

Appendix 5 – summary of written responses by organisation

Written responses to the Public Consultation were received from seven organisations and are summarised below.

City Property Association

The CPA supports “the permanent and enhanced adoption of the measures outlined in this consultation for all the streets concerned”, and not to do so would be a missed opportunity.

The CPA believes that the pedestrian priority measures will increase capacity for footfall which will increase comfort levels, safety and accessibility which will contribute to the City remaining and attractive and world-leading destination for workers, visitors and residents. It points out that prior to the pandemic City workers contributed 43% of spending in the City and vital that workers are encouraged to return and “linger longer”.

The CPA supports the City’s Destination City policy and considers the pedestrian priority measures will contribute to this by creating “Healthy Streets with greenery and seating, encouraging people to rest and enjoy the Square Mile will help to create much improved public realm”

London Living Streets

Living Streets “strongly support the proposal for making the Pedestrian Priority measures permanent.”

Living Streets have requested that traffic volumes on King William Street and Lombard Street be monitored as they have some concerns with allowing access for taxi and private hire vehicles in case these become “ratruns” for vehicles not genuinely dropping off or picking up passengers.

Cheapside Business Alliance

The Cheapside Business Alliance is broadly supportive of the programme to help deliver environmental, public realm and greening opportunities. Balanced with this support is feedback from businesses, especially retail and hospitality venues, regarding accessibility, particularly the availability of taxis and deliveries for businesses. Cheapside business claim to have noted a discernible decrease in taxi volumes. The CBA would like to see consideration given to full or targeted access for taxis.

A City Developer

This developer, who wished to remain anonymous in public reports, are very supportive of the principles that lie behind these works in terms of making the City a more pleasant and safer place for pedestrians and cyclists and that the City needs to be ambitious in pursuing this agenda: prioritising sustainable modes of transport and interventions such as those proposed here.

Member for Cordwainer

The Member’s main response regards the Cheapside measure which they consider “unnecessary and potentially dangerous”. Whilst the Member

supports more trees, they do not believe they should be placed in too close proximity to the edge of the road.

The Member considers that there is already adequate space for pedestrians on Cheapside and that there are already nearby areas of public space in vicinity to the Cheapside measure.

The Member notes that “ensuring the ward is accessible to taxis and other modes of transport along Cheapside is an essential part of operating in the City and is vital to increasing the footfall for the businesses in the ward. It is also clearly necessary for businesses to have delivery and other access to their premises, particularly for those who have mobility issues”.

London Taxi Drivers Association

The LTDA would specifically like to have the same access as buses and cyclists on Cheapside to facilitate better and more direct access. The diversions drivers must take lead to congestion and a more expensive route for passengers.

The LTDA would prefer King Street to revert to its previous two-way arrangement but recognises the busy footways along here but does not think the cycle lane is justified due to alternative parallel routes and if kept one-way would be better to provide more pedestrian space. On Threadneedle Street the LTDA would like to see more two-way operation, at least between Bartholomew Lane and Old Broad Street and ideally all the way to Bishopsgate. The Old Jewry and King William Street measures have a neutral impact on taxis.

Motorcycle Action Group

The MAG generally object to the pedestrian priority measures. They consider that the measures will lead to increased congestion and provide only marginal benefit to pedestrians and a greater detrimental impact on powered two wheelers.

They continue “some of the schemes, notably King St., exhibit limited pedestrian footfall and no obvious pavement capacity or cycling issues over an extended period of time. Therefore we do not feel that these are all critical measures that significantly change the environment for pedestrians in a way that validates the trade-off.”