomes Monitoring Framework for mortality due to PM2.5 and which Camden has to report against. Data shows that the proportion of deaths attributable to PM2.5 in the borough in 2012 was 7.3%, a reduction compared to 2011 and 2010 (7.9% and 7.7% respectively) but higher than the London average of 6.6% and the England average of 5.1% (2012 figures).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

TfL's Health Safety and Environment Report 2012/13 shows that taxis and private hire vehicles (PHVs) account for 78% of PM10 of all TfL fleet emissions, and that taxis and PHVs emitted a total of 102.5 tonnes compared to 18.39 tonnes for buses.

Road transport and heating systems are the main sources of NOx (Air Quality in Camden: A guide for Public Health officials. Greater London Authority, 2012). NOx is primarily made up of two pollutants - nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2). NO2 is of most concern due to its impact on health. However NOx easily converts to NO2 in the air, so to reduce concentrations of NO2 it is essential to control emissions of NOx.

Levels of NO2 in London continue to exceed legally binding limits, for which London is currently being threatened with a Euro 350 million fine. Cars and domestic gas are the biggest contributors to total NO2 tonnage for Greater London (GLA, 2012). However, a comparison between buses and taxis show the contribution of buses to total tonnage in London is double that for taxis. TfL's Health and Safety Report (2012-13) shows that buses contributed over 5,000 tonnes of NOx compared to 2,000 tonnes for taxis.

However, when the data has been assessed per passenger km on a site-specific basis, across the fleet, taxis emit more PM than buses. For NOx and CO2, all types of taxi (Euro III, IV and V) emit significantly more per passenger km than buses. This suggests that allowing taxis unrestricted access into Tottenham Court Road would reduce air quality compared to the consultation proposal.

### Accessibility

Further concerns were raised by respondents regarding access for older people and disabled people or those with reduced mobility. An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was completed for the Camden Transport Strategy (CTS), which is the guiding document for the development of all transport schemes in Camden. Although the CTS states that the West End Project would help the Council to achieve its objectives and targets to reduce casualties and encourage walking and cycling and equalities impacts have been addressed in the CTS, it was considered necessary to undertake an additional EqIA for the West End Project on its own (attached at Appendix J).

The CTS states that Tottenham Court Road would be bus and cycle only, under the proposals, but does not explicitly mention the exclusion of taxis from 40% of the length of Tottenham Court Road, and so an additional assessment of the impacts on older people and disabled people or those with reduced mobility has been carried out.

The furthest distance on Tottenham Court Road that someone would have to walk to access a taxi would be 60 metres, half of the distance between Great Russell Street and Stephen Street. Guidelines for Inclusive Mobility suggest that resting points should be provided at a spacing of 50 metres.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

Having examined the spacing of proposed seating, including that in new and existing public spaces and in bus shelters, it is proposed that additional seating be provided between Store Street and Goodge Street to ensure that in the sections of Tottenham Court Road that would be bus and cycle only, there would be opportunities for people with mobility impairments to stop to rest at a spacing of approximately 50m.

It is understood that a very small proportion of older and disabled people use taxis; for cost reasons they are far more likely to use bus services. Indeed, 9.3 million public transport trips were made by Camden residents with an older person's freedom pass in 2012/13 (the latest data available). 76% of these were made by bus over other forms of public transport. For disabled people under the age of 64, 2.8 million public transport trips were made by Camden residents registered for the pass, of which 79% were made by bus. The bus is clearly an important transport mode for older and disabled people and improvements to bus stop accessibility, bus journey times and reliability will provide significant benefits for people that rely on them.

According to Taxicard usage data to date for 2014/15, the average number of trips made per month by Camden residents is 4,023, making the number of trips per year approximately 48,000.

The volume of trips made by Taxicard users is clearly far lower than the number of trips made by freedom pass users (the ratio is 1:200) and therefore although the lack of access to some parts of TCR to taxis might cause problems for some disabled and older people, the improvements to bus services would benefit a far larger number of disabled and older people.

For those people, including disabled people, who require a taxi, the number of taxi ranks would be increased, as set out in paragraphs 8 and 29 of Appendix D. In addition, taxis would still be able to access 60% of Tottenham Court Road (the unrestricted sections), and for the remaining 40% (where taxis would be restricted), taxis could stop close to a junction of the nearest side street with Tottenham Court Road, not more than 60m away, to pick up and set down passengers.

### **Conclusion**

Given the issues of traffic levels, road safety, air quality and accessibility, officers recommend that taxis should be restricted on certain sections of Tottenham Court Road, 8am-7pm, Monday to Saturday, as set out in the consultation material. Taxi access on Tottenham Court Road is proposed to be reviewed following full and detailed monitoring after the project is implemented and following the implementation of an Ultra-Low Emission Zone. A review would consider the impacts on road safety, traffic congestion, accessibility and air quality.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Comments on traffic flow**

- Support introduction of two-way working (28 individuals)

### **Officers' responses**

8.41 The comments in support of the proposals are noted.

### **Comments on traffic restrictions**

- Extend restrictions to late evening and Sunday /at all times (London Travelwatch, CCC, LCC, Sustrans, Camden Green Party)
- Allow only local east-west traffic across TCR (CCC, LCC, Sustrans)
- Do not support restrictions (Camden Civic Society)
- All traffic should be allowed in the proposed two-way TCR as the restriction to buses and cycles only is the major cause of the increase in traffic on Torrington Place (GMRA).
- Request exemption to restrictions for Blue Badge holders (Transport for All, Disabled Motoring UK)
- Restrictions would be confusing / unenforceable (Camden Civic Society, Camden Green Party, GMRA)
- Supports the principle of reducing traffic on TCR by limiting through traffic to buses and cyclists but does not support the current proposals due to the impact on residential streets as through traffic should be directed to main roads (Charlotte Street Association).
- Would like 24 hour / 7 day restriction of TCR to buses, cycles and taxis only, with vehicles allowed to leave northbound only in evenings and at weekends (FNA).

### **Officers' responses**

8.42 The proposed restrictions aim to balance the needs of different road users at different times of the day. Allowing taxis and other traffic between 7pm and 8am would help to stimulate the night-time economy, allow servicing in quieter traffic periods when there would be fewer potential conflicts with cyclists and pedestrians and enable safer travel at night. The hours of the restrictions would be reviewed, following implementation, if the proposals were to go ahead.

8.43 Preventing through traffic on east / west routes (e.g. Torrington Place / Howland Street and Goodge Street / Chenies Street) would create additional displaced traffic on adjacent roads within Camden and Westminster and create very difficult access for residents in Fitzrovia. The east / west traffic would be designed using traffic signals to be clear of TCR north / south traffic which would significantly reduce conflicts with cyclists.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- 8.44 The lack of support for the restrictions is noted.
- 8.45 The proposals would lead to a reduction in traffic across the area. There is predicted to be an increase in traffic in certain streets including Torrington Place and Grafton Way. To address concerns raised in the public consultation, a recommendation to undertake public consultation on proposals to reduce through traffic on Torrington Place has been included as part of this report (Appendix H).
- 8.46 Whilst it might be desirable to provide exemptions for certain vehicles carrying disabled people, there would be no way to exempt disabled drivers or passengers from these restrictions, using normal traffic management processes. However, additional Blue Badge parking bays would be provided as part of the proposals.
- 8.47 The proposed restrictions would be clearly signed and publicised should the project be approved. The restrictions are no more complex than many pedestrianised areas which permit certain vehicles access at different times of the day.
- 8.48 All restrictions would be clearly signed. If the proposals are approved there would be targeted publicity to ensure that road users were aware of restrictions and access routes.
- 8.49 Allowing all traffic to use TCR would significantly increase traffic on the street making it less safe and attractive for walking and cycling. Buses would also have slower journey times and less reliable services.
- 8.50 The comment regarding allowing vehicles to leave the area in a northbound direction only would not be feasible due to difficulties of enforcement.

### **Comments on loading**

- Insufficient time to load on TCR and loading restrictions in the area are confusing (FTA)
- Restrictions will inconvenience residents and businesses who require servicing (Alliance of British Drivers)
- Loading times of TCR would conflict with cycling (Sustrans)
- Relocate loading bays from TCR to side roads and restrict to middle of day (Sustrans)
- Not enough loading bays (GMB Drivers' Branch)
- Request that coaches and trucks be permitted and encouraged to use TCR and at appropriate times to service the St Giles Hotel, the shops and offices between Bedford Avenue and Bayley Street along the eastern side of TCR (Bedford Court Mansions RA).
- Do not support night-time deliveries (FNA)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' responses**

- 8.51 The consultation proposals allowed loading on TCR from 7am to 10am and from 4pm to 8pm in the unrestricted sections and from 7am-8am and 7pm-8pm in the restricted section. The public consultation highlighted concerns from businesses that the proposed loading hours were insufficient and supported an additional time period for loading between 10am and 12pm. In addition, residents raised concerns that the access restrictions on Tottenham Court Road could lead to an increase in heavy goods vehicles using residential side roads to access loading facilities. To address these concerns and to minimise congestion a quiet out of normal hours delivery trial is recommended as part of this report in partnership with TfL covering local businesses on Tottenham Court Road, Gower Street / Bloomsbury Street and New Oxford Street. The trial would allow loading on these streets from 5am to 7am, 10am to 12pm and 7pm to 10 pm and would investigate increasing loading restrictions on side streets, subject to further analysis of loading requirements, residents' concerns and a review six months after implementation. The Council would work with freight operators to ensure that loading facilities were appropriate to service the needs of frontages.
- 8.52 The proposals are not expected to adversely impact on servicing vehicles accessing residential or businesses properties.
- 8.53 Following public consultation, it is recommended that a trial of quiet out or normal hours deliveries is implemented as mentioned above to help to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution and address road safety concerns.
- 8.54 The proposals for loading bays were developed following a detailed assessment of loading activity including discussions with businesses. Following public consultation, the proposed loading bays on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street have been increased in length, and additional loading bays have been proposed on Tottenham Court Road and Denmark Street. Loading facilities would be reviewed as part of the overall review of the scheme following implementation, if the proposals were to go ahead.
- 8.55 Coaches are considered to be part of general traffic and so would not be exempt from the restrictions on Tottenham Court Road. Coaches servicing the hotel during restricted hours on TCR would need to access Bedford Avenue via Gower Street.
- 8.56 The trial of evening and early morning servicing on TCR would help to reduce the volume of large vehicles on side streets.



## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Comments on lighting**

- Require full assessment of impact of relocating listed lighting columns (English Heritage).

### **Officers' responses**

8.57 Should the project be approved, a full assessment of the impact of relocating listed lighting columns would be undertaken.

### **Other comments**

- TCR needs to be repaired and resurfaced, to withstand additional buses (Bloomsbury Association)
- Would like as many phone boxes and as much redundant street furniture to be removed as possible (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Support street trading and welcome the proposal for new street vending kiosks but would like to be consulted on their design (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Concerned about potential for more kiosks on TCR (Bloomsbury Association).
- The kiosks should be an approved uniform high-quality design, subject to the planning process (Bloomsbury Association).
- Would like the existing large advertising hoarding on TCR opposite Torrington Place removed and a new amenity space created here and in front of the ventilation shaft (Charlotte Street Association).
- Suggest that the land on TCR opposite Torrington Place be used for a public toilet and disappointed that none is proposed in the area (FNA).

### **Officers' responses**

8.58 The proposals would include resurfacing and strengthening of the carriageway, subject to available funding.

8.59 The comments regarding removal of phone boxes and the design of new street vending kiosks are noted. Officers will aim to remove as many phone boxes and street clutter as possible, subject to funding and legal constraints.

8.60 There are no proposals to increase the number of kiosks on TCR. The kiosks would be a high quality design and would be subject to an appropriate approval process.

8.61 The Council's planning enforcement scheme will investigate whether or not the hoarding can be removed.

8.62 No public toilets are proposed due to the large ongoing maintenance costs that these facilities incur.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Recommendations on the Tottenham Court Road proposals (question 8)

8.63 Following detailed assessments and taking on board the comments set out above, the following recommendations are proposed:

**Approve making Tottenham Court Road bus and cycle only in certain sections between 8am and 7pm, Monday to Saturday, subject to a review 12 months after implementation.** It is recommended that the results of the review and recommendations as to how to proceed be considered by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning at that stage.

**Approve the proposal for three bus stops in each direction, with the amendment of relocating the central stops closer to Goodge Street underground station,** and consequent changes to the location and size of the raised pedestrian crossing areas, as requested during public consultation and as set out in Appendix F.

**Approve the proposals to change loading hours on Tottenham Court Road but with an amendment to work with local businesses, local residents and Transport for London on a quiet out of normal hours delivery trial for Tottenham Court Road, Gower Street/ Bloomsbury Street and New Oxford Street,** including consideration of loading from 5am to 7am, 10am to 12pm and 7pm to 10pm on the main streets and increasing loading restrictions on side streets, subject to further analysis of loading requirements, residents' concerns and a review six months after implementation.

8.64 The proposed loading hours for all streets in the area and the results of the review following implementation, should the proposed hours be taken forward, would be determined by the Assistant Director, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning.

**Approve the proposed restrictions to taxi access on the basis of reduced road danger, less traffic congestion, improved air quality and a more attractive environment to walk and cycle.** These restrictions would be reviewed should the Mayor of London's proposed ultra-low emission zone go ahead, and would be the subject of a separate decision report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning, at that stage.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

8.65 The Mayor of London is proposing to create an ultra-low emission zone where almost all the vehicles running during working hours are either zero or low emission. A public consultation has recently taken place on proposals to introduce a vehicle emissions charging scheme in central London, alongside proposals for buses and revised taxi and Private Hire Vehicle licensing requirements.

**Q9: Do you agree with the proposals for Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street to introduce protected cycle lanes, provide better crossings and make the street two-way for all vehicles. (All bus routes would move to Tottenham Court Road. There would be no parking on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street. Loading would be allowed in bays between 10am and 2pm)?**

9.1 Of those who answered this question (1106 people), the majority (60%) were in favour of the proposals:

<b>Table 9: Do you agree with the proposals for Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street to introduce protected cycle lanes, provide better crossings and make the street two-way for all vehicles. (All bus routes would move to Tottenham Court Road. There would be no parking on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street. Loading would be allowed in bays between 10am and 2pm)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	657	60%
No	369	33%
No opinion	80	7%

9.2 Of those who expressed an opinion on this question, 1026 respondents, 64% supported the proposals and 36% did not. All types of individual and business response were in favour of the proposal:

### **Comments received on the Gower Street / Bloomsbury Street proposals (question 9) and officers' responses**

9.3 A total of 435 comments were received on the Gower Street / Bloomsbury Street proposals. The most frequently mentioned comments (over 10 responses) were:

#### **Comments on pedestrians**

- Concerned about reduced pavement width on Gower Street (Living Streets)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- Widen pavements and install central island to make it easier to cross on Gower Street (UCL)
- Widen crossing outside UCL (Sustrans)

### **Officers' responses**

9.4 A key element of the proposals is to provide protected cycle lanes on Gower Street. It would not be possible to widen pavements or provide a central island, as well as protected cycle lanes. An assessment of pedestrian volumes suggests that the proposed footway widths would safely accommodate pedestrian numbers.

9.5 The proposed crossing outside UCL would be 6m wide. This width is considered sufficient to deal with the numbers of pedestrians expected to cross the street at this location.

### **Comments on cycling**

- Cycle lanes should be protected including at junctions and wider / 2m / for inexperienced cyclists and children (64 individuals, TfL, Brent Cyclists, Sustrans, FNA)
- Support proposed protected cycle lanes (33 individuals, Guide Dogs for the Blind, Metropolitan Police, Bloomsbury Ward Councillors)
- Loading bays in the cycle lane are dangerous / not good idea (22 individuals, Sustrans)
- Cycle lanes will cause congestion including when a vehicle breaks down or parks illegally (13 individuals)
- Concerned that light segregation will not be effective (TfL, Brent Cyclists)
- Protected cycle lanes would make it difficult to pick up and set down passengers (Unite the Union, RGRA)
- Ban large vehicles to allow more space for cycling (Sustrans)
- A cycle lane on the east side of Bedford Square would detract from the heritage nature of the Square and the road should be raised to the level of the pavement at this point (Bloomsbury Association).
- Improved cycle facilities should be provided on Malet Street rather than Gower Street (Bloomsbury Association).

### **Officers' responses**

9.6 The comments regarding support for the proposed protected cycle lanes are noted.

9.7 Following comments in this public consultation and in response to the working group to improve facilities for walking and cycling, the cycling proposals have been amended from light segregation (or "armadillos) to wider cycle "stepped

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

tracks” protected by a height difference from the road, and also from the pavement.

- 9.8 Regarding the comments on cycle lanes, the maximum width of cycle lanes that could be provided is between 1.75 and 2m. Providing wider cycle lanes would require narrowing pavements to unacceptable widths or making Gower Street one-way to traffic. This option would lead to unacceptable traffic impacts in the local and wider area. Further details on the different options that have been assessed for Gower Street and TCR are included in Appendix E.
- 9.9 In relation to loading bays in cycle lanes, unfortunately there is insufficient road and pavement width to install the loading bays between the cycle lane and the pavement and the provision of loading bays are essential for the operation of the businesses on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street.
- 9.10 In relation to the cycle lanes causing congestion, the proposals have been assessed using an approved Transport for London traffic model which highlights the proposals would lead to less traffic on Gower Street and Bloomsbury Street.
- 9.11 The proposals include a number of taxis ranks in the area where passengers could be picked up / dropped off. Following comments in the public consultation the proposed cycle lane on Gower Street would have a kerb to separate cycles from other traffic. The kerb would make it easier for people to get into and out of taxis than armadillos as it would provide a continuous level surface.
- 9.12 It is not considered practical to ban large vehicles in the area without a wider strategic initiative across London.
- 9.13 The importance of heritage considerations needs to be carefully balanced with the need to provide safe and attractive cycling facilities. The proposals have been altered in response to consultation including raising the road to the level of the pavement for half of the east side of the Square, as shown in Appendix F.
- 9.14 Malet Street currently provides a quiet cycling route but is not a substitute for Gower Street as it does not serve the same destinations, including UCL or UCLH.

### **Comments on road safety**

- Concerned that there will be more casualties (13 individuals)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' responses**

9.15 With regard to road safety, the proposals would provide new and improved pedestrian crossings and protected cycle lanes and these measures would be likely to improve road safety. The scheme would be subject to a road safety audit if it were to go ahead.

### **Comments on buses**

- Keep buses on Gower Street including for British Museum, University of London, UCL, UCLH (13 individuals, Camden Green Party)

### **Officers' responses**

9.16 The proposals would relocate two-way buses to Tottenham Court Road. Services would unfortunately be further from the British Museum, University of London and UCL (but the same distance from UCLH), in a southbound direction. However, the advantages of the simplicity of operating bus services two-way on one street, and the journey time savings from north-south buses not generally having to use New Oxford Street were felt to outweigh the disadvantages of some services being further from some destinations. As set out under paragraph 8.32 above, officers considered keeping one route on Gower Street but it was decided that this would be confusing for bus passengers and would provide slower journeys for bus passengers. In addition, bus passenger surveys showed that the majority of passengers wanted to start or end their journeys in Tottenham Court Road rather than Gower Street.

9.17 If the final proposals were to include one bus route on Gower Street there would not be space on the street to provide protected cycle lanes and allow traffic to flow. There would also be significant conflict between bus passengers and cyclists at bus stops.

### **Comments on air quality**

- Proposals will cause pollution and congestion (19 individuals)

### **Officers' responses**

9.18 The proposals have been assessed using an approved Transport for London traffic model which highlights the proposals would lead to less traffic and quicker bus journeys. As a result there is likely to be less traffic congestion and improved air quality.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Comments on loading**

- Loading for a four-hour window is not practical. Guests arrive and leave by taxi at all times of the day (Ridgmount and Jesmond Hotels), Extend delivery times / more loading bays (10 individuals)
- Insufficient loading provision for the hotel and university (Bloomsbury Association).
- Loading bays should be clearly marked to ensure that parked vehicles in these areas are out of the way of pedestrians (Guide Dogs for the Blind).

### **Officers' responses**

9.19 The proposals for loading were developed using detailed on street surveys and following discussions with local businesses. The loading provision would be reassessed as part of the proposed quiet out of normal hours delivery trial recommended under question 8 above, should the proposals go ahead.

9.20 Where loading bays are located on the pavement, the space is intended for use by pedestrians when not occupied by vehicles and therefore it is not necessary to use contrasting colours or surfaces. However, the extent of the bays would be clearly marked for drivers and enforced.

### **Comments on traffic**

- Making streets two-way will lead to congestion / and will not be beneficial to people living, working, running businesses and staying in the area (72 individuals).
- Concerned about volume of traffic on Gower Street (UCL).
- Concerned that one traffic lane in each direction would lead to congestion (Unite the Union).
- Permission should be sought to introduce a yellow box at the junction of Bloomsbury Street and Great Russell Street as congestion on Bloomsbury Street blocks traffic exiting Great Russell Street, including No. 7 bus (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Concerned that Gower Street would become a car park, and that measures should be put in place to allow right turns on Gower Street without holding up traffic. A third lane in the centre of Gower Street would be a more sensible use of space than protected cycle lanes (Bedford Court Mansions RA, Bloomsbury Association).
- Concerned that there may only be a drop in traffic on Gower Street initially (Bloomsbury Association).

### **Officers' responses**

9.21 Making TCR and Gower Street two-way allows buses and general traffic to move through the area more efficiently. The proposals have been assessed

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

using an approved Transport for London traffic model which highlights the proposals would lead to less traffic and quicker bus journeys.

- 9.22 The traffic modelling highlights that the proposals would lead to 30% less traffic on Gower Street as well as less traffic and therefore less congestion on TCR and in the surrounding area.
- 9.23 The turning arrangements at the junction of Bloomsbury Street and Great Russell Street would be monitored, if the proposals were to go ahead, and any problems that were identified would be addressed if possible and appropriate.
- 9.24 The traffic modelling predicts that the proposals would lead to 30% less traffic on Gower Street. Right turning traffic is not expected to create significant congestion.
- 9.25 Traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation, should the proposals go ahead.

### **Comments on impact on residents**

- Displaced traffic will cause more pollution, affecting residents including on Torrington Place, Ridgmount Gardens and Chenies Street (20 individuals)

### **Officers' responses**

- 9.26 Making TCR and Gower Street two-way allows buses and general traffic to move through the area more efficiently. The proposals have been assessed using an approved Transport for London traffic model which indicates that although traffic would increase on some streets, including on Torrington Place, the proposals would lead to less traffic in the area as a whole and quicker bus journeys. A trial is proposed as part of this report to reduce through traffic on Torrington Place, between Gower Street and Tottenham Court Road, and further information is included in Appendix H.

### **Recommendations on the Gower Street / Bloomsbury Street proposals (question 9)**

- 9.27 Given the level of support for the proposals and the comments above, the following is recommended:

**Approve the proposal for protected cycle lanes on Gower Street/Bedford Square/Bloomsbury Street, with an amendment to widen the lane to 1.75m, and 2m where possible, and provide stepped cycle tracks between the pavement and the road, subject to detailed design and a safety audit.**



## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Q10: Do you agree with the proposals for New Oxford Street to introduce better pedestrian crossings and improve pavements?

10.1 Of those who answered this question, (1050 people), 79% were in favour of the proposals for New Oxford Street:

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	827	79%
No	141	13%
No opinion	82	8%

10.2 Of those who expressed an opinion on this question, 968 respondents, 85% supported the proposals and 15% did not. All categories of individuals were in favour of the proposals:

### Comments received on the New Oxford Street proposals and officers' responses

10.3 A total of 239 comments were received. The most commonly mentioned topics (by ten or more respondents) were:

#### General comments

- General support for proposals (27 individuals)
- Keep street unchanged (16 individuals)

#### Officers' comments

10.4 Comments regarding support for the proposals are noted.

10.5 There is a clear case for making changes to the area. The proposals would provide good value for money and have a strong business case based on reducing casualties, reducing travel times for bus passengers and providing a better environment for walking and cycling.

#### Comments on pedestrians

- Support increased pedestrian priority / better crossings / diagonal crossing (25 individuals)
- Support safer and wider pavements (13 individuals)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- Need better facilities for pedestrians than those proposed (Sustrans)

### **Officers' comments**

10.6 The comments regarding improvements for pedestrians are noted.

10.7 Officers consider that facilities for pedestrians would be greatly improved under the proposals including more direct and convenient crossings.

### **Comments on cycling**

- Need segregated cycle lanes / space for cycling on New Oxford Street (50 individuals, Brent Cyclists, Sustrans)
- Make junctions safer (Sustrans)

### **Officers' comments**

10.8 To provide segregated cycle lanes on New Oxford Street would require the removal of one of the two eastbound traffic lanes. This has not been proposed as it would be likely to lead to significant delays to traffic at the junctions and displacement of traffic to other streets which would lead to unacceptable delays to traffic including buses. Further examination of this proposal and the safety at junctions will be undertaken as part of the Holborn Project which is currently being developed by the Council.

### **Comments on buses**

- Support the removal of the bus stop from near Dyott Street north further west as the anti-social behaviour generated by it will be further from residential properties (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).

### **Officers' comments**

10.9 The comment regarding the relocation of the bus stop is noted.

### **Comments on air quality**

- Measures will cause congestion and pollution (13 individuals)

### **Officers' comments**

10.10 The traffic impacts of the proposals have been assessed using an approved Transport for London traffic model which predicts that the proposals would lead to an overall reduction in traffic in the area as well as quicker bus journeys. As a result there would be likely to be less congestion and better air quality.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Comments on public space

- More green space / trees are needed (10 individuals)

### Officers' comments

10.11 Providing trees or other greening on New Oxford Street would require wider footways. This would require the removal of one of the two eastbound traffic lanes. Traffic modelling predicted that this would lead to unacceptable delays to traffic including buses. Further examination of changes to New Oxford Street will be undertaken as part of the Holborn Project which is currently being developed by the Council.

### Recommendations on the New Oxford Street proposals (question 10)

10.12 Given the level of support for the proposals, the following is recommended:

**Approve the proposals for New Oxford Street, as consulted on.**

**Q11: Do you agree with the proposal to create a 'mini park' with new seating, cycle parking and trees on Bedford Avenue (the street would be closed to all traffic except cyclists at the Tottenham Court Road end)?**

11.1 Of those who answered this question (916 people), 68% were in favour of a mini park on Bedford Avenue:

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	620	68%
No	220	24%
No opinion	76	8%

11.2 Of those who expressed an opinion, 840 respondents, 74% were in favour of the proposals and 26% were against. All categories of individual were in favour of the proposal:

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Comments on closure of Bedford Avenue

- Support the closure of Bedford Avenue, either between Tottenham Court Road and Morwell Street or between Morwell Street and Adeline Place (Bloomsbury Association).
- Concerned that insufficient analysis has been undertaken in terms of coach routes, deliveries and residential access. Allowing traffic to the southern part of Tottenham Court Road so that these businesses (and hotel) may be serviced via Morwell Street. The traffic and the air quality impacts of this change should be assessed (Ward Councillors).
- The traffic arrangements for the construction of 1 Bedford Avenue including the use of Morwell Street should be considered as a model. Moving the park and road closure to the area between Morwell Street and Adeline Place would allow access and reduce traffic on Bedford Avenue and Bedford Square (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, Bloomsbury Association).
- The single yellow line for deliveries on Bedford Avenue and access for residents of Bedford Court Mansions should be retained (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, Bedford Court Mansions Residents' Association).
- The full length of Bedford Avenue should be completed in York Stone, as this is a conservation area and pedestrian traffic to and from the British Museum is likely to increase significantly.
- Would like the mini park on Bayley Street to be adjacent to Bedford Square not TCR, so that vehicles could exit into TCR rather than Bedford Square (Bedford Court Mansions RA, Bloomsbury Association).
- The St Giles Hotel and shops at southern end of TCR could be serviced from TCR and Great Russell Street, leaving the conservation area clear of excess traffic (Bedford Court Mansions RA, Bloomsbury Association).
- The proposals fail to address long term problems associated with the St Giles Hotel (Bedford Court Mansions RA, Bloomsbury Association).
- The proposed closure of Bedford Avenue might also increase the number of coaches that decide to stop in Adeline Place, which should be discouraged. (Bloomsbury Association).
- Morwell Street should be one way north, with traffic being allowed to leave via Bayley Street into Tottenham Court Road to reduce the volume of traffic on Bedford Square (Bedford Court Mansions RA).
- The southern part of TCR will become a bus station and that there will be increased footfall through Bedford Square and Bedford Avenue as a result (Bedford Court Mansions RA).
- Concerned that the northern side of Bedford Square will be full of queuing traffic, including large trucks and coaches, with the added problem of coaches leaving the Square attempting tight turns both north and south

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

onto Gower Street adding to further congestion (Bedford Court Mansions RA).

- Allowing eastbound cycling on Bedford Avenue is unnecessary as cyclists can use Great Russell Street and Bedford Square north already (Bedford Court Mansions RA).
- Request all residents' parking be retained (Bedford Court Mansions RA)
- Concerned about the ongoing maintenance of the mini-parks and is of the view that Camden should not license additional vendors and kiosks in these locations (Bedford Court Mansions RA).
- Concerned that the restrictions on Tottenham Court Road will increase traffic (and taxis) on all the side streets, including Bedford Avenue, where there is inadequate space for larger commercial vehicles and coaches to turn. The Estate would like Morwell Street one-way northbound to allow vehicles to exit Bedford Avenue along Morwell Street and onto Bayley Street. Signage would also be required to advise drivers that there is no access to Tottenham Court Road from all relevant side streets to avoid confusion (Bedford Estate).

### **Officers' response**

- 11.3 The comment regarding support for the closure of Bedford Avenue is noted.
- 11.4 The proposals were developed using detailed traffic studies looking at traffic movements across the area. Following comments in public consultation, a trial to allow loading on TCR in the evenings and early mornings has been recommended. This would reduce the need for servicing vehicles to use Bedford Avenue.
- 11.5 Allowing servicing traffic to use the southern section of TCR would increase the volume of traffic on TCR making the street less safe and less attractive for walking and cycling. Following comments in public consultation, a trial to allow loading on TCR in the evenings and early mornings has been recommended. This would reduce the need for servicing vehicles to use Bedford Avenue and Bedford Square.
- 11.6 The single yellow line is proposed to be removed to allow residents' bays to be relocated. Delivery vehicles would still be able to use residents' bays to make deliveries, if space were available.
- 11.7 There are no proposals to resurface Bedford Avenue at this stage.
- 11.8 Allowing coaches to exit onto TCR at the Bayley Street junction would reduce the length of the bus and cycle only section of TCR, increasing the volume of traffic and making the street less safe and less attractive for walking and cycling. The loading trial mentioned above would help to reduce the need for servicing vehicles to use Bedford Avenue and Bedford Square.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

- 11.9 The existing traffic impacts from the hotel particularly coaches are not easy to address without creating other adverse impacts. The Council will continue to work with the hotel to minimise disturbance to local residents.
- 11.10 The number of coaches that use Bedford Avenue is not expected to increase as a result of these proposals. A loading bay for use by coaches is proposed for Bedford Avenue.
- 11.11 Following comments received in public consultation, Morwell Street would be converted to one-way north to prevent larger vehicles blocking the street. The volume of traffic using Bedford Square would not be expected to be significantly impacted as a result of the proposals.
- 11.12 The number of buses that would use TCR would increase. However, the street would have significantly less traffic and congestion than now as well as better air quality and a safer and more attractive environment for walking and cycling. Encouraging more people to walk through Bloomsbury is a key element of the project.
- 11.13 The number of coaches and large vehicles that use Bedford Avenue and Bedford Square is not expected to increase significantly as a result of these proposals or to lead to congestion issues on Gower Street. As Bedford Avenue and Adeline Place were not included in Transport for London's traffic model, officers have carried out separate traffic counts in order to assess the impact of the proposals on Bedford Avenue. The data suggests that the majority of traffic in the area (including coaches) is through traffic and that between 80 and 90% of this traffic would be removed under the proposals. However, traffic flows would also be monitored after implementation and if adverse effects were identified, these would be mitigated where possible and appropriate.
- 11.14 Making as many of our streets safe and attractive for cycling is a key Council objective. Making streets two-way for cycling opens up a network for cycling allowing people to reach a variety of destinations quickly and safely.
- 11.15 To create new public space, parking and loading changes would be needed. Parking and loading would be relocated to adjacent streets, where at all possible. However, some parking would be removed. Every effort has been made to minimise the loss of parking for residents.
- 11.16 The maintenance of the mini-parks would be part of the Council's ongoing maintenance of the public realm. There are no proposals to license additional street traders in the mini-parks.
- 11.17 The results of traffic modelling highlight that the most side streets would not see an increase in traffic. Following comments in the public consultation,

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

Morwell Street would become one-way northbound to avoid turning vehicles blocking other traffic.

### Recommendations for Bedford Avenue and Bayley Street closures (questions 11 and 13)

11.18 Having analysed the comments above and taking into account the support for the proposals, the following is recommended:

**Approve the mini-parks and road closures** (with access for cyclists and emergency services), **with the changes to waiting and loading in Bedford Avenue and Morwell Street, and making Morwell Street one-way northbound, with two-way cycling**, set out in Appendices F and G.

### Q12: Do you agree with the proposal to create a 'mini park' on Capper Street with new seating, cycle parking and trees (the street would be closed to all traffic except cyclists at the Tottenham Court Road end)?

12.1 Of those who answered this question, (912 people), 67% were in favour of creating a mini park on Capper Street:

**Table 12: Do you agree with the proposal to create a 'mini park' on Capper Street with new seating, cycle parking and trees (the street would be closed to all traffic except cyclists at the Tottenham Court Road end)?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	608	67%
No	208	23%
No opinion	96	10%

12.2 Of those that expressed an opinion, 816 people, 75% supported the proposal and 25% did not. All categories of individual were in favour of the proposal.

### Comments received on the closure of Capper Street (question 12)

- Objection to blocking-up Capper Street at junction with Tottenham Court Road as would increase traffic on Torrington Place (GMRA).
- Object to proposed reversal of traffic on Huntley Street and closure of Capper Street. All daytime traffic serving the UCH, UCL and other buildings in Huntley Street would have to go via Torrington Place (adding

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

even further to that traffic) and then via the quiet residential part of Huntley Street (GMRA)

- Concerned about access to Mortimer Market if Capper Street and also Huntley Street were closed (UCLH).

### Officers' response

- 12.3 Without closing Capper Street, it would be difficult to assess the impact of the road closure on traffic flows on Torrington Place and Huntley Street as well as access to UCLH's sites. If the proposals were to be taken forward, the impacts would be monitored and the feasibility of opening Capper Street at night to allow hospital servicing would be considered.
- 12.4 Following comments raised in public consultation the change in traffic direction on Huntley Street would not be progressed.
- 12.5 Access to Mortimer Market would be maintained as the Council has no plans to close Huntley Street.

### Recommendations on the proposed closure of Capper Street (question 12)

- 12.6 Taking into account the consultation responses above, the following is recommended for Capper Street:

<b>Approve the mini-park and road closure (with access for cyclists and emergency services) as consulted on.</b>
--

- 12.7 The impact of the road closure on access to UCLH's sites, traffic flows on Huntley Street, and the feasibility of opening Capper Street at night to allow hospital servicing would be considered. It is recommended that the results of the feasibility study and any recommendations for changes to the scheme be considered by the Assistant Director of Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning.



## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

**Q13: Do you agree with the proposal to create a 'mini park' on Bayley Street with new seating, cycle parking and trees (the street would be closed to all traffic except cyclists at the Tottenham Court Road end)?**

13.1 Of those who answered this question, (910 people), 63% were in favour of this proposal:

<b>Table 13: Do you agree with the proposal to create a 'mini park' on Bayley Street with new seating, cycle parking and trees (the street would be closed to all traffic except cyclists at the Tottenham Court Road end)?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	572	63%
No	235	26%
No opinion	103	11%

13.2 Of those that expressed an opinion, 807 people, 71% were in favour and 29% were against. All categories of individual were in favour of this proposal.

13.3 The comments and recommendation on the closure of Bayley Street are included under comments on the closure of Bedford Avenue under question 11 above.

**Q14: Do you agree with the proposal to split the cycle lanes on Torrington Place between Gower Street and Tottenham Court Road? There would be a cycle lane on either side of Torrington Place.**

14.1 Of those who answered this question, (919 people), 57% were in favour of splitting the cycle lanes on Torrington Place:

<b>Table 14: Do you agree with the proposal to split the cycle lanes on Torrington Place between Gower Street and Tottenham Court Road? There would be a cycle lane on either side of Torrington Place.</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	523	57%
No	250	27%
No opinion	146	16%

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

14.2 Of those who expressed an opinion, 773 people, 68% were in favour of the proposals and 32% were against. All categories of individual were in favour of the proposals.

### **Comments on Torrington Place (question 14)**

- The increase in traffic on Torrington Place is unacceptable and would make it worse for the large concentration of residents, their families and children. The extra traffic would lead to more congestion, more air pollution and impact on health and road safety (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, Charlotte Street Association, Gordon Mansions RA, Ridgmount Gardens RA).
- Concerned about volume of traffic and air quality on Torrington Place (UCL, Brent Cyclists, Ridgmount Gardens RA)
- Suggest that motor traffic be removed from Torrington Place altogether, but residential access and the facility to pick up and drop off be maintained (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Would like the narrow, overcrowded pavements to be widened (GMRA).
- Concerned about more loading vehicles using Torrington Place to service TCR businesses (GMRA).
- Concerns about cycle lane proposals making it harder to cross the street and for shops / residents to have deliveries and for people to pick up and drop off passengers (GMRA).
- The proposals would reduce times when the street is quiet e.g. weekends, late evening and public holidays (GMRA).
- Concerned that there are no firm proposals to reduce traffic on the Torrington Place / Tavistock Place corridor (GMRA).
- Should ban the left turn from Gower Street (north) into Torrington Place and divert traffic to Grafton Way or Euston Road slip road (RGRA).

### **Officers' response**

14.3 The public consultation highlighted significant concerns about increased traffic from residents on Torrington Place and adjacent streets. Petitions were received from residents of Gordon Mansions Residents' Association (51 signatories) on Torrington Place, Huntley Street and Chenies Mews, and Ridgmount Gardens Residents' Association (78 signatories) on Ridgmount Gardens and Torrington Place. To address these concerns the Council will be progressing a trial to remove through traffic on Torrington Place and funding has been committed to undertake a feasibility study of the options to achieve this outcome. Any proposal would be subject to statutory processes. The trial would consider converting Torrington Place (from Gower Street to Judd Street) to one-way eastbound, providing more space for cycling and widening the pavements by up to 1.5m (in the final situation) as set out in Appendix H.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

- 14.4 It would not be possible to enforce removing motor traffic from Torrington Place whilst allowing residential access and the facility to pick up and drop off.
- 14.5 Some traffic servicing TCR would need to travel along Torrington Place. The traffic flows and composition on Torrington Place would be monitored if the West End Project proposals were to go ahead. The proposed trial mentioned above would help to reduce the volume of general traffic on Torrington Place.
- 14.6 The existing cycle lane is confusing for pedestrians and with the volume of cyclists it can be difficult to cross the street. By separating the cycle lanes and narrowing the carriageway it is expected that the street would be safer and easier to cross. A loading bay would be provided as part of the proposals.
- 14.7 Officers are of the view that the proposed trial would reduce through traffic on Torrington Place and should the trial be implemented, traffic flows would be monitored on all affected streets in the surrounding area to establish whether there would be any adverse impacts on other residential streets, including Grafton Way.
- 14.8 Banning the left turn from Gower Street into Torrington Place and diverting traffic to Grafton Way would adversely affect residents at that location. Any changes made to Torrington Place would need to minimise adverse impacts on adjacent streets and take account of the importance of the street as a busy walking and cycling corridor and other requirements, e.g. local access and servicing.

### **Recommendations on proposals for Torrington Place (question 14)**

- 14.9 Given the consultation results and comments and the officers responses above, the following recommendations are made:

**Approve converting the existing two-way cycle lane on the north side of Torrington Place to a two-metre eastbound protected cycle lane and introducing a new two metre wide westbound protected cycle lane on the south side of the street, with the amendment of providing a loading area on the south side of Torrington Place.**

- 14.10 The cycle lanes would be protected with either light segregation (similar to Royal College Street) or “stepped tracks” (similar to Old Shoreham Road, Brighton). No changes are proposed to the east / west route via Howland Street and Maple Street but could be considered as part of the Central London Cycling Grid at a later date.

**Approve undertaking a trial to reduce through traffic on Torrington Place, including to alleviate traffic on the section west of Gower Street.**

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

14.11 Funding has been committed to undertake a feasibility study of the options to achieve this outcome. Any proposal would be subject to statutory processes. The trial would consider converting Torrington Place and Tavistock Place (from Gower Street to Judd Street) to one-way eastbound and providing more space for cycling as set out in Appendix H. A separate decision report on whether or not to go ahead with the trial including appropriate public engagement would be presented to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning.

### **Q15: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a protected cycle lane between Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street on Grafton Way?**

15.1 Of those who answered this question, (919 people), 67% of people agreed with the proposal to introduce a protected cycle lane on Grafton Way:

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	612	67%
No	194	21%
No opinion	113	12%

15.2 Of those that expressed an opinion, 806 people, 76% were in favour and 14% were against. All categories of individual agreed with the proposals:

#### **Comments on Grafton Way including the protected cycle lane proposal**

- Would like assurances that parking proposals on Grafton Way take account of recent UCLH permitted development including access (UCLH)
- Concerns about increase in traffic congestion on Grafton Way (and the reduced road width) and TCR delaying emergency vehicles (UCLH)
- Would like traffic on Grafton Way to be reduced by improving conditions on Euston Road, and the situation regarding patient transport ambulance parking to be resolved (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Would like the problem of the gyratory system around the hospital removed to reduce traffic on Grafton Way (east), and to make this street better for pedestrians (Charlotte Street Association).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Officers' response

- 15.3 The proposals in the public consultation do not conflict with UCLH's permitted development access.
- 15.4 The traffic modelling does predict an increase in traffic on Grafton Way in the morning peak. However the modelling also shows that this would not cause unacceptable queuing at the Tottenham Court Road / Grafton Way junction and therefore should not delay emergency vehicles. If the proposals were to go ahead, traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation and any adverse effects identified would be mitigated where possible and appropriate.
- 15.5 The Council is working with TfL to improve Euston Road for walking and cycling, improved air quality and urban realm as well as preserving the function of the road as the inner ring road. Reducing traffic on Grafton Way without other initiatives would be difficult to achieve. Detailed assessments have been undertaken to examine if all northbound traffic could continue up Gower Street to Euston Road (the proposal currently permits only westbound traffic). However, this would increase traffic congestion at Euston Circus and lead to delays to all vehicles including buses.

### Recommendation for Grafton Way protected cycle lane proposal

- 15.6 Given the consultation results and comments and the officers responses above, the following recommendations are made:

<b>Approve the additional streets being made two-way for cycling, with two exceptions; Chenies Street and Grafton Way.</b>
--

- 15.7 Following consultation, a new pedestrian crossing was requested by Rigmount Gardens Residents' Association and this is proposed at the junction of Chenies Street with Tottenham Court Road. The crossing cannot be accommodated unless the section of Chenies Street between Alfred Place and Tottenham Court Road remains one-way for cycling. However, two-way cycling would be provided on parallel streets including Torrington Place and Store Street.
- 15.8 Cycle lanes were not proposed on Gower Street, north of Grafton Way because of a lack of road space. Further design has shown that it would be possible to provide a continuous cycle route, northbound via Grafton Way and southbound via Gower Street. It is therefore recommended to change the proposed contra-flow kerb-segregated cycle lane from the north side of Grafton Way to a with-flow lightly segregated cycle lane on the south side (and relocate the parking to the north side).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

15.9 Moving the cycle lane to the south side of the street would reduce conflict with emergency vehicles and allow more disabled and pay and display parking to be provided close to the hospital entrance. Installing the cycle lane as a stepped track which provides a height difference between the road and the cycle lane and between the cycle lane and the pavement, rather than segregation with a narrow kerb upstand would allow it to be over-run in emergency situations. Officers would also work with Transport for London to provide a cycle lane northbound from Grafton Way, on Tottenham Court Road, and on the Euston Road slip road to provide a continuous southbound cycle route from Hampstead Road to Gower Street.

**Q16: Do you agree with the proposal to allow two-way cycling on Bedford Avenue, Store Street, Grafton Way, Charlotte Street, Windmill Street, Chenies Street, Percy Street, Bedford Square, Montague Place, Tottenham Street, Endell Street, Huntley Street, New Oxford Street, Whitfield Street and Gower Place?**

16.1 Of those who answered this question, (923 people), 58% of people were in favour of the proposals to allow two-way cycling on the streets mentioned:

<b>Table 16: Do you agree with the proposal to allow two-way cycling on Bedford Avenue, Store Street, Grafton Way, Charlotte Street, Windmill Street, Chenies Street, Percy Street, Bedford Square, Montague Place, Tottenham Street, Endell Street, Huntley Street, New Oxford Street, Whitfield Street and Gower Place?</b>		
<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	534	58%
No	253	27%
No opinion	136	15%

16.2 Of those who expressed an opinion, 787 people, 68% of people supported the proposals and 32% did not. All categories of individual are in favour of the proposals:

### Comment

- Support proposals for cycling / more space for cyclists (12 individuals)
- Road safety concerns about two-way cycling on one –way streets (Express Networks Forum).

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Officers' response

- 16.3 The comments regarding support for cycling are noted.
- 16.4 The Council has introduced two-way cycling on one-way streets on a large number of streets across the borough and there have been no significant road safety issues with these changes.
- 16.5 The recommendation for two-way cycling on one-way streets is included under question 15 above.

### Q17: Do you agree with the changes to parking and loading on the side roads?

- 17.1 Of those who answered this question, (913 people), more were in favour of the parking and loading changes than against (45%):

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	408	45%
No	254	28%
No opinion	251	27%

- 17.2 Of those that expressed an opinion, 662 people, 62% agreed with the changes and 38% did not. All categories of individual support the parking proposals except for businesses, where of those that expressed an opinion, 45% agreed and 55% disagreed.

### Comments on changes to parking and loading on the side roads (question 17)

- There is insufficient information to make an informed decision about servicing for hotels in the area. Lack of consideration to waste disposal vehicles, coaches visiting large hotels and the British Museum (Bloomsbury Association).

### Officers' response

- 17.3 The proposals for servicing have been developed based on detailed on-street surveys. In addition, the Council's waste team and businesses including hotels have been contacted to discuss their access and loading requirements. To make the streets safer and more attractive for walking and cycling, and to create new public space, parking and loading changes would be needed.

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

Parking and loading would be relocated to adjacent streets, where at all possible. However, some parking would be removed.

- 17.4 Comments were made as part of the consultation regarding improving access to the area for disabled people. Disabled parking was surveyed across the area, as part of an extensive waiting and loading review. The consultation proposed that three green badge bays be removed, as their usage was low. However, following discussions with Camden's Mobility Forum on the West End Project, it is still proposed to remove these green badge bays as their usage is low, but also to install additional Blue Badge bays in the area, including three bays on Grafton Way, one bay on Morwell Street and one on Maple Street. This proposed increase in blue badge bays should help some disabled people to access the area.

### Recommendations for changes to parking and loading on the side roads (question 17)

- 17.5 Comments on parking and loading changes given throughout the consultation have been assessed and led to the following recommendation:

**Approve the parking and loading changes with the following amendments:**

- Additional loading bays on Tottenham Court Road.
- The relocation and extension of the taxi rank outside the Dominion Theatre on Tottenham Court Road.
- An additional taxi rank on Grafton Way east, close to University College London Hospital.
- Changes to proposed waiting and loading arrangements on Grafton Way, Bedford Avenue, Morwell Street, Bucknall Street, Denmark Street, including specifically additional Blue Badge disabled bays on Grafton Way, Maple Street, Morwell Street, and Denmark Street, as set out in Appendix F.
- Further discussions would be held with TfL regarding the hours of operation of the taxi ranks and the proposed hours would be determined by the Assistant Director, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning, after the required publication of the Traffic Management Order.



## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

### Q18: Do you agree with the changes to one-way streets and banned turns?

18.1 Of those who answered this question, (910 people), more respondents were in favour of the changes to one-way streets and banned turns (43%) than against (34%):

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	394	43%
No	314	34%
No opinion	204	23%

18.2 Of those that expressed an opinion, 708 people, 56% agreed with the changes and 44% did not.

18.3 More businesses and residents were against the changes to one-way streets and banned turns than in favour of the changes. Of those businesses who expressed an opinion (127 people) 47% said Yes and 53% said No. Of those residents who expressed an opinion, 46% said Yes and 54% said No. Local students, visitors and students all supported the proposals.

### Comments received on changes to one-way streets and banned turns (question 18)

- Do not ban turns as they will be ignored / cause congestion and confusion / are inconvenient (20 individuals)

### Officers' response

18.4 The comments regarding banned turns being ignored and inconvenient, and causing congestion and confusion are noted. The Council would enforce against drivers ignoring banned turns, should the proposals go ahead, and as a result, officers would expect compliance to increase.

### Recommendations on changes to one-way streets and banned turns (question 18)

18.5 Comments on changes to one-way street and banned turns given throughout the consultation have been assessed and led to the following recommendations:

## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

**Approve the changes to the direction of certain one-way streets, as shown in Appendix G, with the following exceptions including:**

- Huntley Street, which would remain one-way southbound for its entire length to reduce the impact of traffic accessing the hospital sites on Torrington Place;
- Chenies Mews, which would be one way eastbound from Huntley Street with the rest of the street two-way for access, to prevent large vehicles from reversing through the no-entry at the junction with Torrington Place;
- Morwell Street, which would change from two-way to one-way northbound to allow more space for large vehicles to manoeuvre;
- Streatham Street and Bainbridge Street, which would be one-way westbound with a left-turn only at New Oxford Street to prevent a rat-run avoiding the New Oxford Street / Bloomsbury Street junction;
- Bucknall Street (as set out under question 3 above);
- Dyott Street (as set out under question 3 above).

18.6 All of these streets would allow two-way cycling, with the exception of Chenies Mews which would be one-way eastbound for a short section at the very narrow northern end.

**Approve the banned turns except for the turning arrangements at the following junctions:**

- **Hanway Street/Tottenham Court Road/Great Russell Street where there would be a forced right turn out of Hanway Street onto Tottenham Court Road, as shown in Appendix G, to prevent vehicles rat-running through Great Russell Street and the pedestrian crossing on Hanway Street would need to be removed** to allow space for servicing vehicles turning into Hanway Street.
- **Grape Street/High Holborn where a left turn would be permitted** to improve access.
- **Shaftesbury Avenue/Bucknall Street where a left turn in would be permitted but not a right turn in**, as the latter conflicts with traffic movements at the junction.

### Other comments

18.7 The comments for questions 11-18 were grouped together in the questionnaire. A total of 247 comments were made. Those that were relevant to particular questions are included above. Others are listed below.

18.8 The most frequently mentioned comments (by at least ten respondents) were:

### General comments

- Do not support changes (10 individuals)
- Object to all road closures (Alliance of British Drivers)

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' response**

18.9 The comments regarding no support for the changes and objecting to all road closures are noted.

### **Comments on accessibility**

- Concerned about access to UCLH (Ridgmount Gardens RA)
- Generally the approach that appears to have been taken is non-inclusive and as a person who is mobility impaired the scheme is unusable and illegible (Camden's Mobility Forum)
- Proposed access to Tottenham Court Road for taxis to drop off and pick up mobility impaired passengers will adversely impact people with severe mobility difficulties. The planned drop-off points are too far in relation to key destinations, e.g. UCLH (Camden's Mobility Forum).
- Likely traffic congestion around the hospital, with no access from TCR and a reduction in traffic capacity (Camden's Mobility Forum).
- Access to and from the hospital buildings becomes more challenging due to complicated routes, which could translate to more expense especially for those using taxis or Taxicard scheme (Camden's Mobility Forum).
- Cost of taxi fares inevitably going to rise with added congestion expected on some roads (Camden's Mobility Forum).
- Has the Council spoken to Camden Carers' Voice? They care for people who move around the area a lot and are concerned that keeping appointments and patient journeys in the future will become a lot more difficult and time consuming (Camden's Mobility Forum).
- Concern about conflict of work with Crossrail and HS2 and constraining the public highway further in this area will make matters worse (Camden's Mobility Forum).

### **Officers' response**

18.10 As part of the West End Project development and recent planning applications for UCLH developments, the transport needs of hospital patients, workers and visitors have been considered in detail. The impacts on the local community have also been carefully considered.

18.11 The West End Project proposals aim to balance the needs of all users and include widening pavements on Tottenham Court Road, removing redundant street furniture, providing more seating, reducing bus journey times and increasing journey time reliability and reducing traffic which improves air quality and road safety. The proposals would improve road safety, reduce congestion and improve air quality across the area as a whole. The number of Blue Badge disabled bays has been increased in the area, in response to the public consultation.

18.12 Officers are aware that restricting taxi access to certain sections of Tottenham Court Road could cause problems for some mobility impaired passengers.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

Dial-a-ride vehicles would have access to the full length of Tottenham Court Road and dial-a-ride users would benefit from the scheme in terms of reduced journey times through the area. All UCLH sites would still be accessible by taxi.

- 18.13 Under the proposals, Gower Street would be two-way for all vehicles and traffic modelling has predicted that the traffic on Gower Street would be reduced by up to 30%. If the proposals were to go ahead, traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation and if adverse effects were identified, attempts would be made to mitigate these effects where possible and appropriate.
- 18.14 Access to and from hospital buildings would be maintained. The traffic modelling predicts that although on some roads there would be an increase in traffic as a result of the proposals, traffic across the area would go down as traffic would be displaced across the wider network. Traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation. It would be difficult to assess the impact in terms of the cost of taxi journeys until after the proposals were implemented. If the proposals were to go ahead, traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation and if adverse effects were identified, attempts would be made to mitigate these effects where possible and appropriate.
- 18.15 Officers engaged with Carers' Voice and provided them with information circulated as part of consultation exercise, but they did not respond to the consultation.
- 18.16 Officers have been working with Crossrail regarding phasing and timescales of works. Although construction of several major projects within one area at the same time is challenging in terms of coordination of works, there are savings to be gained in terms of disrupting the traffic network and public realm for a shorter length of time and being less likely to dig up the same sections of road and pavement more than once. In addition, the West End Project proposals would help to cater for the increase in footfall as a result of the new Crossrail station.
- 18.17 The earliest that work could begin on HS2 is December 2016 but this date is still uncertain. If the West End Project proposals were to go ahead, the road layout and traffic impacts would be used as a base for the HS2 highway proposals, and the modelling of the traffic impacts of HS2 would have to take these into account.

### **Comments on Chenies Mews**

- Currently this street does not have much traffic, but the concern is that Chenies Mews could become a rat run for traffic, and especially service traffic going to Huntley Street and Torrington Place (GMRA).

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' response**

18.18 There is a need for servicing traffic to access Chenies Mews. It is currently no-entry at its junction with Torrington Place. As large vehicles cannot gain access from Huntley Street, it is proposed that the wide section of Huntley Street becomes a two-way cul-de-sac with a no-entry at the narrow northern end into Huntley Street to prevent it becoming a rat run northbound. Smaller vehicles would still be able to access Chenies Mews from Huntley Street. It would be unlikely to become a rat-run in a southbound direction due to the width of the access at its northern end. However, the situation would be monitored before and after implementation.

### **Comments on Ridgmount Gardens and Whitfield Street**

- Would like to see the impact of the proposals assessed for these streets and others not included in the traffic model (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors, Bloomsbury Association, Ridgmount Gardens RA).

### **Officers' response**

18.19 The traffic model has been developed by Transport for London to assess the traffic impacts of major projects in Central London. The model only includes streets that are part of strategic routes or carry high volumes of traffic, as these are the most likely to be affected in terms of changes in traffic flows. Streets that are not included, such as Ridgmount Gardens and Whitfield Street, are generally assumed to be relatively unaffected. Traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation if the proposals were to go ahead, and if adverse impacts were identified, attempts would be made to mitigate these impacts where possible and appropriate.

### **Comments on Mortimer Market**

- Would like to see public space in Mortimer Market as identified in the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan would be of great benefit to both users and local residents (Charlotte Street Association, Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association).

### **Officers' response**

18.20 There is little scope to create a public space on highway land; it would be more appropriate to consider a space on the southern side of Mortimer Market and this would be considered should a development proposal be brought forward.

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Comments on Chenies Street**

- A pedestrian crossing on Chenies Street next to TCR is needed, and will be more necessary if there is to be a park in Alfred Place (Ridgmount Gardens RA).

### **Officers' response**

18.21 Following comments in the public consultation, an additional pedestrian crossing has been included at this location.

### **Comments on the Ultra-Low Emission Zone**

- Would be interested in extending the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) to commercial vehicles, buses, taxis and ambulances travelling through the area (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).

### **Officers' response**

18.22 ULEZ is a Transport for London proposal. The current proposals would impact on all vehicles in the West End Project area. These comments have been included for consideration in the Council's response to the ULEZ consultation.

### **Comments on British Museum Signage**

- Finger signs, rather than Legible London, are needed at the north-east exit of Tottenham Court Road station, on the corner of Tottenham Court Road and Great Russell Street and Great Russell Street / Bloomsbury Street, to direct people to the British Museum (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).

### **Officers' response**

18.23 Improvements to wayfinding would be progressed as part of the project.

### **Comments on trees**

- Support the planting of more trees and the use of hypo-allergenic species that maximise CO2 elimination (Bloomsbury Ward Councillors).
- Would like further information on the proposed tree planting, including how the Council will ensure that existing buildings will not be impacted by tree roots in the long term (Bedford Estates).

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

### **Officers' response**

18.24 A large number of new trees would be planted and the species would be carefully selected to ensure that issues of aesthetics, allergies, and pollution absorption are taken into account.

18.25 New trees would be introduced with tree root protection systems to avoid intrusion to buildings and other structures.

### **Comments on cycling**

- Strongly support the proposals to improve cycling in the area and would encourage the Council to consider further measures to separate cyclists and motor traffic (Bedford Estates).

### **Officers' response**

18.26 The comment regarding support for cycling is noted. Consideration will be given to further measures to improve cycling in the area as part of the process of developing our programme of investment.

### **Comments on closing other roads**

- Requests an investigation of closing Hanway Street, Store Street, Dyott Street and Charlotte Street which would improve the pedestrian environment (Bloomsbury Association).

### **Officers' response**

18.27 The project has not investigated closing additional roads. It is unlikely to be possible to close Hanway Street as this provides access for businesses to load. If the project were approved, further assessment of other road closures could be considered at a later date.

### **Comments on increasing traffic on other streets**

- Concerned about the increase in traffic on Woburn Place and Southampton Row (Bloomsbury Association).

### **Officers' response**

18.28 In relation to increasing traffic flows on Southampton Row and Woburn Place, the traffic modelling predicts an increase of 16% (123 vehicles an hour in the morning peak) and 11% (73 vehicles an hour in the morning peak) respectively. These predicted increases are not considered to be significant

## **Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion**

but traffic flows would be monitored before and after implementation and any adverse effects identified would be mitigated, if possible and appropriate.

### **Comments on Environmental Impact Assessment**

- Would like to know if an EIA Screening Opinion has been requested or whether a particular opinion has been adopted and do not feel the impact on the environment and heritage in the area have been taken into account (Bloomsbury Association).

### **Officers' response**

18.29 The proposals have not been subjected to an EIA Screening Opinion. Legal advice is that the project does not require an EIA as the anticipated overall effect of the changes would be to decrease traffic and other impacts in the scheme area as a whole given that the West End Project is a unified project that can be looked at holistically.

.18.30 A Strategic Environmental Assessment was completed as part of the Camden Transport Strategy, which includes the West End Project. Air quality monitoring would be carried out before and after the implementation of the project if it were to proceed, in terms of measuring nitrogen oxides on affected streets. An air quality model has also been commissioned to predict the effects of the changes in traffic levels on air quality. Further consideration of environmental and heritage impacts assessments would be undertaken if the project were approved, as part of detailed design.

### **Comments on the consultation process**

- The public consultation has been inadequate on a number of counts including not taking into account urban design and environmental effects and how they can be managed, a lack of reference to the quality of the carriageway surface, manhole and water main covers in any of the consultation documents, And a lack of awareness by the that the area includes a major part of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area (Bloomsbury Association).
- Concerned that the Council has not been working sufficiently closely with local amenity groups in developing the project (Covent Garden Community Association).
- Concerned that some residents, particularly those without access to the internet, have not been well informed about these plans. Would have liked more time to consult residents (Ridgmount Gardens RA).

### **Officers' response**

18.31 In relation to comments on the consultation process, the proposals include significant improvements to the public realm which would improve the setting



## Appendix A: Headline consultation results and discussion

of a number of key heritage assets. The consultation was intended to provide an overview of the proposals and did not include details of carriageway surfaces or service covers.

18.32 The proposals were developed over a number of years and included involvement with Area Action Groups and meetings with local groups.

18.33 The consultation documents were sent by post to all residents in the area and the consultation was widely publicised including with bus stop adverts, lamp column posters and reminder letters to residents. The consultation deadline was also extended to allow local groups more time to consult their members.

### Q19: Mode of transport

19.1 The mode of transport table below includes people that have mentioned more than one mode of transport. A total of 512 people did not complete this question, and one person included their own category of 'Motorcycle'.

<b>Table 19: Mode of transport</b>	
Mode	If you are responding as an <b>individual</b> , please tell us how you usually travel for the majority of your journey?
Bus	232 (19%)
Bicycle	230 (19%)
Car	75 (6%)
Taxi / private hire passenger	54 (4%)
Taxi / private hire driver	100 (8%)
Walk	282 (23%)
London Underground	239 (19%)
National Rail	26 (2%)
Other: motorcycle	1 (0%)
Total	1239

## SECTION C: CONCLUSION

1.1 The recommendations relating to each question are set out in the relevant sections above, and also in the main report.