

APPENDIX 1: Consultation outcome and response breakdown

A. Consultation details

Stakeholders and occupiers along the routes were given an opportunity to express their views on the proposals between Thursday 12 November and Sunday 6 December 2015. A total of 2482 people and organisations were contacted:

- 957 letters were hand delivered to frontagers and City occupiers
- 1405 letters were emailed to the residents of the Barbican Estate
- 44 letters were emailed to key and local stakeholders including TfL, Cycling and pedestrian groups, Access Group, Smithfield Market Superintendent, SMTA, Barbican Association, the emergency services, and many others.
- 69 letters were posted to City of London Members who are Ward Member of the affected wards or sit on the Barbican Residential Committee or the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee
- 6 letters were emailed to London Borough of Islington Councillors who are Ward Councillor of the affected wards
- 1 letter was sent to the Service Director for Planning & Development, London Borough of Islington (LBI).

The letter included a link to a 2-page section on the City of London website with the details of the proposals. This website was also promoted on the homepage of the City of London website, the intranet, on social media platforms, and featured in the weekly DBE Streetworks newsletter which is sent to over 1,100 recipients. In addition, consultation posters were sited at 7 locations along the routes to further engage with the wider public.

Following this, further discussions continued with a number of stakeholders, including the Barbican Association, the SMTA and the Smithfield Market Superintendent. This included a further meeting with the SMTA and the Superintendent in May 2016 and officers consider that all the issues and concerns raised have now been addressed. A further meeting also took place with Ward Members of Cripplegate and Aldersgate and, the Barbican Residents Association in May 2016. As a result of this, further minor additional comments have been raised which officers believe have now been addressed or will be separately considered as part of other projects and activities.

B. Consultation outcome

A total of 65 responses were received. 24 (37%) responses came from residents, 7 (11%) from key stakeholders, 3 (5%) from businesses and 3 (5%) from Members. The remainder did not state their relation to the City or the consultation.

9 (14%) of respondents stated that they are cyclists.

The key stakeholders who responded include the Barbican Estate Office (BEO), the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association (SMTA), the London Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA), the Barbican Association, CrossRail, London Cycling Campaign (LCC) and TfL (London Taxi and Private Hire).

Support for the project in principle?		
Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	29	45%
Neutral/ specific	14	22%
No	13	20%
Not specified	9	14%
total	65	100%

From the above table, it can be seen that there is a least twice the level of support for the overall cycle Quietways proposals compared to those who are against.

A further 8 (12%) of respondents stated that the proposals do not go far enough and that more is required to be undertaken to provide safer conditions for new and beginner cyclists. 11 (17%) respondents stated that they are not in favour of the alignment of the routes, whilst 6 (9%) expressed concerns about the air quality and 9 (14%) about cyclists' behaviour including cycling on pavements, not providing right of way, and ignoring red lights etc.

C. Responses to specific proposals and design considerations/alterations

Many comments received were aimed at specific proposals, including at the three locations where significant measures are proposed as described in the gateway 3/4 report. It should be noted that the number of responses on these specific proposals are very low and therefore the percentages can be significantly influenced by just a few responses. It should also be noted that alterations have now been incorporated into the design which has mitigated the majority of the concerns raised.

A summary of the main concerns across the 6 different locations are detailed as follows:

1. Proposed contraflow cycle lanes in West Smithfield and associated measures required at the junction with Farringdon Street

Response to proposals	Number	Percentage
in favour	4	31
not in favour	9	69
total	13	100
Specific comments	Number	
concerns with visibility	5	
concerns with reduced capacity	4	
concerns with safety on TLRN	4	
concerns with removing loading bays	3	

- The SMTA and CrossRail objected to the removal of the loading bays, which are also being utilised as holding areas for construction traffic for the CrossRail sites during the day. These have now either been retained or repositioned with no overall loss.
- 5 respondents are concerned about the visibility at the junction of Snow Hill and West Smithfield, where right turning vehicular traffic may not expect or see contra-flow cyclists (from the right). Minor alterations to the alignment are now proposed to improve sightlines.
- The SMTA and the LTDA objected to the removal of the second westbound lane at the junction of Snow Hill and Farringdon Street. The revised design now retains the two lanes at the junction. It has also been acknowledge that this junction may change as a result of TfL's extension to the North-South Cycle Superhighway.

2. Proposals at the junction of Smithfield Street and Hosier Lane

Response to proposals	Number	Percentage
in favour	2	22
not in favour	7	78
total	9	100
Specific comments	Number	
concerns with visibility	1	
concerns with presence of HGV's	2	
concerns with traffic speed	2	
concerns with manoeuvrability	1	

- The SMTA and the LCC both expressed concerns with cyclists in both directions having to cross Smithfield Street which is often subject to fast-moving traffic including a high number of HGV's, and suggested to maintain the existing one-way flow for all traffic in this area. The design has been amended to include a raised carriageway and changes to kerblines to reduce traffic speed and improve sightlines.

3. Proposals at the junction of Long Lane and Aldersgate Street

Response to proposals	Number	Percentage
in favour	0	0
not in favour	5	100
total	5	100
Specific comments	Number	
concerns that not enough is done	3	
concerns with cyclists' behaviour	1	
junction Cloth Street /Long Lane	3	

- There were a number of suggestions for further improvements that include low level cycle signals and segregation at this junction. Unfortunately, due to the timescales involved to deliver these measures, it is not possible to include these as part of the Quietways project without impacting on the programme as set out by the GLA for completion by 31 December 2016. However, these will be considered separately, when opportunities arise.
- There were requests to discourage vehicles from entering the advisory cycle lane. The design has been amended to include a mandatory cycle lane.

4. The proposed closure to motor vehicles on Moor Lane at the junction with Chiswell Street

Response to proposals	Number	Percentage
in favour	4	31
not in favour	9	69
total	13	100

- The experimental closure would have tested the effectiveness of the proposals but this is no longer being taken forward as it has not been possible to obtain Islington's agreement so far. The design has therefore been amended.

5. At the proposals for the junction of Moor Lane and Fore Street

Response to proposals	Number	Percentage
in favour	1	17
not in favour	5	83
total	6	100

- Concerns from the Barbican residents about conflicts between cycles and pedestrians. As a result of further engagement with the Barbican Association, some amendments to reduce this conflict are now proposed. This comprises of footway widening on the corner with Fore Street, providing route guidance paving and markings to guide cyclists and repositioning of drop kerbs to discourage cyclists/encourage them to re-join the carriageway at more

appropriate locations. Consideration of a short cycle lane on the approach to Moor Lane is still being investigated but if suitable, this will be included.

6. The proposed cycle lane removal in King Street and Queen Street

Response to proposals	Number	Percentage
in favour	0	0
not in favour	5	100
total	5	100
Specific comments	Number	
concerns with cycle lane removal	4	
safety concerns at junction with Queen Victoria Street	3	
concerns with the shared spaces	3	

- The removal of the existing cycle lanes on King Street and Queen Street was not supported. However, the London Cycle Design Guidance recommends that cycle lanes should be no narrower than 1.5m and for ASL lead-in lanes, a minimum of 1.2m. The existing cycle lanes on King Street are 1.1m and there are no opportunities to widen this due to limited road width. Narrow cycle lanes represent a low level of service for cyclists and cannot cope with the growth in cycle numbers. They provide limited lateral clearance from vehicles and encourage cyclists to cycle close to the kerb. The removal of the cycle lanes encourages cyclists to take a better road positioning and with the quieter nature of King Street, the removal is considered appropriate. The ASL area will however be retained.
- The existing cycle lanes in Queen Street have recently been widened in line with the guidance and therefore these will remain.
- Other measures requested to mitigate the safety concerns raised at the junction with Queen Victoria Street and the shared spaces on either side of Cannon Street will not be included as part of this project because of the current building activity taking place. However, if opportunities allow, these will be considered separately.

D. Comments and suggestions received that are not taken forward under the Quietways programme but can be considered when opportunities arise

Location	Suggestion for further improvement	Number
East of proposals	Link CSEW with Aldgate	1
West of proposals	Request for a separate phase for cycles at Holborn Circus	1
Signalised junctions	Use of early-start low level cycle traffic signal	1
Alignment	Move the route of the Quietway to cover all of Wood Street, then Bread Street, Watling Street and into the no-vehicle section of Queen Street if the City wants to remove the advisory cycle lanes on King Street and Queen Street	1
General	Include the prohibition of cycling on any pavement. The creeping inclusion of signage which signifies the permitted joint use of pavements by cyclists and pedestrians is a lazy and dangerous solution to providing facilities for cyclists.	1
General	Use sufficient signage along the route and to provide clarity at shared surfaces in the City	2
General	Enforcement of ASL's	1
General	All proposed road changes are affecting taxi drivers and the taxi trade, incl the Bank Junction scheme. Their livelihoods are being destroyed in front of their eyes because no consideration seems to be given to people who rely on the roads for a living and drivers who have no alternative.	1
West Smithfield (market)	Make right turn into West Smithfield safer by introducing a traffic island in Farringdon Rd	1
West Smithfield (market)	Create permeability in West Poultry in both directions / drop kerb on the cycle side of segregating islands	1
West Smithfield (Ambulance station)	Remove metal barrier near the gate to St Bart's (that forms part of the Ring of Steel)	2
Smithfield Market	Allow cycling through Smithfield Market to improve cycle access to Cowcross St and St. John St where there are many employers	1
Hosier Lane	Increased numbers of cyclists will cause conflict with pedestrians walking in the carriageway due to narrow footways in Hosier Lane, as well as with vehicles accessing property.	1
Cloth Fair	Cloth Fair is too narrow to accommodate motor traffic and should be made access only (model filter)	2
Cloth Fair	Ensure coordination with the proposals in the Area Enhancement Scheme, announced a few years ago, and the Cloth Fair Noise Disturbance Proposals, currently being consulted on.	1
Cloth Fair / promotion	As many pedestrians are walking or standing in the road, notices should be put up to ask cyclists to use their bell more often	1
Long Lane / Aldersgate	Introduce double yellow line waiting restrictions and peak hour loading restrictions on north side of Long Lane	1
Aldersgate /Beech Street	Some "semi segregation" using cats eyes or slightly raised/bumpy road surface few metres into Beech Street	1

	immediately after the pedestrian crossing area	
Aldersgate /Beech Street	Introduce low level cycle signals for an early start / elephants footprints across junction	1
Beech Street	Introduce segregation	1
Beech Street (cinemas)	Requested traffic calming measures to reduce speed and encourage better behaviour especially towards pedestrians using the crossing	1
Beech Street (cinemas)	Right turn into Silk Street is difficult, and it was suggested to relocate the zebra crossing in Silk Street by a few yards further south	1
Moor Lane	No right into and out of Moor Lane as an alternative	1
Moor Lane	Suggested to change the one-way operation in Finsbury St and Moor Lane in order to keep the taxi ranks in Ropemaker Street operating efficiently	1
Moor Lane/Fore Street	Provide segregated cycle tracks on southern Moor Lane	1
Moor Lane /Fore Street	Change priority and install the give way marking on the eastern arm / raise the junction	1
Wood Street, Fore Street and Moor Lane	Request for more street furniture and trees in the footway to deter footway cycling	1
London Wall /Wood St	The markings encouraging cyclists to cross the lane diagonally from the left should be removed and the radius on the bend tightened to ensure there is no space for a vehicle to get on the outside of a cyclist.	1
London Wall /Wood St	Introduce new ped crossing on east arm, new ASLs on London Wall, remove stagger crossing, introduce no loading restrictions /armadillos south of junction	1
London Wall /Wood St	Introduce elephants footprints across junction also in n/b direction / introduce lead-in cycle lanes to ASLs	1
Gresham St /Wood St	Make Wood Street north of Gresham Street one-way, and provide segregated cycle facility in Wood Street and Gresham Street	1
Gresham St /Wood St	Change priority and install the give way marking on the western arm / raise the junction	1
Queen Street (Cheapside /Queen Victoria St)	Introduce area wide model filtering: between Trump Street and Cheapside, and between Pancras Lane and Queen Victoria Street.	2
Queen Street	There should be segregated cycle lanes with differential kerbs in the shared surface areas in Queen Street and over Cannon Street	1
Queen Street	Please remove the last parking space at the southern end of Queen Street. It makes it hard for cyclists to see what pedestrians are doing on the kerb where the cyclist will shortly turn left into College Street to access the calm safe bike stand area near Whittington Gardens.	1
Queen and King Street	Stepped cycle track	1
Promotion	Publish maps of recommended cycle routes (with the Boris bike stations marked) and update them as you make progress	1