

## Appendix 5

Statutory Objections and Response to Experimental traffic Order (Order 1) (the main restriction)

<b>Date:</b> 13 September 2017	<b>Name:</b> ID2	<b>Address:</b> by email
<b>Comments:</b> I am writing this about the City of London's embarrassing management of the roads in the square mile. Close Bank Junction to all but buses and bikes, claiming it's about "safety" is laughable. Then close Bishopsgate?! This has caused gridlock in the surrounding areas, and as a knock on effect I dread to think what the toxin levels we are all breathing are at the moment.  I appreciate works have to be done but do you not see the misery you are causing to the general public? Do your city planners not realise what they are doing to the city? It's making London unworkable! It's embarrassing.		

### RESPONSE TO OBJECTION POINTS:

There is careful consideration of the planned network restrictions within the City with close coordination with Transport for London to accommodate traffic signal timing changes to optimise traffic flows on alternative routes. Closures will cause delays, but these are not necessarily going to be lessened by re-opening Bank due to the way the traffic signal phasing, away from Bank, operates. This is taken into consideration when reviewing planned closures, and was reviewed as part of the plans for the Bisphosphate closure.

The experiment at Bank is proving, so far, to have reduced casualties at this location (compared to the previous five- year average) and had a positive effect in the surrounding area in terms of casualty reduction. The monitoring work on NO<sub>2</sub> has to date not shown a specific detrimental impact and is under continuous review.

<b>Date:</b> 16 August 2017	<b>Name:</b> ID4	<b>Address:</b> by email
<b>Comments:</b> Experimental is it – so you can see what a good way of getting money from unsuspecting road users it is. Close a major thoroughfare that has been used for years by road users, then fine them – this is unacceptable. When you get the penalty notice, you then give information on the changes. A bit late, don't you think. A warning should be issued for this, not a fine – to make road users aware of the changes. Clearly nothing to do with safety – only extorting money from the public.		

**RESPONSE TO OBJECTION POINTS:**

There was a lot of publicity around the changes prior to the implementation both on social media and traditional newsprint. A lot of work with the local businesses was also undertaken. This is testament that in the first week of operation the compliance rate was in the region of 76%. It has since increased to 97%. Warning letters were issued for the first couple of weeks to all drivers but there was a need to start increasing the compliance levels as soon as possible. There was also continued publicity about the scheme, but it is accepted that this would not reach all drivers.

This experiment has always been about improving safety at Bank, which the data to date supports is being achieved, not only at Bank but also in the wider monitoring area.

<b>Date:</b> 24 November 2017	<b>Name:</b> ID20	<b>Address:</b> By email
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>The experimental scheme to date has negatively impacted the operation of and guest experience at the Ned. The key challenges that the hotel has experienced over the last six months are as follows:</p> <p>Taxi Drop-Off/Pick-Up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Taxis refuse to stop close to the hotel for fear of receiving a ticket</li> <li>•Taxis at Kings Cross refuse to drop off at the Ned</li> <li>•Guests have to walk from Grocers' Hall Court or Gresham Street/Moorgate – they often complain about this and more so when it rains or when they have a large amount of luggage</li> <li>•Guests/Doormen cannot readily hail taxis and guests have missed appointments and demanded compensation from the hotel</li> <li>•Guests are directed to Princes Street entrance to find no cabs using the taxi rank</li> </ul> <p>The complaints received to date describe the situation as “a nightmare”, “an absolute joke”, “ridiculous” and “impossible”. This is not the feedback a 5-star hotel welcomes, especially in its first few months when it is crucial to make the right impression.</p> <p>Servicing and Logistics</p> <p>The Ned has also received complaints from private drivers and delivery and servicing vehicle operators who have been compromised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Items are not delivered or are delayed due to the restrictions</li> <li>• Vehicles are moved on by traffic wardens without being given an alternative route</li> <li>• Delivery and servicing vehicles receive fines</li> <li>• Requests for the Ned to guarantee that any fines received are paid for by the hotel</li> </ul> <p>Surrounding Areas</p> <p>Visitors and staff have experienced increased traffic and noise pollution on surrounding streets including, but not limited to, standstill traffic back down to London Bridge and along Cannon Street, heavy traffic along Old Jewry, Gresham Street and Lothbury as vehicles divert around the closure and also observed</p>		

numerous delivery and servicing vehicles parked along both Old Jewry and Gresham Street further restricting movements along these adjacent routes.

#### Additional Surveys

The Ned commissioned its own surveys along adjacent roads to the hotel, on Poultry and Prince's Street. The week-long surveys were undertaken between Wednesday 15th November and Tuesday 21st November. In addition, the hotel has captured further visual data from its own CCTV cameras that look onto Poultry and Princes Street.

The restrictions at Bank encourage vehicles to make a U-turn on approaching the junction. The U-turn is known to be a dangerous manoeuvre and the consequences of accidents caused by U-turns are often serious and sometimes fatal. [table of u-turns on Poultry and Princes Street from 15-21 Nov submitted]

We are concerned that the closures have resulted in a new hazard, which, over the passage of time, will result in a serious or fatal accident.

#### Accidents

A review of accident data over the last 5 years (2012-2016) for Bank Junction indicates that taxis have not been the cause of accidents. It would be deemed safer to allow taxis back onto the junction rather than continue to encourage U-turns, and this would support the Primary Objective of the experimental scheme.

It is somewhat surprising that taxis are excluded thus creating the new U-turn hazard described above. This, coupled with apparent freedom of buses and cyclists to travel faster through the junction, the latter often ignoring traffic signals, exacerbates this risk further.

#### Further Studies

We would like the CoLC to permit taxis through the junction as part of the experimental scheme. This would also allow the City to understand how this would impact the junction.

We are looking into our own options for the long-term scheme to be implemented at Bank Junction and trust that these may be considered with the other options that the City were considering prior to the Bank On Safety project understandably taking precedent.

We appreciate the time and attention that both members and officers have given us in recent months and the Ned wants to continue to support and engage in order to find a good solution for this junction that is safe, meets the growing demands of the City and the increase in people traversing this busy intersection in the future.

#### **RESPONSE TO OBJECTION POINTS:**

The Ned hotel opened its doors to customers in May 2017 shortly before the experiment at Bank became operational. There was no provision for taxi pick up and drop off on the northside of Poultry prior to the experiment or for on street servicing at either entrance. The experiment has not changed this. Direction of travel to the hotel service area has been decreased, but access is still possible for servicing to

take place from the west. Deliveries Can still take place during the operational hours of the scheme.

Taxis refusing to take customers to legitimate drop off destinations is a matter to be taken up with Transport for London's taxi and private hire licensing team. To confirm that taxis are able to pick up and drop off at the Princess Street hotel door by undertaking a u-turn ahead of the enforcement area and there is a rank for three cabs available, but which the City has no control over whether the rank is fully utilised.

The traffic on London Bridge is predominantly due to the lane restriction by Arthur Street. We agree that Increased traffic in Gresham Street and Old Jewry has been observed, as has loading activity which is monitored and enforced if not compliant.

Taxis or other vehicles u-turning to pick up and drop off at the hotel or other property within the restriction has been audited and it is felt that with the reduced volume of opposing flow of vehicles, the compromise of designing this manoeuvre in to the design to maintain access to the properties is acceptable. U-turns took place prior to the experiment and continue to take place after the scheme operating hours. There has been no recorded casualty, to date, during scheme operating hours due to a u-turning vehicle. Therefore, there is currently no evidence to support that it would be safer to allow taxis to cross the junction.

<b>Date:</b> 18 July 2017	<b>Name:</b> ID21	<b>Address:</b> By email
<b>Comments:</b> One of our engineers has recently fallen foul of the experimental traffic changes around Bank. Disappointingly there does not seem to be adequate warning signs advising the unsuspecting van driver of these changes.  We provide property maintenance services for premises in this and the surrounding areas and we would be obliged if you could advise as to what provision has been made to allow for the servicing of the premises in the restricted zones, especially in the case of an emergency such as a serious drain blockage, power outages, gas and water leaks, security issues etc.  This experiment comes under the name of Bank On Safety, it is anything but, if you have a business in the retail or leisure sector. In fact it is the complete opposite as people working in the area will be at risk, as safety repairs will not be able to be carried out between 07.00 and 19.00, so if an issue is discovered at 08.00 the business may have to close until the necessary work is carried out which will probably involve closing for a full day with all that entails for staff who are on hourly or zero hours contracts and a massive loss of revenue for business. What is more is that all work will have to be carried out of normal hours placing a not insignificant burden as far as cost go on all the affected businesses.  Whenever there is a proposal to ease traffic issues in the City, the first thing the powers that be think of is cyclists, the very last, if it is given any thought at all, is the		

simple practicality that buildings need servicing and maintaining. There may come a time when the smaller independent bars and shops throw the towel in and say 'no more', and move on.

It would appear that, having spoken to our clients in the areas concerned, that none of them were aware of this 'experiment', that how well this has been publicised. Still as Arthur Daley would say 'it's a nice little earner', for the City of London, the opposite for everyone else.

**RESPONSE TO OBJECTION POINTS:**

It is possible to drive to, or close by, to all premises within the restricted area, with all approach arms remaining available to traffic to the enforcement point. Past the enforcement points, there was no loading or waiting permitted, so vehicles could not stop to wait or load prior to the experiment. The design of the experiment did encompass the local buildings servicing needs, and whilst direction of travel to those buildings may be impacted, there is still the ability to access service bays and loading areas except for one building (with whom we have an agreement with), during the operational hours of the scheme.

There was a lot of publicity around the changes prior to the implementation both on social media and traditional newsprint. A lot of work with the local businesses was also undertaken. This is testament that in the first week of operation the compliance rate was in the region of 76%. It has since increased to 97%.

This experiment has always been about improving safety at Bank, which the data to date supports is being achieved, not only at Bank but also in the wider monitoring area.