

Technical Note v2

Project:	Jubilee Cycle Grid Route	Job No:	60343287-C0239
Subject:	Consultation Response		
Prepared by:	Yasir Arafat	Date:	13/11/2015
Checked by:	Karl Chan	Date:	13/11/2015
Approved by:	Andy Blanchard	Date:	13/11/2015

1 Introduction

1.1 Project and Objectives

The Cycle Grid is a network of continuous and safe cycle routes across Inner London. The routes are not just for current cyclists but for people who have been put off cycling by the thought of sharing the road with high volumes of motorised traffic. The Cycle Grid and Quietways form an integral part of the Mayor of London's vision for cycling launched in 2013 and the council's objective to significantly increase the number of residents who opt for cycling as their preferred mode of transport, particularly when making local trips. The proposed area is located within the postcode SE1 district of Southwark borough. See Figure 1 below.




Figure 1 Location Plan

1.2 Consultation

The route was divided into four different sections (A, B, C and D) due to the length of the route. A total of 4,993 consultation leaflets and questionnaires were sent to the local residents, businesses and stakeholders through the Royal Mail postal service.

A specific consultation leaflet was prepared for each of the four sections. These leaflets described the proposals, included colour design drawings of the proposals, and incorporated a questionnaire and comment form that could be sent to the London Borough of Southwark through a pre-paid address reply. The leaflet also directed recipients to an online location on the Council's website where they could complete the questionnaire and comment on the proposals. The leaflet also included information on

Technical Note v2

where to go for assistance in translation and large print versions of the consultation document), see Appendix A for the leaflets.

The consultation leaflets were delivered to those directly on the alignment of the proposals, as well as local residents and businesses in the wider community that could be indirectly affected by the proposed measures. A mailing list was established for the area by way of the Council's GIS database. The consultation areas for each of the four sections were selected after discussion with the project sponsor (See Appendix B for each consultation area).

The public consultation period started on 12 October 2015, initially for a 3-week period. But after reports that some residents and businesses had not received the leaflets, additional leaflets were distributed and the consultation period extended to 8 November 2015 for a 4-week period in total.

The proposals were also available to view online through the consultation section of the Southwark Council's website, with an e-form questionnaire provided in order to capture responses.

Southwark Council held two public consultation exhibition drop-in events with representatives from the project team and consultation team present to explain the proposals and answer any questions from those attending. These events were held on:

- Friday 23rd October 2015, 14:00 to 18:00 at Southwark Council offices, Tooley Street
- Monday 26th October 2015, 16:00 to 19:00 at Southwark Council offices, Tooley Street

Nine people attended the Friday afternoon event and 13 people attended on Monday evening. Attendees were invited to provide their feedback formally through answering the leaflet questions and either post it to the address provided in the consultation leaflet or hand it to the staff present at the event.



Photograph 1 Consultation Exhibition

Technical Note v2

2 Consultation Responses

2.1 Distribution and Response Rate

Southwark Council received 3741 responses (a 7.5% response rate) overall from residents, businesses and stakeholders for the proposed plan.

Section	Leaflet delivered	Number of response	Response rate %
A	319	41	12.9
B	585	100	17.1
C	1,413	74	5.2
D	2,676	159	5.9
Total	4,993	374	7.5

Table 1 Consultation distribution and response rate

2.2 Questionnaire Analysis

The questionnaire element of all four consultation leaflets contained questions about the consultee's name, address, telephone (optional), email (optional) and whether they are local resident or employee or owner of a local business.

For analysis purpose, only the residents or employee / owner of a local business located within the postcode SE1 were considered to be 'Local'.

The questionnaire also contained site specific questions to gauge support on individual elements of the proposal. There were eight questions for Section A & C and eleven questions for Section B & D. All section leaflets included a general question on whether the consultee generally supported the proposals.

2.2.1 Section A – Nicholson Street, Chancel Street & Dolben Street

This section summarises the responses to all the site specific questions for Section A about the proposed changes. Comments made by the responses were grouped, and a summary of the most repeated comments can be found at the end of the section.

Figure 2 and Figure 3 show the overall and 'Local' responses to the questionnaire for Section A.




Figure 2 Overall response to questionnaire on Section A




Figure 3 Local response to questionnaire on Section A

Q0. Do you support the proposal in general?

Support for the proposal in general on Section A is at 59%. Focusing on the locals residents and businesses within the postcode SE1, the support drops to 52% with 28% opposed to the proposal in general.

Technical Note v2

Q1. Do you support the proposed one way system of traffic flow on Nicholson Street?

Almost two thirds of overall responses supported the proposed one way eastbound traffic flow only on Nicholson Street. The majority of local responses supported the proposal although with a slightly lower majority.

Officers visited Edward Edwards' House as part of the consultation and the consensus is that they are opposed to the one-way system. This is as a result of the residents in Edward Edwards' House being concerned that the one-way system will encourage more cyclists travelling at a higher speed thus endangering the elderly residents.

Response: Officers do not believe that if properly designed, the one way with cycle contraflow will encourage greater cycle speeds.

Q2. Do you support the proposed loss of one parking space on Nicholson Street to improve the visibility at the Nicholson Street / Chancel Street junction?

In total 63% of response agreed to the loss of parking space with . Just under 60% of the local respondents supported this proposed change. 5 of the 12 locals opposed to this proposal live in Edward Edwards' House.

Response: Officers believe the loss of one parking space to be justified on road safety grounds.

Q3. Do you support the proposed no waiting and no loading at any time restrictions within the Chancel Street contra-flow cycle facility?

Over 65% of total responses supported these proposed changes to the parking restrictions. If only responses within the local area are taken into account, the support drops to a smaller majority of 59% for the proposed no waiting and no loading at any time restrictions on Chancel Street.

Q4. Do you support the proposed change from single yellow lines to double yellow lines along Dolben Street, to ensure good visibility along the route at all times and removal of pinch points?

25 out of 41 responses (61%) supported the proposed changes of single yellow lines to double yellow lines on Dolben Street. A majority (55%) of locals supported this proposal.

From the comments submitted with the questionnaires, there were comments on the lack of existing loading / parking for local residents and their visitors. The proposal will affect the availability during evenings and weekends. However, it should also be noted that there are also comments supporting the removal of parking/loading.

Response: Overall, it is important that the cycle route is safe for all road users at all times and therefore it is important that the single yellow line restrictions are upgraded.

Q5. Do you support the proposed traffic calming measures (replacement of speed cushions with road humps and raised tables)?

Over 65% responses supported the proposed traffic calming measures.

Q6. Do you support the proposed footway and carriageway improvements in general?

The improvements for footway and carriageway were supported by over 70% of responses for both local and overall respondents.

Q7. Do you support the proposed improvements for pedestrians?

The improvements for pedestrians were supported by 70% responses for both local and overall respondents.

Other comments

- Three respondents questioned the suitability of Nicholson Street as a cycle route. Two of the responses suggested using The Cut and Union Street as the preferred route.

Technical Note v2

-
- *Response: Both TfL and Southwark Council believe Nicholson street to be the most appropriate route*
 - Two respondents commented about an existing U-turning problem on Dolben Street as it is not clear from Great Suffolk Street that Dolben Street is a no through road (Chancel Street is one-way southbound only except for cyclists).
 - *Response: Officers will consider this issue when detailed designs including signage are developed, should the scheme proceed to implementation.*

Technical Note v2

2.2.2 Section B – Union Street (Between Great Suffolk Street and Great Guildford Street)

This section summarises the responses for Section B.

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the overall and specifically 'Local' responses to the Section B questionnaire respectively.




Figure 4 Overall response to questionnaire on Section B




Figure 5 Local response to questionnaire on Section B

Q0. Do you support the proposal in general?

The overall support for the proposal in general on this section was 47%, 37% opposed and the remaining 16% did not answer this question. 21 of the 37 general public who opposed to the proposal classified themselves as 'Employee or owner of a local business'.

Technical Note v2

However, 61% of the local respondents supported the proposals with only 20% of responses against the proposal in general.

Q1. Do you support the proposed contra-flow cycle facility on Ewer Street?

57% of overall respondents indicated support, while 38% opposed the proposal. However, 75% of the local respondents supported the proposals.

Q2. Do you support the proposed change from single yellow lines to double yellow lines along Union Street, to ensure good visibility along the route at all times and removal of pinch points?

The majority of respondents including local respondents backed the proposed changes from single yellow lines to double yellow lines.

Q3. Do you support the proposed closure of Union Street between Great Guildford Street and Southwark Bridge Road to traffic except cycles and access?

52% of the responses opposed the proposal while 47% of the total responses supported the scheme. Of the 52% that opposed to the proposal, just over half described themselves as 'Employee or owner of a local business'.

The level of support by local respondents for this proposal was significantly higher at 61%.

There were six respondents that explained their objection to the proposals; with half of them citing the closure would increase traffic level on adjoining streets such as Great Guildford Street, Copperfield Street and Pepper Street.

Response: Officers believe that whilst some traffic may be diverted onto these local roads, closing the through route will encourage most non-local traffic to divert onto the main roads and therefore any such diversion on local roads will be modest – mainly local resident/business traffic. Additional traffic calming measures are proposed as part of the scheme on Great Guildford Street.

Q4. Do you support the proposed prohibition of loading at any time along the northern kerblines of Union Street within 60m west of Borough High Street?

Majority of the respondents including local respondents agreed with the proposed changes. Again the vast amount of local responses showed support towards implementing this proposal.

Four respondents questioned the need to apply more restrictions to loading as this will affect the operation of existing businesses. All four comments were made by local residents, employers or employees.

Response: Officers will give this issue more detailed consideration during the detailed design stage, if the proposals are agreed in principle. All loading restrictions are subject to a statutory consultation.

Q5. Do you support the proposed two-way cycle track at the east end of Union Street?

51% of the responses supported the proposal, although the support from the local respondents was very positive at 70%.

Q6. Do you support the proposed measures at Union Street / Great Suffolk Street junction?

The numbers of respondents supporting and opposing this proposal were at a similar level with 49 in favour and 46 against. However, the local respondents were overwhelmingly (66%) in support of the scheme.

Q7. Do you support the proposed traffic calming measures (replacement of speed cushions with road humps and raised tables)?

A total of 59% of respondents supported the proposed traffic calming measure. From local respondents the support was stronger, with 75% in favour.

Q8. Do you support the proposal to switch priority from Ayres Street to Union Street traffic?

A total of 70% local respondents agreed, while over 54% of the overall respondents also supported the proposed changes.

Technical Note v2

Q9. Do you support the proposed lowering the existing cycle track between Flat Iron Square and Borough High Street to road level?

The overall support for the proposal was 54% with 40% against. 75% of local respondents supported the proposal.

Q10. Do you support the proposed footway and carriageway improvements in general?

The improvements for footway and carriageway were supported by around 70% of respondents from both local and overall categories.

Other Comments:

- Twelve respondents commented that they want less cycle measures, of which 10 lived outside the SE1 area.
- Seven respondents commented on the need for more segregation on Union Street where the cycle track is lowered to the road level. Also mentioned was the lack of segregation / clear paths between cyclists and pedestrians.
- *Response: The principle of the design is to improve segregation between cyclists and pedestrians. The need for more segregation between cyclists and motor vehicles will be given further consideration at the detailed design stage should the proposals be taken forward for implementation.*

Technical Note v2

2.2.3 Section C – Newcomen Street

This section summarises the responses to the proposed changes in Section C.

Figure 6 and Figure 7 show the overall and specifically 'Local' responses to the Section C questionnaire respectively.




Figure 6 Overall response to questionnaire on Section C




Figure 7 Local response to questionnaire on Section C

Technical Note v2

Q0. Do you support the proposal in general?

Support for the proposals in general on Section C was 50% with 39% opposed to the proposals. Focusing on the Local residents and businesses within the postcode SE1, 48% supported and 44% opposed the proposals in general.

Almosts all of the respondents opposed to the scheme live or work on the streets in the vicinity of the scheme such as Tennis Street, Bowling Green Place, Crosby Row, Mermaid Court and Long Lane.

Q1. Do you support the proposed closure on the section of Newcomen Street near Borough High Street and the rest will become two ways for traffic?

In total, 55% of respondents agreed to the proposals. However, support within Locals dropped to 49%, while 43% opposed this proposed change.

Seventeen respondents had concerns about the impact of the proposals on traffic movements, especially HGVs, as they thought that there will be increased number of vehicles using the narrow side streets such as Tennis Street, Bowling Green Place and Crosby Row as a rat run.

Eleven respondents commented about the wider traffic impacts on the surrounding road network including Long Lane, Borough High Street and Tower Bridge Road.

Response: Officer response is that the general principle of the proposals, together with those for Snowfields adjacent to the Guys Hospital development, is to take non-local through traffic away from the area and onto main roads therefore the amount of traffic diverting onto other minor roads in the area is anticipated to be modest.

Q2. Do you support the proposed change to parking on Newcomen Street and Weston Street to improve sightlines?

A total of 69% respondents supported this proposal overall while support from local respondents was 67%.

Q3. Do you support the proposed change from single yellow lines to double yellow along Newcomen Street, Kipling Street and Guy Street to ensure good visibility along the route at all times and removal of pinch points?

65% of the respondents including local respondents agreed with the proposed changes.

Q4. Do you support the proposed removal of a tree to improve accessibility and walking conditions?

54% of the overall and local responses agreed with the proposed removal of a tree. However, 41% of responses opposed this proposal. For local respondents 44% opposed this with 52% supporting,

Response: If implemented, the overall proposals for the route offer a net increase in greening to offset the loss of this tree.

Q5. Do you support the proposed traffic calming measures (replacement of speed cushions with road humps and raised tables)?

A total of 68% respondents supported the proposed traffic calming measures while the level of support from local respondents was the same.

Q6. Do you support the proposed raised junction table on Weston Street and Guy Street and the relocation of the zebra crossing?

A majority (67%) of the overall and Local respondents supported this proposed change.

Q7. Do you support the proposed footway and carriageway improvements in general?

The improvements for footway and carriageway were supported by 80% of respondents.

Other comments

- 12 respondents wrote about their concerns regarding the loss of parking and loading facilities including the replacement of single yellow lines with double yellow lines.

Technical Note v2

-
- *Response: Waiting and loading restrictions will be subject to a statutory consultation. The detail of loading restrictions can be considered at detailed design. Additional waiting restrictions are designed to ensure the route can safely operate at all times.*
 - Respondents questioned the road widths on Newcomen Street and the suitability of converting this street to two-way traffic movement.
 - *Response: Only local traffic servicing the adjacent premises will be using the very narrow stretch of Newcomen Street. This will greatly reduce number of motor vehicles thus allowing two way operation;*
 - Concerns about the hospital traffic and access were also mentioned.

It is thought that the overall proposal received lower level of support than the individual measures mainly due to the concerns over the impact on the roads in the vicinity.

Technical Note v2

2.2.4 Section D – Weston Street

This section summarises the responses to the proposed changes in Section D.

Figure 8 and Figure 9 show the overall and specifically 'Local' responses to the Section D questionnaires' respectively.




Figure 8 Overall response to questionnaire on Section D




Figure 9 Local response to questionnaire on Section D

Q0. Do you support the proposal in general?

The overall support for the proposal in general on this section was 54%, while 36% of respondents opposed the proposals and the rest of them did not answer this question. For Local respondents, support was the same although 38% of these respondents were not in favour of the proposals.

Q1. Do you support the proposed removal / relocation of parking bays on Weston Street with a net loss of 1 space?

A significant number of respondents, 107 out of 159 overall and 98 of 149 Locals supported this proposed change.

Q2. Do you support the proposed one-way operation in the eastbound direction on Leathermarket Street and a section of Morocco Street with contra-flow cycle facility?

This proposal received an almost equal amount of support (47%) and opposition overall (48%). 50% of Local respondents indicated their disapproval, while 45% supported this proposal.

The response for this question is closely connected with Q4 (one-way Tanner Street), 77 respondents were opposed to both proposals while 67 supported both. Only 15 responses answered these two questions differently.

Regarding these two proposals, the main concerns were the impact on Bermondsey Street and access for local residents / businesses. For respondents who supported the proposals, the main benefits they identified were the reduction in the east-west rat run and fall in traffic volumes on these three streets.

Response: The proposed one-way operation on Leathermarket Street, Morocco Street and Tanner Street (except pedal cycles) is fundamental to the overall scheme proposals. Given the overall

Technical Note v2

proposals are supported by a majority of respondents (as in Q0) officers believe they should proceed. Officers will give further consideration to any detailed issues regarding local access in the detailed design process. One-way operation will be subject to a statutory consultation before implementation giving a further opportunity for local objections to be considered.

Q3. Do you support the proposed reduction of 1 parking space on Leathermarket Street to remove pinch point and improve visibility?

A majority of around 70% overall and Local respondents were supportive of this proposed change.

Q4. Do you support the proposed one-way operation in the westbound direction on Tanner Street with contra-flow cycle facility?

This proposal received an equal (46%) amount of support and opposition. The responses from Locals revealed 48% opposed to this proposal while 44% were in support.

If only residents on Tanner Street are taken into account, 52% are in support against 38% opposing the proposal.

See Q2 for comments.

Q5. Do you support the proposed traffic calming measures (replacement of speed cushions with road humps and raised tables)?

Significant number (64%) of the respondents including local respondents agreed with this proposed change.

Q6. Do you support the proposed change from single yellow lines to double yellow lines along Leathermarket Street and Tanner Street, to ensure good visibility along the route at all times and removal of pinch points?

A total of 67% respondents supported the proposal while the level of support from local resident was 65%.

Q7. Do you support the proposed reconfiguration of parking on Tanner Street to create a chicane effect?

Overall, about 56% of respondents supported and 36% opposed the proposal. Similar numbers of support and opposition were recorded for local respondents.

Q8. Do you support the proposed footway and carriageway improvements in general?

The improvements for footway and carriageway were supported by majority of local and overall respondents.

Q9. Do you support the proposed junction realignment and public realm improvement at Weston Street / Leathermarket Street junction?

A majority (70%) of the respondents including Local respondents supported the proposed changes.

Q10. Do you support the proposed footway buildout adjacent to the Tanner Street Park entrance?

Just under 60% of overall respondents supported the proposals while support from the 'Local' area similar at 56%.

Other comments

- From the comments received, many respondents (31 comments) were concerned about the impact of the proposals on Bermondsey Street.
- 24 respondents commented on the impact on local access under the proposal. They indicated that local residents and businesses will have to take long detours to exit or enter the area.

Technical Note v2

- 18 comments were received expressing their objection on the proposed one-way working on Leathermarket Street / Tanner Street. Officer response to this issue is summarised under Q2 above.
- There were also 18 comments showing strong support on the scheme.
- Nine responses suggested that the one-way proposals should be in the opposite direction.

2.3 Level of Consensus

The following results show the overall level of support for the four combined sections.

- 52% of respondents supported the proposals in general
- 36% of responses opposed the proposals in general
- 12% of responses express no opinions on the proposals

The level of support for individual sections is shown in Table 2 below.

Q0: Do you support the proposal in general	Overall		Local SE1	
	Number of responses	% Support	Number of responses	% Support
Section A	41	59	29	52
Section B	100	47	44	61
Section C	74	50	61	48
Section D	159	54	149	52

Table 2 Level of support for individual sections

2.4 Key Stakeholder Responses

Six key stakeholders provided a reply to the consultation:

- Bermondsey Street Area Partnership (BSAP)
- Better Bankside
- London Cycle Campaign
- Southwark Cyclists
- Southwark Living Streets
- Tabard Gardens North Tenants and Residents Association

Table 3 summarises the general view from the key stakeholders. (a tick indicates general support of the proposals, a cross indicates objections and a dash signifies no response)

Stakeholder	Overall	A	B	C	D
BSAP	-	-	-	-	x
Better Bankside	✓	✓	✓	-	-
London Cycle Campaign	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Southwark Cyclists	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Southwark Living Street	-	-	✓	-	✓
Tabard Gardens North TRA	-	-	-	x	-

Table 3 Response from key stakeholders

The following paragraphs capture the main comments from the key stakeholders, the full transcript of their response can be found in Appendix C.

Technical Note v2

2.4.1 Bermondsey Street Area Partnership (BSAP)

BSAP welcomes improved cycling conditions and reduced traffic in its area of concern; however, they believe this proposal will cause major problems with traffic flow in particular in the north section of Bermondsey Street. Servicing traffic for business and residents for Bermondsey, Leathermarket and Tanner Streets would all be funnelled up the north section of Bermondsey Street which is already congested.

See officer response on this issue in section D above.

2.4.2 Better Bankside

Better Bankside strongly support the plan for the Jubilee Quietway. However, they have also expressed their regret that Roupell Street and Great Suffolk Street were not covered by the proposals.

Response: Roupell Street is out of scope. The proposals for Great Suffolk Street are thought by officers to strike the correct balance between accommodating general traffic and providing a safe environment for cyclists.

2.4.3 London Cycle Campaign (LCC)

LCC fully supports the four sections but would like to see Southwark rapidly develop a proper area-based traffic management approach to the network of quiet street, considering 'modal filters' and other measures where appropriate to constrain and remove through traffic.

LCC is concerned about the lack of information on Great Suffolk Street. They are in support of removing more on-street parking to improve the schemes.

Response: points noted. Quietway funding limits scope to undertake area-wide filtering. Excessive removal of on-street parking would likely result in considerable local opposition to the proposals. The measures as consulted provide an appropriate balance between all road users.

2.4.4 Southwark Cyclists

Southwark Cyclists support the proposals in general.

Southwark Cyclists' view is that the route should continue along Union Street and onto the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) rather than via Dolben, Chancel and Nicholson Streets.

They have commented on the lack of proposals on Great Suffolk Street which is narrow and heavily trafficked.

It is Southwark Cyclists' view that more parking can be removed due to the availability of off-street parking in the area.

Southwark Cyclists feel that the proposed 'chicane' at the park entrance in Tanner Street is very dangerous for cyclists.

Response: this issue will be reconsidered at detailed design stage

They urge the Council to look at the network of roads bounded by Long Lane, Borough High Street, Tower Bridge Road and the railway to ensure that no through traffic is allowed on the local roads and ensure that the proposals are consistent with the long-term traffic plan for the area.

2.4.5 Southwark Living Streets

Southwark Living Streets supported the proposal in general for Sections B and D but did not provide an overall view on Sections A and C. However, they have expressed their support on the individual proposals in these two sections.

Technical Note v2

Southwark Living Streets believes Great Suffolk Street is not acceptable as part of a Quietway route as vehicle volumes and speeds are too high. The levels of intimidation for pedestrian and cyclists remain extremely high and will deter people from using the route.

They feel more cycle parking is needed along the whole route.

Response – noted and to be considered at detailed design

They request a better defined cycle way across Flat Iron Square and asked that the proposed cycle track on Union Street have some sort of segregation.

Response – noted and to be considered at detailed design

Southwark Living Streets proposed that Tanner Street is made one-way but in the eastbound direction instead of the currently proposed westbound one-way.

Response – officers believe this would be less effective at removing through 'rat-run' traffic from the area

2.4.6 Tabard Gardens North Tenants and Residents Association

The Tabard Gardens North TRA is concerned about the impact on surrounding network, in particular Crosby Row, Bowling Green Place, Mermaid Court, Tennis Street. They complained that there is no consideration of cycle safety or pedestrian safety on residential streets off Newcomen Street.

The Treasurer of the TRA suggested that the project be put on hold until more information becomes available.

Response- see earlier comments about the aim of removing most through traffic from the area completely, thus ensuring only very local traffic is diverted onto other local roads.

Technical Note v2

3 Summary

Southwark Council has undertaken a public consultation on the proposed Jubilee Cycle Grid Route scheme that runs between Blackfriars Road and Tower Bridge Road. Due to the size of the affected area, the consultation was separated into four sections. Each section received a leaflet detailing the proposal along that particular section. The leaflets also included a questionnaire aiming to gauge the support for the proposed measures. Two public consultation exhibition events were held as part of the consultation process.

A total of 4,993 leaflets were distributed and 347 responses were received, equating to an overall response rate of 6.9%. Overall 52% of the respondents supported the proposal. For analysis purposes, only residents/employees/business owner within SE1 has been classified as 'Local'.

The responses for each section are summarised below:

Section A

- A majority of 59% respondents indicated their support for the proposals in general. This support slipped to 52% when responses from only Locals were considered. All individual proposals received overall support.
- One proposal received a majority of objections from Local respondents, which was changing single yellow lines to double yellow lines along Dolben Street.
- It should be noted that residents of Edward Edwards' House on Nicholson Street opposed the proposed one-way on Nicholson Street, the loss of parking bay and the increasing of waiting and loading restrictions.
- All other proposals received majority support.

Section B

- Overall, a majority of 46% respondents supported and 38% opposed the proposals in general. Focusing on just responses from Locals, this supports increases significantly to 63%. The Locals overwhelmingly supported all the individual proposals in this section; all items received at least 65% support.
- When all responses are taken into account, there were concerns about access and congestion that the road closure or the cycle measures may bring.
- All other individual proposals received majority support.

Section C

- In total 50% of the overall respondents supported the proposals in general, while 39% opposed them.
- Locally, the support rate was slightly lower at 48% while 44% opposed.
- The main concern about the proposals was the impact on the local streets nearby due to the closure of Newcomen Street
- Removal of a tree on Newcomen Street also received slightly lower support although 50% of respondents supported its removal.
- All the other individual proposals received at least 65% support.
- The Tabard Gardens North TRA recorded their objection to the scheme mainly due to the negative impact on the side streets.

Section D

- Overall support for the proposals in general was received, with 54% overall support and 52% support from Locals.
- The most controversial measures were the one-way proposals on Leathermarket Street and especially Tanner Street. The two one-way proposals received more opposition than support from Locals respondents.
- The main concern about the one-way schemes is the impact on Bermondsey Street and access for the local residents/ businesses.

Technical Note v2

-
- There were a few responses suggested reversing the proposed one-way direction on Tanner Street or closing Tanner Street completely as an alternative.
 - All other individual items received majority of support.
 - BSAP welcomed cycling improvement but strongly disagreed with the one-way proposal for Tanner Street and Leathermarket Street.

The key stakeholders mainly supported the proposals in general with specific comments on a number of design measures. However, the Tabard Gardens North TRA and BSAP objected to the Section C and Section D proposals respectively.