

Appendix B: Pre-consultation Stakeholder Feedback

SECTION A: PRE-CONSULTATION: BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

On 23rd November 2015, the Council implemented an experimental traffic scheme, which changed the route that motor traffic used along the corridor of streets that includes Torrington Place, Byng Place, Gordon Square, Tavistock Square and Tavistock Place (Torrington Tavistock corridor). Associated improvements were made for pedestrians and cyclists by making the corridor mainly eastbound only for motor vehicles and introducing a partially segregated (protected) cycle lane on the southern section of the corridor. The existing segregated cycle lane on the north side of the corridor was retained and some changes made to parking and loading/unloading restrictions. The trial was introduced using an experimental traffic order (ETO).

The Council's website provided detailed information on the trial which included a 'Frequently Asked Questions' page. Further to this, a printed information leaflet was distributed along the corridor, inviting stakeholders to provide feedback on the trial layout by emailing a dedicated Torrington/Tavistock email address¹. Over 1,400 respondents provided feedback during the period between the trial being implemented and the public consultation being launched (23rd November 2015 until 11th September 2016). The project email account, together with enquiries logged via Camden's Website² and by contact with Ward Councillors, enabled officers to monitor feedback on the trial, including support and opposition, and address concerns where possible and respond to enquiries. This feedback, together with the Council's own observations and data collection, enabled the Council to modify some of the features introduced to address concerns that arose during the trial, and informed the proposals set out in the public consultation in September/October 2016. Modifications to the trial are discussed in Section E of this report.

Feedback received during the trial included responses from residents, employees at local businesses, hospitals, university staff and students, taxi drivers, businesses and charities, stakeholder groups such as Living Streets and Camden Cyclists, as well as cyclists, pedestrians and motorists passing through the area.

1 torringtontavistocktrial@camden.gov.uk

2 <https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/council-and-democracy/having-your-say/complaints-and-enquiries/>

SECTION B: PRE-CONSULTATION: RESPONDENT SUMMARY

From commencement of the trial on the 23rd of November 2015 up to the start of the public consultation process which began on the 12th of September 2016, a total of 1,424 respondents sent comments to the dedicated Torrington Tavistock email address, via Camden's Website or by means of contact with Ward Councillors. In some cases, multiple items of correspondence were received from the same respondent, however when this occurred all comments were considered and were combined to create one cohesive response from each respondent.

The comments from each respondent have been analysed in such a way as to differentiate between those who support the changes made to the street during the trial, those who did not support the trial and those who did not express a clear opinion. This was undertaken to facilitate comparison with feedback received during the public consultation, where respondents were asked simple yes, no and no opinion questions in relation to their support for the trial street layout.

Each respondent was labelled *Yes/No/No Opinion*; (see Section C below).

Abusive Responses: A total of 29 emails from 19 respondents received during the trial were considered abusive and their content was not analysed as part of this report. None of the respondents made any positive/supportive comments about the trial. However some raised concern over longer journey times, negative impacts on air quality, missed hospital appointments, underutilised cycle lanes, financial impacts for disabled taxi passengers and adverse effects on local business. Officer responses to the concerns raised are included in 'Section C of Appendix C: Headline Consultation Results and Discussion'.

Additional Responses: In addition to the responses logged via the Torrington Tavistock dedicated email address, letters that were received by post were scanned and stored with the emails received to facilitate analysis. The comments received in this capacity have been considered in addition to the comments summarised in Section's B and C (and are detailed in more depth in Section D) of this report.

Information on respondents: In terms of type of respondent, the composition is as shown in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 Respondents' connection to the Torrington Place/Tavistock Place corridor		
Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Organisation ³	54	3.8%
Individual (total): ⁴	1370	96.2%
Resident	152	10.7%
Employee at Local Business ⁵	94	6.6%
University Staff and Student	178	12.5%
Taxi Driver	196	13.8%
Other	750	52.7%
Total	1424	100%

Explanatory notes on categories

Organisation: Respondents classified as an Organisation, Business or Charity.

Individual (total): All respondents not classified as an organisation. These included residents, employees at local businesses, university staff and students, taxi drivers and all other individuals beyond those categories.

Resident: Respondents who either stated they were a Camden resident or who included a Camden residential address within their correspondence.

Employee at Local Business: Respondents who either stated they were a local employee or who included a postcode within the Bloomsbury or King's Cross wards. This category also includes employees of the hospitals located within the scheme area.

University Staff and Students: Respondents who either stated they worked or studied at one of the universities located within the scheme area or respondents who emailed from a university email address from University College London, University of London, SOAS, Birkbeck (part of UoL) and RADA.

Taxi Driver: Respondents who identified themselves as taxi drivers within their correspondence.

Other: All other respondents who did not identify themselves within the categories above. They could be non-Camden residents, individuals 'passing through', hospital patients and friends or relatives of people affected by the scheme. However, this should not be assumed as they could also fit into the categories above.

³ Includes businesses, charities, hospitals, educational institutions and not-for-profit organisations.

⁴ Abusive emails and voicemails removed from total

⁵ Individuals that identified as 'local employees' and/or included a work address within the local area.

SECTION C: PRE-CONSULTATION RESULTS: SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

Response	Number of responses	Percentage
Yes	782	55%
No	553	39%
No Opinion	89	6%
Total	1424	100%

The responses received show an overall support of the trial from both Organisations and Individuals with a majority of 55% in favour of the scheme.

Category	Yes		No		No Opinion	
Organisation	45	83%	4	7%	5	9%
Individual (total)	737	54%	549	40%	84	6%
Resident	78	51%	62	41%	12	8%
Employee at Local Business	84	88%	8	9%	3	3%
University Staff and Students	167	94%	9	5%	2	1%
Taxi (Driver)	0	0%	187	95%	9	5%
Other	408	54%	283	38%	58	8%
Total	782	55%	553	39%	89	6%

Organisations (total 54): As outlined above, 83% (45 respondents) of organisations expressed support for the trial, 7% (4 respondents) opposed the trial and 9% (5 respondents) expressed no clear opinion at the pre-consultation stage.

A list of the organisations, businesses and charities that provided feedback during the trial period between the 23rd of November 2015 and the 11th of September 2016 can be found in Section G at the end of this report.

Residents (total 152): Of the 152 respondents who were residents, 51% (78 respondents) supported retaining the current street layout, 41% (62 respondents) did not support the trial arrangements, and 8% (12 respondents) expressed no clear opinion.

Employees at local businesses (total 95): Comments received from employees at local businesses showed clear support for the trial layout. Of the 94 respondents to comment in this category, 88% (84 respondents) expressed support for retaining the trial layout permanently, 9% (8 respondents) did not support the trial layout and 3% (3 respondents) expressed no clear opinion.

University staff and students (total 178): University staff and students were strongly in favour of the trial arrangements. 94% of this category (167 respondents) expressed support. 5% (9 respondents) were opposed to the trial arrangements and 1% (2 respondents) expressed no clear opinion.

Taxi drivers (total 196): The responses from Taxi drivers during the pre-consultation trial period were predominantly opposed to the trial layout. No supportive comments were received, 95% (187 respondents) were against the trial layout and 5% (9 respondents) expressed no clear opinion.

Others (total 749): Of the remaining respondents that did not identify with any of the categories above (749 respondents), 54% (408 respondents) supported the trial, 38% (283 respondents) were opposed and 8% (58 respondents) expressed no clear support or opposition to the scheme, or gave opinions on aspects of the scheme, or associated issues, that were general in nature and did not fit neatly into the positive or negative categories.

SECTION D: PRE-CONSULTATION RESULTS: COMMENTS ANALYSIS

For consistency, feedback received in the pre-consultation phase (from launch of the trial on 23rd November 2015 until 11 September, 2016) has been categorised using the same themes used to analyse comments received in the public consultation (12 September 2016 – 21 October 2016). Comments within each of the emails have been identified as either 'positive', 'negative' or as 'further comments' which were made that didn't fit readily into the positive or negative categories. Some emails included both positive and negative comments, despite the respondents' overall opinion of the scheme, and thus the sum of positive, negative, or as 'further comments' which were made that didn't fit readily into the positive or negative categories being greater than the number of respondents.

Positive/supportive comments on the trial layout were organised into the following categories:

- Safer, more pleasant cycling and walking;
- General improved environment;
- Improved air quality;
- Reduced traffic;
- Encourages more cycling/walking/shift to sustainable modes;
- Advantages for older people/disabled/families;
- Reduced noise; and
- Other supportive comments.

Negative comments were categorised as follows:

- Concerns about displaced traffic/congestion/longer routes/traffic flow;
- Air quality concerns;
- Concerns about delay to emergency services;
- Concerns about servicing, loading & unloading, taxi/mini-cab drop off & pick up;
- Concerns about safety;
- Underutilised cycle lanes;
- Disadvantage to older people/disabled/families; and
- Other negative comments.

Further comments were made which didn't fit readily into the positive or negative categories and to facilitate analysis, the reporting of these has been classified as follows:

- Enquiry: General (including those not directly related to the Torrington Tavistock proposals, such as calls for cyclist or driver education, enforcement of traffic regulations etc).
- Suggested improvements to the scheme (see the bullet points on pages 10 and 11 of this report);

Of the total 2,657 comments made, 50% (1,338 comments) were positive, 43% (1,134 comments) were negative and 7% (185 comments) included 'further comments' as described above.

Table 3.1 below gives details of the breakdown of how the views of respondent groups differed, outlining the positive and negative comments together with others that have been identified as 'further comments'.

Table 3.1 Comments Analysis Breakdown						
Comment	Individual		Organisation		Total	
	No. of comments	% of Respondents (Total)	No. of comments	% of Respondents (Total)	No. of comments	% of Respondents (Total)
Safer, more pleasant cycling and walking	517	36%	44	3%	561	39%
General improved environment	201	14%	37	3%	238	17%
Improved air quality	75	5%	9	1%	84	6%
Reduced traffic	72	5%	4	0.3%	76	5%
Encourage more cycling/walking/shift to sustainable modes	48	3%	5	0.4%	53	4%
Advantages for older people/disabled/families	31	2%	1	0%	32	2%
Reduced noise	12	1%	4	0.3%	16	1%
Other supportive comments	245	17%	33	2%	278	20%
Concerns about displaced traffic/congestion/longer routes flow	459	32%	5	0.4%	464	33%
Air quality concerns	195	14%	2	0.1%	197	14%
Concern about delay to emergency services	94	7%	2	0.1%	96	7%
Concerns about servicing and loading/taxi/mini-cab drop off	70	5%	4	0.3%	74	5%
Concerns about safety	46	3%	2	0.1%	48	3%
Empty/underutilized cycle lanes	40	3%	1	0.1%	41	3%
Disadvantage to older people/disabled/families	29	2%	0	0%	29	2%
Other negative comments	182	13%	3	0.2%	185	13%
Enquiry: General	89	6%	6	0.4%	95	7%
Suggested improvements	88	6%	2	0.1%	90	6%
Total number of respondents	1370	96%	54	4%	1424	100%

The most frequently occurring theme, expressed in comments by 39% of all respondents (561 comments), was that the trial facilitated safer, more pleasant cycling and/or walking.

The second most common theme, expressed in comments made by 33% of all respondents (464 comments), was concern about displaced motor traffic, increased congestion and/or longer routes for motor traffic.

A total of 278 'other' supportive comments were made (20% of the total 1,424 respondents). This category encompassed all other positive comments that did not align with the categories in Table 3.1.

Frequently occurring comments categorised as 'other' positive feedback include:

- Health benefits of cycling and walking to individuals and society;
- Trial encourages increase in physical activity;
- More direct route for cyclists;
- Safer for drivers of motorised vehicles;
- Encourages underrepresented groups to cycle (especially women);
- Economic benefits to local shops, cafes and other employers;
- Extra space for cyclists and the logical separation of the two cycle lanes is welcomed;
- Walking and cycling (which are encouraged by the scheme) are cost effective modes of transport;
- The new scheme improves on the previous road layout which was overcrowded, dangerous and confusing;
- Cyclists, as a result of the new and improved layout, are now altering their existing routes to incorporate Torrington/Tavistock, rather than more trafficked alternatives such as Euston Road;
- Concern that the Torrington/Tavistock scheme is a trial and that it could revert to its previous layout;
- Suggestions to extend the scheme to include more roads (including in the neighbouring Boroughs of Islington and the City of Westminster); and
- Suggestions to add trees/greenery to the route.

A total of 197 negative comments raised concerns about air quality (14% of the total 1,424 respondents).

A total of 185 'other negative comments' were received (13% of the total 1,424 respondents). This category encompassed all other negative comments that did not align with the categories identified in Table 3.1.

Frequently occurring comments categorised as 'other negative feedback' included:

- Concerns that the trial would cause patients to miss appointments at local hospitals;
- Concerns that the trial was causing taxi/minicab passengers to miss trains from Euston, Kings Cross and St Pancras International stations;

- Concerns over increased noise on certain streets in the vicinity of the corridor (these concerns and examples of streets affected are discussed in detail in Appendix C: Headline Consultation Results and Discussion);
- Concerns that the scheme could have an impact on local businesses due to the loss of the westbound traffic lane for motor vehicles;
- Concerns about cyclists' behaviour;
- Concerns that the scheme is unfairly biased towards cyclists;
- Concerns that the trial street layout was dangerous and difficult for pedestrians to cross the road;
- Concerns that the trial could negatively affect services which require a motor vehicle (such as plumbers, builders, deliveries and taxi drivers); and
- Longer wait for passing taxis (due to removal of the westbound traffic lane)

Refer to 'Section C' in 'Appendix C: Headline Consultation Results and Discussion' for officer comments on all other negative points outlined in the 'other negative feedback' list above together with comments in Table 3.1.

A further 185 comments were made (7% of the total 1,424 respondents), which did not fit neatly into the positive or negative categories. 95 comments (7% of the total 1,424 respondents) made general enquiries and 90 comments (6% of the total 1,424 respondents) made comments suggesting improvements to the scheme.

Reoccurring themes in this category include:

- Request for more information on the scheme, or aspects of it;
- Enquiries/concerns regarding positioning of bollards/orcas⁶, including suggestions to relocate/remove;
- How the consultation process was conducted before implementation of the trial layout;
- Clarity on road signage/suggestions that additional road signage was required;
- Requests that the Council address concerns at certain junctions on the corridor (e.g. Judd Street, Woburn Place, Bedford Way and Gordon Street);
- Enquiries about enforcement of loading and parking along the corridor;
- Suggested improvements to the road surface, including filling potholes and dealing with manhole covers;
- Requests for more cycle parking along and around the corridor; and
- Concerns about lobbying by stakeholder groups who were opposed to/supportive of the trial.

⁶ Orcas: black and white rubber blocks used to separate the cycle lanes from motor traffic.

SECTION E: PRE-CONSULTATION: MODIFICATIONS TO TRIAL SCHEME

Various modifications were made to the road layout in response to comments and suggestions made by respondents as well as observations made by officers during the monitoring of the trial. The modifications included:

- Amendments to the existing segregated cycle lane on the north side of the corridor. This included removing some sections of kerb segregation and replacement with orcas, wands⁷ and traffic management posts. This helped to address turning movement conflicts at uncontrolled junctions and vehicular crossovers (i.e. improved access to and from the corridor for motor vehicles, while also improving road safety at such locations).
- Amendments to the new segregated cycle lane on the south side of the corridor. This included the removal of orcas where it was felt too many had been provided. This helped to address turning movement conflicts at uncontrolled junctions and vehicular crossovers (i.e. improved access to/from the corridor for motor vehicles, while also improving road safety).
- Removal of cast iron bollards at junctions along the corridor. This helped to reduce unnecessary street clutter while also addressing road safety issues (e.g. poorly positioned bollards being struck by vehicles).
- Signing and roadmarking improvements along the corridor to raise awareness of the cycle facilities while also addressing road safety concerns.
- Amendments to traffic signals at junctions along the route (Judd Street, Marchmont Street, Woburn Place and Bedford Way). This included modifications to signal timings and the signing on signal heads to improve road safety (e.g. by reducing turning movement conflicts between cyclists and motor vehicles). This also helped to regulate traffic flows more efficiently.
- Amendments to the road layout at certain junctions including the provision of additional traffic islands and yellow box markings to address road safety concerns (e.g. turning movement conflicts between cyclists and motor vehicles).
- Amendments to the zebra crossing at the junction with Malet Street (removal of redundant traffic island to improve streetscape and address turning movement conflicts).
- Amendments to loading and unloading facilities (e.g. in the vicinity of Planet Organic on Torrington Place). This helped to cater for the needs of local businesses and residents while being mindful of the needs of cyclists and pedestrians using the corridor.
- Provision of additional secure cycle parking facilities along the corridor where possible. This helped to address demand for such facilities in the local area.

⁷ Wands: black and white posts used to separate the cycle lanes from motor traffic.

SECTION F: PRE-CONSULTATION: CONCLUSION

1,424 respondents provided comments on the trial arrangements. The feedback received indicates overall support of the trial from both Organisations and Individuals with a majority of 55% in favour of the scheme.

A high level of support was received from organisations (83%). Further analysis of the results indicated a high level of support from university staff and students (94%), and employees at local businesses (88%).

Residents made up 11% of all respondents, and of these, 51% of residents were in favour, 41% opposed, and 7% expressed no opinion. It was not possible to provide a breakdown of this analysis in terms of proximity to the corridor as many of the respondents who identified themselves as Camden residents did not include address and/or postcode information.

Taxi drivers (14% of respondents) were strongly opposed to the trial arrangements with 95% opposed, and 5% expressing no opinion.

Comments received during the pre-consultation period (positive and negative), together with the Council's own observations and data collection, enabled the Council to modify aspects of the scheme to address concerns that arose during the trial, and informed the nature of potential future improvements which were set out in the public consultation in September/October 2016.

SECTION G: ORGANISATIONS, BUSINESSES AND CHARITIES

The following organisations, businesses and charities provided feedback during the trial period between 23 November 2015 and 11 September 2016.

Organisations, Charities and Businesses that responded during the trial	
Club Peloton	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Elfrida Rathbone Camden	LTDA
Marie Stopes International	McElhanney Consulting Services Ltd.
Nuffield Foundation	Network Rail
Askia	Parkes Cycling
AskPOB	Point Topic
Bicycle Users' Group at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	Premier PR
Big Sofa LTD	Profile Books
Birkbeck	Ralph Dubber Creative Services
Boyd & Associates	RNIB
Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust?	SESome
Central Saint Martins and University of Arts London	SOAS
Chair, Rugby & Harpur Residents Association	Springer Nature
Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals	St. Athans Hotel
Crescent Hotels	Tavistock Hotel
Diagonal View	The Flying Dutchman
eClerx Ltd	UCL
Engine	UCL Eastman Dental Institute
Farrell + Clark Architects	UCLH
Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios	Universities and Colleges Employers Association
Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association	University of London
Gilkes & Co	Unspun Ltd
Health and Safety Committee of the Institute of Historical Research, (UoL)	Usborne Publishing
Hotel Creative	West London College
KASE	Yoyo Wallet
London International Development Centre	Mavity & Co
London School of Business and Management	Price & Myers