



People-Friendly Streets
Better places for everyone

Cycleway 38 – Liverpool Road – people-friendly streets trial

Consultation and engagement report



ISLINGTON

Appendix 3


Consultation and Engagement report – Cycleway 38 South people-friendly streets trial

Date: 28 February 2022

Ward(s): Barnsbury, St Mary's

Contents

Consultation and Engagement report – Cycleway 38 people-friendly streets.....	1
SUBJECT: Cycleway 38 Trial Consultation and Engagement Report.....	2
1. Summary.....	2
2. Introduction and background.....	2
3. Engagement prior to public consultation.....	4
Commonplace.....	4
Formal objections.....	5
Email correspondence.....	5
Statutory consultees.....	6
Business engagement.....	7
Engagement with Schools.....	7
4. Public consultation.....	7
5. Conclusion.....	9



SUBJECT: Cycleway 38 Trial Consultation and Engagement Report

1. Summary

- 1.1. This report sets out the results from the engagement and consultation during the trial period from implementation on 11 September 2020 to the end of the consultation period on 15 December 2021 for Cycleway 38 (C38). C38 was implemented under the people-friendly streets (PFS) programme, which was agreed by the council's Executive on 18 June 2020 and further committed to on 14 October 2021. The C38 scheme was initially implemented on 11 September 2020.
- 1.2. This report outlines the results from the Commonplace engagement, general correspondence, objections received during the formal 6-month objection period to experimental traffic orders (ETOs), public consultation responses and emails received during the public consultation. An independent public consultation report can be found as Appendix 5 of the delegated decision report of 2 March 2022 as well as this report as Appendix 3. These reports together inform the decision-making on the future of the C38 scheme.
- 1.3. There were 226 comments submitted on the Commonplace platform along the C38 South route. Ten formal objections were received to the Cycleway 38 South traffic orders during the six-month objection period, in addition to five received outside of the objection period. 231 correspondence emails were received during the trial and 1088 responses to the public consultation survey. The consultation questionnaire responses are presented in more detail in the independent consultation report found as Appendix 5 and analysed in section 4 of this report.
- 1.4. The Commonplace platform was an online engagement tool set up for residents and other stakeholders to suggest ways the council could help them to walk and cycle more safely. It was in use from May 2020 to March 2021. The comments made are taken into consideration as part of the development of PFS schemes and can be viewed on the website at: <https://islingtonpeoplefriendlystreets.commonplace.is/>

2. Introduction and background

2.1. Cycleway 38 spans two wards, Barnsbury ward and St Mary's ward. Data from the 2011 Census shows that a total of 23,754 residents in total live in both wards. Table 1 highlights the population profile of the area.

	London	Islington	Barnsbury Ward	St Mary's Ward
	Total: 8,173,941	Total: 206,125	Total: 12,201	Total: 11,553
Gender: Female	51%	51%	49%	51%
Gender: Male	49%	49%	51%	49%
Age: Under 16	20%	16%	15%	14%
Age: 16-24	12%	14%	15%	12%
Age: 25-44	36%	42%	42%	46%
Age: 45-64	21%	19%	19%	19%
Age: 65+	11%	9%	9%	9%
Disabled	14%	16%	14%	15%
Ethnic group: BME	40%	32%	26%	25%
Ethnic group: White	60%	68%	71%	75%
Religion or belief: Christian	49%	40%	41%	40%
Religion or belief: Muslim	12%	9%	9%	6%
Religion or belief: Other	10%	4%	4%	4%
Religion or belief: No religion	21%	30%	30%	33%
Religion not stated	9%	17%	16%	17%

Table 1 - demographics of London, Islington, Barnsbury and St Mary's wards.

Source: 2011 Census data available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/>

2.2. Cycleway 38 was implemented as a pop-up scheme in September 2020 with the majority of the construction completed in October 2020.

3. Engagement prior to public consultation

Commonplace

- 3.1. Since the early stages of the first Covid-19 lockdown, residents from Islington's local communities and other stakeholders had the opportunity to suggest ways the council could help them to walk and cycle more safely and easily using the online engagement tool, Commonplace. This was set up on 29 May 2020 to enable residents and others to indicate locations and measures for the people-friendly streets programme to respond to the challenges that the Covid-19 pandemic posed. More detailed information can be found in the [Executive Report](#) (October 2021).
- 3.2. The Commonplace tool closed for comments in March 2021, but the comments made are taken into consideration as part of the development of PFS schemes and can still be viewed on the website at: <https://islingtonpeoplefriendlystreets.commonplace.is/> . A total of 6,447 respondents across the borough left comments on the Commonplace site. For each point placed on the map, users were prompted to select from a list of problems or barriers which prevented them using active travel methods more frequently and to select prepopulated solutions.
- 3.3. The council received 226 responses via the Commonplace tool for the C38 scheme area between 15 May 2020 and 2 March 2021 among these, 82 specifically regarded Cycleway 38. The Commonplace platform was an effective way to gather local people's views of a) the current streets and public spaces; and b) how to make Islington's streets more people-friendly.

The findings from the pre-consultation survey are summarised in [Table 2](#) below.

Table 2: Commonplace pre-consultation survey results summary

Question	Summary of responses
What are you commenting on?	The majority of respondents were commenting on the road or cycle lane (43% and 23% respectively)
What is the problem?	The volume as traffic received the most respondents listing it as a problem (38%) followed by 33% saying fast traffic was a problem and 31% responding it is not safe to cycle.
How could we make it better?	Over a third (34%) answered there was something other than listed that could be done. A quarter said to slow down traffic, followed by 23% responding with more space for cycling and 23% a safer junction. The main other responses included removing the cycle lane, retaining or replacing car parking spaces, implementing traffic lights/pedestrian crossings, and enforcement including speed cameras.
Would you support these changes being made long-term?	Most respondents (77%) answered yes, only 12% responded no.
What is your connection to the area?	Three quarters of respondents live in the area and 19% of respondents work here.

How do you usually travel in the areas?	Almost three quarters (73%) walk, over half (56%) cycle and over a third (34%) drive a car.
If you have a car, how do you expect the amount you drive it to change in the coming months?	Of the 51% of people who answered the question and do drive, 43% answered they would drive it less, 21% more and the remaining the same amount
If you walk, how have you felt while travelling around your local area in recent weeks?	A quarter felt safer than before and a quarter felt less safe, the remaining respondents either did not answer or felt their safety level was the same
If you cycle, how have you felt while travelling around your local area in recent weeks?	26% felt safer than before, 14% less safe and the remainder either do not cycle, did not respond, or felt their safety level was the same
In the past few weeks, have you noticed an improvement in air quality where you live?	28% have noticed a significant improvement, 14% some improvement and 13% responded air quality has been worse. The remainder did not respond or noticed no change
Do you support temporary measures to reduce traffic speeds and/or volumes to help aid social distancing and keep those taking exercise safe?	Over half (55%) answered yes
Where you live, have you space to safely store a bicycle?	Over half (53%) answered yes, almost a quarter (24%) answered no
Any other comments about this location?	There were 82 responses regarding Cycleway 38. Of these, 38% raised accessibility concerns, 37% safety concerns, 20% congestion concerns and 13% equality/protected characteristics concerns. 11% of the responses were supportive comments for the cycleway and around a quarter of respondents (26%) gave suggestions

Number of respondents: 226

Formal objections

- 3.4. Members of the public can make a formal objection to a traffic order. There is an initial six-month statutory objection period as part of the Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) process; the feedback must be considered when deciding whether to make a trial scheme permanent.
- 3.5. Any formal objection to a specific ETO has to be in writing and must state the grounds on which it is made. Objections to this scheme had to be sent by email to PublicRealm@islington.gov.uk or by post to Public Realm, 1 Cottage Road, London, N7 8TP.
- 3.6. Ten qualifying objections were received for the Cycleway 38 South scheme during the initial ETO objection period that came into force on 11 September 2020, and expired 11 March 2021. Outside of this time frame, a further five objections were made.

Email correspondence

- 3.7. 231 individuals sent correspondence to the council regarding Cycleway 38 during the trial scheme period to-date. This correspondence was categorised according to the views expressed about the scheme:
 - 204 were negative
 - 8 were positive

- 7 were mixed
- 5 were unclear
- 7 were other

3.8. These emails were received through the PFS email address set up for correspondence relating to the wider programme (peoplefriendlystreets@islington.gov.uk). It should be noted that this email address was set up to answer queries and provide information to people who had questions about the programme, and that the council did not directly invite feedback through this email address. Therefore, email correspondence in isolation should not be understood as a quantifiable measure of the support for or against the scheme. It is worth pointing out that people who are the most severely impacted by the scheme tend to write to the council. Most council services would show a similar proportion of 'negative' to 'positive' correspondence, as most residents feel more motivated to write in when they perceive that a change has impacted them negatively than when a change has had a beneficial effect. The negative themes of this correspondence were mirrored in the objections and feedback in the public consultation.

Statutory consultees

Pre-scheme engagement

3.9. Pre-implementation consultation with statutory consultees took place in September 2020, with the following statutory stakeholders: London Ambulance Service (LAS), London Fire Brigade (LFB), the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), the NHS Blood and Transplant Service, the Road Haulage Association, the Freight Transport Association (now Logistics UK), TfL Network Management, TfL Buses, HCT Bus company, Emily Thornberry MP (Islington South) and Sem Moema AM (GLA).

3.10. Of the statutory consultees listed above, responses were received from:

- TfL, who conducted a design review; all comments were addressed.
- The MPS did not raise any issues.
- The LAS and LFB registered concerns that the use of traffic wands may prevent access in emergencies. This was addressed by changing the design to provide an eight metre break in traffic wands for every 30 metres where there is no kerbside stopping space.

3.11. All emergency services agreed that the increased spacing between the segregation was acceptable. The council agreed to monitor and review the scheme with the Emergency Services once implemented if required.

Post-scheme consultation

3.12. Post-implementation consultation was undertaken between December 2021 – January 2022 with the following statutory stakeholders: London Ambulance Service (LAS), London Fire Brigade (LFB), the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), the NHS Blood and Transplant Service, the Road Haulage Association, Logistics UK (formerly Freight Transport Association), TfL Network Management, TfL Buses, HCT Bus company, Royal Mail, Emily Thornberry MP (Islington South), Sem Moema AM (GLA).

3.13. Of the statutory consultees that responded:

- The MPS did not have any objection to the scheme being made permanent but have requested changes to four sets of speed cushions and one speed table if the scheme is made permanent.
- Neither the LAS nor the LFB had any objections to the scheme being made permanent.
- The Royal Mail postal service did not have any objections to the scheme being made permanent.
- TfL provided a joint service response which supported the scheme being made permanent.

Business engagement

- 3.14. Prior to implementation, all businesses along the route were sent letters and follow up phone calls were made by an LBI officer.
- 3.15. On 19 November 2021, during the recent public consultation, all businesses were visited by an LBI officer to make sure they were aware of the consultation and to answer any questions about the scheme. Businesses were also posted the consultation leaflet. A mixture of positive and negative feedback about the scheme was provided during these visits. None of the people spoken to in these businesses mentioned that the scheme had affected their business either negatively or positively. Some businesses raised safety concerns about the floated parking on Penton Street and some voiced their support for the scheme.

Engagement with Schools

- 3.16. All schools along the route were sent the Cycleway 38 letter in September 2020 ahead of the implementation and also during the recent public consultation in November / December 2021. We did not receive any correspondence from any of the local schools nor any response to the consultation.

4. Public consultation

- 4.1. In June 2020 the council committed to undertake a formal consultation around 12 months after the implementation of each trial people-friendly streets scheme.
- 4.2. In November 2021 a public consultation was held on making the C38 scheme permanent whilst retaining the existing layout. The consultation ran between 18 November 2021 and 15 December 2021 and included an online questionnaire available via the Islington website.
- 4.3. Paper copies of the questionnaire were made available at events, by visiting the Town Hall reception on Upper Street and could be requested by post or online.
- 4.4. The consultation information was shared on social media platforms including Next door, Twitter and Facebook.
- 4.5. 4,500 leaflets were sent out to people and businesses along the route and within a 100 metre buffer zone of the route. The council also promoted the consultation and encouraged people to fill in the questionnaires at C38 engagement events.

4.6. These events included:

- 30 November: On-street event on Liverpool Road outside the Business Design Centre including Dr Bike between 8am-10am
- 2 December: On-street event on Liverpool Road at the junction with Cloudesley Square including Dr Bike 3pm-6.30pm
- 6 December: In-person event at New River College – Registration required
- 7 December: Online Zoom event – Registration required

4.7. The survey received a good response rate with 1088 responses equating to a 24% response rate when compared to the number of flyers delivered.

4.8. Respondents were presented with a series of statements and asked to select if they thought these were occurring more or less since the trial began in September 2020, or if no change had occurred, or if the statement did not apply to them.

4.9. In October 2021, the council appointed transport consultants Steer to produce an independent consultation report and support with the online public consultation event. This report is available as an appendix to the delegated decision report and summarises the consultation feedback received via the consultation questionnaire and some of the engagement activities held during the consultation.

4.10. Overall, there were a number of areas where significant numbers of respondents agreed with statements that support the rationale for the scheme:

- 54% of survey respondents agreed that the scheme was a positive change, with 43% disagreeing.
- 48% agreed that it is easier to access friends, family and school.
- 49% agreed that it is easier to get to shops and local services by walking and cycling.
- 52% agreed that it is easier to make trips by walking and cycling.

4.11. There were also areas where significant numbers of respondents highlighted areas of concern or felt the scheme was causing issues:

- 55% of respondents felt that it is now less safe to walk, use a wheelchair or other mobility aid.
- 44% agreed that it was less easy to cross the street.
- 41% felt it was less safe to drive.
- 47% of respondents agreed that they want to see the scheme changed as it is causing issues (46% disagreed).

Business responses to the public consultation survey

4.12. Fifteen respondents (1%) stated they filled in the survey on behalf of a business. Three fifths (60%) stated their business was on the Cycleway 38 route. Twelve respondents answered question 10 which asked what would benefit their businesses. 60% of respondents answered 'other'. Of the relevant responses to this other category:

- two responses stated to remove or revert the cycleway back to before
- two suggested to open the roads
- two suggested more parking facilities
- one an extension of Santander bikes North
- one requesting more charging points.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. The positive and negative points raised from the consultation, Commonplace engagement and correspondence are considered as part of the delegated decision report.