

Appendix 11 – Statutory Consultation Summary

The Experimental Traffic Order's commenced on the 25th January 2022. The statutory consultation period commenced on this date and ran for six months, concluding on the 24th July.

No Statutory consultees responded formally to the consultation. In total, 20 responses were received from the public:

- Generally supportive – 5
- Neutral - 1
- Objections - 2
- Generally unsupportive - 12

The responses have been summarised and tabulated:

	Category	Comments
1	Supportive	City worker. "step in the right direction to discourage the use of personal motor vehicles and encourage walking, cycling and public transport"
2	Supportive	"Please make these schemes permanent and it would be good if they look less 'temporary' at that point"
3	Supportive	St. Bart's Hospital "We support the continued efforts by the CoL to prioritise space for pedestrians and cyclists whilst maintaining access for public transport and emergency services"
4	Supportive	"They will make it safer for pedestrians, who outnumber cars in the City. By encouraging people to walk rather than drive, they will also take cars off the road and lead to lower pollution."
5	Supportive	"I am strongly in favour of the above measures, which have made walking and cycling in the area much safer. "
6	Neutral	Neither supports or opposes, requests more cycle infrastructure improvements in the square mile
7	Objection	See full response below this table
8	Objection	See full response below this table
9	Unsupportive	Generally abusive message
10	Unsupportive	"These vehicle restrictions are making the transit of goods and materials more time consuming, inefficient. Ultimately, making drivers constantly take longer than necessary routes and herding them onto a few congested roads will add to emissions"
11	Unsupportive	"I don't believe any more action is necessary"
12	Unsupportive	London Taxi driver "this along with other local schemes in place at the city of London make driving a taxi and providing a good service to those who need assistance (for which ever reason) difficult at certain times of the day".
13	Unsupportive	"I am writing to say that all of your proposed changes to do not take the Licensed Taxi trade into account and restricts further our access to pick up and drop off passengers around the City of London"
14	Unsupportive	"With all these road closures and diversions and points of no entries you are creating and moving the problem else where with in the city !!! Moving around the city is becoming a lot more difficult thus creating more and more traffic jams !!!"
15	Unsupportive	Generally abusive message
16	Unsupportive	"people that are back working cannot get around and businesses are suffering because of the cycle lanes and pedestrian areas"

17	Unsupportive	"As a PLC driver who has to collect from accounts in the area (including your own),I feel it is Poorly thought out and has no real gain ,with the exception of creating more pollution,"
18	Unsupportive	Generally abusive message
19	Unsupportive	"The covid19 is just a excuse for blocking the roads why the government are not making all London pedestrian roads there will be no cars already businesses are struggling you making it more harder taxi drivers are the same can't drive anywhere because of closed roads then they will totally sit home."
20	Unsupportive	"Why is it that the City feels a need to continue to clutter our streets with obstacles and confusing signage. Why in London and nowhere else?"

The first objector identifies as a London Taxi driver, and the full text of their objection is below:

As a Licensed London Taxi Driver I object to any proposals to limit my access to ANY street in the City of London.

The pandemic is over, no more need for social distancing, we need to try and get back to normality, city workers need to go about their business as before including travelling by road to get to and from meetings etc etc.

Stop putting up barriers to easy road transport to and through the city of London. It is not Amsterdam! Carry on like this and businesses will never return to their offices and the shops, cafes and restaurants, who rely on their workforces for their livelihoods, will close down as many all ready have. Please stop effing about with our roads.

The second objector identifies as living in the City:

Dear Persons,

I wholeheartedly object to your intentions to introduce the proposal to close roads to anyone other than buses , cycling , pedestrians... Not everyone is able to cycle, walk , or willing to risk being subject to irrational driving by unprofessional bus drivers ..

the people putting forward these ideas should understand other peoples frailty or situations..

We are not all single white males aged 25 to 40 .. one day you'll be old , maybe disabled or maybe with a young family that can't cycle around the city , who might wish to take an electric taxi on a straight line through the city without having to detour for miles at a cost well over what it should be .. yes put in place restrictions but not to the detriment of people who live in the city and want to move around it but not by riding a bicycle.. allow taxi and residential access ..

Please can you tell me what accept for access or authorised vehicles actually means ..

Can I cross bank junction to access my home in a reasonable and timely way or I'm I driving an authorised vehicle when I do so because I actually live in the city and don't just ride a bicycle here from Clapham Monday to Friday

Both objections are made to increased restrictions on some vehicle movements. It is noted in the main body of the report that due to the limited space available on the City streets, it is not possible to create pedestrian priority measures and maintain all vehicle movements. It is therefore not practically feasible to reconcile these objections and meet the objectives of the project (which contribute towards delivery of the Transport Strategy and Climate Action Strategy) due to the physical constraints of our streets.