

Pluck, Geoffrey

From: Betteridge, Philip [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2012 09:50
To: Pluck, Geoffrey
Subject: Cheapside Stage 4A – Gresham Street Evaluation

Dear Mr Pluck,

Following your e-mail correspondence with Ben Custance about the Gresham Street Traffic Evaluation (your e-mail of 19 July 2012 16:17), we have debated the matter internally and can confirm that we would like to raise an objection to any proposals making Gresham Street open to two-way traffic on a permanent basis. We understand that formal consultation has closed, but that you would be prepared to consider a late objection

Although we acknowledge that 2-way traffic improves accessibility, we believe that it is at the expense of pedestrian convenience and safety following formal internal staff representation and discussion. Most of our staff who work in 31 Gresham Street and nearby satellite offices have to cross Gresham St more than once a day. This has become a much more difficult and hazardous experience during busy traffic periods since the road was re-opened to 2-way traffic. The welfare and safety of our staff is our primary concern and we therefore we support the option that reinstates the one-way system.

Thank you for your consideration in discussing this matter now that formal consultation is closed. We would be happy to discuss the matter further if required.

Regards

Philip Betteridge

Philip Betteridge
Head of Corporate Services
Schroder Investment Management Limited

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Visit Schroders Talking Point for market news and expert views

<http://www.schroders.com/talkingpoint>

This message might contain confidential information. If it has been sent to you in error please do not forward it or copy it or act upon its contents, but report it to postmaster@schroders.com

Schroders has the right lawfully to record, monitor and inspect messages between its employees and

Pluck, Geoffrey

From: R Smyth [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 January 2012 23:23
To: Pluck, Geoffrey
Subject: Gresham St

Dear Mr Pluck

I am writing to object to the proposed experimental traffic order ('ETO') enabling motor vehicles to enter the western end of Gresham Street but to support the proposal to increase permeability for pedal cycles.

The latter, although far from perfect as the crossing of a wide one-way road would be difficult, is a step towards a larger scheme to remove the gyratory. There is no point doing anything more than a light-touch design involving minimal signing in this context. The former, however, would degrade conditions for the increased number of people on foot or on cycle in Gresham Street.

This is a narrow street with a historic setting that already has too much motor traffic during the day and does not function well. The City should be fostering a better balance, supporting the cafes offering street seating and improving the public realm by reducing air and noise pollution from through motor traffic. It has been noticeably worse during the temporary removal of the restriction-there is no point continuing this experiment.

Continuing this removal through a new ETO would go against the principles and policies of the recently approved City Local Implementation Plan, specifically discouraging through motor traffic using minor roads and creating high quality cycle routes. These policies were included following unprecedented calls by the public and business during public consultation.

It is acknowledged there have been calls by a few individuals for greater access to Gresham St. If the City does decide to heed these, then it should at most make the turn into Gresham St no motor vehicles 7am-7pm Mon-Fri, reducing rat-running when they most people are there on foot and on cycle but allowing access for evening events. This could be enforced easily by camera.

CRISP studies carried out for cycle route development highlighted the need for reduction in motor traffic - if anything is to be trialled here it should be new restrictions, such as making King Street one-way except for cycles.

By way of background I worked for 10 years in the City and have now relocated to the South Bank, cycling daily to work via Gresham Street.

Regards

Ralph Smyth
(responding as an individual)
[REDACTED]

24 January 2012

Re Gresham Street two-way cycle link

Dear Geoffrey

Many thanks for giving us the chance to comment on the proposed experimental cycle link into Gresham Street.

Please find our comments below. Also, a copy of the blog post that I wrote on the Cyclists in the City website and copies of the 11 comments that people have made about the scheme through the site.

- We welcome the fact that the City will enable this route to be opened to cyclists by opening up the link into Gresham Street.
- We are concerned that the route should be clearly signposted so that cyclists can both find their way on to and off the shared space and so that pedestrians are aware cyclists are allowed there. We also note that coaches sometimes park in or very near the space where you propose the drop kerb on Angel Street.
- Overall, we're not fans of shared space. We don't think it's good for cyclists or pedestrians. We would prefer a longer-term solution that gives cyclists proper, clearly identified space.
- We would hope that the longer term solution would also include much better and safer provision for cyclists as they leave King Edward Street and enter Angel Street which involves crossing two lanes of traffic, often with impatient bus or taxi drivers on their tails.
- We would also like to see a longer term link so that cyclists heading west along Gresham Street can turn north towards Little Britain and up towards Smithfield rather than having to turn south and loop across four lanes of motor vehicle traffic and then around the gyratory.
- We would like to register concerns that the City proposes to turn Gresham Street into a two-way rat-run in contravention of the City's Local Implementation Plan. Gresham Street is a local access road. The opening of Gresham Street to two-way working will turn it into a rat-run, making it less pleasant and potentially much less desirable as a route for cyclists. We note the Local Implementation Plan states a commitment to: "The continued creation of more pedestrian and cyclist shared routes and more pedestrian zones that permit access for cyclists, i.e., the selective exclusion of motor vehicles from some local access streets, at all times or only at some times of day." We question why motor vehicles are being given more rather than less access to this local access street and suggest the City should consider measures to reduce the impact of the increase in motor vehicle traffic on this local access road. We would ask you to consider, for example, imposing motor traffic restrictions

eastbound into Gresham Street during the day when it is most busy with pedestrians.

Best regards

Danny Williams