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Executive summary

Between 2 November and 13 December 2016, we consulted on further proposed changes to the junction of Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill as part of North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6). The proposals aimed to address many of the current conflict points between motor traffic, cyclists and pedestrians and provide dedicated priority for all road users. They included a new controlled cycle crossing between Farringdon Street and West Smithfield, a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing and traffic signals across Farringdon Street and segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct. The proposals also included banning the southbound left turn for motor vehicles from Farringdon Street to West Smithfield.

Overall responses

We received a total of 815 responses to the consultation, of which 508 (62%) supported or strongly supported the proposals and 293 (36%) opposed or strongly opposed the proposals. 13 (2%) said they neither opposed nor supported or that they did not know. One (<1%) respondent did not answer the question.

Key themes that emerged from consultation included:

- Generally supportive comments
- Benefits of the scheme for cycling, including safety improvements compared to the existing road layout
- Concerns regarding increases in congestion or journey times on local roads or generally for motor vehicles
- Generally negative comments
- Concerns about existing conflicts between cyclists and motorists due to cyclists mixing with motor traffic, motorists blocking cyclists or motor vehicle speed

Stakeholder responses

We received nine stakeholder responses from organisations including local authorities and statutory bodies, transport and road user groups, business groups, and local businesses. The stakeholder responses are summarised in Section 4.3.

Response to issues raised and next steps

We have published our response to issues raised report at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield/. It gives our response to issues raised during the consultation and describes how we intend to proceed with the scheme.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction

The North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) has been designed to improve safety and reduce conflict between motor vehicles and cyclists, and to encourage the large numbers of people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so. Data from existing Cycle Superhighways suggests the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes in central London which are less suitable for them.

Following feedback from the consultation on the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, we redesigned the segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct. This created more road space for us to implement traffic signals at the West Smithfield / Farringdon Street junction to address many of the concerns, including safety issues, raised during the previous consultation.

More information about the previous consultation is available at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth/

Cycle Superhighways are our flagship cycling programme and aim to provide a London-wide network of direct and high-capacity cycle routes, mostly along main roads, although also using residential and low-traffic roads where these offer an optimum solution. The Cycle Superhighways provide safe, comfortable and convenient journeys for anyone on a bicycle and essential links between London’s suburbs and the city centre, and for shorter journeys in between.

1.2 Purpose

The scheme updates the previous design for the Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill junction. It addresses many of the current conflict points between motor traffic, cyclists and pedestrians and provides dedicated priority for all road users.

1.3 Detailed description

The proposals we consulted on included the following measures:

**Pedestrian crossings**
- A new pedestrian crossing on Farringdon Street to provide pedestrians with a signal-controlled crossing point
- Raising the existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossing across Snow Hill and West Smithfield to footway level to provide a level crossing point
• Widening the footway on the north side of the West Smithfield arm of the junction to reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians

**Signal-controlled cycle link between CS6 and the Central London Grid**

• A new cycle link to provide cyclists with a controlled crossing point between CS6 and the Central London Grid on West Smithfield, including a segregated cycle feeder lane on West Smithfield and a link to Snow Hill

**Segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct**

• Segregated cycle tracks (at least 1.5 metres wide) behind the existing protective kerbs under Holborn Viaduct, creating extra road space for motor traffic and cyclists

**Traffic signals on Farringdon Street, Snow Hill and West Smithfield**

• New traffic signals for motor vehicles to separate movements between Farringdon Street and West Smithfield / Snow Hill
• A 1.8 metre wide segregated cycle track behind the loading / disabled parking bay to allow northbound cyclists to bypass the signals
• A segregated cycle track for southbound cyclists, who would proceed with southbound traffic to maximise green time

**Banned left turn into West Smithfield except cycles**

• A banned turn for southbound traffic turning left from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield to remove the risk of ‘left hook’ conflicts between turning motor vehicles and cyclists travelling ahead at the junction
• Traffic counts show that a maximum of 40 vehicles per hour make this movement. Alternative routes are available nearby

**Changes to parking and loading**

• The loading / disabled bay previously proposed on the west side of Farringdon Street, north of Holborn Viaduct would be retained

You can find details of the original North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross consultation at [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth/](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth/).
2. About the consultation

2.1 Purpose

The objectives of the consultation were:

- To give stakeholders and the public easily understandable information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- To understand the level of support or opposition for the proposals
- To understand any issues that might affect the proposals of which we were not previously aware
- To understand concerns and objections
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 Potential outcomes

The potential outcomes of the consultation were:

- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to proceed with the scheme as set out in the consultation
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we modify the proposals in response to issues raised and proceed with a revised scheme
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide not to proceed with the scheme

Our conclusion and next steps are set out in our response to issues raised report.

2.3 Consultation history

We have conducted two previous consultations on the North-South Cycle Superhighway.

Between 3 September and 9 November 2014, we consulted on proposals for the North-South Cycle Superhighway between Elephant and Castle and King’s Cross. The consultation included detailed information on the proposals between Elephant and Castle and Stonecutter Street, and this section opened in April 2016. The consultation also included more general proposals on the route between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross.

Between 8 February and 20 March 2016, we consulted on detailed proposals for the North-South Cycle Superhighway between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross. Our
report published in September 2016 announced our intention to proceed with the route with some changes to the proposals.

Because the updated design at Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill involves significant changes to the road layout and permitted vehicle movements, we have consulted on this separately.

2.4 Who we consulted

We consulted local residents and businesses, and stakeholders based in the area. A map of the letter distribution area is available in Appendix E. We also consulted stakeholders who represent road user and other interest groups. A list of stakeholders we contacted is available in Appendix H.

2.5 Dates and duration

The consultation ran from 2 November to 13 December 2016.

2.6 What we asked

We asked respondents to tell us their level of support or opposition for the scheme. Respondents could choose one of ‘Strongly Support’, ‘Support’, Neither support or oppose’, ‘Oppose’, ‘Strongly oppose’ or ‘Don't know’. We also asked respondents to give us any comments they had about the scheme in a text box. The full list of consultation questions is available in Appendix B.

2.7 Methods of responding

People were able to respond to the consultation through the following channels:

- By answering the questions in the survey on our consultation website at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield/
- By sending a letter to FREEPOST TfL CONSULTATIONS
- By emailing: consultations@tfl.gov.uk. We also answered questions from members of the public and stakeholders via email

Through our Customer Services Team, it was possible to request foreign language translations, large print, Braille or audio versions of our consultation materials.
2.8 Consultation materials and publicity

We publicised the consultation as widely as possible, including sending letters to local businesses, residents and stakeholders, emailing stakeholders and sending Tweets about the consultation from TfL Twitter accounts.

2.8.1 Website

The consultation web pages provided information about the proposed design of the scheme, including text explanations and a drawing showing the intended changes. The consultation also included information about the traffic impacts of the scheme, including impacts on general traffic, buses, cycling and pedestrians. The information was available online from 2 November 2016 at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield/.

2.8.2 Letters

We wrote to 5,490 addresses in the scheme area with information about the proposed design of the scheme, including text explanations and a drawing showing the intended changes. A copy of the letter is available in Appendix C, the consultation drawing is available in Appendix D and the distribution area is shown in Appendix E.

2.8.3 Emails to previous consultation respondents

We emailed 792 individuals, businesses and stakeholders who responded to the previous consultation on detailed proposals for the North-South Cycle Superhighway between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross that ran between 8 February and 20 March 2016. The text of the email is available in Appendix F.

2.8.4 Emails to stakeholders

We sent an email outlining the scheme and explaining where to find more information and respond to around 600 businesses and organisations identified as interested in road schemes in this area. The text of the email is available in Appendix G and the list of stakeholders we contacted can be found in Appendix H.

2.8.5 Social media

We sent Tweets announcing that the consultation was open from the main @TfL Twitter account and the @TfLTph account which is run by the TfL Taxi and Private Hire team.
2.8.6 Meetings with stakeholders

We held meetings with the following stakeholders to discuss the proposals:

- City of London Corporation
- Crossrail
- Museum of London
- Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association
- Hatton Garden BID
- Bleeding Heart Yard
- London Development Project

2.9 How we considered equalities in the consultation

We took steps to ensure that all groups in the community, such as organisations representing older or disabled people were made aware of the consultation, the potential impacts of the scheme, and how to respond to the consultation. Measures taken included:

- Identifying and emailing relevant stakeholders including but not limited to the British Dyslexia Association, Age UK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute for the Blind, Action on Hearing Loss and Inclusion London, inviting them to respond to the consultation
- Ensuring that the materials were written in plain English, and available on request in different formats (for example, Braille, large print, other languages)

We are fully aware of our obligations under the Equality Act 2010, in particular the effect of the public sector equality duty on our decision-making.

2.10 Analysis of consultation responses

Analysis of all responses was carried out by our Consultation team. We used our standard peer-review processes to verify the coding of comments. Detailed analysis of comments can be found in Appendix A.
3. About the respondents

This chapter provides more information on respondents to this consultation, based on the information they provided to us in the online questionnaire. For a full list of the consultation questions, see Appendix B.

3.1 Number of respondents

A total of 815 respondents responded to this consultation after 20 duplicates were combined. Duplicates can occur when the same person responds by email and via the consultation web page. We identified two responses from the same email address as duplicates and combined the responses.

Stakeholder responses are those submitted by respondents who indicate they are responding on behalf of a political or other organisation, business or campaign group. Their responses are summarised in Section 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

We asked respondents to tell us how they heard about the consultation. A total of 749 (91%) of 815 respondents provided an answer. Percentages given are from the total 815 consultation respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How respondents heard</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on the TfL website</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about in the press</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Mode of transport

We asked respondents about the mode of transport they used in the area. Respondents could choose more than one mode of transport. Percentages given are from the total 815 consultation respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Mode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/scooter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van/lorry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Postcode

Of the 815 respondents to the consultation, 656 (80% of all respondents) submitted their postcode. Below is a list of postcode sectors taken from the postcodes provided by 10 or more respondents, with percentages given from the total number of consultation respondents (815).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1V</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Support for scheme by postcode across Greater London

The graph below shows the support for the scheme by postcode across Greater London.
4. Summary of all consultation responses

We asked respondents two questions concerning the scheme. The first question was a closed question designed to determine the numerical level of support and opposition to the scheme. The second question asked respondents to give their comments about the scheme in a free text box with no limit on the length of the comment.

4.1 Overall support and opposition for the scheme

To gain feedback and get an idea of the level of support for and opposition to the scheme, we asked respondents a closed question that allowed them to give one of the following responses: ‘Strongly Support’, ‘Support’, ‘Neither support or oppose’, ‘Oppose’, ‘Strongly oppose’ or ‘Don’t know’. 814 respondents gave an answer to this question. Percentages are given from the total number of consultation respondents (815).

Stakeholder responses are included in all the results in this chapter, and percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents. No question was mandatory. For responses provided by email, we included the level of support implied or expressed as a response to this question.

Overall support and opposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support or oppose</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support or oppose</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Most frequently made comments

Of the 815 people who responded to the consultation, 514 (63 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for the scheme. A detailed analysis of comments is available in Appendix A. The most frequently raised issues are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive comment</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would improve the junction for cycling</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion on local roads</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative comment</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction currently unsafe, intimidating or inconvenient for cycling</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would increase congestion generally</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported signalising the junction at Farringdon Street / West Smithfield</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current risk of conflict between cyclists and motorists due to the existing road layout</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion from other schemes or Cycle Superhighways</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist safety would be improved</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme would improve the situation generally or for other road users</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme would increase pollution</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme offered too much provision or over prioritised cyclists</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed the banned turn from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the feedback we received from stakeholders. We have condensed detailed responses into brief summaries. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes.

Local authorities & statutory bodies

City of London Corporation

Neither supported nor opposed the scheme. Thanked TfL for an open and collaborative approach. Recognised and supported the improved benefits of the scheme, but opposed the banned turn due to impact on Smithfield Market. Claimed that proposals would increase traffic and road risk around Smithfield Market.
Requested that TfL look to allow vehicles to turn left from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield overnight during market operational hours. Requested further revisions to pedestrian crossing at Stonecutter Street (not part of this consultation).

**Transport and road user groups**

**20's Plenty for Us**
Strongly supported the scheme, especially welcoming the signalised pedestrian crossing on Farringdon Street. Requested that pedestrian priority at Snow Hill junction was emphasised through a blended / Copenhagen crossing. Welcomed the raised element of the crossing. Also concerned with 20mph compliance on Farringdon Street and asked for measures to increase compliance.

**Brent Cyclists (regional branch of London Cycling Campaign)**
Strongly supported. Said it was a useful improvement and extension to the existing Cycle Superhighway.

**Camden Cycling Campaign**
Neither supported nor opposed the scheme. The Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC) noted its response to the previous consultation, where it raised concerns over collision risks for cyclists, including left hook risks for cyclists turning left into West Smithfield and collisions with northbound traffic turning right onto West Smithfield from Farringdon Street.

On the current consultation, the CCC welcomed the banned left turn as it would remove some left hook risks. It also felt the crossing would make the cycle crossing between West Smithfield and Farringdon Street northbound safer and welcome the benefits for pedestrians and the reduction of pedestrian / cycle conflict risk.

The CCC believed that some risks remained for southbound cycles and northbound motors turning into West Smithfield and suggested banning the right turn into West Smithfield.

The CCC also raised concerns about the motorcycle/ disabled taxi / loading bay and suggested the cycle track should go behind any parking bays. It was also concerned about potential confusion for cyclists at the Snow Hill junction between the CS6 route and the ASL box and suggested removing the latter.

The CCC suggested lengthening the contraflow on West Smithfield and extending the pedestrian / cycle area between Smithfield Street and Farringdon Street. Also believed that the proposed banned turn from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield could create a pedestrian and cycle area on West Smithfield.
London Cycling Campaign
Supported the proposals. The London Cycling Campaign (LCC) raised a number of issues, including current safety issues for cycling at the junction and the complexity of the junction design given the segregated and non-segregated right turn lanes. Pointed out the need to phase traffic signals carefully.

Raised a concern about visibility at the junction, and suggested signalising West Smithfield for pedestrians. Also suggested co-ordinating the provision with local cycling and non-cycling infrastructure, including the Museum of London plans and those of nearby Central London Grid, ideally rerouting the Grid along West Smithfield.

Among suggested changes to the cycle track, it suggested positioning the shared loading bay / disabled bay / taxi rank between the cycle track and the carriageway and fully segregating the cycle track west of Farringdon Street south of Holborn Viaduct.

The LCC supported the proposed bus stop bypass and suggested using transparent bus stops to maximise visibility. Reasserted benefits of providing high quality cycling routes and having all schemes conform to London Cycle Design Standards and Cycling Level of Service.

London Highways & Ranks Committee
Neither supported nor opposed. Highlighted importance of access to the west arm of Charterhouse Street and the potential for displacement of traffic onto other routes as a result of the banned turn, especially onto Charterhouse Street East and West Smithfield. Suggested using the design previously consulted on for the West Smithfield junction.

Westminster Living Streets
Strongly supported. Welcomed any help for cyclists.

Business groups
Smithfield Market Tenants' Association
Opposed the scheme. Thanked TfL for engagement. Raised concern over the banned left turn from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield, and urged TfL to investigate a time-limited ban so that market traffic could turn left between certain prescribed hours (such as 9pm to 6am). Claimed that the number of vehicles making the turn was significant and the proposals have the potential to cause the roads around the market to become congested, in turn congesting neighbouring roads and causing loss of trade at the market.
Businesses, employers and venues

Images In Print
Strongly opposed. Opposed cycle lanes, saying that they were detrimental to business.

4.6 Summary of comments from social media

The consultation was publicised by Tweets from the TfL Taxis and Private Hire (@TfLTPH) account on 5 November (available [here](#)) and 10 November 2016 (available [here](#)). The consultation was publicised by a Tweet from the @TfL account on 25 November. The Tweet is available [here](#).

Issues raised in response to the Tweets included:

- 10 made a generally negative comment or opposed the scheme
- 5 comments mentioned journey time / congestion concerns
- 3 made a negative comment or criticism of TfL
- 7 said the consultation results will be ignored or that the decision had already been made
- 3 said TfL transport planning lacked local knowledge or that the design was poor
- 1 was concerned that the proposed taxi rank would no longer be introduced
- 1 was concerned about cyclist behaviour
- 1 was concerned about pollution
- 1 said that the scheme was a waste of money

The London Cycling Campaign also Tweeted about the scheme on 7 November (available [here](#)) and 15 November 2016 (available [here](#)). The Tweets directed people to the LCC’s article about the scheme at [http://lcc.org.uk/articles/take-action-support-snow-hill-changes-to-the-north-south-extension](http://lcc.org.uk/articles/take-action-support-snow-hill-changes-to-the-north-south-extension).
5. Conclusion and next steps

Between 2 November and 13 December 2016, we consulted on further proposed changes to the junction of Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill as part of North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6). The proposals aimed to address many of the current conflict points between motor traffic, cyclists and pedestrians and provide dedicated priority for all road users. They included a new controlled cycle crossing between Farringdon Street and West Smithfield, a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing and traffic signals across Farringdon Street and segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct. The proposals also included banning the southbound left turn for motor vehicles from Farringdon Street to West Smithfield.

Overall responses

We received a total of 815 responses to the consultation, of which 508 (62%) supported or strongly supported the proposals and 293 (36%) opposed or strongly opposed the proposals. 13 (2%) said they neither opposed nor supported or that they did not know. One (<1%) respondent did not answer the question.

Response to issues raised and next steps

We have published our response to issues raised report at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield/. It gives our response to issues raised during the consultation and describes how we intend to proceed with the scheme.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of comments

Of the 815 total respondents to the consultation, 514 (63 per cent) responded to the question ‘Please give us any comments about the proposed changes to the junction of Farringdon Street and West Smithfield / Snow Hill as part of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’. We have summarised the key themes arising for the overall scheme. Percentages given are from the total of 815 consultation respondents. Key themes arising included:

Benefits and impacts for road users
248 respondents made a comment about the benefits and impacts on different groups of road users and others in the area. Comments included:

Cyclists
159 (20%) respondents made a comment about the benefits and impacts for cyclists. Comments included:

- 104 (13%) said that the proposals would improve the junction for cycling, including 51 (6%) who said cyclist safety would be improved
- 81 (10%) said the junction was currently unsafe, intimidating or inconvenient for cycling
- 12 (1%) said the scheme would encourage cycling
- 8 (1%) said that the scheme would not improve the junction for cyclists, including 5 (1%) who said that cyclist safety would not be improved
- 7 (1%) asked that more was done to improve cyclist safety
- 7 (1%) made a comment that turning uphill from West Smithfield into Farringdon Street was difficult for cyclists
- 5 (1%) commented about the poor condition of the road surface for cycling
- 2 (<1%) said the scheme would discourage cycling

Other road users
77 (9%) respondents made comment about the impacts on other road users. Comments included:

- 50 (6%) said that the scheme would improve the situation generally or for other road users, including 10 (1%) who said it would improve safety generally
- 12 (1%) made a comment about the current situation generally or for other road users
- 12 (1%) said the scheme would disadvantage other road users
- 5 (1%) believed the scheme would improve the situation for vulnerable road users or those with disabilities
- 4 (<1%) said there would be no improvement for vulnerable road users
Pedestrians
45 (6%) respondents made a comment about the benefits and impacts for pedestrians. Comments included:

- 37 (5%) felt the proposals would improve the situation for pedestrians, including 13 (2%) who said it would improve pedestrian safety
- 9 (1%) said the junction currently served pedestrians poorly
- 3 (<1%) asked that more was done for pedestrian safety

Motorists and taxis
34 (4%) respondents made comment about the impacts on motorists and taxis. Comments included:

- 19 (2%) claimed that motorists would be disadvantaged
- 11 (1%) said that taxis and taxi passengers would be disadvantaged
- 4 (<1%) said the scheme would improve the situation for motorists
- 3 (<1%) were concerned about the freight impacts

Local impacts
19 (2%) respondents made comment about the local impacts on other road users. Comments included:

- 8 (1%) were concerned about the negative impact on residents
- 7 (1%) raised the issue that local business would be affected
- 4 (<1%) raised the issue of the construction impacts of the scheme

General support and opposition
214 (26%) respondents made a comment in general support or opposition. Comments included:

- 124 (15%) made a generally supportive comment
- 91 (11%) made a generally negative comment

Traffic and congestion
178 (22%) respondents made a comment about motor traffic or congestion. Comments included:

- 94 (12%) said the scheme would increase congestion on local roads
- 80 (11%) said the proposals would increase congestion generally
- 60 (7%) highlighted congestion from other schemes or Cycle Superhighways
- 40 (5%) were concerned about current congestion
• 22 (3%) said the scheme would increase journey times or inconvenience
• 14 (2%) were concerned about local access for motor vehicles
• 14 (2%) were worried about the loss of road space for motor vehicles that the scheme would involve
• 1 (<1%) said that traffic should be reduced

Road layout suggestions
• 2 (<1%) suggested that yellow box junction markings be provided
• 1 (<1%) suggested reducing the number of traffic lanes on Snow Hill

Traffic signals
110 (13%) respondents made a comment about signalising the junction or traffic signals. Comments included:

Signalising the junction
90 (11%) made a comment about signalising the junction. Comments included:

• 77 (11%) supported signalising the junction at Farringdon Street / West Smithfield
• 9 (1%) suggested signalising the West Smithfield crossing rather than providing pedestrian priority
• 8 (1%) opposed signalising the junction

Traffic signal phasing
14 (2%) made a comment about traffic signal phasing. Comments included:

• 8 (1%) said that traffic signals currently caused congestion or that the signals proposed would increase congestion
• 5 (1%) suggested coordinating the signals with those at the Charterhouse Street junction
• 5 (<1%) urged that signals should be improved or better coordinated generally or outside the scheme area
• 4 (<1%) said that signal green time for cyclists should be increased
• 4 (<1%) asked for separate traffic signals for cyclists
• 2 (<1%) said that signal phasing is complicated
• 2 (<1%) asked for green time for motorists to be increased
Cycle facilities
101 (13%) made a comment about the cycle facilities proposed. These included:

Quality of design
49 (6%) made a comment about the quality of the proposed design. Comments included:
- 22 (3%) said that the new design for the junction improves on the proposals in the previous North-South Cycle Superhighway consultation
- 15 (2%) asserted that an improved design or better facilities were needed
- 6 (1%) believed that the existing road layout is complicated
- 6 (1%) supported the suggestions made by the London Cycling Campaign as part of their response to the previous North-South Cycle Superhighway consultation
- 3 (<1%) said that a new design was needed to improve safety
- 3 (<1%) said that better design principles or guidelines should be followed

Segregation
29 (4%) made a comment about segregation. Comments included:
- 23 (3%) made a comment supporting segregated cycle facilities
- 4 (<1%) supported segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct
- 2 (<1%) believed that the cycle track should be stepped

Route alignment and access
19 (2%) made a suggestion about the proposed route of the cycle track. Suggestions included:
- 7 (1%) suggested extending the North-South Cycle Superhighway to the north, including to Kings Cross and beyond. This included:
  - 1 (<1%) who asked for the route not to continue north on side streets
- 3 (<1%) said that the proposals would improve connectivity for cycling
- 2 (<1%) said the cycle track should be extended to the south
- 2 (<1%) commented that the route should be provided off the carriageway
- 1 (<1%) suggested that the route go via Chancery Lane, Holborn and Hatton Garden
- 1 (<1%) suggested extending the cycle track contraflow between Farringdon street and Smithfield Street
- 1 (<1%) asked for the proposals to be aligned with Central London Grid routes
- 1 (<1%) suggested that the cycle track change to the other side of the carriageway after Charterhouse Street

Cycle track
13 (2%) made a comment about the cycle track. Comments included:
- 5 (1%) were concerned that the cycle track was too narrow
- 4 (<1%) said that a two-way track should be provided
• 2 (<1%) asked for splayed kerbs on either side of the cycle track
• 1 (<1%) said that ramps in the cycle track should be shallow

*Cycle crossing and waiting facilities*

7 (1%) respondents made a comment about the proposed facilities at cycle crossings, in particular waiting areas. Comments included:

• 5 (<1%) made a comment about waiting areas for cyclists, including:
  o 3 (<1%) who suggested increasing the size of the cycle waiting areas on West Smithfield or Snow Hill or making them easier to access
  o 2 (<1%) who suggested providing more waiting areas on Farringdon Street
  o 2 (<1%) who suggested that no Advanced Stop Line (ASL) or cycle markings be provided on Snow Hill / West Smithfield
• 1 (<1%) was concerned about the tight turn for cyclists from West Smithfield into Farringdon Street
• 1 (<1%) suggested moving the cycle stop lines on West Smithfield closer to Farringdon Street to improve visibility for cyclists and motorists at the junction
• 1 (<1%) who suggested extending the North-South Cycle Superhighway feeder lane to the stop line on Snow Hill to allow cycles to merge onto the North-South Cycle Superhighway more easily

*Other suggestions*

4 (<1%) respondents made another comment or suggestion, including:

• 2 (<1%) suggested that more cycle parking be provided
• 2 (<1%) suggested that cycle signage should be provided or improved

*Road user conflicts*

101 (12%) respondents made a comment about potential conflicts between road users. Comments included:

*Cyclist / motorist conflicts*

83 (10%) made a comment about conflicts between cyclists and motorists. Comments included:

• 76 (9%) mentioned the current risk of conflict between cyclists and motorists due to the existing road layout. Reasons for such conflict included:
  o 31 (4%) said that cyclists are currently forced to mix with traffic or cross multiple lanes of traffic which was risky
  o 24 (3%) highlighted that motorists blocking or edging out into a traffic lane was a problem
  o 15 (2%) pointed to motor vehicle speed as an issue
  o 6 (1%) said that the lack of visibility at the junction caused problems
6 (1%) were concerned about cyclist speeds caused by the downhill southbound slope on Farringdon Street
- 13 (2%) were concerned specifically about cyclist conflicts with heavy vehicles

*Left hook risks for cyclists*
12 (1%) respondents made a comment about the left hook risk for cyclists. Comments included:
- 4 (<1%) claimed that cyclist behaviour was the cause of left hook conflicts
- 3 (<1%) were concerned about left hook risks from Snow Hill into Farringdon Street
- 2 (<1%) highlighted the current left hook risk for cyclists turning from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield

*Pedestrian conflicts*
17 (2%) made a comment about conflicts between pedestrians and other road users. Comments included:
- 13 (2%) were concerned about cyclists conflicting with pedestrians, including:
  - 3 (<1%) who were concerned about cyclists conflicting with those waiting at bus stops
  - 1 (<1%) who raised potential cyclist conflicts with disabled road users
  - 1 (<1%) who mentioned cycle speeds in relation to pedestrian conflict
- 9 (1%) were concerned about motorists conflicting with pedestrians

*Demand and level of provision for cycling*
67 (8%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision for cycling in the scheme or the level of cycling demand. Comments included:

*Level of provision*
50 (5%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision. Comments included:
- 39 (5%) said that the scheme offered too much provision or over prioritised cyclists
- 9 (1%) said that cycling provision should be improved elsewhere
- 3 (<1%) said that more provision for cyclists was needed

*Demand*
23 (3%) respondents made a comment about the level of cycling demand. Comments included:
- 6 (1%) said that high demand for cycling was only at peak times
- 6 (1%) commented that demand is increasing or that the scheme was insufficient to meet current or future demand
- 5 (1%) said that these proposals are needed to meet current or future demand
5 (1%) said that the scheme is not justified by the demand

Banned turn
56 (7%) respondents made a comment about the banned left turn from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield. Comments included:

- 39 (5%) opposed the banned turn from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield, giving the following reasons:
  - 15 (2%) believed the banned turn would increase congestion
  - 4 (<1%) said it would create more pollution
  - 2 (<1%) said it would cause drivers to make U-turns
- 10 (1%) supported the banned turn
- 6 (1%) suggested changing the banned turn arrangements or made other suggestions to allow or ban different turns for cycles and motor vehicles, including:
  - 2 (<1%) who suggested allowing the right turn into Charterhouse Street for motor vehicles

Impact on Smithfield Market
- 5 (1%) suggested that a part time ban be used to allow vehicles including Smithfield Market delivery vehicles to turn into the market overnight
- 3 (<1%) believed the banned turn would have an adverse impact on Smithfield Market

Environment and health
52 (6%) respondents made a comment about the impact on health and the environment or made suggestions to improve the local environment. Comments included:

Pollution
- 46 (6%) believed that the scheme would increase pollution
- 4 (<1%) said that the proposals would decrease pollution

Health
- 5 (1%) said that the scheme would negatively affect health
- 1 (<1%) said that the scheme would improve health

Suggestions
- 2 (<1%) suggested improving the lighting and street environment under Holborn Viaduct
Cost and social impact
46 (6%) respondents made a comment about the cost of the scheme or its impact on London. Comments included:
- 35 (4%) said the scheme would have a negative impact on London or the economy
- 12 (2%) said the scheme was a waste of money
- 1 (<1%) said the scheme was a good use of money

Traffic modelling information and consultation
28 (3%) respondents made a comment about the consultation or the information provided. Comments included:
- 17 (2%) said that the data or traffic modelling information given as part of the scheme was inaccurate or misleading
- 11 (1%) made a negative comment about the consultation, including claims that the consultation results would not be taken account of, that the consultation was not sufficiently advertised or similar
- 1 (<1%) said that it was good to see TfL listening to the consultation results

Road user behaviour
25 (3%) made a comment about the behaviour of different road user groups. Comments included:
- 16 (2%) made a comment about cyclist behaviour, including riding through red lights or on the pavement, or causing inconvenience or distress to other road users
- 6 (1%) commented on motorist behaviour such as stopping in cycle waiting areas and paths, disobeying traffic signals or not giving due attention, including 2 (<1%) who called for enforcement of a 20mph speed limit for motorists and 2 (<1%) who called for illegal or unsafe driving behaviour generally to be more strongly enforced
- 6 (1%) said that cyclists should be educated to improve their behaviour or their behaviour should be enforced
- 2 (<1%) believed that cyclists should not ride in the road
- 1 (<1%) commented about cyclists not paying road tax

Pedestrian crossings and facilities
19 (2%) respondents made a comment about facilities for pedestrians. Comments included
- 14 (2%) called for improved pedestrian crossings or for other crossings to be provided. Suggestions included single-stage crossings, enforcement, zebra
crossings over the cycle track, a raised crossing and providing a pedestrian crossing on Charterhouse Street

- 4 (<1%) asked for pedestrian facilities to be improved generally, including 1 (<1%) comment that the footway was too narrow at the proposed bus stop bypass
- 3 (<1%) suggested that pedestrians and cyclists have priority over motor traffic at junctions

Parking, loading and taxi bays
18 (2%) made a comment about the taxi, loading and parking bay on the east side of Farringdon Street. Comments included:

- 8 (1%) suggested repositioning the loading bay
- 7 (1%) said that the position of the cycle rank would create conflict between motorists and cyclists
- 5 (1%) suggested that there should be space or protection between the cycle lane and the loading bay

Taxi ranks and bays
- 2 (<1%) suggested increasing provision for taxi ranks or opposed the loss of taxi ranks
- 1 (<1%) supported the reduction of taxi rank space

Bus passengers and bus stops
15 (2%) respondents made a comment about the impact on bus users and the design for the bus stop. Comments included:

- 6 (1%) were concerned about the impact on bus users
- 2 (<1%) supported the proposed bus stop design
- 2 (<1%) opposed the proposed bus stop design, including 1 (<1%) who pointed out the benefits of a conventional bus stop
- 1 (<1%) said the proposals would improve the situation for bus users
- 1 (<1%) said that buses cause congestion
- 1 (<1%) supported the contrasted road surface for the pedestrian cycle track crossings at the bus stop bypass
Appendix B: Consultation questions

Questions about our proposals

Both questions were optional.

1. To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed changes to the junction of Farringdon Street and West Smithfield / Snow Hill as part of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

2. Please give us any comments about the proposed changes to the junction of Farringdon Street and West Smithfield / Snow Hill as part of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Questions about the respondent

3. What is your name?

4. What is your email address?

5. Please provide us with your postcode?

6. If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name:

7. Are you (please tick all boxes that apply):
   - Local resident
   - Business Owner
   - Employed locally
   - Visitor to the area
   - Commuter to the area
   - Not local but interested in the scheme
   - Other (Please specify)

8. What types of transport do you normally use locally? (Please tick all boxes that apply)
   - Tube
   - Train
   - Taxi
   - Bus
   - Private coach
   - Bicycle
   - Walk
• Car
• Van/lorry
• Motorcycle/scooter
• Other (Please specify)

9. How did you find out about this consultation?

10. What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)?
Appendix C: Consultation letter

Transport for London

2 November 2016

Dear Sir or Madam,

Proposed changes to the junction of Farringdon Street and West Smithfield / Snow Hill as part of the North-South Cycle Superhighway

Following the recent publication of our response to issues raised report for the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross, we are proposing further changes to the junction of Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill. The proposals include a new controlled cycle crossing which would provide a cycle link between CS6 and the Central London Grid cycle route through West Smithfield. In addition, a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing across Farringdon Street and traffic signals at the junction are proposed. The proposals would also create space for new segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct. Our proposals would address many of the current conflict points between motor traffic, cyclists and pedestrians and provide dedicated priority for all road users. The scheme would include the following measures, which are also shown in the accompanying consultation drawing:

Pedestrian crossings
- A new pedestrian crossing on Farringdon Street to provide pedestrians with a signal-controlled crossing point
- Raising the existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossing across Snow Hill and West Smithfield to footway level to provide a level crossing point
- Widening the footway on the north side of the West Smithfield arm of the junction to reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians

Signal-controlled cycle link between CS6 and the Central London Grid
- A new cycle link to provide cyclists with a controlled crossing point between CS6 and the Central London Grid on West Smithfield, including a segregated cycle feeder lane on West Smithfield and a link to Snow Hill

Segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct
- Segregated cycle tracks (at least 1.5 metres wide) behind the existing protective kerbs under Holborn Viaduct, creating extra road space for motor traffic and cyclists

Traffic signals on Farringdon Street, Snow Hill and West Smithfield
- New traffic signals for motor vehicles to separate movements between Farringdon Street and West Smithfield / Snow Hill
• A 1.8 metre wide segregated cycle track behind the loading / disabled parking bay to allow northbound cyclists to bypass the signals
• A segregated cycle track for southbound cyclists, who would proceed with southbound traffic to maximise green time

**Banned left turn into West Smithfield except cycles**
• A banned turn for southbound traffic turning left from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield to remove the risk of 'left hook' conflicts between turning motor vehicles and cyclists travelling ahead at the junction
• Traffic counts show that a maximum of 40 vehicles per hour make this movement. Alternative routes are available nearby

**Changes to parking and loading**
• The loading / disabled bay previously proposed on the west side of Farringdon Street, north of Holborn Viaduct would be retained

We would no longer be able to introduce the previously proposed taxi rank on the west side of Farringdon Street as the space would be needed for the new pedestrian crossing. However, as detailed in the response to the North-South Cycle Superhighway consultation, the bay on the east side of Farringdon Street, south of Holborn Viaduct will be a shared taxi rank / loading bay and we propose switching its position with the motorcycle parking bay to improve visibility from the north. The total net loss of taxi rank length for this scheme is 2.3 metres. You can find details of the original North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King's Cross consultation at [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth).

**Traffic impacts**
Our traffic modelling shows this scheme would have largely neutral impacts on traffic and bus journey times along Farringdon Street. More information about journey time impacts and how we mitigate them is available at [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield).

**How to comment on the proposals**
**Website** – For further information or to let us know your views, please visit our website at [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield).
**Email** – Send to consultations@tfl.gov.uk with 'Cycle Superhighway North South – West Smithfield' as the subject.
**Letter** – Write to us at FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, ‘Cycle Superhighway North South – West Smithfield’

To request a copy of the consultation text and drawing in Braille, large text or another language, please contact us using the details provided above. The consultation will close on **Tuesday 13 December 2016**. Subject to the outcome of consultation, we plan to start construction in spring 2017.

Yours faithfully,

Matthew Moore, Consultation Team, Transport for London
Appendix D: Consultation drawing
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Appendix F: Email to previous consultation respondents

The following email was sent to previous consultation respondents:

**North-South Cycle Superhighway at Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill - consultation now open**

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to you because you responded to our recent consultation on the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross. We are proposing further changes to the junction of Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill.

We would like your views on our new proposals, which include:

- A new signal-controlled cycle crossing which would provide a cycle link between CS6 and the Central London Grid cycle route through West Smithfield
- Raising the existing unsignalised pedestrian crossing across Snow Hill and West Smithfield
- A new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing across Farringdon Street and traffic signals at the junction
- New segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct
- Banned left turn (except cycles) for traffic turning left from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield to remove the ‘left hook’ conflict risk between motor vehicles and cyclists
- Changes to parking, loading, taxi and disabled bays

Please visit [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield) for more details and to respond to the consultation, which closes on **Tuesday 13 December 2016**.

Yours faithfully

Matthew Moore
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Appendix G: Email to stakeholders

The following email was sent to stakeholders.

**North-South Cycle Superhighway at Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill - consultation now open**

Dear Sir or Madam,

Following the recent consultation on the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross, we are proposing further changes to the junction of Farringdon Street / West Smithfield / Snow Hill.

We would like your views on our new proposals, which include:

- A new signal-controlled cycle crossing which would provide a cycle link between CS6 and the Central London Grid cycle route through West Smithfield
- Raising the existing unsignalised pedestrian crossing across Snow Hill and West Smithfield
- A new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing across Farringdon Street and traffic signals at the junction
- New segregated cycle tracks under Holborn Viaduct
- Banned left turn (except cycles) for traffic turning left from Farringdon Street into West Smithfield to remove the ‘left hook’ conflict risk between motor vehicles and cyclists
- Changes to parking, loading, taxi and disabled bays

Please visit [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-smithfield) for more details and to respond to the consultation, which closes on **Tuesday 13 December 2016**.

Yours faithfully

Matthew Moore
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Appendix H: List of stakeholders emailed

Abellio West London Ltd t/a Abellio Surrey,
Action for Blind People
Action on Hearing Loss (RNID)
Age Concern London
Age UK
Alive in Space Landscape and Urban Design Studio
All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group
Alzheimer’s Society
Anderson Travel Ltd,
Angel BID
APC-Overnight
Argall BID
Arriva London North Ltd,
Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance
Association of British Drivers
Association of Car Fleet Operators
ATCoaches t/a Abbey Travel,
Baker Street Quarter
Bayswater BID
Best Bike Training //Cycletastic
Better Bankside
Better Transport
Bexley Council
bhs bikeability
BidVest
bikeworks
bikeXcite
Borough Cycling Officers Group
Breakspears Road Project
Brentwood Community Transport,
Brewery Logistics Group
British Cycling
British Land
British Medical Association
British Motorcycle Federation
British Retail Association
BT
Bucks Cycle Training
Camden Council
Camden mobility forum
Camden Town Unlimited
Campaign for Better Transport
Campbell's
Canal & River Trust London
Capital City School Sport Partnership
CBI-London
CCG City and Hackney
Golden Tours (Transport) Ltd,
Goldman Sachs
Greater London Authority
Greater London Forum for Older People
Green Flag Group
Guide Dogs
Health Poverty Action
Heart of London Business Alliance
Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee
Hermes Europe
House of Commons
HR Richmond Ltd t/a Quality Line,
ICE -London
In Holborn
Inclusion London
Independent Disability Advisory Group
Independent Shoreditch
Inmidtown
Institute for Sustainability
Institute of Advanced Motorists
Institution of Civil Engineers
Islington Council
Islington mobility forum
John Lewis Partnership
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)
Joint Mobility Unit
Keltbray
Kingston First
Laing O'Rourke
Lambeth Cyclists
Leonard Cheshire Disability
Licenced Taxi Drivers Association
Living Streets
Local Government Ombudsman
London ambulance Service
London Bike Hub
London borough of Brent
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Bridge Team
London Business Forum
London Cab drivers Club
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI)
London City Airport
London Climate Change Partnership
London Councils
London Cycling Campaign
London Duck Tours Ltd
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London European Partnership for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Mencap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Older People's Strategy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Omnibus Traction Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Strategic Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Suburban Taxi-drivers' Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Tourist Coach Operators Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London TravelWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London United Busways Ltd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Visual Impairment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Community Transport (MCT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrobus Ltd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroline Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Cycle Training Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Autistic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Children's Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Express Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Motorcycle Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New West End Company BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbank BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbank Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Youth Connexions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Your Bike Cycle Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philip kemp cycle training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzzle Focus Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge Cycling Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Danger Reduction Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roadpeace
Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames
Royal Institute of British Architects
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
Royal London Society for Blind People
Royal Mail
Royal National Institute for the Blind
Royal Parks
Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)
Sainsbury's Supermarkets
Sense
Sixty Plus
Smithfield Market
Smithfield Market Traders Association
South Bucks Cycle Training
South East London PCT
South Herts Plus Cycle Training
Southbank Employers Group
Southwark Cyclists
Space Syntax
Spokes Cycling Instruction
Stratford Renaissance Partnership
Stroke Association
Successful Sutton
Sunwin Service group (SSG Excellence)
Superdrug
Sustrans
Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector
Taxi and Private hire
Team London Bridge
Technicolour Tyre Company
Tesco
Thames Water
Thamesmead Business Services
The AA
The Big Bus Company Ltd,
The British Dyslexia Association
The British Motorcyclists’ Federation
The Canal & River Trust
The Disability Foundation
The Original Tour
The Royal Parks
Time for Twickenham
TNT
Tour Guides
Tower Transit Operations Ltd,
Trailblazers, Muscular Dystrophy UK
Transport for All
Transport for London (TfL)
Travis Perkins
Tyssen Community School Cycle Training
UK Power Networks