

Committees:	Dates:	
Planning and Transportation Committee	09 April 2018	
Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee	10 April 2018	
Projects Sub	16 May 2018	
Subject: Bank on Safety: Consultation findings report	Gateway 6 Progress Report Regular	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Gillian Howard		For Information
<u>Summary</u> • Dashboard Project Status: Green Total estimated Project Cost: £1,401,207. Spend to date: £1,102,557 and commitments of £101,634 (15/03/18) Overall Project Risk: Green Approved Budget: £1,401,207. • Last Gateway approved: Gateway 4/5 December 2016 Some 4300 responses across the Bank on Safety consultations have been received and reviewed. This is the largest consultation response to a transport consultation. The public consultation is a key building block of the suite of evidence required to give a full picture of the Bank on Safety experimental scheme outcomes. FTI Consulting were commissioned to provide a comprehensive independent analysis of the consultation results. The second report on the performance of the experiment, which considers performance against the agreed success criteria, is also being presented as a separate report during April and May 2018 at the same Committees as this paper. Before Summer recess a further report will be presented to Committee. This will evaluate the experiment as a whole and seek a decision from Members as to whether: • The experiment should be made permanent, as trialled; • The experiment should be made permanent, with minor modifications; or • The junction should revert to its previous operation. Total Estimate Cost:£1,401,207		

Summary

Of the consultation survey, 45% of respondents supported the experiment as implemented. A further 29% generally supported the scheme but would like to see changes. In total 75% of respondents support or generally support the experiment.

The majority of business and representative group respondents are supportive, including the City Property Association; which represents 150 businesses within the City.

Requests for changes to the experiment range from issues such as:

- extending the scheme to 24/7 or removing buses etc.; and
- allowing more types of vehicles through such as taxis (black cabs) and/or motorcycles.

Overall, the most frequent request of a variation in the consultation survey was to allow black cabs through the junction. This was suggested by 12% of the total respondents.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Members note:

1. The outcomes of the Bank on Safety Consultation exercise.

Main Report

1. Reporting period	The Scheme became operational on 22 May 2017. The Bank on Safety Consultation was open from 22 May 2017 – 30 November 2017. The statutory consultation period for the Experimental Traffic Orders (ETO) ran from 22 May 2017 until 12 February 2018.
2. Progress to date	What did we do? 1. There were three distinct consultation activities undertaken as part of the Bank on Safety experimental scheme. These were on the: • Experimental traffic order relating to the main restriction of the scheme (statutory consultation); • Experimental traffic order relating to the loading and waiting changes (statutory consultation); and the • Public consultation for comment and opinion on how the experiment is perceived to be working. <u>Statutory consultations</u> 2. The City received 22 representations to the first ETO which closed on 24 November 2017. Officers are in the process of responding to the comments raised. Any unresolved objections will be presented to Members in the Summer 2018 decision report.

3. The second ETO, regarding loading, was modified in July 2017 after officers had undertaken some initial monitoring of how the new changes were working and how the local businesses were finding the new loading operation. This required the statutory six-month period to start again, so the formal statutory public consultation concluded 12 February 2018 for this ETO. No comment or objection was received to this order.


Public consultation

4. The next part of the consultation was the formal public consultation to seek comment and opinions on how people felt the scheme operated and whether or not the scheme was supported. This public consultation activity formally ran from 22 May to 30 November 2017. Officers have collated all emails, written responses as well as those received to an online survey.
5. The public consultation online survey went live at the end of June and was open for five months, closing on the 30 November 2017. This was open to any interested persons and enabled people to respond to questions on the scheme, and provide other feedback, over a reasonable period of time as the scheme settled in.
6. The Bank on Safety online survey consisted of five questions regarding the scheme. These were as follows;
- How do you normally travel in the vicinity of or through or near Bank Junction?
 - What do you think is working well since Bank on Safety became operational?
 - What do you think is not working well since Bank on Safety became operational?
 - Given your experiences, since the Bank on Safety scheme became operational, do you support these changes to becoming permanent?
 - Any additional comments that you would like to make.
7. A total of 3730 respondents completed the online survey. This is a large number of respondents compared to other previous consultations the department has undertaken for other projects. Emails from 507 individuals/organisations were received by the team.
8. Officers encouraged awareness of the consultation through drop in sessions at local businesses, posting 3,000 letters, 2,000 hand-outs, social media activity, adverts in local papers, and static towers with scheme information located at the Royal Exchange.
9. Responses were received across a range of transport mode users. In terms of the split of respondents to the consultation survey, Figure 1 below suggests that the split is not particularly representative of commercial drivers, bus passengers and private vehicles, in comparison

to the proportion of people moved daily thorough the City’s streets. It also shows that our survey respondents are likely to be under representative of pedestrians (despite being the largest number) and over represented by taxi and private hire drivers and pedal cyclists.

10. However, the consultation survey is not skewed by any one mode. As would be expected there was a strong pedestrian and cycle response to the survey, but it should be noted that pedestrians are by far the most dominant mode across the City and particularly Bank. Cyclists also have a strong vehicular presence at the junction making up 50% of the vehicles in the peak times.

Figure 1 Survey response profile vs people moved in the City (Transport in the City 2017)



11. In other recent transportation related consultations across London there have been issues with template responses from single modal representatives that have heavily skewed the response rate. This has not been an issue for the Bank on Safety consultation.

Analysis of the public consultation survey:

12. Given the volume of response Officers instructed an independent research company to analyse the public consultation. The report from FTI Consulting is attached in Appendix 1.

13. The next part of this committee report provides a representative summary of the findings, as analysed by FTI. Due to the survey’s structure, a large amount of qualitative data was collected across the four open questions, which required careful consideration in categorisation, which FTI have undertaken.


Online survey responses summary:

14. It should be noted that the first question of the survey let the respondents choose multiple transport modes; as we know that people tend to experience the junction and surrounding areas in a variety of ways. This means that when analysing things from a modal perspective, one respondent's comments will appear across all of the other modes that they chose. This means that throughout the FTI document when looking at themes by mode, percentages often exceed 100%.

Is there support to make the experimental scheme permanent?

15. The FTI report summarises that 45% of respondents supported the experiment as implemented. A further 29% generally supported the scheme but would like to see changes. In total 75% of respondents support or generally support the experiment.

3 IN 4 ARE SUPPORTIVE OF THE SCHEME



Q4: Given your experiences, since the Bank on Safety scheme became operational, do you support these changes to becoming permanent?

- Yes
- Generally support the scheme but would like to see changes
- No

Base: (All respondents) n=3,730

16. When looking at the support by mode, (and accepting that people could have selected more than one mode) it is clear that most pedestrians and cyclists support the scheme (over 90%). Every mode, except taxi and private hire drivers and commercial drivers, had over 50% overall support for the experiment. See section 5, page 8, of the FTI report in Appendix 1

What variations did people want to see to the current operation?

17. Overall, 29% of respondents "given their experiences since the bank on safety scheme became operational...generally support the bank on safety scheme but would like to see the following variations...". The variations once analysed were categorised into changes that would be seen as:

- progressive changes (i.e. introducing greater restrictions such as extending hours or removing buses);
- regressive changes (i.e. relax the restriction and allow more types of vehicles through such as black cabs and motorcycles); and
- enhancements (i.e. would not change the operation of the scheme but would like to see better enforcement, wider

pavements etc.).

18. The largest requested variation to the scheme was for Taxis (black cabs) to be allowed in the restricted areas (identified as a regressive change). This was mentioned by 451 respondents (which is 12% of all respondents). Of these 451 respondents, 70% identified themselves as a taxi/private hire driver.
19. It should be noted that variations also included suggestions of better signage and enforcement (158 responses or 4% of total respondents) and extending the operational hours of the scheme to 24/7 (151 respondents or 4% of total respondents) as the second and third most common variation requested.

What do people think is working well?

20. The objectives/key success criteria of the experiment, are to achieve:
- a significant safety improvement;
 - maintain access for deliveries;
 - improve air quality at Bank (whilst not make the wider area worse); and
 - not unreasonably impact on traffic flow whilst preferably improving bus journey times.
21. There were 3692 responses to this open text question. In terms of what respondents felt was working well:
- 1107 (30%) of respondents cited less traffic/congestion as the key success
 - improved safety for cyclists cited by 997 (27%) of respondents.
22. Safety was mentioned in three of the five top themes, accounting for over 2100 mentions (not individuals as they may have said safety has improved for pedestrians and cyclists which would be coded as two separate elements by one person).
23. Respondents (553 or 15%) also identified that the scheme was working well in that there was less pollution.
24. It should be noted that the top five themes from respondents correlated closely with the agreed objectives of the scheme.
25. The second performance report, that is also progressing during April and May 2018 at these committees, has more information of the data led detail of the performance of these objectives.

What do people think is not working well?

26. There were 3684 responses to this open text question. In terms of what respondents felt was not working well:
- 1,363 (37%) of respondents cited worsened traffic in the area

- 847 (23%) cited that banned vehicles were still going through the junction;
- 442 (12%) citing signage needing improvement;
- 368 (10%) of respondents felt that it was more dangerous for pedestrians; and
- 295 (8%) felt that pollution was worse in the surrounding area

Other consultation responses outside of the survey

27. FTI also reviewed 507 emails to independently assess their content as to whether they were query based or part of the consultation, or a mixture. The interpreted sentiment of the emails showed that 52% were not able to determine an overall sentiment, i.e. they contained both positive or negative statements or were queries; 26% had negative sentiment towards the scheme and 22% had positive sentiment.

28. The largest re-occurring comment was that warning signs needed to be more visible/ more policing/general signage, which was raised by 24% of the responses?

Groups and Business representative responses

29. An interpreted summary of responses from groups and local businesses who responded to the consultation can be found in Appendix 2. Officers have interpreted these comments to fall within three broad categories of support (or support with a more stringent variation), support with a less stringent variation or do not support. Table 1 summarises this support (interpreted) for representative groups and organisations that responded, with Table 2 summarising individual business response support (interpreted).

Table 1: interpreted category of support from representative groups and organisations

Representative groups/organisations	Support or support with more stringent variations	Support but would like to see variations	Do not support (i.e. return to previous operation)
Alliance of British Drivers			
City Property Association (CPA)			
Living Streets			
London Cycling campaign			
London Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA)			
Stop killing cyclists			
Worshipful Company of Hackney Carriage Drivers			

Table 2: interpreted category of support from local businesses and organisations

Local business/occupier responses.	Support or support with more stringent variations	Support but would like to see variations	Do not support (i.e. return to previous operation)
British Land			
Oxford Properties			
Shanghai Commercial Bank			
The Ned Hotel (submitted by Paul Basham Associates)			
WBRC			
Welltower			

30. Of the above companies or organisations who responded to the consultation it should be noted that the CPA response is on behalf of 150 businesses within the City, which can be found in Appendix 3. There are strong levels of support from the businesses which responded for the scheme as trialled.

31. It was not entirely clear from two of the responses whether they were in support for the junction to return to its previous operation, or if they would only support a scheme where taxis and private hire vehicles were allowed to pass through Bank Junction. As such they have been indicated in both the 'not supportive' and 'supportive with less stringent operation'.

Conclusion to the Public Consultation:

32. Overall the public consultation has been successful in terms of generating responses from a wide variety of respondents. It is clear that there is very strong support for the experimental scheme from the general public and local businesses and organisations. There are areas that have been identified where the operation of the scheme could be improved. The consultation shows a low level of support for the removal the experiment.

33. There is significant support for making the scheme that has been trialled permanent as it currently operates (45% of survey responses). There is a further 29% of respondents who generally support the scheme but would like to see changes. Of those changes identified, the most common theme was to introduce taxis through the junction (12% of all respondents).

3. Next steps	34. Before Summer recess a further report will be presented to Committee. This will evaluate the experiment as a whole and seek a decision from Members as to whether: • The experiment should be made permanent, as trialled; • The experiment should be made permanent, with minor modifications; or • The junction should revert to its previous operation.
----------------------	---

Appendices

Appendix 1	FTI Consulting: Consultation analysis report
Appendix 2	Interpreted responses from groups and businesses.
Appendix 3	CPA Membership 2017

Contact

Report Author	Gillian Howard
Email Address	Gillian.howard@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3139