

# **Emergency Active Travel Measures – ETRO/1 Consultation Summary Report January 2021 (Updated 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021)**

## Document Details

**Date:** Monday, 8<sup>th</sup> February 2021 (Updated 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021)  
**Prepared by:** Daniel Parsons  
**Checked by:** Samantha Grant  
**Approved by:** Richard Pearson

## Contents

Document Details.....	2
Contents .....	2
Background.....	5
Overall feedback.....	6
Statistical totals .....	6
Analysis .....	7
Breakdown by time periods .....	7
Analysis .....	8
‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox.....	8
Online Questionnaire.....	8
Aggregated statistics .....	8
Business feedback.....	9
‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox.....	9
Draft Interim Business Impact Review .....	10
Online Questionnaire.....	11
Analysis.....	11
ETRO Response Mailbox.....	11
Draft Interim Business Impact Review.....	12
Online Questionnaire .....	12
Access feedback.....	13
Displaced traffic / parking .....	13
‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox .....	13
Online Questionnaire – views by equalities groups. ....	14

Conditions for cycling and walking.....	14
Analysis.....	14
Displaced traffic / parking.....	14
Conditions for cycling and walking .....	15
Suggestions to improve the scheme .....	16
‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox and Online Questionnaire.....	16
Draft Interim Business Review.....	17
Council responses to suggestions made .....	18
Outcomes.....	19
Amendments to the restrictions.....	19
Complementary measures .....	20
Parking .....	20
Conclusion and recommendations .....	21
Conclusions.....	21
Overall .....	21
Business feedback.....	21
Access feedback.....	22
Suggestions to improve the scheme .....	22
Recommendations.....	22
Notes .....	23
Appendix A – Notes on derivation of statistics.....	24
‘Against’ Category .....	24
‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox .....	24
Draft Interim Business Impact Review.....	24
Online Questionnaire – levels of agreement with aspects of the trial.....	24
Online Questionnaire – views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling .....	24
Online Questionnaire – impact of the changes.....	24
‘Neutral’ Category.....	25
‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox .....	25
Draft Interim Business Impact Review.....	25
Online Questionnaire – levels of agreement with aspects of the trial.....	25
Online Questionnaire – views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling .....	25
Online Questionnaire – impact of the changes.....	25

'For' Category.....	26
'ETRO Response' Mailbox .....	26
Draft Interim Business Impact Review.....	26
Online Questionnaire – levels of agreement with aspects of the trial.....	26
Online Questionnaire – views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling .....	26
Online Questionnaire – impact of the changes.....	26
Overall feedback – statistical totals.....	27
'ETRO Response' Mailbox .....	27
Online Questionnaire .....	27
Aggregated Statistics .....	27
Overall feedback – breakdown by time periods .....	27
'ETRO Response' Mailbox .....	27
Online Questionnaire .....	27
Aggregated Statistics .....	27
Business feedback .....	28
'ETRO Response' Mailbox and Online Questionnaire .....	28
Access Feedback .....	28
Displaced traffic / parking.....	28
Online Questionnaire – views by equalities groups.....	28
Conditions for cycling and walking .....	28
Online Questionnaire – levels of agreement with aspects of the trial .....	28

## Background

This Consultation Summary Report brings together all the feedback received for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order on Poole Quay and Lower High Street (ETRO/1).

ETRO/1 was implemented on Saturday 27th June 2020 for an initial 6-month period lasting until Sunday 27th December 2021 as part of the Council's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Feedback about the scheme have been captured via the following reporting tools:

- 'ETRO' Response' mailbox (latest statistics as of close of play on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2021 plus findings from three Monitoring Reports issued Tuesday 6th October 2020, Thursday 26th November 2020 and Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021);
- Draft Interim Business Impact Review (issued Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020); and
- Online Questionnaire (Six-Month Review issued 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021).

These outputs have been considered collectively to identify key themes, areas of consensus, points of difference and any suggestions for improvement.

Where applicable, a Red-Amber-Green (RAG) methodology has been used to aid analysis and interpretation, setting out feedback into three categories: 'Against'; 'Neutral' and 'For'.

Overall, the purpose of this report is to inform the decision-making process as to whether the scheme should:

- continue in its current form for a further period of time;
- be changed in some way;
- made permanent; or
- be removed.

This report has been structured into the following chapters:

- Overall feedback;
- Business feedback;
- Access feedback;
- Suggestions to improve the scheme; and
- Conclusions and recommendations.

## Overall feedback

This section reports on the overall feedback, setting out statistical totals and a breakdown by time periods during the course of the experimental trial.

### Statistical totals

The table below outlines the five sources of information from the three reporting tools which were determined to elicit such data. These five sources have then been aggregated to provide a series of combined statistics highlighting the prevailing view.

It should be noted that the percentages given do not add up to 100% because certain message types have been excluded from the analysis. This includes messages in the 'ETRO Response' Mailbox which have been classified as a 'Follow up to a Standard Response' or a 'Query' and messages from the Online Questionnaire which answered 'Don't know' or did not provide an answer. Such an approach was undertaken to avoid double-counting the views of those who had responded on more than one occasion and misrepresenting those who had not elicited a view. (See Appendix A of this report)

<b>ETRO Response' Mailbox – latest statistics as of Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2021</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	46	18	32
<b>Proportions</b>	39%	15%	27%
<b>Draft Interim Business Impact Review – Question 1A (overall impact) – ‘Do you consider that the daytime and evening closures of the Lower High Street and The Quay have been beneficial overall so far?’</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	9	2	12
<b>Proportions</b>	38%	8%	50%
<b>Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial – ‘The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling’</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	444	25	359
<b>Proportions</b>	54%	3%	43%
<b>Online Questionnaire – Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling – ‘Do you agree with prioritising the following roads for walking and cycling?’</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	408	50	362
<b>Proportions</b>	50%	6%	44%
<b>Online Questionnaire – Impact of the changes – ‘How do the changes impact on you?’</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	395	81	330
<b>Proportions</b>	48%	10%	40%
<b>Aggregated statistics</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	471	72	394
<b>Proportions</b>	50%	9%	42%

## Analysis

Looking at the disaggregated statistics from each the five sources of information:

- Neither of the three feedback categories garners a proportion in excess of 54%.
- Share of responses ‘Against’ exceeded those ‘For’ in four of the five sources.
- Biggest percentage of responses ‘Against’ (54%) came from the Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial.
- Largest share of ‘Neutral’ feedback (15%) came from the ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox.
- Greatest proportion ‘For’ came from the Draft Interim Business Impact Review.

Taking into account the aggregated statistics, there is no clear-cut consensus:

- Half are ‘Against’ (50%), representing the largest share, but not constituting a majority.
- Just under half are ‘For’ (43%).
- It would appear that views are finely balanced. Alterations or improvements to the scheme could alter the views and operating the measures in a more normal post Covid context could also produce a different outcome.

## Breakdown by time periods

The table below provides a breakdown of responses at three points during the course of the experimental period. Percentages given indicate the proportion of all messages received during these periods. This has been done to illustrate how feedback may have changed as time progressed.

Data from the Draft Interim Business Impact Review was not relevant because this was gathered over a much shorter time period (approx. 1 week).

Again, it should be noted that the percentages given do not add up to 100% because certain message types have been excluded from the analysis for the same reasons as previously stated.

<b>‘ETRO Response Mailbox’</b>						
<b>Time period</b>	<b>Against</b>		<b>Neutral</b>		<b>For</b>	
	<b>Qty</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Qty</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Qty</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>All</b>	46	39%	18	15%	32	27%
<b>Before launch</b>	9	41%	8	36%	2	9%
<b>First 4 Weeks</b>	20	48%	7	17%	13	31%
<b>After 4 weeks</b>	17	31%	3	6%	17	31%
<b>Online Questionnaire – See questionnaire report page 15</b>						

## Analysis

### *'ETRO Response' Mailbox*

A total of 118 responses were received, 32 in favour, 46 against and the remainder were comments or queries or neutral.

Considering the responses that came in after the first 4 weeks of the measures operation, 17 were in favour and 17 were against with the remainder being comments or queries.

### *Online Questionnaire*

As of 27<sup>th</sup> Dec 2020, 833 responses were received.

- Overall, 43% agree and 53% disagree that the Quay, Lower High Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling.
- 46% agree and 38% disagree that deliveries should be restricted between 10pm and 10am.
- 43% agree and 47% disagree that the changes will/do make it safer to walk around the Quay area.
- 32% agree and 57% disagree that the changes will/do encourage them to cycle in the area.
- 43% agree and 51% disagree that the changes make the Quay and (Lower) High Street a better place to visit.

42% of respondents took part in the consultation before the scheme was launched, with 35% responding in the first four weeks and 24% responding after four weeks.

Analysis shows that before launch 42% agree and 55% disagreed that the Quay, Lower High Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling. During the first 4 weeks this changed to 33% and 64% respectively and in the following 5 months the feedback changed notably to 61% and 37% respectively, indicating that the feedback was becoming more positive as people experienced the impact of the measure in practice.

In terms of overall impact on whether the measures made the Quay and (Lower) High St a better place to visit. 43% of people said that the measure had a positive impact and 51% negative. Before launch these figures were 41% and 51% respectively. During the first 4 weeks this changed to 35% and 63% however in the remaining 5 months this changed to 60% and 36% respectively again indicating that the feedback was becoming more positive as people experienced the impact of the measure in practice.

### General Observations

- Another trend is that people appeared more energised to speak about the scheme at the start, declining as time went on, with a slight uplift in the total number of responses towards the end of the trial.

## Business feedback

This section examines feedback regarding impact to business, including footfall, use of space and deliveries. Pertinent findings from the three reporting tools are presented below along with an analysis of key trends. Sources of information include the following:

- **‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox** – key points made, and issues raised by businesses;
- **Draft Interim Business Impact Review** – Questions 1B and 5 relating to business impact and use of outdoor space respectively; and
- **Online Questionnaire** – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial concerning delivery restrictions and whether it makes the place more attractive to visit.

A RAG methodology has again been used for Question 1B in the Draft Interim Business Impact Review and the two questions from the online questionnaire. **Appendix A** contains details on how the statistics for these have been derived.

### ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox

- Of those who objected to the scheme, 54% (25) cited a negative impact to business. This represents around 21% of all respondents.
- Those in support argued that it was conducive to trade by reducing traffic dominance, allowing for outdoor seating and making it more amenable for recreation.

Theme	Issues raised by businesses
<b>Bus tours and land train</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key selling point is access to Poole Quay and its visitor attractions.</li> <li>Costs of changing route.</li> </ul>
<b>Disabled and elderly</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-routing of bus service plus lack of access for taxis and drop-off have deterred disabled and elderly clientele.</li> </ul>
<b>Maritime activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implications for RNLI operations.</li> <li>Need for vehicular access to support passenger boats and any larger vessels that may be moored up including charters and fisherman.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking and loading</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Imbalanced parking allocation on the section of The Quay west of Thames Street. New disabled spaces mean there is a lack of short-stay parking and appears to be an over provision of loading bays.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery issues for premises with takeaways or no rear access.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher delivery costs for consignments before 10am.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confusion as to whether deliveries can be received if a vehicle entered the restricted area before 10am.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disturbance from relocated loading bay outside Custom House.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access issues for premises with private off-street parking.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of short-stay parking on the High Street has reduced footfall.</li> </ul>
<b>Seasonality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access requirements for weddings and exhibitions at Poole Museum.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictions unsuitable during winter months or inclement weather.</li> <li>Implications for event nights.</li> </ul>
<b>Taxis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access required to support boat excursions, evening trade, hospitality venues, summer events and visitors unfamiliar with the area.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortfall of taxi rank capacity due to removal of facility on The Quay. Existing facility outside Orchard Plaza suffers from parking stress. (N.B. a new taxi rank was created in Old Orchard).</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncertainty of where to pick-up booked passengers.</li> </ul>

## Draft Interim Business Impact Review

<b>Question 1B (impact for business) – ‘Do you consider that the daytime and evening closures of the Lower High Street and The Quay have been beneficial overall so far?’</b>			
	<b>Against</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>For</b>
<b>Messages</b>	8	9	7
<b>Proportions</b>	33%	38%	29%

<b>Question 5 (Use of outdoor space – tables and chairs etc)</b>			
<b>Response</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	
I have made use of the outdoor space and would want to continue over winter.	8	33	
I have made used of the outdoor space but would not want to continue over winter.	3	13	
I have not made use of the outside space but plan to do so in the future.	5	21	
I have not made use but think the use of outdoor furniture improves the area.	4	17	
I do not support the space being used in this way.	4	17	
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	

## Online Questionnaire

Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial – ‘Deliveries should be restricted to between 10pm and 10am’				
		Against	Neutral	For
<b>Messages</b>		316	113	377
<b>Proportions</b>	<b>Overall</b>	38%	14%	46%
	<b>Resident living in the area</b>	42%	13%	46%
	<b>Resident living outside the area</b>	39%	11%	48%
	<b>Business owner</b>	77%	3%	20%
	<b>Visitor</b>	43%	14%	41%
	<b>Works in the area</b>	45%	17%	38%
	<b>Travels through the area</b>	40%	14%	45%
	<b>Member of local group / organisation</b>	44%	16%	39%
	<b>Other</b>	38%	15%	44%
Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial – ‘The changes will/do make the Quay and Lower High Street a better place to visit’.				
		Against	Neutral	For
<b>Messages</b>		424	39	356
<b>Proportions</b>	<b>Overall</b>	52%	5%	43%
	<b>Resident living in the area</b>	46%	8%	46%
	<b>Resident living outside the area</b>	51%	3%	46%
	<b>Business owner</b>	71%	11%	18%
	<b>Visitor</b>	62%	8%	31%
	<b>Works in the area</b>	61%	5%	34%
	<b>Travels through the area</b>	56%	6%	38%
	<b>Member of local group / organisation</b>	65%	6%	28%
	<b>Other</b>	59%	2%	39%

## Analysis

### ETRO Response Mailbox

- Negative business impact is the most frequent reason cited in objections to the scheme, although this only represents around 20% of all respondents.
- Alternative means of access for customers is required when cycling and walking is not a viable option. Specifically, permitting taxi access could cater for those with reduced mobility and support the hospitality sector including seasonal events and coastal tourism.
- Relaxations to existing moving orders could also better accommodate certain access and delivery requirements including the land train, maritime activities, premises with no rear access and exemptions for approved events / functions.
- However, for any periods when the road is re-opened to motorised vehicles, the nine pavement licences on the High Street would need to be revoked due to width constraints. Conversely, of the six pavement licences on The Quay, four were pre-existing so a degree of coexistence can be applied.
- Fluidity of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic means that the original purpose of the scheme remains valid for the foreseeable future with government advice likely to continue advocating social distancing. Narrow footways on the Lower High Street do not permit social distancing, hence the closure to motorised vehicles.

- Parking allocations near the closure points could also be reviewed for suitability. This would need to take into account the Council's emerging parking strategy which is likely to discourage on-street parking in town centre areas, promote sustainable travel modes and direct vehicle traffic to available off-street car parks.

### **Draft Interim Business Impact Review**

- Impact on business appears to be mixed with the majority providing an answer that can be considered neutral. This suggests alterations to the scheme may be useful.
- Approximately 83% of respondents have either already used the outdoor space, are planning to do so in the future or think that it improves the area.
- Usage of the space is two-fold, with the area supporting both seating provisions and queuing for businesses operating a takeaway service.
- More appear to support retaining outdoor space during winter rather than its removal.
- On the whole, there appears to be general support for the reallocation of street space towards business use. However, this needs to be balanced against access requirements.
- Poole Harbour Commissioners (PHC) have also indicated that the Quay is a working Quay and as such vehicle access is required at all times.

### **Online Questionnaire**

- Businesses report being the most impacted, with residents voicing more mixed opinions.
- In terms of delivery restrictions, more are 'For' than 'Against' overall, but there is no discernible majority. Business owners are predominately against the restrictions (77%).
- Just over half (52%) are against the notion of it making the place more attractive to visit, with businesses, organisations, visitors and workers the most critical (71%, 65%, 62% and 61% respectively).

## Access feedback

This section reports on comments relating to the transport impact of prohibiting motorised vehicles. As part of this, factors include displaced traffic / parking and conditions for cycling / walking. Findings from the reporting tools are outlined below according to the two sub-themes along with an analysis of key outcomes. Sources of information include the following:

- **‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox** – key issues raised; and
- **Online Questionnaire** – Views by equalities groups and levels of agreement with aspects of the trial concerning whether it makes walking safer and encourages cycling.

A RAG methodology has again been used for the data from the Online Questionnaire.

**Appendix A** contains details on how the statistics for these have been derived.

### Displaced traffic / parking

#### ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox

- Of those who objected 41% (19) referred to disabled / elderly impact; 15% (7) cited displaced traffic; 4% (2) alluded to displaced parking; and another 4% (2) mentioned emergency access. This represents circa 16%, 6% and 2% of all responses respectively.

Streets affected	Issues raised
<b>Displaced Traffic</b>	
<b>Church Street, Levet’s Lane, Market Street and New Street</b>	▪ Traffic diverting via Levet’s Lane, Church Street, and Thames Street, with vehicles allegedly exceeding the 20mph posted speed limit and ignoring signage indicating that motor vehicles are prohibited except for access.
	▪ This could relate to local access traffic avoiding southbound queues on the A350 West Street when the Poole Lifting Bridge is in operation which can block vehicular access to the western section of The Quay.
	▪ Prior to ETRO/1 some residents apparently used Old Orchard and the section of The Quay currently closed to bypass this congestion.
	▪ Reports of motorcyclists using Church Street, Market Street and New Street as an alternative route, ignoring the one-way system on New Street and the prohibition to motorised vehicles along the cobbled section of Market Street (numbers 6 to 12).
<b>Barbers Gate, St James Close and Thames Street</b>	▪ Reports of motorcyclists riding along the footway between St James Close and the A350 West Street, vehicles frequently turning around in St James Close and Barbers Gate cul-de-sacs, plus instances of road rage.
	▪ ‘No through road’ signs have been installed at the entrance point.
<b>Ballard Road and Greens Garden</b>	▪ One report of this becoming the main route for delivery vehicles, with HGVs mounting the footways on bends and at junctions.
<b>Displaced parking</b>	
<b>Castle Street and the Quay</b>	▪ Alternate disabled bays are too far away from facilities and shops.
	▪ Substitute bays outside of MDG sports lack sufficient dropped kerbs.
<b>Old Orchard / The Quay</b>	▪ Anti-social vehicle use transpiring at the replacement motorcycle parking on the roundabout, with noise disturbing residents of Dolphin Quays.
<b>Strand Street</b>	▪ Use by blue badge holders and delivery vehicles has increased parking stress and emissions, with incidents of private access being obstructed.

## Online Questionnaire – Views by equalities groups.

	Against		
	Age 65+	Disability – Limited a lot	Disability – Limited a little
Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial	52%	83%	65%
Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling	48%	78%	65%
Impact of the changes - How much of an impact, if at all, do the changes have	45%	70%	58%
Average	48%	77%	63%

## Conditions for cycling and walking

<b>'ETRO Response' Mailbox – Feedback</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflict between cyclists and pedestrians has been alleged, with the issue appearing to be most pronounced on the Lower High Street. Of those who objected to the scheme 9% (4) referred to this issue, representing approximately 3% of all respondents.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This could be accentuated by a misconception from some that the scheme involves the full pedestrianisation of the area.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Handful of respondents have stated that the scheme encourages a modal shift away from car use towards cycling and complements other similar measures.</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representation made by Dorset Cyclists Network was in favour of the scheme.</li> </ul>			
<b>Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial – 'The changes will/do make it safer for me to walk around the Quay area'</b>			
	Against	Neutral	For
<b>Messages</b>	388	74	355
<b>Proportions</b>	47%	9%	43%
<b>Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial – 'The changes will/do encourage me to cycle in the area'</b>			
	Against	Neutral	For
<b>Messages</b>	469	82	263
<b>Proportions</b>	57%	10%	32%

## Analysis

### Displaced traffic / parking

- Negative implications for the disabled / elderly is the second most common reason cited by formal objections, with substitute parking bays viewed by some as inadequate.
- Likewise, in the Online Questionnaire those people with a disability were significantly against the scheme reporting values in excess of 60% on average across all the question types. However, those aged over 65 were more mixed, with just under half (48%) against the scheme on average.
- General parking bays outside the building known as 'PIPLERS' (currently occupied by DEFRA for the Fisheries Office and MDG Sports retail) have been converted to three new disabled bays to replace those no longer accessible. Four disabled bays were lost within the closed road areas however 3 of these were significantly substandard.

- Localised issues are apparent and complementary measures may be helpful in mitigating against displaced traffic in Poole Old Town, parking stress on Strand Street, and anti-social vehicle use outside Dolphin Quays.
- Keys have already been provided to those emergency services which requested them.

### **Conditions for cycling and walking**

- Suitability of arrangement along the Lower High Street could be reviewed to ascertain whether cycle access is still practical given the new pedestrian uses of road space.
- This is substantiated by the fact that in the Online Questionnaire, views on whether the changes made it safer for walking were mixed.
- Most (57%) did not think the changes would encourage cycling. This could possibly be the result of viewing the scheme in isolation without wider sustainable travel initiatives.

## Suggestions to improve the scheme

This section summarises suggested improvements made by respondents. Findings are summarised below followed by a Council response and an analysis of key outcomes.

### ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox and Online Questionnaire

Suggestions made in correspondence captured by the ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox and the Online Questionnaire have been tabulated together into three categories below. Totals are italicised in brackets.

Theme	‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox	Online Questionnaire
Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Separate ETROs for The Quay and Lower High Street to account for different contextual factors and requirements. <i>(1 person)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase parking provision, with resident permits available for the multi-storey car park. <i>(~2 people)</i></li> <li>Removal of on-street parking along Lower High Street. <i>(~2 people)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic calming or one-way system. <i>(~5 people)</i></li> </ul>	
Complementary measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updating signage from the A350 West Street to deter rat-running through the Old Town <i>(~3 people)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shop mobility scheme for disabled. <i>(1 person)</i></li> <li>Altering barriers to facilitate access by non-standard bicycles. <i>(1 person)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical measures to segregate cyclists and pedestrians. <i>(~10 people)</i></li> <li>Modal filter or barrier on Levet’s Lane to stop rat running. <i>(~10 people)</i></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soft landscaping including parklets, crabbing spots, and tourist information boards. <i>(~2 people)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved street lighting, more seating, reductions in street clutter, and resurfacing. <i>(~5 people)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exemptions for blue badge holders, deliveries, staff, and taxis or an ‘Access Only’ restriction. <i>(~10 people)</i></li> <li>Prohibit cyclists and create a pedestrianised area. <i>(~10 people)</i></li> <li>Alter closure timings i.e. off-peak / weekend only closures or separate winter and summer restrictions. <i>(~10 people)</i></li> </ul>	
Restrictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alterations to parking allocations on the section of The Quay west of Thames Street. <i>(1 person)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exemptions for motorcycles and classic cars to support event-based tourism. <i>(2 people)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend closure of The Quay to a point east of Dolphin Quays. <i>(1 person)</i></li> </ul>	

## Draft Interim Business Review

The Draft Interim Business Review included three questions specifically considering potential modifications to the scheme. The table below summarises these, including feedback provided by Ward Councillors.

<b>Draft Interim Business Impact Review</b>
<b>Question 2 – ‘If a revised winter arrangement were implemented what would be your preferred options?’</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The preferred winter arrangement appears to be for the roads to be fully re-opened between November and March. This was ranked number one by 46% of respondents (11 people). Although this preference is contradictory to the desire to make more use of the road space by businesses.</li> <li>▪ However, 29% (7 people) ranked the option to retain the current closure as their favourite choice.</li> <li>▪ Instances of non-answers increases among lower rankings (Rank 2: 38% (9 people); Ranks 3 &amp; 4: 50% (12 people)).</li> <li>▪ Second preferred winter arrangement seems to be split between the option for a weekend closure and the option to re-open except for the section between Da Vinci’s and the High Street. These were ranked number two by 25% (6 people) and 21% (5 people) of respondents respectively.</li> <li>▪ Ward Councillors favour a weekend closure, with the roads re-opened during the week except for the stretch of road outside Da Vincis to prevent through traffic.</li> </ul>
<b>Question 3 – ‘If the roads were re-opened fully or re-opened to some degree between November and March inclusive, which parking option would you prefer?’</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A significant majority 67% (16 people) indicated that they would prefer parking to be allowed in part of the Lower High Street as per the pre-existing arrangement.</li> <li>▪ Councillor Hadley mentioned that reinstating car parking would be necessary if the roads were reopened to traffic so as to regulate vehicle speeds through forms of horizontal deflection.</li> <li>▪ Councillor Howell proposed that the Coastguard space and some of the loading bays should be converted to parking for general traffic.</li> <li>▪ However, both Councillors highlighted that reinstating parking would hinder efforts for social distancing and reduce the amount of outdoor space for businesses to use.</li> </ul>
<b>Question 4 – ‘If parking is allowed, what should be the maximum time limit?’</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The majority of responses 42% (10 people) selected 30 minutes as the maximum time limit. Both Ward Councillors also felt that this time limit would be the best use of available space</li> <li>▪ 63% (15 people) favour a maximum time limit of somewhere between 30 and 60 minutes.</li> </ul>
<b>Other Ward Councillor Feedback</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Councillor Hadley suggested reviewing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Signage on nearby roads in the Old Town; and</li> <li>– Space at the West Street pedestrian crossing to support RNLI operations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Councillor Howell mentioned that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– During a ‘lockdown’ the roads should be closed to prioritise non-motorised users;</li> <li>– If there is no consensus, then the roads should be closed but reopened at 16:00; and</li> <li>– A winter arrangement for less than three months may create more confusion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Council responses to suggestions made

Suggestion	Council Response
Separate ETROs	<i>A single ETRO for both Poole Quay and the Lower High Street suffices because the purpose is the same (to support social distancing). It also minimises possibility for public confusion and /or operational and enforcement difficulties.</i>
Increase parking provision	<i>This would not align with the Council's emerging parking strategy and its policies towards fostering sustainable travel choices.</i>
Removal of on-street parking	<i>These would not create the space necessary for social distancing.</i>
Traffic calming or one-way system	
Updating signage from the A350 West Street and the possibility for a modal filter or barrier on Levet's Lane	<i>Rat running through Poole Old Town is considered to be a temporary issue relating to unfamiliarity with the scheme. As the restriction becomes known, it is anticipated that such issues will dissipate. Nonetheless, if the trial were extended or made permanent, the matter would continue to be monitored. Levet's lane is subject to an 'Access Only' restriction. If necessary, further mitigation measures would be looked into such as extra enforcement.</i>
Shop Mobility Scheme	<i>There is a Shopmobility Centre in the Dolphin Shopping Centre Car Park. Further information is available on the following webpage: <a href="https://www.poole.gov.uk/streets-and-travel/public-transport/shopmobility/">https://www.poole.gov.uk/streets-and-travel/public-transport/shopmobility/</a></i>
Altering barriers to facilitate access by non-standard bicycles	<i>Design team to review and if necessary, make amendments in accordance with guidance contained within Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20).</i>
Physical measures to segregate cyclists and pedestrians	<i>This is not supported because evidence has shown that segregated routes in this type of area do not eliminate conflict.</i>
Soft landscaping and street furniture	<i>This is a separate matter to the scheme in hand and would of course be considered as part of any wider regeneration strategy should one arise.</i>
Resurfacing	<i>As a highway authority the Council regularly undertakes planned preventative maintenance and repairs to roads under its remit. Potholes can be reported using the Council's 'Report It Tool' via <a href="https://www.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/Report-a-problem-or-fault-or-tell-us-about-something/Report-a-problem-or-fault-or-tell-us-about-something.aspx">https://www.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/Report-a-problem-or-fault-or-tell-us-about-something/Report-a-problem-or-fault-or-tell-us-about-something.aspx</a></i>
Exemptions for taxis	<i>The current ETRO prevents Taxis from using the open roads between 10pm and 10am as it only permits the loading and unloading of goods. This limitation is arguably unduly restrictive. Recommend amending moving order to permit Taxis to enter, collect and drop off passengers between 10pm and 10am.</i>
Exemptions for blue badge holders	<i>This introduces motorised vehicles to a pedestrian area. Existing narrow footways makes disabled access and social distancing very challenging. It would also mean that pavement licenses are no longer viable. Disabled bays in the zone were replaced by three outside the building know as 'PIPLERS' (currently occupied by DEFRA for the Fisheries Office and MDG Sports retail).</i>
Exemptions for deliveries, drop-off, and staff.	<i>Broader exemptions such as these would give rise to public confusion and /or operational and enforcement difficulties. They would also insufficiently limit the volumes of motorised vehicles to safely provide the space needed for social distancing.</i>
'Access Only' restriction	<i>This by itself would not create the space necessary for social distancing.</i>
Prohibit cyclists	<i>This would be counterproductive to sustainable travel initiatives. Poole Quay is an on-carriageway cycle route which forms part of Poole's cycle</i>

	<i>network. During events however, The Quay is temporarily closed to take account of larger pedestrian numbers and special uses of the space.</i>
Alter closure timings	<i>Seasonal or weekend restrictions to be investigated as part of strategic measures to manage the resort during the busy summer tourism period.</i>
Alterations to parking allocations on The Quay near Thames Street.	<i>General parking bays outside the building know as 'PIPLERS' (currently occupied by DEFRA for the Fisheries Office and MDG Sports retail) have been converted to three new disabled bays to replace the four disabled bays no longer accessible although three of those bays were substandard so there provision is relatively similar overall. A new loading bay has also been provided opposite the Customs House. This is to support deliveries between 10am and 10pm (the periods when restrictions apply) for those businesses within the closure area. However, if loading bays are being underutilised, consideration could be given to the introduction of short-stay car parking (30mins).</i>
Extend closure of The Quay east of Dolphin Quays.	<i>There is a smaller concentration of businesses at this point meaning there is less need for additional pedestrian space. Additionally, this section of road needs to be open to support the Route One bus service.</i>
Exemptions for event-based tourism.	<i>Once it is safe again to host such activities, events will be held on The Quay in a similar way to how they were prior to the scheme by applying for Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders.</i>
Space at the West Street pedestrian crossing	<i>To be reviewed by the design team so as to better support RNLI operations.</i>
Allowing parking on the Lower High Street	<i>This is not supported because pavement licences would have to be revoked to allow access for motorised vehicles.</i>
<i>Option for a smaller closure of The Quay outside Da Vincis</i>	<i>This is something that could be considered as part of a future review.</i>

## Outcomes

### Amendments to the restrictions

- Greater flexibility seems to be needed to support taxis and specific access requirements such as events, whilst simultaneously prohibiting through traffic.
- Timings of the restrictions could be investigated to account for seasonality and distinguish between weekdays and weekends. This could form part of strategic measures to manage summer tourism over a longer review period.
- Results from the Draft Interim Business Impact Review infer that:
  - Retention of the existing arrangement or a return to the original set-up is not desired by a significant number.
  - A compromise between a weekend closure and / or the retaining of a smaller pedestrianised area would be the preferred winter arrangement when considering the wider interests of the business community although this would be at odds with the concurrent desire to make more use of the highway space by businesses.
  - Such an approach could simultaneously address some of the concerns that have raised, whilst continuing to realise the benefits of the scheme cited by others.

## Complementary measures

- Vehicle rat-running through Poole Old Town, parking stress on Strand Street and anti-social vehicle use outside Dolphin Quays should continue to be monitored. If necessary, further mitigation measures could be looked into (i.e. extra enforcement and / or further modal filters).
- Details of access arrangement for events need to be confirmed during the application process.
- Space at the West Street pedestrian crossing needs to be reviewed to better support RNLI operations as part of separate network management work.
- Barriers at the closure points should be assessed to ascertain whether they facilitate access by non-standard bicycles as per guidance contained within Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20).

## Parking

- Feedback suggests that parking should be reviewed in line with any alterations made.
- The preference is for more short-stay parking especially on the Lower High Street. However, this would be incompatible with the pavement licences which have been issued when roads are closed but can be considered when roads are open.
- An alternative would be to ascertain the utilisation of loading bays on The Quay west of the closure. If they were found to be poorly used, consideration could be given to reallocating them towards short-stay car parking with a 30-minute maximum stay or disabled bays.
- A shorter maximum stay would increase parking turnover and the number of available parking sessions throughout the day. This means that there would be more opportunities for different people to make use of the available parking spaces.

## Conclusion and recommendations

### Conclusions

#### Overall

- There is no-clear cut consensus about the scheme, and it would appear that some alterations, would be beneficial if the scheme were to be made permanent.
- Over time respondents became more positive about the scheme although the early response was more negative, and more individuals responded earlier in the consultation window.
- People appeared more energised to speak about the scheme at the start, declining as time went on, with a slight uplift towards the end of the trial.
- Retention of the existing arrangement without any changes or a return to the original set-up, is not desired by a significant number.

#### Business feedback

- Mixed depending on where a business is located and their particular needs.
- Results from the Draft Interim Business Impact Review contrast with those in the Online Questionnaire.
  - The former appears to suggest that the scheme is positive overall and neutral for business.
  - The latter infers that the impact to business is negative.
  - This contradiction could be reflective of wider economic impacts.
  - COVID-19 has radically altered the commercial environment, creating challenging operating conditions and rendering many businesses inoperable.
  - It is possible that some of those businesses which responded to the online questionnaire last summer may have ceased trading during the trial period. It is not possible to be certain however the impact of Covid has been extremely detrimental to many businesses and that impact is likely to outweigh the impact of the experimental arrangement.
  - Positive impacts may have been more widely felt if the pandemic was not at large, substantiated by the general support for the use of outdoor space.
- Negative effects seem to be felt more by businesses than residents.
- General support for the reallocation of street space towards business use is apparent, with its function twofold, supporting outdoor seating and queuing. However, this needs to be balanced against access requirements.
- It is noted that extensive further discussions have taken place with the BID, who were requested to advise after speaking with businesses that are not levy payers as well as those that are. The draft decision reflects the BID's wishes.

## Access feedback

- Alternative means of access for customers is required when cycling and walking is not a viable option, with impacts on the disabled / elderly a key issue.
- Localised issues apparent in the Old Town, Strand Street and outside Dolphin Quays.
- Suitability of cycle access on the Lower High Street could be reviewed in light of the new pedestrian uses of road space and pre-existing width constraints.

## Suggestions to improve the scheme

- Relaxations to existing moving orders would better accommodate certain access and delivery requirements, including the land train, maritime activities, premises with no rear access and exemptions for approved events / functions.
- Permitting taxi access would support those with reduced mobility and the hospitality sector, including special events and coastal tourism although depending on the timing of access that could negate the use of road space by businesses.
- Seasonal and / or weekend only restrictions could be examined as part of strategic measures to manage summer tourism.
- Likewise, the option for a smaller closure of The Quay outside Da Vincis is something that could also be considered in future.
- Vehicle rat-running through Poole Old Town, parking stress on Strand Street and anti-social vehicle use outside Dolphin Quays should continue to be monitored. If required, further mitigation measures could be looked into.
- Barriers at the closure points should be assessed to see if they accommodate access by non-standard bicycles.
- Utilisation of loading bays on The Quay west of the closure requires quantifying to determine if some of these can be converted into short-stay car parking or disabled bays.

## Recommendations

- **Make the experimental road closures permanent on a seasonal basis and include some additional amendments.**
- It is recommended that the moving traffic regulation orders are slightly relaxed to permit:
  - Taxis to enter, collect and drop off passengers between 10pm and 10am; and
  - The Council to authorise vehicles into the area between 10pm and 10am to allow it to consider accommodating the request for the land train, PHC, wedding cars and other vehicles beyond the scope of the current order.
  - Short term parking be permitted in existing bays when the roads are open.
- Other amendments could include:
  - An assessment of the barriers at the closure point to ascertain whether they facilitate access by non-standard bicycles as per guidance contained within Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20).
  - A review of vehicular space at the West Street pedestrian crossing to support RNLI operations.

- For the short-term, displaced traffic and anti-social vehicle use should continue to be monitored with further mitigation measures considered if required.

## Notes

- Ward Cllrs have also been involved in the discussions on a number of occasions.
- An amendment to the ETRO will re-start the 6-month review period.
- The current ETRO has a maximum duration of 18 months from the date which it commenced (27th June 2020).
- In view of the timing of this decision there is no opportunity for a further 6 month review and conclusion of a decision in the remaining 18 month window and therefore the recommendation is make the arrangement permanent whilst carefully reflecting the nuanced consultation feedback received to date.
- Any future amendments to parking will need to consider the Council's emerging parking strategy.
- Weekend restrictions would result in very complicated road signage that may lead to public confusion and operational / legal difficulties with enforcement.
- Depending on the requirements to change signage and road markings it will take approximately eight weeks to implement a revision to the current arrangement following the formal confirmation of such through the Council's prevailing governance process.

## Next Steps

- Amend and make permanent the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order as per any alterations made. (Moving orders)
- Prepare a new Traffic Regulation Order to reflect revisions to the parking in the area.
- Advertise and communicate with stakeholders, outlining what has been decided and why. Inevitably some will always disagree, however, follow-up communication could help improve understanding of the factors.
- Confirmation with emergency services.

## Appendix A – Notes on derivation of statistics

### ‘Against’ Category

#### ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox

- The ‘Against’ category comprises of responses which have been classified as an ‘Objection’.

#### Draft Interim Business Impact Review

- Applies to Question 1A (overall impact) and Question 1B (business impact).
- The ‘Against’ category comprises of responses in which participants chose the three lowest numbers on the scale (1 through to 3), indicating that the effect of the closures had not been beneficial.

#### Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial

- This applies to the following questions:
  - ‘The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling’;
  - ‘Deliveries should be restricted to between 10pm and 10am’ (as well as disaggregation by respondent type);
  - ‘The changes will/do make the Quay and Lower High Street a better place to visit’ (as well as disaggregation by respondent type);
  - ‘The changes will/do make it safer for me to walk around the Quay area’; and
  - ‘The changes will/do encourage me to cycle in the area’.
- The ‘Against’ category comprises of responses in which participants answered either ‘Strongly disagree’ or ‘Disagree’.

#### Online Questionnaire – Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling

- Applies to the question ‘Do you agree with prioritising the following roads for walking and cycling?’.
- This question incorporated four embedded questions, asking respondents the same thing but from the different perspectives of each of the roads affected by the scheme (The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street). Consequently, an average has been used in the figures above.
- The ‘Against’ category comprises of responses in which participants chose ‘No’.

#### Online Questionnaire – Impact of the changes

- Applies to the question ‘How do the changes impact on you?’.
- The ‘Against’ category comprises of responses in which participants answered ‘Negative impact’.

## **‘Neutral’ Category**

### **‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox**

- The ‘Neutral’ category includes responses which have been classified as a ‘Comment’.
- Follow up’ messages and ‘Queries’ were not included in the statistics.

### **Draft Interim Business Impact Review**

- Applies to Question 1A (overall impact) and Question 1B (business impact).
- The ‘Neutral’ category includes responses in which participants picked the four numbers in the middle of the scale (4 through to 7), suggesting that the effect of the closures had been neutral. It does not include the solitary response which provided ‘No answer’.

### **Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial**

- This applies to the following questions:
  - ‘The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling’;
  - ‘Deliveries should be restricted to between 10pm and 10am’ (as well as disaggregation by respondent type);
  - ‘The changes will/do make the Quay and Lower High Street a better place to visit’ (as well as disaggregation by respondent type);
  - ‘The changes will/do make it safer for me to walk around the Quay area’; and
  - ‘The changes will/do encourage me to cycle in the area’.
- The ‘Neutral’ category includes responses in which participants marked ‘Neither agree nor disagree’.

### **Online Questionnaire – Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling**

- Applies to the question ‘Do you agree with prioritising the following roads for walking and cycling?’.
- This question incorporated four embedded questions, asking respondents the same thing but from the different perspectives of each of the roads affected by the scheme (The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street). Consequently, an average has been used in the figures above.
- The ‘Neutral’ category includes responses in which participants picked ‘Don’t know’.

### **Online Questionnaire – Impact of the changes**

- Applies to the question ‘How do the changes impact on you?’.
- The ‘Neutral’ category includes responses in which participants marked ‘Mixed positive and negative impact’.

## **‘For’ Category**

### **‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox**

- The ‘For’ category consists of responses which have been classified as a ‘Message of support’.

### **Draft Interim Business Impact Review**

- Applies to Question 1A (overall impact) and Question 1B (business impact).
- The ‘For’ category consists of responses in which participants selected the three highest numbers of the scale (8 through to 10), signifying that the effect of the closures had been beneficial.

### **Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial**

- This applies to the following questions:
  - ‘The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling’;
  - ‘Deliveries should be restricted to between 10pm and 10am’ (as well as disaggregation by respondent type);
  - ‘The changes will/do make the Quay and Lower High Street a better place to visit’ (as well as disaggregation by respondent type);
  - ‘The changes will/do make it safer for me to walk around the Quay area’; and
  - ‘The changes will/do encourage me to cycle in the area’.
- The ‘For’ category consists of responses in which participants selected either ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’.

### **Online Questionnaire – Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling**

- Applies to the question ‘Do you agree with prioritising the following roads for walking and cycling?’.
- This question incorporated four embedded questions, asking respondents the same thing but from the different perspectives of each of the roads affected by the scheme (The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street). Consequently, an average has been used in the figures above.
- The ‘For’ category consists of responses in which participants selected ‘Yes’.

### **Online Questionnaire – Impact of the changes**

- Applies to the question ‘How do the changes impact on you?’.
- The ‘For’ category consists of responses in which participants selected ‘Positive impact’.

## Overall feedback – statistical totals

### ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox

- Since Monitoring Report 3, six messages have been reclassified from a ‘Comment’ to an ‘Objection’ for reasons of consistency following an internal review.

### Online Questionnaire

- Figures are an average.
- Mean values were first calculated for each of the three specific questions:
  - Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial – ‘The Quay, Lower High Street, Castle Street and Paradise Street should be prioritised for walking and cycling’;
  - Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling – ‘Do you agree with prioritising the following roads for walking and cycling?’; and
  - Impact of the changes – ‘How do the changes impact on you?’.
- An average of the mean values for each of the three questions was then calculated.

### Aggregated Statistics

- Quantities from the ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox and Draft Interim Business Impact Review were added to the averages from the Online Questionnaire.
- Percentages were then calculated from the total of these three inputs.

## Overall feedback – breakdown by time periods

### ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox

- Time periods have been aligned to those reported in the Online Questionnaire.
- A more detailed breakdown across all the various 4-week periods is available in Monitoring Report 3.

### Online Questionnaire

- Figures are an average.
- Mean values were first calculated for each of the three themes (Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial; Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling; and Impact of the changes).
- An average of the mean values for the three themes was then calculated.

### Aggregated Statistics

- Quantities from ‘ETRO Response’ Mailbox were added to the averages from the Online Questionnaire.
- Percentages were then calculated from the total of these two inputs.

## **Business feedback**

### **Draft Interim Business Impact Review**

- Applies to Question 1B (business impact).
- Same process as outlined in the 'Against', 'Neutral and 'For' categories.

### **Online Questionnaire**

- Applies to the questions 'Deliveries should be restricted to between 10pm and 10am' and 'The changes will/do make the Quay and Lower High Street a better place to visit'.
- Same process as outlined in the 'Against', 'Neutral and 'For' categories.

## **Access Feedback**

### **Displaced traffic / parking**

#### *Online Questionnaire – Views by equalities groups*

- This included those:
  - Age 65+;
  - Disability – Limited a lot; and
  - Disability – Limited a little
- The 'Against' category comprises of responses in which participants answered either 'Strongly disagree', 'Disagree' or 'Negative impact', depending on the specific theme.
- Mean values were first calculated for each of the three themes (Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial; Views on prioritising the roads for walking and cycling; and Impact of the changes).
- An average of the mean values for the three themes was then calculated.

### **Conditions for cycling and walking**

#### *Online Questionnaire – Levels of agreement with aspects of the trial*

- Applies to the questions 'The changes will/do make it safer for me to walk around the Quay area' and 'The changes will/do encourage me to cycle in the area'.
- Same process as outlined in the 'Against', 'Neutral and 'For' categories.