

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>Increase in traffic/ pollution</p> <p>Congestion and pollution have risen on main roads due to idling gridlocked vehicles; there is no signs of traffic evaporation after almost 4 months</p> <p>The scheme will increase traffic and queues on boundary roads including New North Road, Baring Street and Balls Pond Road</p>	<p>The objective of people friendly streets is to reduce the overall number of trips, not to displace all traffic from local streets onto main roads. This will only happen if some car trips are replaced by walking, wheeling, or cycling. For some journeys, the filters will make driving more inconvenient and are in this way designed to encourage those who do not need to drive to choose a different way to travel, especially for short trips. Every journey switched from driving to active travel removes a car from the road and leaves the roads clearer for people who have no other choice but to drive.</p> <p>The council's pre-consultation monitoring data (which can be found on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east) shows that overall, across the scheme's boundary roads, the total changes in volumes of traffic show a negligible change of 0% (rounded figure) when considering the monitoring results comparing July 2020 and July 2021, which is a positive pre-consultation outcome in line with the objectives of the scheme. Balls Pond Road and New North Road have seen increases of 15% and 11% respectively since June 2020, which is not desirable. However, traffic volumes on Essex Road East have fallen by 11%, and on Southgate Road North by 9%, from the Baseline counts in July 2020 and all other roads have seen negligible changes.</p> <p>The council is working with TfL to develop mitigating measures and will continue to monitor these roads. The increase on New North Road could be caused to a certain extent by factors other than the Canonbury East trial. For example, the removal of Old Street roundabout is a major transport infrastructure project that is being delivered and may have impacted traffic in the results. In addition, New North Road borders two low traffic neighbourhood trials (St Peter's in Islington, and Hoxton West in Hackney) which were all implemented within months of each other, and this may have exacerbated the early traffic displacement visible in the Canonbury East trial pre-consultation monitoring. In the longer term, travel behaviour is expected to adjust, resulting in lower motorised traffic levels overall, though essential trips will continue.</p> <p>The monitoring results also show that overall, the changes in levels of nitrogen dioxide comparing before and after the scheme reflect those in the borough more widely.</p>
<p>Exiting home (off-street residential parking from the Hackney side of Southgate Road) - into Southgate Road made more dangerous by motor vehicle since the Dove Road closure was implemented</p>	<p>Southgate Road is a LB Hackney road for which Hackney is the Highways and Traffic authority – officers have contacted Hackney to ensure the road safety issue is considered and addressed by their minor works programme.</p> <p>We do not expect that the introduction of the Dove Road closure would make exiting off-street parking from the Hackney side of Southgate Road more dangerous. The scheme has removed through-traffic which previously cut through from Essex Road to Southgate Road via Dove Road. The council's pre-consultation monitoring data (which can be found on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east) shows that there has been a negligible change in traffic volumes on Southgate Road since the introduction of the scheme: a 9% decrease in traffic volumes on Southgate Road (North site) and 2% increase on Southgate Road (South site) when comparing July 2020 and July 2021.</p>
<p>Disturbance from traffic (affecting quality of life)</p>	<p>Noise pollution would be linked to the volume of traffic on the roads in and around the Canonbury East LTN. Our monitoring report shows that overall, motorised traffic volumes on internal roads of the Canonbury East LTN have decreased by an average of</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>– noise pollution</p>	<p>80%. Across the boundary roads, the total volumes of motorised traffic show a negligible change (0%), which is a positive result in line with the objectives of the trial.</p> <p>On average, motorised traffic volumes have changed on Essex Road East by -11%, on Southgate Road North by -9%, Canonbury Road by -6%, Southgate Road South by +2%, Essex Road West by +5%, Baring Street by +8%, New North Road by +11% and Balls Pond Road by +15%.</p> <p>The council also held a public consultation from 2 November to 30 November 2021 – one of the questions asked respondents how noise from traffic had evolved since the start of trial. 41% of respondents said there was less noise from motor traffic, 27% said there was more.</p> <p>The council will continue monitoring boundary roads to ensure the scheme is not having a significant impact there in terms of traffic levels leading to noise pollution.</p>
<p>Impact on GP Surgeries in the Area - affecting their ability to provide care</p> <p>Allow Exemptions for Residents, GPS, blue badges</p>	<p>Local residents and staff at local GP surgeries have several choices when deciding how to travel to local appointments.</p> <p>The 2020 Executive Paper resident impact assessment (RIA) for people-friendly streets had identified a series of negative impacts for people who have a protected characteristic, for disabled people. Following this RIA, the council engaged with disabled groups and people with complex mobility needs, reviewed correspondence, LTN trial feedback survey data, Commonplace comments, gathered data on car journey length and times, and reviewed research reports to better understand the nature of the constraints experienced by disabled people who travel by private car. Based on this feedback and evidence, an exemption for Blue Badge holders was proposed in the October 2021 Executive Report, and this is being rolled out across the Islington LTNs (including in Canonbury East).</p> <p>The exemption will only apply for a single LTN and will allow Blue Badge holders to register a single motor vehicle for their personal use which is registered to their own address within (or on the boundary of) the low traffic neighbourhood in which they live.</p> <p>The reasons given for not providing exemptions more widely than the Blue Badge exemptions are:</p> <p>Access to all addresses is maintained. The scheme has been designed so that all residents can access their homes without the need for an exemption. We know that it is vital that people who need to use their cars, such as Blue Badge holders, can access their home by car at all times. That is why in any of our people-friendly streets neighbourhoods across Islington, all residents are still able to drive to and from their homes, and people are still able to access shops and services in their area by car. The only thing that may change in some circumstances is the route they have to take.</p> <p>We need to create a safer environment for people to walk, use wheelchairs and cycle. If private vehicles in the area are still able to travel through the restrictions, then we will not see the benefits in terms of reducing road danger, air quality and noise pollution that we would otherwise expect. This is because one of the main barriers that puts people off walking, using wheelchairs or cycling instead of driving is not feeling safe when sharing the road with the increasing volumes of traffic in the borough. By preventing all motor vehicle trips through camera-controlled filters (except for emergency vehicles and some council service vehicles) we will make the environment feel much safer and make it much more likely that local people will begin to travel more by active means.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>We need to reduce congestion and air pollution on the main roads. The objective of the people-friendly streets programme is to reduce the overall number of trips, not to displace all traffic from local streets onto main roads. This will only happen if some car trips are replaced by walking, using wheelchairs or cycling. For some journeys the filters will make driving more inconvenient and are in this way designed to encourage those who don't need to drive to choose a different way to travel, especially for short trips. Every journey switched from driving to active travel (such as walking, using wheelchairs or cycling) removes a car from the road and leaves the roads clearer for people who have no other choice but to drive.</p> <p>Congestion has risen in Islington (and in London) because every day people make decisions to drive, thinking that is their easiest option. By introducing people-friendly streets, walking, using wheelchairs or cycling become a more convenient choice for people to make - safer, easier, and quicker than driving. Every journey switched to active travel removes a car from the roads and leaves the roads clearer for people who may have no choice but to drive.</p>
<p>No Consultation or due notice Residents and businesses, who are suffering have not been properly consulted</p> <p>Council is required to revise its consultation plans so that all residents of a LTN scheme MUST be consulted</p>	<p>Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 enables the Council to make experimental traffic orders (ETOs) to deliver our people-friendly streets schemes, prior to a public consultation. In deciding whether to make an order under section 9, the Council has to comply with the provisions of section 122 of the 1984 Act which requires the Council to exercise that function (as far as practicable having regard to the matters specified below) to secure the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The specified matters are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises. (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run. (bb) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy). (c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and (d) any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant. <p>The Council has complied with section 122, balanced the various considerations, and concluded that implementing the ETO is the appropriate decision.</p> <p>Further, when deciding whether to make a traffic order the Council must have regard to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy (sections 142 and 144(1)(a) Greater London Authority Act 1999) and it has done so. That strategy emphasises the importance of reducing emissions and improving air quality.</p> <p>The provisions of the ETO process do not require public consultation prior to the start of the trial, although the Council did in fact engage with the public before the start of the trial.</p> <p>In making the ETO, the Council must follow the procedure set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (as amended by the Traffic Orders Procedure (Coronavirus) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020). It has followed this procedure, including consultation of relevant bodies.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>The Council has also considered the application of relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010. It is not considered that the implementation of these ETOs will impede the rights of individuals.</p> <p>Consultation was carried out on the Islington Transport Strategy (in 2019) and the net zero carbon strategy (in 2020). The former had made the case for the introduction of measures aimed at enabling a reduction in motor traffic, enabling more people to walk, cycle and wheel and lead active lifestyles, reducing road danger and reducing the impact of transport on local air pollution and climate change. The Islington Vision 2030 (Net Zero Carbon) Strategy is a response to the Climate Change Emergency that the council declared in June 2019, and it identifies the PFS programme as a significant contributor to delivering the transport priority of reducing vehicular emissions in the borough by encouraging walking, cycling and public transportation.</p> <p>Guidance from the Department for Transport issued in May 2020 stated that: "local authorities in areas with high levels of public transport use should take measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling ... Measures should be taken as swiftly as possible, and in any event within weeks, given the urgent need to change travel habits before the restart takes full effect." This meant that as well as there being no legal duty to carry out pre-implementation consultations, there was also no time.</p> <p>This guidance has subsequently been updated to: "As we emerge from the pandemic, local authorities should continue to make significant changes to their road layouts to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians and to maintain the changes they have already made".</p> <p>Following the introduction of this and other PFS schemes, the council introduced trial feedback surveys so that residents and businesses could give their feedback during the trial and the council could respond by making changes where necessary.</p>
<p>Allow exemptions for residents</p>	<p>The 2020 Executive Paper resident impact assessment (RIA) for people-friendly streets had identified a series of negative impacts for people who have a protected characteristic, for disabled people. Following this RIA, the council engaged with disabled groups and people with complex mobility needs, reviewed correspondence, LTN trial feedback survey data, Commonplace comments, gathered data on car journey length and times, and reviewed research reports to better understand the nature of the constraints experienced by disabled people who travel by private car. Based on this feedback and evidence, an exemption for Blue Badge holders was proposed in the October 2021 Executive Report, and this is being rolled out across the Islington LTNs (including in Canonbury East).</p> <p>The exemption will only apply for a single LTN and will allow Blue Badge holders to register a single motor vehicle for their personal use which is registered to their own address within (or on the boundary of) the low traffic neighbourhood in which they live.</p> <p>Local residents have several choices when deciding how to travel in their neighbourhood. The reasons given for not providing exemptions more widely than the Blue Badge exemptions are:</p> <p>Access to all addresses is maintained. The scheme has been designed so that all residents can access their homes without the need for an exemption. We know that it's vital that people who need to use their cars, such as Blue Badge holders, can access their home by car at all times. That's why in any of our people-friendly streets neighbourhoods across Islington, all residents are still able to drive to and from their</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>homes, and people are still able to access shops and services in their area by car. The only thing that may change in some circumstances is the route they have to take.</p> <p>To create a safer environment for people to walk, wheel and cycle. If private vehicles in the area are still able to travel through the restrictions, then we will not see the benefits in terms of reducing road danger, air quality and noise pollution that we would otherwise expect. This is because one of the main barriers that puts people off walking, wheeling or cycling instead of driving is not feeling safe when sharing the road with the increasing volumes of motor traffic in the borough. By preventing all motor vehicle trips through camera-controlled filters (except for emergency vehicles) we will make the environment feel much safer and make it much more likely that local people will begin to travel more by active means.</p> <p>To reduce congestion and air pollution on the main roads. The objective of people friendly streets is to reduce the overall number of trips, not to displace all traffic from local streets onto main roads. This will only happen if some car trips are replaced by walking, wheeling or cycling. For some journeys the filters will make driving more inconvenient and are in this way designed to encourage those who don't need to drive to choose a different way to travel, especially for short trips. Every journey switched from driving to active travel removes a car from the road and leaves the roads clearer for people who have no other choice but to drive.</p>
<p>LTN has made cycling an extremely unpleasant and hazardous experience</p>	<p>LTNs reduce traffic volumes by preventing through-traffic cutting through the neighbourhood. Perceived or actual traffic danger is one of the biggest barriers preventing people from taking up cycling.</p> <p>When comparing the pre-implementation of the scheme data in July 2020 and in July 2021, overall cycling has increased by 48% across the internal road locations. The greatest increase in cycling trips was at Northchurch Road, from 1,374 to 1,987 trips a day.</p> <p>Insights from the pre-consultation monitoring report (which can be found on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east) show cycling volumes on internal and boundary roads (combined) increased across the internal roads measured against the July 2020 baseline. All internal roads recorded significant increases in cycle counts. The highest percentage change in cyclist counts was on Englefield Road in July 2020 from 227 to 421 in 2021, an increase of 85%. Overall, average cyclist numbers have increased from 2,516 in 2020 to 3,722 in 2021; an observed increase of 1,206 cycle trips across the PFS as a daily average.</p> <p>On average across boundary roads, results were more varied. Overall, there was a negligible change (up 8%) in cycle volumes on the boundary roads of the PFS, with arise from 5,247 to 5,668 in the 7-day daily average. Canonbury Road, Southgate Road North and Balls Pond Road experienced a negligible change, while Southgate Road South had a 21% increase in cyclists and Essex Road East had a 25% increase in cyclists. Baring Street saw decreases of 27% in counts, along with Essex Road West and New North Road recording decreases of 11% and 18% respectively. There was a negligible change in the volume of cyclists on the boundary roads, while on the internal roads cycle volumes increased by 1,206, so cycling has increased overall.</p>
<p>Increase of dangerous driving on boundary roads, or on small</p>	<p>Speeding is a major contributing factor to road danger, so reducing speeding is vital to making our roads safer for all. We carefully monitor all our PFS schemes before and after implementation for any changes in traffic patterns, including speeds.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response																																																																																								
residential streets	<p>Full data can be found in our report "Canonbury East people-friendly streets trial Results from the twelve-month pre-consultation monitoring report", available on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east.</p> <p>Overall, our data shows that there has been a negligible change in speeding on both internal and boundary roads since the introduction of the scheme.</p> <p>The following data from our monitoring report shows speeds on Canonbury East PFS internal roads:</p> <p>Results (seven-day averages, 'change in volumes' use seven-day daily averages)</p> <p>Table 8: Changes in speeds on internal roads</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="347 696 1225 913"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Difference in average speed (mph)</th> <th>Difference in average speed (%)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (mph)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (%)</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)</th> <th>Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ecclesbourne Road</td> <td>-0.58</td> <td>-4%</td> <td>-0.5</td> <td>-3%</td> <td>-54</td> <td>-57%</td> <td>-1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northchurch Road</td> <td>-1.52</td> <td>-10%</td> <td>-1.5</td> <td>-8%</td> <td>-151</td> <td>-75%</td> <td>-4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Englefield Road</td> <td>0.16</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>3%</td> <td>-251</td> <td>-83%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oakley Road</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Downham Road</td> <td>-5.10</td> <td>-30%</td> <td>-7.29</td> <td>-34%</td> <td>-774</td> <td>-100%</td> <td>-22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>-1.61</td> <td>-10%</td> <td>-1.72</td> <td>-10%</td> <td>-5,419</td> <td>-89%</td> <td>-5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 9: Changes in speeds on internal roads – various baseline dates</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="347 981 1238 1115"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Difference in average speed (mph)</th> <th>Difference in average speed (%)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (mph)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (%)</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)</th> <th>Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Shepperton Road*</td> <td>0.20</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>6%</td> <td>-120</td> <td>-46%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elizabeth Avenue*</td> <td>2.98</td> <td>20%</td> <td>4.3</td> <td>24%</td> <td>239</td> <td>113%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rotherfield Street**</td> <td>-0.03</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-0.1</td> <td>-1%</td> <td>18</td> <td>223%</td> <td>-2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*July 2020 Baseline ** April 2019 Baseline</p> <p>On average across the internal road sites, average speeds have decreased overall by a negligible amount, as has the proportion of vehicles speeding. The 85th percentile speed has decreased by 10%. The number of vehicles speeding has decreased on average across internal roads by 89%, which is related to the overall decrease in the volume of motorised traffic. The volume of vehicles speeding decreased by more than 70% at over half of the sites, which is a positive outcome in line with the objectives of the scheme at this stage. These results demonstrate that a decrease in motorised traffic on internal roads does not necessarily increase speeding. In fact, when the speed and volume results are considered together, they suggest the opposite is true. The decrease in the volume of motorised traffic and in the volume of vehicles speeding (other than on roads with a known leak) may also suggest that through-traffic tends to go faster than local traffic. The proportion of vehicles speeding increased by 22% on Elizabeth Avenue and the average speed increased by 2.98mph, from 15mph to 17.9mph-this is still below the posted speed limit of 20mph. Introducing the PFS has reduced motorised vehicle volumes on Elizabeth Avenue by 62% (average daily traffic). The higher volumes in the baseline counts may have had a slight suppressing effect on speeds.</p> <p>It was mentioned that residents are enduring an increase in speeding on small residential roads due to frustration as there is no other route to get through the area. These roads do not provide a cut-through between the boundary roads of the scheme, and it is therefore unlikely motorists would use the local street network of Canonbury East as they provide no through routes between Balls Pond Road, Southgate Road, Baring Street, New North Road and Essex Road.</p> <p>The following data from our monitoring report shows speeds on Canonbury East PFS boundary roads:</p>	Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)	Ecclesbourne Road	-0.58	-4%	-0.5	-3%	-54	-57%	-1%	Northchurch Road	-1.52	-10%	-1.5	-8%	-151	-75%	-4%	Englefield Road	0.16	1%	0.6	3%	-251	-83%	3%	Oakley Road	0.08	1%	0.1	1%	0	0%	0%	Downham Road	-5.10	-30%	-7.29	-34%	-774	-100%	-22%	Overall	-1.61	-10%	-1.72	-10%	-5,419	-89%	-5%	Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)	Shepperton Road*	0.20	1%	1.2	6%	-120	-46%	6%	Elizabeth Avenue*	2.98	20%	4.3	24%	239	113%	22%	Rotherfield Street**	-0.03	0%	-0.1	-1%	18	223%	-2%
Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)																																																																																		
Ecclesbourne Road	-0.58	-4%	-0.5	-3%	-54	-57%	-1%																																																																																		
Northchurch Road	-1.52	-10%	-1.5	-8%	-151	-75%	-4%																																																																																		
Englefield Road	0.16	1%	0.6	3%	-251	-83%	3%																																																																																		
Oakley Road	0.08	1%	0.1	1%	0	0%	0%																																																																																		
Downham Road	-5.10	-30%	-7.29	-34%	-774	-100%	-22%																																																																																		
Overall	-1.61	-10%	-1.72	-10%	-5,419	-89%	-5%																																																																																		
Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)																																																																																		
Shepperton Road*	0.20	1%	1.2	6%	-120	-46%	6%																																																																																		
Elizabeth Avenue*	2.98	20%	4.3	24%	239	113%	22%																																																																																		
Rotherfield Street**	-0.03	0%	-0.1	-1%	18	223%	-2%																																																																																		

Objection Theme	Officers Response																																																																																								
	<p>Results (seven-day averages, 'change in volumes' use seven-day daily averages)</p> <p>Table 16: changes in speeds on boundary roads</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="344 327 1233 551"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Difference in average speed (mph)</th> <th>Difference in average speed (%)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (mph)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (%)</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)</th> <th>Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Southgate Road North</td> <td>3.89</td> <td>19%</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>24%</td> <td>1557</td> <td>24%</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Southgate Road South</td> <td>-0.31</td> <td>-2%</td> <td>-0.4</td> <td>-2%</td> <td>230</td> <td>4%</td> <td>-3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Balls Pond Road</td> <td>1.92</td> <td>10%</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>5%</td> <td>2,179</td> <td>43%</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Canonbury Road</td> <td>-0.37</td> <td>-2%</td> <td>-0.3</td> <td>-1%</td> <td>-86</td> <td>-4%</td> <td>-2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Essex Road East</td> <td>-0.24</td> <td>-1%</td> <td>-0.6</td> <td>-3%</td> <td>-1,575</td> <td>-38%</td> <td>-4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Essex Road West</td> <td>-2.89</td> <td>-15%</td> <td>-4.7</td> <td>-19%</td> <td>-932</td> <td>-15%</td> <td>-14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Baring Street</td> <td>-0.17</td> <td>-1%</td> <td>-0.1</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1,102</td> <td>16%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>0.26</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.19</td> <td>1%</td> <td>17,320</td> <td>7%</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 17: changes in speeds on boundary roads June Baseline</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="344 618 1233 696"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Difference in average speed (mph)</th> <th>Difference in average speed (%)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (mph)</th> <th>Difference in 85th percentile (%)</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding</th> <th>Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)</th> <th>Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>New North Road</td> <td>-0.83</td> <td>-4%</td> <td>-1.1</td> <td>-4%</td> <td>846</td> <td>13%</td> <td>-8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>On average across the boundary road sites, average speeds and 85th percentile speeds, and the percentage change of the proportion of vehicles speeding have all shown a negligible change. The highest decrease is seen on Essex Road West with a -14% fall in the proportion of vehicles speeding, however Southgate Road North and Balls Pond Road have seen increases of 14%.</p> <p>It should be noted the conclusion of the study July 23, 2021 Impacts of 2020 Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in London on Road Traffic Injuries Published in Findings (findingspress.org) which stated that "LTNs implemented in London in 2020 were associated with a substantial decline in road traffic injuries inside LTN areas during their initial months of implementation, with no changes on boundary roads."</p>	Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)	Southgate Road North	3.89	19%	6.3	24%	1557	24%	14%	Southgate Road South	-0.31	-2%	-0.4	-2%	230	4%	-3%	Balls Pond Road	1.92	10%	1.1	5%	2,179	43%	14%	Canonbury Road	-0.37	-2%	-0.3	-1%	-86	-4%	-2%	Essex Road East	-0.24	-1%	-0.6	-3%	-1,575	-38%	-4%	Essex Road West	-2.89	-15%	-4.7	-19%	-932	-15%	-14%	Baring Street	-0.17	-1%	-0.1	0%	1,102	16%	0%	Overall	0.26	1%	0.19	1%	17,320	7%	1%	Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)	New North Road	-0.83	-4%	-1.1	-4%	846	13%	-8%
Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)																																																																																		
Southgate Road North	3.89	19%	6.3	24%	1557	24%	14%																																																																																		
Southgate Road South	-0.31	-2%	-0.4	-2%	230	4%	-3%																																																																																		
Balls Pond Road	1.92	10%	1.1	5%	2,179	43%	14%																																																																																		
Canonbury Road	-0.37	-2%	-0.3	-1%	-86	-4%	-2%																																																																																		
Essex Road East	-0.24	-1%	-0.6	-3%	-1,575	-38%	-4%																																																																																		
Essex Road West	-2.89	-15%	-4.7	-19%	-932	-15%	-14%																																																																																		
Baring Street	-0.17	-1%	-0.1	0%	1,102	16%	0%																																																																																		
Overall	0.26	1%	0.19	1%	17,320	7%	1%																																																																																		
Location	Difference in average speed (mph)	Difference in average speed (%)	Difference in 85th percentile (mph)	Difference in 85th percentile (%)	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding	Difference in volume of vehicles speeding (%)	Difference in proportion of vehicle speeding (%)																																																																																		
New North Road	-0.83	-4%	-1.1	-4%	846	13%	-8%																																																																																		
<p>Increase in traffic on remaining open, small, residential roads</p>	<p>The pre-consultation monitoring report (which can be found on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east) shows that motorised traffic has decreased on most internal roads in both observed and normalised results, which is a positive outcome in line with the objectives of the scheme.</p> <p>Overall, motorised traffic volumes on internal roads have decreased by 80%. The greatest decrease by volume has been on Englefield Road, where there was a 90% decrease. Across internal roads, average speeds have decreased by 10% and the proportion of vehicles speeding has decreased by 7%. The above figures have been normalised to account for the impacts of COVID-19 on motorised traffic levels in July 2020 and in July 2021.</p> <p>The one road which shows an increase in traffic volumes is Oakley Road, with a normalised increase of 28% between July 2020 and July 2021. This is likely to be due to the existing banned right turn from Englefield Road (east of the Southgate Road junction), which means drivers wanting to travel north could turn left onto Southgate Road, then right onto Oakley Road, loop around and turn left to travel north on Southgate Road. However, the actual volume of traffic is relatively small, with less than 350 vehicles using Oakley Road per day (observed data).</p>																																																																																								
<p>Emergency Service Access / Increase in time</p>	<p>Resident safety remains a key priority for the council and is one of the key drivers for the programme.</p> <p>We have worked closely, and continue to work closely, with the emergency services before the installation of each scheme to ensure they can access every street and ensure their crews are aware of the changes. Up to October 2021, none of our monitoring reports show no significant impacts on emergency service response times.</p>																																																																																								

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>We spoke to the London Fire Brigade (LFB), the London Ambulance Service (LAS) and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) about the changes we were planning and discussed how the changes and traffic filters might impact them. In some circumstances we adjust our plans based on these discussions.</p> <p>We have shared, and will continue to share, our maps and suggested routes with all emergency services so they can update their route-planning and mapping software. There will be an adjustment period as the services get used to the new routes, but we expect them to be fully embedded within a brief time.</p> <p>Emergency vehicles can legally pass-through camera-controlled filters so their routes across many local streets remain unchanged. Where there are physical barriers, like bollards, these can be unlocked by the London Fire Brigade, who carry keys. In many cases, a filter with a physical restriction is often nearby to a camera-controlled filter, so there is usually an unrestricted route through via a short diversion.</p> <p>We are monitoring roads in and around each area as the trials progress, and we can make changes if we think we can improve how a scheme works. We also work with the emergency services to monitor the impact that the changes are having post-implementation, and we have made changes based on the feedback we received: these changes included in August 2020 replacing a planned physical (bollard) filter at Halliford Street with a camera-enforced filter.</p> <p>Our people-friendly streets programme is designed to help residents to lead active and healthy lives, and the changes we are making should make it easier to move around the borough in ways which will also provide benefits to individual and public health.</p> <p><u>London Ambulance Service</u> The Council is in conversation with the London Ambulance Service (LAS) about where it may be able to feed into future reports regarding traffic schemes within the Borough and LAS continues to monitor schemes and provide feedback to the council traffic officers should any delays occur to emergency responses. TAs of January 2022, there have also been no reported delays to the London Ambulance Service or the Metropolitan Police Service, each of whom provided a statement for the Canonbury East pre-consultation monitoring report, as a result of the people-friendly street area being implemented in Canonbury East. We will continue to monitor this closely in the future.</p> <p><u>Metropolitan Police Service</u> The council continues to engage and consult with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) as part of the implementation of its PFS programme. The following statement has been provided by the MPS: 'Analysis of call data for the past 12 months, up to the end of July 2021, shows there has been no difference in average response times across the London Borough of Islington when compared to the previous 12 months (2019/2020) for both immediate and standard graded calls. There is no specific data available for low traffic neighbourhoods. Of note, over the past 12 months there has been a considerable reduction in call demand because of the coronavirus pandemic, c.2,800 fewer calls than the 12 months between August 2019 to end of July 2020 and a 19% reduction in offences. As we come out of the pandemic restrictions, we will continue to monitor call data to see if changes in road layouts across the borough affect our response times.'</p> <p><u>London Fire Brigade</u> The London Fire Brigade (LFB) monitors the time it takes their vehicles to attend emergencies (attendance times). They are sharing data with the council to enable us to</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response																																								
	<p>understand if the PFS schemes have adversely impacted attendance times. The LFB use average attendance times to monitor attendance times. This is because there are a significant number of variables that can impact attendance times – for example, responding vehicles are not always setting off from the same place. As detailed in the London Safety Plan, “London Fire Brigade’s intention is always to get to an emergency incident as quickly as possible on each and every occasion. But the LFB also sets itself targets for the time it should take to arrive at an incident.</p> <p>The LFB’s London-wide attendance targets are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To get the first fire engine to an incident within an average of six minutes. · To get the second fire engine to an incident within an average of eight minutes. · To get a fire engine anywhere in London within 12 minutes on 95 per cent of occasions.” <p>As advised by the LFB, the 2019 average attendance times for Islington and Canonbury ward are used as the baseline against which to compare the post-implementation averages for each area. The average attendance times for the Canonbury ward are considered together with average attendance times for the whole borough, to ascertain to what degree the scheme has impacted the post-implementation attendance times in the PFS area compared to the borough overall, thus accounting for any potential Covid-19 disruption. Please note that data from LFB is only available by ward. Canonbury ward also contains the Canonbury West PFS area, so it is not possible to isolate the impacts of Canonbury East PFS. However, as shown in Table 26 and Table 27, there have been negligible changes to response times in Canonbury ward. The results cover response times to incidents attended by the brigade to an address in the specified area. They do not include the times of response vehicles that passed through the area to attend an incident in a different area.</p> <p>London Fire Brigade Response Time Results</p> <p>Table 26: Average attendance times of the London Fire Brigade – Islington-Wide Data</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="347 1200 1257 1429"> <thead> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>No. of mobilisations - Islington</th> <th>Average Attendance 1st Appliance (minutes)</th> <th>Average Attendance 2nd Appliance (minutes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2019 (baseline)</td> <td>2,076</td> <td>04:36</td> <td>06:17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020 (full year)</td> <td>2,046</td> <td>04:29</td> <td>06:02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11/2020 to 04/2021</td> <td>942</td> <td>04:44</td> <td>06:06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Change against 2019 data</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>+00:08</td> <td>-00:11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 27: Average attendance times of the London Fire Brigade – Canonbury Ward Data</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="347 1473 1257 1693"> <thead> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>No. of mobilisations – Canonbury Ward</th> <th>Average Attendance 1st Appliance (minutes)</th> <th>Average Attendance 2nd Appliance (minutes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2019 (baseline)</td> <td>124</td> <td>04:47</td> <td>06:16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020 (full year)</td> <td>150</td> <td>04:59</td> <td>06:24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>07/2020 to 06/2021</td> <td>54</td> <td>05:07</td> <td>06:16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Change against 2019 data</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>+00:20</td> <td>00:00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Given the extent of variables that affect response times, the differences between the 2019 baseline, the 2020 pre-implementation period and the post-implementation period are considered negligible by the LFB and the council. As such, it is the view of the LFB and the council that the PFS area in Canonbury East has not impacted this emergency service’s attendance times. We will continue to monitor this indicator.</p>	Period	No. of mobilisations - Islington	Average Attendance 1st Appliance (minutes)	Average Attendance 2nd Appliance (minutes)	2019 (baseline)	2,076	04:36	06:17	2020 (full year)	2,046	04:29	06:02	11/2020 to 04/2021	942	04:44	06:06	Change against 2019 data	n/a	+00:08	-00:11	Period	No. of mobilisations – Canonbury Ward	Average Attendance 1st Appliance (minutes)	Average Attendance 2nd Appliance (minutes)	2019 (baseline)	124	04:47	06:16	2020 (full year)	150	04:59	06:24	07/2020 to 06/2021	54	05:07	06:16	Change against 2019 data	n/a	+00:20	00:00
Period	No. of mobilisations - Islington	Average Attendance 1st Appliance (minutes)	Average Attendance 2nd Appliance (minutes)																																						
2019 (baseline)	2,076	04:36	06:17																																						
2020 (full year)	2,046	04:29	06:02																																						
11/2020 to 04/2021	942	04:44	06:06																																						
Change against 2019 data	n/a	+00:08	-00:11																																						
Period	No. of mobilisations – Canonbury Ward	Average Attendance 1st Appliance (minutes)	Average Attendance 2nd Appliance (minutes)																																						
2019 (baseline)	124	04:47	06:16																																						
2020 (full year)	150	04:59	06:24																																						
07/2020 to 06/2021	54	05:07	06:16																																						
Change against 2019 data	n/a	+00:20	00:00																																						
Increase/ Encouragement of Crime Poor Safety in the area	<p>In terms of volumes of crime and ASB, during the past 23 months Canonbury East PFS area showed similar trends to that of Islington as a whole. Across the various analyses of the volume of ASB calls and crimes in Canonbury East and Islington over the period, the monthly volume of calls and crimes as a proportion of the total over the year period has remained approximately consistent between Canonbury East and Islington.</p>																																								

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>There are real anxiety and safety concerns about walking around these deserted LTNs for women, children and young people</p>	<p>There is no evidence so far that the Canonbury East PFS scheme has had an impact on crime and ASB – as confirmed by the Metropolitan Police and the council’s Community Safety Team.</p>
<p>Poor effect on businesses, less passing trade</p>	<p>PFS aims to ensure that transport improvements support local economic activity and growth. We are working closely with the council’s Inclusive Economy team to aim to build a knowledgeable economy with fairness, shared prosperity, and social justice at its core. Maintaining shops and services within Islington contributes to the sustainability of local communities and the local economy, making them available to all and reducing the number and lengths of trips undertaken which is at the forefront of the PFS scheme.</p> <p>All addresses remain accessible by cars, but short car journeys might take longer. The plus side of that approach is that active travel is made more attractive, inclusive and safer, which can overall reduce the number of vehicle trips. Regarding businesses, TfL has published some useful evidence in their ‘Walking and cycling: the economic benefits (https://content.tfl.gov.uk/walking-cycling-economic-benefits-summary-pack.pdf) which shows how walking and cycling can benefit businesses in London. For instance, waling and cycling improvements can boost retail sales by 30%.</p> <p>Many items can also be delivered by cycle or cargo bike, and these vehicles will be able to pass through any traffic filters that are installed. As well as being quicker for local trips, using cycles would also mean no extra costs to your business (like VED, fuel or insurance).</p> <p>To improve business access to the area we are also implementing changes at filters at Elmore Street, Halliford Street and adding a new filter at Ecclesbourne Road, which will improve the function of the LTN and access for servicing and deliveries.</p> <p>Finally, it is worth noting that many businesses in Canonbury East are located on the boundary roads, where access has remained unchanged.</p>
<p>Negative effect on vulnerable/ disabled leading to less independence</p> <p>The exceptional needs of the elderly, vulnerable and disabled have not been considered or</p>	<p>The council has carried out a Resident Impact Assessment (RIA) for the overall programme and for each individual scheme. This is referred to as an Equaly Impact Assessment (EqIA). The EqIA evaluates the impacts of the changes on people with different protected characteristics which includes people with disabilities.</p> <p>Anyone who could access their home by motor vehicle, private car or taxi prior to the scheme is still able to do so after the people-friendly streets neighbourhood has been introduced. People who use walking aids, wheelchairs or mobility scooters will find the streets quieter, safer and more enjoyable with lower amounts of traffic, and fewer drivers using local roads for quick short-cuts.</p> <p>The council’s people-friendly pavements programme will be introduced in 2022 and will improve conditions for anyone walking (or using mobility aids, including wheelchairs) on pavements. We will provide additional dropped kerbs to make crossing</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>addressed and in doing so the Council is guilty of discrimination.</p>	<p>the road easier, improve foliage maintenance and ensure level surfaces are kept clear of unnecessary obstructions. People with visual impairments will benefit from reduced traffic and road danger, and the reduction in noise should help with navigating their local area more easily. It is also important to note that there are no plans to include any new "shared space" areas. Pavement space will be maintained for people walking or wheeling. The quieter and calmer streets should also make the streets more welcoming to people with cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>The council's new exemption policy for Blue Badge holders was announced with the October 2021 Executive decision of the PFS programme and will allow people who live within a low traffic neighbourhood (LTN) to register a single vehicle which will be exempt from some of the camera-enforced filters in that LTN, which are Dove Road, Ockendon Road, Englefield Road, Halliford Street and Downham Road. This will improve journey times for shorter, local journeys for Blue Badge holders in Canonbury East.</p> <p>Compared to the London average, a higher proportion of people in Islington identify themselves as being disabled. Pedestrian enhancements could be of particular benefit to people with a disability in terms navigating an urban environment, including but not limited to those using walking aids, wheelchair or mobility scooter. In residential areas, those with cognitive disabilities could benefit from reduced levels of noise pollution, supported by the neighbourhood walking and cycling improvements and the removal of through traffic. Providing better conditions for cycling can empower more disabled people to cycle, particularly those with less balance who may want to choose adapted cycles away from traffic. All modal filters would be designed in a way that is inclusive and accessible to larger cycles such as tricycles and cargo cycles.</p> <p>The council approved an Executive Report on 18 June 2020 on the people-friendly streets programme which outlines the principles of the programme and you can read that report here. There is also an associated resident impact assessment (RIA) which can be found here. RIAs have been produced for individual schemes and can be found on each scheme's page at https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets .</p> <p>In October 2021 the council renewed its commitment to the people-friendly streets programme with an Executive decision - the report can be read here, in conjunction with the Resident Impact Assessment which can be read here. Those two reports set out what the exemption policy and the people-friendly pavements programme are and how they bring benefits to people who have protected characteristics, including the disabled.</p>
<p>Creating an increase of Anxiety, Stress & depression levels - effect on mental health</p>	<p>Prior to each scheme, a Resident Impact Assessment (RIA) is carried out which aims to assess the impact of the scheme on residents who have protected characteristics (which includes people with disabilities). The June 2020 RIA for Canonbury East lays out the potential positive and negative impacts on these cohorts. On the positive side, this included the potential for reduction of noise levels to aid those with cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>It is very hard to quantify the levels of increase of anxiety, stress and depression (and effects on wider mental health) and ascribe them purely to the impacts of the low traffic neighbourhood (LTN). As the implementation of the LTN occurred after the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, it would be difficult to unpick the effects of one from the other.</p> <p>Between 8 March and 2 November September 2021, we ran a trial feedback survey in Canonbury East, and between 2 November and 30 November 2021 we ran a consultation on the LTN trial. There were 457 responses to the trial feedback survey and 1,255 responses to the consultation. The consultation results show that, in</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>general, respondents feel that their local area has improved: 38% spend more time in the area (compared to 19% spending less), 46% think the streets look nicer (25% think the opposite), 45% say the air is cleaner (22% think less clean), 41% said there is less noise from traffic (27% disagreed). More than a quarter of respondents (26%) say they now socialise more with neighbours (compared to 15% who do so less often). Whilst we cannot tie these answers directly to mental health, it may be the case that for many people, the LTNs have had a beneficial effect on how they feel about their area and neighbours. Similarly, the most common three things' people said they liked about the Canonbury East LTN in the trial feedback survey were the reduction of traffic (19%), making the area more pleasant (16%) and the reduction of air pollution (15%)</p>
<p>Islington Council are not representing all their residents, including, the elderly, those with young children, those with disabled children and disabled people, not just the able bodied</p>	<p>The council approved an Executive Report on 18 June 2020 on the people-friendly streets programme which outlines the principles of the programme and you can read that report here. There is also an associated resident impact assessment (RIA) which can be found here. RIAs have been produced for individual schemes and can be found on each scheme's page at https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets</p> <p>The council also approved an Executive Report on 16 October 2021 on the people-friendly streets programme which outlines the principles of the programme and you can read that report: Executive Report Pre-tender (islington.gov.uk)</p> <p>On page 16 (3.3.60.) The council is launching the 'people-friendly pavements' programme which will become another key element of the PFS programme. This programme will make Islington's pavements more accessible through improvements such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Footway repaving ○ Foliage maintenance ○ Additional dropped kerbs ○ Tactile paving ○ Street clutter removal <p>On page 17 (3.3.65.) Based on this feedback and evidence, officers are now recommending the people friendly streets programme offers an exemption to Blue Badge holders. The exemption will only apply for a single LTN and will allow Blue Badge holders to register a single motor vehicle for their personal use which is registered to their own address within (or on the boundary of) the low traffic neighbourhood in which they live. Proof of address, car registration and Blue Badge status are likely to be the evidence required. On successful application, a permit will be provided for this vehicle, which will allow the Blue Badge holder to drive, or be driven, through designated camera-enforced filters of the LTN in which they reside.</p> <p>Generally positive impacts of successful implementation of the strategy should deliver the creation of shared inclusive public spaces and streets that welcome people from all walks of life. The PFS programme will improve safety and accessibility, which should provide benefits to all residents with protected characteristics. The measures should also reduce the negative impacts of traffic, improving air quality, reducing injuries from road traffic collisions and community severance.</p> <p>The RIA produced before the implementation of Canonbury East LTN in July 2020 (which can be found on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east) considers both the expected positive and potential negative impacts of the scheme on residents generally and specifically on people with protected characteristics. It concludes that the positive impacts for all residents including those with protected characteristics outweigh</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>the potential negative impacts, and outlines actions the council will take to mitigate negative impacts.</p> <p><u>Specific positive benefits to each of these groups highlighted in the July 2020 RIA:</u></p> <p>Age Canonbury East LTN area is a densely populated and built-up area with a scarcity of open spaces. An increase in walking and cycling benefits children in terms of reducing childhood obesity. The Fair Futures Commission found that some of the barriers to children and young people travelling independently revolved around concerns for personal safety. Reduced road danger should facilitate independent travel for children and young people, which is crucial to healthy child development. Older people, who have higher instance of disabling conditions such as mobility impairment, deafness or blindness will benefit from reduced traffic and road danger because of the lower volumes of cars traveling through the area. In addition, older people are also more likely to live with dementia and will benefit from reduced noise pollution. The Canonbury East LTN will create improved conditions for cycling, particularly benefitting those older or younger residents with less balance who may want to choose adapted cycles away from traffic. Air pollution from cars has a significant impact on younger people who are closer to the car exhaust level and who have lungs that are still developing, a growing body of research demonstrates that this impact can result in significant health complications later in life impacting on their life expectancy and quality of life. Older and younger people will benefit from safer crossings in particular because they can take longer to cross the road than the average aged person.</p> <p>Disability Compared to the London and Islington average, a higher proportion of people in Canonbury East identify themselves as being disabled. Pedestrian enhancements could be of particular benefit to people with a disability in terms navigating an urban environment, including but not limited to those using walking aids, wheelchair or mobility scooter. In residential areas, those with cognitive disabilities could benefit from reduced levels of noise pollution, supported by the neighbourhood walking and cycling improvements and the removal of through-traffic. Research has shown that one of the main reasons that disabled people do not cycle more is due to inaccessible infrastructure, even though 75% of disabled cyclists report that they find cycling easier than walking. The proposals in Canonbury East will greatly improve conditions for disabled cyclists by reducing road danger without the need for further traffic calming measures. In this way, providing better conditions for cycling can empower more disabled people to cycle, particularly those with less balance who may want to choose adapted cycles away from traffic. All modal filters in Canonbury East have been designed in a way that is inclusive and accessible to larger cycles such as tricycles and cargo cycle sin line with the London Cycling Design Standards.</p> <p>Pregnancy and maternity -Reduced volumes of traffic and speeds will create a less stressful environment, supporting a healthy pregnancy. -Parents and carers with prams will benefit from a better walking environment and reduced traffic flows when crossing roads, especially in the vicinity of schools. -Parents who use bicycles or cargo cycles for family mobility will benefit from traffic filtering and temporary cycle lanes. The road closures will be designed in a way that is permeable and accessible to larger cycles.</p> <p>Sex</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>-Women, who are more likely than men to be moving through public space with baby prams and expectant mothers and mothers with young children may also particularly benefit from improved walking and cycling conditions, reduced traffic levels.</p> <p>-In London, women are less represented than men in cycling, and lack of cycle infrastructure disproportionately impacts women, attributable in part to a more risk averse attitude to mixing with traffic. Reduced traffic and new cycle infrastructure will therefore benefit and empower more women to cycle.</p> <p>Socio-economic status</p> <p>-Busier roads often dominate more deprived communities. Walking and cycling improvements will benefit those living near busy roads and collision hot spots when they are moving around their local area.</p> <p>-Car ownership is generally correlated to household income in London. Therefore, less affluent households are less likely to own a car and be reliant on active travel and public transport. The PFS programme aims to benefit non car owners.</p> <p>-Finally, the greater connectivity via new cycle and walking routes should support social distancing whilst providing better healthy access to employment.</p> <p>We do acknowledge in the RIA that there are also likely to be some negative impacts of the scheme on people with protected characteristics. These are outlined in the RIA</p>
<p>Scheme not thought through/justifiable</p> <p>There is a clear and distinct lack of thought and planning.</p>	<p>The implementation of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood in Canonbury East supports the council's objective of achieving net zero carbon emissions in Islington by 2030. It will also contribute to the delivery of a Fairer Islington by making it easier and safer for people to travel on foot, by bicycle and public transport; supporting people to live healthier lives; supporting local shops, markets and businesses; and enabling residents to remain socially active and connected to their community.</p> <p>In June 2019 the Council declared a Climate Emergency and pledged to work towards making Islington zero carbon by 2030. The measures proposed as part of this programme will positively contribute to achieving this ambitious commitment by encouraging increased walking and cycling. It will demonstrate the Council's commitment to working towards a zero-carbon future and respond to the Climate Emergency declaration. The delivery of the Islington Transport Strategy, Liveable Neighbourhoods, School Streets and Lorry Control Scheme were all specifically mentioned in the transport section of the Draft Zero Carbon Strategy.</p> <p>Islington's Executive Reports (October 2021 and Delegated Decision Reports (found on our website: https://www.islington.gov.uk/roads/people-friendly-streets/canonbury-east) provide extensive rationale for the scheme. Additionally, please see to access the executive summary regarding a healthy, fair, accessible transport environment in Islington. Strategy to access the executive summary regarding a healthy, fair, accessible transport environment in Islington.</p>
<p>Less travel due to WFH - Road closures not needed</p>	<p>Even if your road is currently quiet, the council must treat your local neighbourhood as a whole. It means that if the traffic filters only addressed the streets that are currently busy within the area, through-traffic could move onto the next available local street. The increasing use of apps and sat-navs and the return of motor traffic as the country has emerged out of lockdown could quickly turn a quiet street into a busy cut-through – therefore the council needs to implement traffic filters in a way that removes all through traffic from a neighbourhood.</p> <p>In May 2020, the Secretary of State for Transport published updated statutory guidance in response to COVID - 19. The council is required to have regard to that guidance in</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>carrying out its statutory network management duties. The Guidance states that: "Local authorities in areas with high levels of public transport use should take measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling, both to encourage active travel and to enable social distancing during restart." The Guidance also requires that measures should be implemented as swiftly as possible given the urgent need to change travel habits before the restart of everyday activities takes full effect.</p> <p>On 15 May 2020, the Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL) released details of TfL's emerging London Streetscape Plan. This Plan aims to give more space to pedestrians and cyclists. It concentrates on three key activities: a) the rapid provision of a temporary strategic cycling network; b) changes to town centres and transport hubs to give pedestrians (including those queuing outside of shops) and cyclists more space; and c) the accelerated delivery of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods within residential areas and School Streets schemes.</p> <p>The Streetspace plans came from a prediction made by TfL during the first lockdown in March and April 2020. The prediction showed that without action, traffic volumes would get much worse than before the crisis. That is why we acted quickly to create more space for local people to walk, cycle, use buggies and wheelchairs as safe alternatives to using public transport. Private car use across London has increased as lockdown eases which is causing congestion, increased road danger, poorer air quality and other negative impacts on health.</p> <p>In common with other London boroughs, we must follow statutory <u>government guidance</u> which states that we need to take steps to encourage more walking and cycling and to enable social distancing. It is within that context that the PFS programme was first implemented.</p> <p>From the Travel in London Report 13 from Transport for London (TfL) https://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-report-13.pdf it states from page 195 "Overall trends during pandemic Casualty statistics for 2019 suggest that, on average, an individual was injured in a road collision approximately once every 320,000 trips in London. This might be regarded as the average risk under normal circumstances. It follows those substantial reductions in trips should, all other things being equal, lead to reductions in injuries. The pandemic indeed saw substantial reductions in motorised road travel, particularly during the spring lockdown. Travel by other modes, for example on foot or cycle, also reduced in the short term, although not uniformly in space and time, reducing absolute exposure (relative activity levels have been estimated using proxy data). The impact of this was to reduce the absolute number of casualties, as fewer people were travelling. However, low casualty figures overall masked the fact that the risk of being injured when travelling in London increased for some road users, and at some locations and times of day. More recently, as motorised traffic and travel demand more generally have returned, both indicators are returning towards pre-pandemic levels."</p> <p>Our Canonbury East Monitoring report demonstrates the trends in use of motorised vehicles over the pandemic and after the LTN implementation. Covid 19 statutory guidance can also be found at Reallocating Road Space in response to COVID-19: statutory guidance for local authorities - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p> <p>The Department for Transport published a 'Gear Change – Year review' document highlighting the Transport changes, a year on from the pandemic, including the new</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	and continuing commitments, which can be accessed here . This document provides evidence for an increase in private motorised vehicles after the pandemic which only solidifies the requirement for LTN's.
Financial Repercussions - more money on cab routes, petrol	<p>Purchasing and maintaining a cycle is significantly less expensive than the comparable costs for motor vehicles and can be cheaper than public transport fares. In addition, most households (71%) in Islington do not have access to a private car and do not drive – and it is worth noting that although the cost of motoring over the past ten years has risen at a lower rate than the cost of living (and significantly lower than rises in public transport costs)¹ it is estimated that owning and running a car in the UK costs around £3,900 per household annually.</p> <p>There is clearly a benefit to those who are economically disadvantaged if LTNs reduce this cost burden, by removing the perceived need for a motor vehicle once other options become more attractive.</p> <p>However for those who rely on taxis for their mobility, schemes such as The London Taxicard Scheme offers subsidised travel in licenced taxis and private hire vehicles to London residents with serious mobility impairments or who are severely sight impaired. This could offset some of the increase in costs resulting from slightly longer routes as a result of the LTN schemes. The council will work to promote uptake of this scheme amongst potentially affected groups. Dial a ride is another service which provides a free door to door service for disabled people, delivered by TfL.</p>
Increase in pollution (cars forced to take a longer journey on congested main roads)	<p>Across the boundary roads, total volumes of motorised traffic show a negligible change (1% fall) when comparing June 2020 and June 2021 in the pre-consultation monitoring report. Traffic on New North Road rose by 24%. Traffic on City Road decreased by a similar amount, indicating that there may have been some redistribution of traffic. The council will continue to monitor this situation and will look at other options if necessary.</p> <p>The Council's analysis of the impact of PFS area schemes on boundary roads (i.e., the roads that go around the PFS area) draws on monitoring results from traffic counts (volumes) and bus journey times. This monitoring report provides data and insights relating to the Canonbury East PFS trial specifically by comparing data from before implementation in July 2020 with data from July 2021. However, it is important to consider all these results in the context of other external factors which could be contributing towards the results. For example, there are other low traffic neighbourhoods which share boundary roads with Canonbury East such as the St Peter's and Hoxton West LTNs. It is therefore not possible to separate out the impacts these may be having on traffic on the boundary roads. In addition to this, during the baseline data collection period the works at nearby Old Street roundabout were having a significant impact on traffic flows on both City Road and New North Road, which both lead to the gyratory. It is not possible to separate out or control for the impact of the Old Street roundabout works or the nearby low traffic neighbourhoods on the boundary roads from the impact of Canonbury East trial.</p>
Air quality will not improve if road mileage increases, that is what LTNs	The objective of people friendly streets is to reduce the overall number of trips, not to displace all traffic from local streets onto main roads. This will only happen if some car trips are replaced by walking, wheeling or cycling. For some journeys, the filters will make driving more inconvenient and are in this way designed to encourage those who do not need to drive to choose a separate way to travel, especially for short trips. Every

¹ <https://www.racfoundation.org/data/cost-of-motoring-index>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>are doing, displacing traffic and increasing mileage</p> <p>Particulate emissions within LTNs will have dropped but their source had been diverted and added to areas where emissions and pedestrians are densest and now impacting greater numbers of people</p>	<p>journey switched from driving to active travel removes a car from the road and leaves the roads clearer for people who have no other choice but to drive. The council is carefully considering feedback from residents and that includes feedback relating to Blue Badge holders and exemptions of traffic filters.</p> <p>The results show that there has been a decrease in pollution at most Canonbury East monitoring sites when the post-implementation period is compared with the year before at the sites where before scheme data is available. There is no significant difference in changes in Canonbury East compared to the whole borough when looking at the overall average. As Graph 6 shows, the borough wide and Canonbury East monitoring site averages saw a substantial peak in November 2019 to January 2020 and then all dropped to a low in May 2020 before generally rising. This low in May can likely be ascribed to the national lockdown measures, which started in March 2020 and were eased by July 2020, as well as seasonal changes in pollution. It coincides with the period post-implementation of the PFS trial in Canonbury East. As such, while NO₂ levels in the trial area have increased since it was implemented in July 2020, this is in line with borough wide trends and can therefore be viewed as related to the impact of lockdown measures, and seasonal variation. The NO₂ levels at the boundary sites rose above 40µg/m³ in November 2020 and January 2021, although the annual average remained below this 40µg/m³ annual objective figure. While there was also an increase in this period at wider borough roadside sites (as well as background sites in Canonbury East and more widely) this peak is more pronounced in Canonbury East. However, the Canonbury East boundary road data in this report is based on just one monitoring site. Additional data for boundary roads in Canonbury East, not included in this analysis because of a lack of before scheme data, shows lower levels of pollution in line with wider borough trends. Monitoring will continue at the Boundary sites to establish if these peaks are part of a long-term trend for this and other boundary road sites, or if they were due to specific circumstances in those months.</p> <p>Graph 6: Average NO₂ levels in Canonbury East compared to long-term borough-wide sites from diffusion tubes</p> <p>In summary these results show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall changes in levels of NO₂ in Canonbury East reflect those in the borough more widely • Average annual NO₂ levels in Canonbury East have been within the annual objective level of 40µg/m³ for the year before and after the LTN was implemented at all but one site.

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Annual average levels of NO2 in Canonbury East since people-friendly streets started (July 2020-June 2021, with changes to the arrangement of traffic filters in June 2021) are, on average, lower than the previous year at internal and off-road sites but higher at boundary road sites, where data is available from 2019. In comparison the wider borough sites show a decrease for internal, off-road and boundary sites, although decreases are lower for internal roads compared to decreases in Canonbury East. •These results are based on a limited number of data points and over a brief period, and so will need longer term analysis and comparison to wider borough trends. This is especially the case for the Canonbury East's internal roads where there were only two monitoring sites with seven months of data before the low traffic neighbourhood was introduced and Canonbury East boundary road sites where there is only one site with full pre-scheme data. •The figures presented are an annual average and do not describe fluctuations within this period that might have influenced the average results. For example, there were several roadwork projects on the boundary roads in the post implementation period and looking at monthly data there was a peak in Canonbury East in January that is higher than larger borough trends but would have impacted average results for the year. It can be very difficult to pick out the reasons for specific spikes and this would require a much more in-depth investigation, not possible within the scope of this analysis.
<p>Islington 20 mile an hour borough, loads of bumps, it is safe already</p>	<p>Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, there was already a widely recognised need to reduce motor vehicle journeys as reflected in the draft Islington Transport Strategy (2019), the Mayor's Transport Strategy for London (2018) and Government policy. Between 2013 and 2019 there was an increase in traffic of almost 10 percent on Islington roads, adding 24.3 million miles to bring the total mileage on Islington's roads in 2019 to 278 million (view source).</p> <p>In the decade since 2009, there has been an increase of over 70% of motorised traffic on London's local roads, which are not designed to take such large numbers of vehicles (view source). These local roads (defined as 'C' or 'unclassified' roads) serve multiple purposes: as places for communities to come together, for play, for local journeys which can be walked, cycled or wheeled (through use of a wheelchair or similar mobility aids). The 70% increase in motor traffic on these streets in the past decade has had a significant impact on the lives of both those who walk, cycle and wheel through those streets, and those who live on them.</p> <p>The people-friendly streets (PFS) programme has facilitated the delivery of the changes envisioned by the Islington Transport Strategy (2020) and Vision 2030 (Net Zero Carbon) Strategy (2020) at an accelerated pace, to both respond to and influence the changing demands in the way people travel due to the public health emergency caused by Covid-19.</p> <p>It is a fact that lots of vehicle's speed and that drivers are three times more likely to have a fatal collision with a child on a local street. When LTNs were installed in London in 2020 they have been shown to reduce the number of injuries from road traffic collisions by half, relative to the rest of London, with no evidence of increased injury numbers or risk on LTN boundary roads. In the UK, the most common non-natural cause of death amongst children aged 5 – 14 is being hit by a vehicle, with a mile driven on a minor road, compared to a mile driven on a main road, being twice as likely to kill or seriously injure a child pedestrian, and three times more likely to kill a child cyclist.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
Invest in electric cars to tackle pollution	<p>London has dangerous levels of air pollution which impact our health and contributes to climate change. Most pollution in London comes from road transport.</p> <p>Replacing petrol and diesel vehicles with electric vehicles (EVs) will help to improve local air quality by reducing harmful emissions such as nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide.</p> <p>We are supporting Islington residents switching to electric vehicles providing an on-street charging infrastructure. We acknowledge most residents in Islington lack off-street parking and cannot charge an EV (electric vehicle) at home.</p> <p>Despite their environmental benefits, EVs are still motorised vehicles which contribute to road congestion and road danger issues. Therefore, public and active transport (e.g., walking and cycling) remain the Council's top transport priority.</p> <p>Although EVs are an option for reducing our carbon footprint, electric cars indirectly cause emissions from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Manufacturing electric vehicles -Generating the energy source to charge batteries -Battery recycling <p>And there is the fact that electric vehicles through the wear and tear of the tires still contribute to particle matter pollution the same as petrol cars.</p> <p>In November 2020, we agreed our net zero carbon strategy and action plan, Vision 2030. This sets out the actions the council will take over the next few years to eliminate emissions, broken down into seven key areas: Buildings and Infrastructure, Transport, Energy, Green Economy and Planning, Natural Environment and Waste, Communications and Finance.</p> <p>Key actions for reducing the council's own emissions include ensuring all the electricity we buy is renewable, switching our vehicle fleet to electric, looking at how best to replace gas heating systems in our corporate buildings and housing stock and install more solar panels.</p>
<p>Unsafe for women travelling alone, forced to use public transport, walk on ghostly streets and cabs can't drop to your door</p> <p>There are real anxiety and safety concerns about walking around these deserted LTNs for women,</p>	<p>While there is no evidence passing cars are a deterrent to street crime, increased numbers of people cycling, and walking is more likely to provide a slower-moving human presence which may stop and intervene than someone passing in a car.</p> <p>On crime, analysis shows anti-social behaviour and crime patterns in the area are in line with patterns across the borough overall, suggesting the PFS trial in Canonbury East has not had an impact on anti-social behaviour and crime patterns. Crime is very much dependent on the local area. The reduction of motor traffic volumes in the Canonbury East LTN area (down by 80%) has happened alongside an increase in people cycling (up by 48%). People driving in vehicles would be moving faster through the area and would be less observant of people walking, so could be less likely to stop. Walking levels were not monitored, but if these have followed cycling levels then there would be an increased presence of people on the streets, increasing passive surveillance.</p> <p>The council has not been able to find evidence that a higher presence of motor vehicles in an area reduces crime rates (discounting the crimes which can be attributed to the drivers themselves, such as speeding and dangerous driving). A study by Anna Goodman and Rachel Aldred (2021) examined the relationship between LTNs and street crime over a 7-year period after the implementation of LTNs in Waltham Forest, based on police data. The report found that the introduction of an LTN was associated with a</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
children and young people	<p>10% decrease in street crime. and this effect increased with a longer duration since implementation (18% decrease after 3 years). An even larger reduction was observed for violence and sexual offences, the most serious subcategory of crime. The only subcategory of crime that increased significantly was bicycle theft, plausibly largely reflecting increased cycling levels. There was no indication of displacement of any crime subcategory into adjacent areas.</p>
Dangerous cycling	<p>An increase of 48% in cycling volumes is significant and would be noticeable to anyone using the streets in the area. All road users, including people cycling, should obey the Highway Code. Islington Council offers free cycle skills training for adults and children to enable people to cycle more confidently and safely on the road. (More details can be seen here). The council has also previously run targeted 'stop and advise' sessions alongside local police officers, at locations where cycling contraventions have been reported.</p> <p>Many surveys show that the main barrier preventing people from cycling on the roads is the perception that sharing the road with motor vehicles is too dangerous, so by reducing motor vehicle traffic on local streets more people should be encouraged to cycle on the roads and away from areas used by people walking.</p> <p>In terms of crime rates and ASB, during the past 23 months Canonbury East's PFS area showed similar trends to that of Islington as a whole. Across the various analyses of the volume of ASB calls and crimes in Canonbury East and Islington over the time, the monthly volume of calls and crimes as a proportion of the total over the year period has remained approximately consistent between Canonbury East and Islington.</p>
Allows a better environment for wealthy homes, yet the less fortunate have more pollution	<p>Recent studies show that the LTNs installed in 2020-2021 do not benefit the better off over more disadvantaged communities. In fact, research has shown that across London, people in deprived areas were more likely to live in a new LTN than people in less deprived areas, and that Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) people were slightly more likely to live in a new LTN than White people.</p> <p>LTNs are realising the benefits that investment in active transport and cycling can have in terms of improving accessibility and mobility, by breaking down physical and psychological barriers to walking and cycling, enabling people from more deprived backgrounds to better access jobs and services. Car ownership is highly correlated to income. The most recent UK data (from 2018) shows that in the top 40% of earners, more than 90% of households own one or more car. In the bottom 10% of earners, only 35% of households own one or more car. Although the cost of motoring over the past ten years has risen at a lower rate than the cost of living (and significantly lower than rises in public transport costs) it is estimated that owning and running a car in the UK costs around £3,900 per household annually. There is clearly a benefit to those who are economically disadvantaged if LTNs remove the perceived need for a motor vehicle, once less expensive options like walking and cycling become more attractive.</p>
<p>Cycle lanes not occupied</p> <p>The new cycle lanes are not</p>	<p>This comment is not relevant to the Canonbury East PFS scheme because Islington council has not installed cycle lanes in the LTN but cycling volumes on internal and boundary roads (combined) cross the internal roads measured against the July 2020 baseline, cycling has increased by an average of 48%. All internal roads recorded significant increases in cycle counts.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>being used as envisaged</p> <p>Islington Council are disregarding Government advice:</p> <p>“The Transport Secretary has admitted too many cycle lanes are being left “unused” with traffic “backed up” as a result of his green transport revolution. The Government is not anti-car, explaining: “No one should be in doubt about our support for motorists.” We are not prepared to tolerate hastily introduced schemes which will create sweeping changes to communities without consultation, and ones where the benefits to cycling and walking do not outweigh the dis-benefits for other road users.”</p>	<p>The highest change in cyclist counts was on Englefield Road in July 2020 from 227 to 421 in 2021, an increase of 85%. Overall, average cyclist numbers have increased from 2,516 in 2020 to 3,722 in 2021; an observed increase of 1,206 cycle trips across the PFS as a daily average. On average across boundary roads, results were more varied.</p> <p>Overall, there was a negligible change (up 8%) in cycle volumes on the boundary roads of the PFS, with arise from 5,247 to 5,668 in the 7-day daily average. Canonbury Road, Southgate Road North and Balls Pond Road experienced a negligible change, while Southgate Road South had a 21% increase in cyclists and Essex Road East had a 25% increase in cyclists. Baring Street saw decreases of 27% in counts, along with Essex Road West and New North Road recording decreases of 11% and 18% respectively.</p> <p>There was a negligible change in the volume of cyclists on the boundary roads, while on the internal roads cycle volumes increased by 1,206, so cycling has increased overall. Although ATCs are fully accurate (as explained in Appendix 6), if a cycle, or multiple cycles pass the counter at the same time as a motorised vehicle, it is possible that there could be under-counting of cycles. This is likely to occur more on roads with higher volumes of motorised traffic, such as the boundary roads. Also, the seasonal variation in weather impacts cycling levels. The surveys for the baseline and pre-consultation reports were both carried out in July, with similar weather conditions.</p> <p>In 2021 the Department for Transport published a ‘Gear Change – Year review’ document highlighting the Transport changes, a year on from the pandemic, including the new and continuing commitments, which can be accessed here. This document provides evidence for an increase in private motorised vehicles after the pandemic which only solidifies the requirement for LTN’s.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>Section 122 of the RTRA 1984 refers to the duty of local authorities "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic"</p> <p>Section 122 of the RTRA 1984 refers to the duty of local authorities "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic" "not to cause unnecessary congestion and pollution" which the LTN scheme fails to provide, and the Authority are therefore in breach of this regulation and failing in its duty of care</p>	<p>Compliance with existing laws and regulations</p> <p>Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 enables the council to make experimental traffic orders (ETOs) to deliver our people-friendly streets schemes. A separate ETO is drawn up for each low traffic neighbourhood. In deciding whether to make an order under section 9, the council must comply with the provisions of section 122 of the 1984 Act which requires the council to exercise that function (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified below) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The specified matters are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises. (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run. (bb) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy). (c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and (d) any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant. <p>The council has complied with section 122, balanced the various considerations and concluded that implementing the ETO is the appropriate decision.</p> <p>Further, when deciding whether to make a traffic order the council must have regard to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy (sections 142 and 144(1)(a) Greater London Authority Act 1999) and it has done so. That strategy emphasises the importance of reducing emissions and improving air quality.</p> <p>The provisions of the ETO process do not require public consultation prior to the start of the trial, although the council did in fact engage with the public before the start of the trial.</p> <p>In making the ETO, the council must follow the procedure set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (as amended by the Traffic Orders Procedure (Coronavirus) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020). It has followed this procedure, including consultation of relevant bodies.</p> <p>The council has also considered the application of relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010. It is not considered that the implementation of these ETOs will impede the rights of individuals.</p>
<p>Data held on the Council's Commonplace</p>	<p>Since the early stages of the first pandemic 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 council's online</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>website is not fit for purpose as anyone nationally can register and comment</p> <p>Data held on the Council's Commonplace website is not fit for purpose - anyone Nationally can register: the Head of Sales and Marketing is Labour Councillor Peter Mason (biased and not independent)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The vast majority (82%) of respondents self-reported as living in the area they were commenting on, with 12% working in the area, 12% shopping in the area, and 8% commuting through the area (multiple options could be selected, so percentages do not sum to 100%).</p>
<p>Islington already has one of the lowest pollution and car ownership levels</p> <p>Islington already exceed the pollution standards set and so such a vast and overreaching exercise is not warranted</p>	<p>24.3 million more miles were driven through Islington in 2019 than 2013 – an almost 10% increase. Traffic on London's local roads has risen by 72% in the past 12 years. If this continues to increase further it will create huge problems for the road network and will increase damage to the environment, including increased air pollution, which is already a serious issue for public health.</p> <p>In 2019, under the "liveable neighbourhoods" banner, the council committed to improve all residential areas in Islington to create a healthy, more equal, accessible and enjoyable environment, and to enable local people to walk and cycle safely. We set this out in our draft Islington Transport Strategy; our Air Quality Strategy; and our Net Zero Carbon Strategy, Vision 2030. Other examples include our ambitious School Streets programme, installing new electric vehicle charging points and electrifying the council's vehicle fleet.</p> <p>EU PM limits are a single metric for measuring the impact of our people-friendly streets measures. They are not even the only metric for measuring air quality in the borough – as the Islington Air Quality Strategy 2019-2023 states: "Despite significant improvements, Islington has consistently exceeded EU limits for NO2 in parts of the borough for many years." It goes on to say: "Road transport accounts for almost half of NOx and over half of PM10 emissions in Islington. The main area where we can reduce emissions from transport is encouraging a modal shift towards more sustainable forms of transport and support individual and businesses to switch to less polluting vehicles when a vehicle is still required. Reducing car use provides huge benefits for everyone."</p> <p>Meeting the EU limits is not in itself a guarantee of healthy air quality. The Islington NHS Clinical Commissioning Group report on air quality from January 2019 states that: "Air pollution is a major environmental risk to health. There is no evidence for a safe level of various air pollutants, and adverse health effects are felt well below the legal EU limits that apply to England."</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
	<p>Residents across the borough (including the 71% of households who do not own a car) are negatively affected by poor air quality. As the extract from the Air Quality Strategy above makes clear, roughly half of the emissions causing this poor air quality come from road transport and from people who choose to drive in the borough. The installation of people-friendly streets schemes to enable and encourage a shift from polluting to non-polluting modes of transport must be a necessary part of making improvements in this area.</p> <p>The impact of LTNs goes far beyond improving air quality. It is a programme also designed to reduce road danger, encourage better public health (by increasing active travel), enable better social distancing, reduce noise pollution and reduce carbon emissions. As part of the monitoring strategy for the LTNs we will be measuring air quality on local roads and side roads.</p> <p>We have published air quality monitoring data here which shows that air quality outside schools is improving in recent years. Over the same timeframe, we have made multiple interventions including limiting motor traffic outside schools using the School Streets scheme.</p>
<p>LTNs are not delivering the benefits envisaged / envisioned</p>	<p>The interim and pre-consultation monitoring reports shows that, at this point in the Canonbury East people-friendly streets (PFS) trial, the project is generally having the intended impacts in the area of reducing motorised traffic across internal roads, as well as levels of speeding on internal roads, thereby making the area's roads safer, cleaner and healthier for residents. There has been a negligible change in crime and anti-social behaviour and London Fire Brigade response times.</p>
<p>LTNs do not provide a reduction in car use or ownership or lower air pollution for the majority</p> <p>Air quality will not improve if road mileage increases, that is what LTNs are doing, displacing traffic and increasing mileage</p> <p>Particulate emissions within LTNs will have dropped but their source</p>	<p>Local Canonbury East streets within the neighbourhood are healthier, with traffic falling overall by 80% between July 2020 and July 2021.</p> <p>Air quality data from within the Canonbury East area, shows that nitrogen dioxide levels have changed in line with borough trends.</p> <p>On air quality, the council received feedback from residents that they felt it had been both improved and reduced. Neither conclusion can be confirmed based on the monitoring data gathered so far. NO₂ levels in Canonbury East have been below the annual objective level of 40µg/m³ at all but one monitoring site post-implementation (July 2020-June 2021), including on boundary roads. Levels of NO₂ in and around Canonbury East reflect those in the borough more widely where data is available for 2019.</p> <p>Annual average levels of NO₂ in Canonbury East since people-friendly streets started are, on average, lower than the previous year at internal and off-road sites but higher at boundary road sites, where data is available from 2019. In comparison the wider borough sites show a decrease for internal, off-road and boundary sites, although decreases are lower for internal roads compared to decreases in Canonbury East.</p> <p>These results are based on a limited number of data points and over a relatively short time period, and so will need longer term analysis and comparison to wider borough trends. This is especially the case for the Canonbury East's internal roads where there were only two monitoring sites with seven months of data before the low traffic neighbourhood was introduced and Canonbury East's boundary road sites where there is only one site with full pre-scheme data.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>had been diverted and added to areas where emissions and pedestrians are densest and now impacting greater numbers of people</p>	<p>The figures presented in the data are an annual average and do not describe fluctuations within this time period that might have influenced the average results. For example, there were a number of roadwork projects on the boundary roads in the post implementation period and looking at monthly data there was a peak in Canonbury East in January that is higher than larger borough trends but would have impacted average results for the year. It can be very difficult to pick out the reasons for specific spikes and this would require a much more in-depth investigation.</p>
<p>Local councillors are responsible for ensuring that local decisions about street infrastructure take account of the needs and opinions of local people</p> <p>Petition signed by over 10,000 people opposing the LTNs has been disregarded</p> <p>Valid concerns put forward by resident representatives to the Council Leader have not been addressed and have been dismissed</p> <p>Our human rights laws protect us all from arbitrary and excessive action by public officials that "intrude into our lives" and the</p>	<p>Islington has an estimated population of 215,667 and Islington's streets belong to everyone. They are a place where life happens and where the community comes together, no matter what our individual circumstances or daily routines look like. But as technology has changed, including the development of sat-navs, we've seen more and more traffic taking short cuts through local streets.</p> <p>The council has a policy for responding to petitions which can be found here: https://democracy.islington.gov.uk/mgEPetitionListDisplay.aspx?bcr=1. This policy applies to petitions submitted directly to the council. According to our records, the following petitions have been submitted to the council regarding the people-friendly streets programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One with 2,406 signatures discussed at the 25 February 2021 full council. Item 130 here https://democracy.islington.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=134&MIId=4060 • One e-petition with 17 signatures, here: https://democracy.islington.gov.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=500000045&RPID=391926&HPID=391926 • A petition in support of a Highbury LTN, presented to the 9 July 2020 Council meeting, with 1,188 signatures - https://www.change.org/p/islington-london-borough-council-highbury-low-traffic-neighbourhood?recruiter=1115898960&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=twitter&recruited_by_id=032af7a0-acbf-11ea-9892-d17f3fd28fb9 <p>The council's response to the first petition listed here is recorded in the minutes of the February 2021 council meeting. The second petition was to "Stop the Temporary Traffic order" for the St Peter's LTN scheme – a temporary traffic order was not used for this scheme. The council has no record of a petition with 7,000+ signatures being submitted. Petitions on independent private sites that are not linked to the Islington route for considering petitions are not considered, additionally there are not any checks on who signed the petition.</p> <p>This petition was brought to the full council meeting on 9 December. A stream of this meeting is available here: https://islington.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/619236. Minutes for this meeting are due to be published in January 2022 and this will form the council's official response to the petition. Until a petition is brought to the council, we are unable to provide a response.</p> <p>Petitions may circulate on social media and independent websites, but the council has no way of verifying the signatories to these petitions. Other London boroughs have used online petitions to justify removing schemes, only to discover later that these</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>Council have failed to address factors that ought to have been taken into account.</p> <p>Councillors of the LBI are neglecting their duties to such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust in the office that they hold. They are therefore guilty of a wilful dereliction of duty.</p>	<p>petitions have been shared not just nationally, but globally: https://www.standard.co.uk/news/transport/kensington-cycle-lane-axed-refund-government-cash-b115087.html</p> <p>After debate in council chambers on 25 February 2021 on the petition 'Reverse the Road Closures' 130 the following main points were raised in the debate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The petitioners said that congestion had increased on the borough's main roads following the introduction of the council's People Friendly Streets scheme. The petitioners considered that there had been inadequate consultation on the schemes prior to implementation. - Councillor Champion commented that the administration was elected on a manifesto to make streets more liveable, including reducing rat-running and increasing cycling. Traffic on London's local streets had increased by 72% over the past 13 years. This volume of traffic was dangerous and discouraged people from choosing active travel options. The Council's scheme would encourage residents to lead active lives that would be beneficial to their health and wellbeing, while also helping to tackle the climate emergency. - London's traffic was a major source of air pollution that was having a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of local people and the environment. The People Friendly Street scheme would help to address this. - The Council's People Friendly Streets scheme was the implementation of national government policy which required local authorities to reallocate road space for cyclists and pedestrians in response to the coronavirus pandemic. The schemes had been implemented through national government funding made available for this purpose and was compliant with statutory guidance. - Councillors were listening to the feedback received on the schemes and this would be taken into account when the schemes were reviewed. - Councillors considered further improvements that could be made to reduce car usage and improve access to public transport and how active travel options could be further promoted. <p>RESOLVED: To continue to encourage residents to participate in local democracy by carefully considering the concerns raised in the petition and to undertake the debate in a spirit of openness and transparency.</p> <p>Local councillors have been listening to local people. The local people tell us that they want their streets to be friendlier places that are easier for everyone to use; to enjoy being outside in clean air; to make it safer for walking, cycling, using buggies and wheelchairs; to relax or play. Over 7% of households in Islington do not own a car (see appendix 7 in link) and 1/3 of journeys in London are less than 2km, a distance which could be walked or cycled by many people – especially if the roads were quieter.</p> <p>The temporarily closing of roads outside schools helps to reduce congestion and pollution at the school gates as well as make it easier and safer for children to get to and from school. In addition to the immediate benefits for school children, the School Street zones also provide a temporary pedestrian and cyclist zone for wider community to enjoy. This means that people travelling through the area to their homes, work or place of education can benefit from safer, greener and healthier travel through the School Street zone.</p> <p>The introduction of low traffic neighbourhoods, School Streets and cycleways under the people-friendly streets programme will create more space for those who want to enjoy Islington as they walk or cycle. This way we will make Islington a more equal place for everyone.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>81% of Islington residents' trips are made by walking, cycling or using public transport and yet the Council is unfairly persecuting its residents</p> <p>Islington already has one of the lowest pollution and car ownership levels</p>	<p>Through the people-friendly streets programme, Islington council wants to bring life back to Islington's streets. Taking the best of what we have learnt in the past year, to make our borough safer, healthier, greener and a fairer place for everyone. Canonbury East, like many neighbourhoods within the borough, has suffered from increased traffic volumes in recent years from the use of the area as a short cut. Quantitative evidence from other areas shows that low traffic neighbourhoods (LTNs) are a successful way for us to achieve these objectives.</p> <p>The data in the pre consultation report shows that they can also make a positive difference in Islington. People-friendly streets make it easier, safer and more pleasant for people to walk, cycle and use wheelchairs, buggies and scooters.</p> <p>Every local trip switched from a motor vehicle to another way of travelling means one fewer vehicle on the road, leaving the roads clearer for people who have no choice but to use cars. The Canonbury East people-friendly streets trial was implemented in August 2020 as a low traffic neighbourhood under the people-friendly streets programme. As part of the council's urgent Covid-19 response, the trial was implemented swiftly to make walking and cycling easier and safer as alternatives to public transport and prevent a car-based recovery.</p>
<p>We want less pollution - so why are you also blocking all electric vehicles and penalising them?</p>	<p>If private vehicles in the area are still able to travel through the restrictions, then we will not see the benefits in terms of reducing road danger, air quality and noise pollution that we would otherwise expect. This is because one of the main barriers that puts people off walking, wheeling or cycling instead of driving is not feeling safe when sharing the road with the increasing volumes of motor traffic in the borough. By preventing all motor vehicle trips through camera-controlled filters (except for emergency vehicles) we will make the environment feel much safer and make it much more likely that local people will begin to travel more by active means.</p> <p>The objective of people friendly streets is to reduce the overall number of trips, not to displace all traffic from local streets onto main roads. This will only happen if some car trips are replaced by walking, wheeling or cycling. For some journeys, the filters will make driving more inconvenient and are in this way designed to encourage those who do not need to drive to choose a separate way to travel, especially for short trips. Every journey switched from driving to active travel removes a car from the road and leaves the roads clearer for people who have no other choice but to drive.</p> <p>Electric vehicles contribute to traffic congestion, parking stress and road danger, and contribute to air pollution through tyre dust. For those reasons they are not proposed to be exempt.</p>
<p>There are Issues for emergency service access - neither LAS or the Met have keys to lockable bollards</p>	<p>We have installed camera-controlled filters to allow emergency services to access local streets and we have used the correct signage to inform drivers in advance that they cannot pass through these filters. This signage is put in place in advance to warn residents and other motorists that the scheme is live and to help drivers avoid having to make U-turns. Where we cannot use physical measures, for example to allow access for emergency services, we use camera enforcement, and we issue penalty charges if motorists don't follow these restrictions.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood shops are risk of closure</p>	<p>If you can currently access a business address in Islington by motor vehicle, you will still be able to after the traffic filters are installed. You may need to change your route, by driving to and from the nearest main road rather than across a residential area.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response
from loss of business	<p>Many items to and from businesses could be delivered by cycle or cargo bike, and these vehicles will be able to pass through any traffic filters that are installed. As well as being quicker for local trips, using cycles would also mean no extra costs to your business (like VED, fuel or insurance).</p>
<p>A judgement was recently made in favour of Nobu Group against Hackney Council for denying access to all but ULEV to certain roads. In that judgement it was stated and confirmed that "Councils do not have the power to close roads, their duty is to repair and maintain only".</p>	<p>A legal challenge, called Horrendous Hackney Road Closures, by residents to the controversial low traffic network scheme in Hackney has been thrown out by the High Court.</p> <p>The council closed 20 roads to through-traffic, open only to pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles as part of its response to Covid.</p> <p>The measures, brought in using 18-month long experimental traffic orders (ETOs), were aimed at aiding social distancing, supporting walking and cycling, and reducing road danger by clamping down on rat-running.</p> <p>The council is not aware of the judgement referred to in the objection, it does not seem to refer to an LTN in Hackney. Councils however do have statutory powers to impose road restrictions.</p>

Objection Theme	Officers Response																																
<p>Traffic being pushed past Rotherfield School, increasing danger and pollution.</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of the scheme, there were some concerns that the Canonbury East LTN would divert all traffic through Elizabeth Avenue and Rotherfield Street due to the location of the traffic filters. When comparing the pre and post implementation situation in Canonbury East, it must be considered that the traffic post implementation of the scheme in its nature became very different from what it was prior to implementation, as through-traffic is no longer possible in Canonbury East. It means that vehicles which used to take Elizabeth Avenue or Rotherfield Street as rat run between Essex Road, Southgate Road and New North Road can no longer do so. The existing traffic data prior implementation confirmed this high volume of through traffic. People-friendly streets makes this through movement impossible – which means that the cars travelling in the area either originate or have a destination in the area. The traffic therefore shifts from London-wide to local in nature, leading to an important reduction in overall volumes.</p> <p>This was confirmed by the monitoring data. Rotherfield Street, Shepperton Road and Elizabeth Avenue have a baseline of February 2020. There was some data loss at Shepperton Road for Friday and Saturday. The missing data was patched with weekday average values for Friday and Sunday values for Saturday, to give the most appropriate comparison. Extra counts at Rotherfield Street were conducted using an April 2019 baseline. The pre-consultation counts took place in July 2021, at the same time as the counts for all the other sites. All three sites showed a fall in traffic volumes, with the most substantial decrease occurring on Elizabeth Avenue (-62%) see Table 3 below. However, the baseline ATC (Automated Traffic Counter) was installed at a slightly different location on Elizabeth Avenue to the ATC for the pre-consultation. The baseline ATC was installed between the junctions of Halliford Street and Rotherfield Street; the pre-consultation ATC was installed between the junctions of Rotherfield Street and New North Road. This may have had some effect on the volumes recorded, though as the vehicle counts were near to each other on the same road it is likely that the difference would be minimal.</p> <p>Table 3: Motorised traffic volumes on internal roads – various baseline dates</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Baseline - Observed</th> <th>Baseline - Normalised</th> <th>Observed - July 2021</th> <th>Normalised - July 2021</th> <th>Difference</th> <th>Difference Normalised</th> <th>Difference Normalised %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Shepperton Road*</td> <td>1,664</td> <td>1,882</td> <td>833</td> <td>888</td> <td>-831</td> <td>-994</td> <td>-53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elizabeth Avenue*</td> <td>4,210</td> <td>4,761</td> <td>1,684</td> <td>1,794</td> <td>-2,526</td> <td>-2,967</td> <td>-62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rotherfield Street**</td> <td>409</td> <td>409</td> <td>322</td> <td>343</td> <td>-88</td> <td>-67</td> <td>-16%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* - Baseline February 2020 ** - Baseline April 2019</p>		Baseline - Observed	Baseline - Normalised	Observed - July 2021	Normalised - July 2021	Difference	Difference Normalised	Difference Normalised %	Shepperton Road*	1,664	1,882	833	888	-831	-994	-53%	Elizabeth Avenue*	4,210	4,761	1,684	1,794	-2,526	-2,967	-62%	Rotherfield Street**	409	409	322	343	-88	-67	-16%
	Baseline - Observed	Baseline - Normalised	Observed - July 2021	Normalised - July 2021	Difference	Difference Normalised	Difference Normalised %																										
Shepperton Road*	1,664	1,882	833	888	-831	-994	-53%																										
Elizabeth Avenue*	4,210	4,761	1,684	1,794	-2,526	-2,967	-62%																										
Rotherfield Street**	409	409	322	343	-88	-67	-16%																										

Objection Theme	Officers Response
<p>Why taxis are not permitted to use the bus gates in the borough</p>	<p>The Council's position on bus gates has been clearly set out. Our use of bus gate signage precludes all motor vehicles except emergency vehicles and buses from passing through camera-controlled filters where these signs are used.</p> <p>With reference to the Mayor's Transport Strategy of 2018, we note that a clear distinction is made between "public transport" and taxis. There are 345 mentions of "public transport" in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and none of those references include taxis in the definition.</p> <p>In fact, many definitions explicitly exclude taxis, and contrast them to public transport.</p> <p>The installation of our people-friendly streets programme involves Islington Council making legally enforceable experimental traffic orders, which comply with all relevant traffic regulations. The purpose of these experimental traffic orders is to significantly reduce traffic flow on local streets, making it impossible for motor traffic to take short cuts between main roads via local streets. At the same time, we wish to allow the drivers of motor vehicles to continue to be able to access all addresses they can currently reach.</p> <p>The experimental traffic orders therefore do not provide any exemptions for any motor vehicles to pass through the filters, except for emergency vehicle access, Blue Badge exemptions and where the filter is placed on a bus route. Buses have a fixed route and a fixed timetable, so do not have any other options than to use the route with a filter installed. Taxis, PHVs and private cars do have other options for any journey they take.</p> <p>The council are not preventing access to any address and so taxi drivers (indeed, all drivers) can still use the shortest legal route between two points.</p> <p>On Taxicards, you state that "Whilst some disabled passengers are eligible for a taxi card, it is a means tested benefit like a personal independence payment so any disabled passenger not eligible meets the cost of the metered fare." This is not our understanding. There is an eligibility criteria for Taxicards but it is not means tested (i.e., dependent upon income). In Islington, a person is automatically eligible for membership if they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Receive the Higher Rate Mobility component of the Disability Living Allowance · Receive 8 points or more under the moving around activity of the Mobility Component of PIP · Are registered as severely sight impaired / blind · Receive a War Pension Mobility Supplement. <p>People can become a member without meeting one of the above criteria, but this means being assessed by the council. Taxicard holders can claim between £8.30-£10.80 of their taxi journey either 52 or 104 times a year. Unlike many boroughs, Islington also allows Taxicard users to "daisy-chain" their trips, so that £16.60-£21.60 can be claimed for a single journey on the same day.</p> <p>We believe the Taxicard scheme allows people with disabilities and mobility impairments to use taxis at subsidised rates, and it was an important part of our Resident Impact Assessment before installing the new people-friendly streets measures.</p>