

Appendix 8:

Business and organisational responses summary

As of 26 August 2021 – the current position of level of support/opposition following further discussions around the original responses

Number of businesses/organisation response	Support (including those who had comments that have been resolved)	Oppose	No objection or would support with changes addressed (not yet resolved)	Just comment
23	10	7	4	2

	Business/or organisation	Location/represents	Support/oppose (status at 26 August 2021)	Summary of original response received
1)	The Cad and The Dandy	Birchin Lane/ Retail	Oppose	Planned road changes damaging to the City. Would like to kept informed
2)	City Property Association	On behalf of membership body of owners, investors, professional advisors and developers of real estate in the City (150 companies)	Support	Support changes to make area safer, healthier and more attractive to visitors. Would like to see even more ambition for reducing traffic and opening up public space.
3)	Cheapside Business Alliance	On behalf of hundreds of businesses they represent in the area	Support	Support improvement and enhancement of local environment and accessibility improvements. Note that some businesses in the immediate area have concerns about access for customers and therefore encourage greater communication (will assist with this)

4)	London Cycling Campaign	On behalf of 11,000 paid members and everyone who cycles in Greater London	Support	Support proposals to improve safety, comfort of use and amenity. Encourage further restriction of motor traffic to create more space for people walking and cycling. Detail comments on design
5)	London Travel Watch	Statutory Watchdog representing transport users in and around London	Support – with comments	Support improvement of pedestrian environment to facilitate walking and the make access to public consultation more attractive. Raised concerns about bus services being removed from Queen Victoria Street and Threadneedle Street, relocation of taxi bay away from junction. (City update: <i>-the issues raised are part of the evolving design- the impact, distances to new bus stops etc will be clearly communicated in the Gateway 5)</i>)
6)	London Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA)	Represents greater than 50% of London's Licensed Taxi Drivers	Oppose	Proposals will make area difficult to navigate for licensed taxis and passengers. In combination with A10 restrictions. Need to consider cumulative impact of all changes and impact on taxis. Would like taxi access to King William Street, Lombard Street, Cornhill, Princes Street and Poultry. Concerned that restrictions will limit accessibility for vulnerable users. Support objectives of project including making area safer for pedestrians, providing a welcoming environment and improving air quality and believe these objectives can be achieved by granting taxi access to certain arms of the junction.
7)	Sustrans	Charity representing people that walk and cycle	Support	Support proposals to enable walking and cycling and supporting efficient movement of people and goods around the city. Urged to be bolder in terms of extending restrictions. Need to consider equalities implications for access and safe movement.

8)	Bloomberg	Occupier on Queen Victoria Street	<i>Holding objection</i>	<p>Raised some concerns about access issues regarding future maintenance of the building.</p> <p><i>(City update: awaiting confirmation that the holding objection has been rescinded – discussion have been ongoing and points addressed)</i></p>
9)	Rothschild	Occupier on St Swithins Lane	Concern raised about access	<p>Access to New Court will be difficult from the east.</p> <p>No further comment was made or indication of support or opposition</p> <p><i>(City update: contacting Rothschild to discuss access concerns further. Daytime access routing is not changed.)</i></p>
10)	Transport for London		Support – with comments	<p>Comments relate to bus journeys and resilience of the network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three additional night routes not included in the City's consultation require consultation. • broadly satisfied with the proposed routeing options and will continue to work with the Corporation to reduce the impact on bus passengers. • A concern was also raised by TFL regarding the resilience of the network, for planned and emergency works. • consider design interventions that could allow for these types of planned and unplanned uses. <p><i>(ongoing discussion – points raised have been discussed. Continuing to work on the bus routing and consultation work to minimise impacts)</i></p>

11)	The Ned Hotel	Occupier on Poultry/Princes Street	Supportive if specific concerns are addressed	<p>Support in principle contingent upon the following concerns being addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to loading bay in St Mildred Court during restriction hours • Provision of a taxi rank on Poultry • Pick up and drop off on Poultry is inconvenient, wants access across the junction <p><i>(City update: the changes proposed do not change the access to Poultry and so the project does not need to mitigate a specific impact in this location. Ongoing discussion as to how this can be resolved and will be reported at Gateway 5)</i></p>
12)	United Cabbies Group	Response on behalf of its members (Licensed Taxi Drivers)	Oppose	<p>Diversions increase journey time and cost for passengers. Impact on people with protected characteristics should be considered; Legal status of taxis as form of public transport which is currently focus of legal challenge on Bishopsgate</p>
13)	Worshipful Company of Drapers	Livery Company located at Throgmorton Avenue	Comment	<p>Positive around consultation.</p>
14)	Worshipful Company of Mercers	Livery Company located at Fredericks Place	No objection	<p>No issues with proposals but believe junction should be open to all electric vehicles. Concerns about lack of coherence between Bank proposals and temporary (COVID) traffic management schemes. Without this believe consultation to be flawed</p>
15)	Buro Happold Ltd	Business located in Westminster	Support	<p>Welcomed the prioritisation of people walking or cycling through the area and requested cycle lanes are designed to London Cycling Design Standards.</p> <p>Would support making the restrictions 24/7. Requested more urban greening, planting and sustainable drainage solutions to soften the space.</p>

16)	Royal Exchange	Representing the freehold and businesses within the building	Supportive (if specific concerns are addressed)	<p>Raised some specific issues around security, tables and chairs, tree placement and maintenance, and sought clarification on some of the details.</p> <p><i>(City update: concerns have been addressed and continuing dialogue as the finer detail of the design develops)</i></p>
17)	Unite the Union	From the survey Representing Taxi drivers of Unite.	oppose	<p>Commented that they campaign for where buses go taxis go, as they are part of the public transport system.</p> <p>Vehicles are recognisable wheelchair accessible and with other assistance features. Want access to be able to get passengers where they want to go.</p> <p>Recognised that areas of Bank are busy with pedestrians and that there are safety aspects but questioned volume of people now post COVID -19.</p> <p>Taxis co-exist with buses on many roads and have a good safety record. Also highlighted that there are far fewer licensed taxis post pandemic.</p> <p>Would like taxis to be permitted to drive with the buses through Bank junction. Suggested a trial of the arrangement to see what happens.</p>

18)	Director GH CITYPRINT	From survey City business – Middlesex Street	oppose	<p>Wanted consideration of electric servicing vehicles to have access and for better consideration of businesses in the area and how they are serviced</p> <p>In general ,supported the public realm enhancements and felt that more electric charging points are needed.</p> <p>Suggested pedestrianising Bank Junction with buses being rerouted around the outside.</p>
19)	London Living Streets	From survey National charity for everyday walking	support	<p>The changes at Bank which were made a few years ago have been hugely successful but were cautious.</p> <p>People are becoming more used to visiting the City for non-work uses and that there are opportunities to cater for those people as well as those who work to keep them safe.</p> <p>Proposed that during the weekdays the timings are in operation from 7am to 10pm to keep those who are working in the City safer longer and also maintain the restrictions on motor traffic at weekends (7am to 7pm).</p>
20)	Motorcycle Action Group	From survey London rep - is a Riders' Rights Organisation that champions and promotes motorcycling in the UK	oppose	<p>Concerns of congestion on alternative routes.</p> <p>Questioned the data used to support the proposals regarding cycling numbers, and that this road space could be used by others.</p> <p>No provision for motorcyclist given in the design – but believes that they are an environmental form of transport.</p> <p>Would like to see motorcycles have access.</p>

21)	Future Transport London	From survey Formerly London branch of the Campaign for Better Transport	support	<p>Commented that it would make the area much better for pedestrians but not appropriate to attract drivers wishing to charge electric cars</p> <p>And that they felt that it was good that it clears areas for pedestrians with minimal effect on the bus routes.</p>
22)	Dutch Church	From survey Church on Austin Friars	Supports	Indicated support through the survey questions but provided no additional comments
23)	Freedom for Drivers Foundation	From survey A body that aims to educate the public about the benefits of road vehicles	oppose	<p>Commented that this is a major road and a key part of the road network and should not be closed to vehicles.</p> <p>The timing restrictions effectively mean a closure of Bank junction to vehicles which is unreasonable.</p> <p>Would support if private cars and vans were allowed access</p>