

## Appendix B: Comments from individuals on St Giles area proposals (question 2)

| Topic              | Comment   | No. | Officer response   |
|--------------------|---|-----|--|
| <b>General</b>     | Do not make changes   | 13  | With the arrival of Crossrail the station at TCR 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.  |
|                    | Waste of money  | 8   | There is a clear case for making changes to the area. There is evidence of issues that need to be addressed including road safety, traffic congestion and a poor environment for walking and cycling. The proposals would provide good value for money and have a strong business case based on reduced travel times and providing a better environment for walking and cycling. equipment |
|                    | Proposals will increase pollution   | 4   | 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.   |
| <b>Pedestrians</b> | Support as improvement for pedestrians  | 15  | Comment noted  |
|                    | Prioritise pedestrians over other traffic including on Denmark Street / widen pavements                                   | 8   | The proposals provide a new pedestrian plaza and wider pavements on Denmark Street.  |
|                    | Support St Giles improvements but want clearer link between Central St Giles piazza and Centre point and to Covent Garden | 3   | The proposals would provide a safe and attractive link from St Giles Circus through the plaza and along wider pavements on St Giles High Street. The proposals for Princes Circus provide a new public space with safe and direct pedestrian crossings linking to Seven Dials.   |
|                    | Better for road safety for pedestrians including in Denmark Street  | 3   | Comment noted.   |

## Appendix B: Comments from individuals on St Giles area proposals (question 2)

|                    |  |    |   |
|--------------------|--|----|---|
|                    | Keep crossing on Denmark Street as a pedestrian route from St Giles High Street to Covent Garden | 1  | The proposals for St Giles would significantly reduce traffic on Denmark Street as the main traffic route would be via Earnshaw Street. A crossing on Denmark Street is therefore not expected to be necessary, but 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.             |
| <b>Cycling</b>     | Additional cycle parking on Denmark Street   | 4  | The proposals include a significant amount of additional cycle parking on Denmark Street and around the new plaza.  |
|                    | Segregated cycle lanes on Charing Cross Road and New Oxford street with bus stop islands         | 3  | The proposals would convert the northern section of Charing Cross Road to bus and cycle only in both directions. To provide segregated cycle lanes in New Oxford Street would require the removal of one of the two eastbound traffic lanes. This option was assessed prior to public consultation but would lead to unacceptable traffic queues and delays to general traffic and buses. |
| <b>Road safety</b> | St Giles Circus junction must be safe for pedestrians and cyclists                               | 3  | The proposals would provide safe and direct crossings for pedestrians and significantly less traffic. Both TCR and Charing Cross Road (between Cambridge Circus and St Giles Circus except for access out of side roads) would be bus and cycle only making these streets safer and more attractive for cycling.  |
| <b>Bus</b>         | Buses / bus stands will cause congestion and pollution on Earnshaw Street / Great Russell Street | 15 | 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 B: Comments from individuals on St Giles area proposals (question 2)

|                     |   |    |  |
|---------------------|---|----|--|
|                     | Do not support routing 176 through Great Russell Street as it is too narrow               | 5  | To provide the new public space at St Giles Circus, the existing bus stands on St Giles High Street (northern section) would need to be relocated. There is not enough space to relocate all of the bus stands to Earnshaw Street and St Giles High Street (southern section) and therefore two bus stands are proposed on Great Russell Street which is the nearest appropriate location. |
|                     | Remove buses / number of buses / bus stands/ from the area / from Denmark Street          | 4  | Transport for London is responsible for bus services including routes and frequency and there are no proposals to reduce bus numbers or change routes. Bus stands are required at the start and end of routes and at the current time, there is a requirement for bus stands in the area. Bus services would not operate along Denmark Street if the proposals were to go ahead.           |
|                     | Bus stand should not be located outside St Giles Church as this is a fine listed building | 4  | As a result of comments received in the consultation, the proposed bus stand outside St Giles in the Fields Church would be reduced in size from the length of two buses to the length of one bus. Unfortunately there are no alternative locations that can be proposed.  |
|                     | Great Russell Street too narrow for buses   | 1  | Our assessments have shown that Great Russell Street would be wide enough to allow bus routes to access the proposed bus stands.   |
| <b>Traffic flow</b> | Proposals will increase congestion  | 21 | 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 it is likely that there would be less congestion and better air quality.  |
|                     | Support reducing cars through the area  | 3  | Comment noted.   |
|                     | Will relieve congestion   | 3  | Comment noted  |
|                     | Restrict traffic more in the area   | 4  | More radical proposals to remove or restrict traffic from other streets would have an adverse impact on traffic congestion.  |

## Appendix B: Comments from individuals on St Giles area proposals (question 2)

|   |  |    |  |
|---|--|----|--|
| <b>Impact on residents and businesses</b> | Good for businesses on Denmark Street and its history including ensure character is retained                 | 5  | Comment noted.   |
|   | Parking and loading proposals will harm businesses   | 5  | The proposals provide adequate space for businesses to load on Denmark Street. Some parking bays are proposed to be removed from Denmark Street but there is no evidence to suggest that this would adversely impact businesses as the majority of their customers would use public transport, walk or cycle.                  |
| <b>Public space</b>                       | Space needs improvement and to be made a space / community   | 8  | Comment noted.   |
|   | More trees / more green space  | 3  | Comment noted.   |
|   | Install water feature on St Giles plaza – consider putting back in 60s style fountains                       | 3  | The previous water fountains were removed as part of the planning approval for the new TCR station.  |
| <b>Parking</b>                            | Do not reduce parking space in Denmark Street and surrounding area   | 6  | Some parking would need to be removed from Denmark Street to provide more space for loading on the street.   |
|   | Support Denmark Street proposals but remove more or all parking in the area / all parking except loading bay | 15 | The proposed parking on Denmark Street aims to balance the needs of different users including residents, businesses, disabled drivers and cyclists; The allocation of space is based on extensive parking and loading surveys.   |
| <b>Accessibility</b>                      | Need enough disabled parking spaces / maintain access for disabled people                                    | 3  | Unfortunately signage and enforcement of a blue badge holder exemption would be too complex.   |
| <b>Air quality</b>                        | Proposals will increase pollution  | 4  | 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 it is likely that there would be less congestion and better air quality. |