

# Response ID ANON-DUME-BRDN-H

Submitted to **Have your say on changes to Grosvenor Place**

Submitted on **2017-09-29 16:09:13**

## Our proposals for Grosvenor Place

### 1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for Grosvenor Place?

#### Comments:

London Living Streets is supportive of the overall goals of this project to reduce the numbers of collisions but we have concerns about aspects of the proposals. Although the controlled crossing at Duke of Wellington Place is of course welcome, of real concern is the proposed removal of the pedestrian island by the junction with Chapel St which will serve not only to increase vehicle speeds but also make the informal crossing which is bound to occur by pedestrians significantly more dangerous. We would strongly argue against the removal of this informal crossing as being a significant dis-benefit and potential source of danger for pedestrians. No arguments appear to have been brought forward for the removal of this island in the consultation text and we can only stress just how this will increase levels of danger to pedestrians who will inevitably need somewhere to cross informally between Duke of Wellington Place and Chester Street. We would also like to see measures taken to address vehicle speeds as there is evidence of a significant proportion of vehicles exceeding the (we would argue too high) current 30mph speed limit. There is also, we believe, a more general case to be made that a 30mph limit is not appropriate here owing to the large number of pedestrian movements, and the potential to create, in a less intimidating environment, a more heavily used walking route between the Victoria area and Hyde Park. More generally we would like to see mention made in the consultation materials of pedestrian flows. While the impact of the changes on vehicular traffic is studied at length, no mention is made of pedestrian movements and existing flows. This absence of mention and data tends to encourage one to overlook the significance of the proposed removal of the traffic island and thus fail to take into account the impact of the proposed changes on people on foot. We welcome the extension of the Bus Lane to a 24/7 operation; and would underscore how important this kind of measure is, in the light of the 6% fall in bus use over the most recent two years (this being, in the London Assembly Transport Committee's view mainly due to increasing congestion on London's roads).

## About you

### 2 What is your name?

#### Name:

Jeremy Leach

### 3 What is your email address?

#### Email:

jeremyleach@posteo.net

### 4 Please provide us with your postcode?

#### Postcode:

SE17 3EQ

### 5 Are you (please tick all boxes that apply):

Not local but interested in the scheme

#### Other:

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

#### Organisation:

London Living Streets

### 7 How did you find out about this consultation?

Received an email from TfL

#### Other:

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

Good

#### Do you have any further comments about the quality of the consultation material?:

Very good and clear but a few comments. It would be good to see some explanation for the proposed removal of the traffic island by the Chapel St junction - it is all too easy to overlook if arguments are not brought forward about it. We note the absence of data about vehicle speeds. It is going to become the job of all TfL schemes/projects to focus on compliance with speed limits and info on speeds should now be supplied in consultations as a matter of course. Also absent is data on pedestrian flows -again it is all too easy to overlook the role of pedestrians if data is not supplied about their significance to an area.

## Equality Monitoring

### 9 Gender:

Male

### 10 Ethnic Group:

White – British

### 11 Age:

56-60

### 12 Sexual Orientation:

Not Answered

### 13 Faith:

Not Answered

**14 Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months? (Please include problems related to old age)**

No