

**STREATHAM HILL LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD  
(LTN)**  
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ANALYSIS



FINAL REPORT

**SYSTRA**

# LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH

## STREATHAM HILL LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD (LTN)

### IDENTIFICATION TABLE

<b>Client/Project owner</b>	London Borough of Lambeth
<b>Study</b>	Streatham Hill LTN – Public Consultation Analysis
<b>Type of document</b>	Final Report
<b>Date</b>	03/03/2022
<b>Reference number</b>	11088113
<b>Number of pages</b>	28

V	Name		Role	Date	Comments
1	Authors	Aisling O’Riain Bradley Goodsell	Assistant Consultant Senior Consultant	07/02/2022	Outline for internal review
	Reviewed by	David Alderson	Associate Director	10/02/2022	
2	Authors	Bradley Goodsell	Senior Consultant	11/02/2022	For client review
	Reviewed by	David Alderson	Associate Director	11/02/2022	
3	Authors	Aisling O’Riain Bradley Goodsell	Assistant Consultant Senior Consultant	03/03/2022	Updated following client comments
	Reviewed by	David Alderson	Associate Director	03/03/2022	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>COVID-19 EMERGENCY TRANSPORT RESPONSE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>THE STREATHAM HILL LTN</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>THIS REPORT</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>CONSULTATION RESPONSE CHANNELS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>CONSULTATION MATERIALS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>ANALYSIS AND REPORTING</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.5</b>	<b>RESPONSE RATES</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>CONSULTATION SURVEY &amp; POLLING DATA: MAIN FINDINGS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>RESPONDENT PROFILE</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>IMPACTS OF THE LTN</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE MEASURES</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>OTHER IMPROVEMENTS PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO SEE INTRODUCED</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.5</b>	<b>OTHER MEASURES TO FACILITATE WALKING, CYCLING AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT USE</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>EMAIL RESPONSES: MAIN FINDINGS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>RESPONSE RATES</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>KEY THEMES</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF KEY TRENDS</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF KEY POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>NEXT STEPS IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>TRANSPARENCY AND DECISION MAKING</b>	<b>27</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Streatham Hill LTN Area (Source: LB Lambeth)	6
-----------	--	---

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Number of responses receive by channel	10
Table 2.	“The LTN...”	11
Table 3.	“The LTN is a positive change”	12
Table 4.	“The LTN has had a positive impact on my businesses/services”	16
Table 5.	If you don’t think the Low Traffic Neighbourhood is a positive change, what alternative measures would you support? (Multiple Response)	16
Table 6.	Please select up to three improvements you would like to see in the Streatham Hill area (Multiple Response)	17
Table 7.	Which of the following would be beneficial for your business?	20
Table 8.	Are there other things we can introduce to support you (and your family) to walk, wheel, cycle or take public transport?	21

## APPENDICES

Appendix A	User Testing ‘Walk Arounds’ – Transport for All
Appendix B	Technical Note – Identification and management of duplicate responses
Appendix C1	Consultation sample profile (Online response form)
Appendix C2	Consultation sample profile (Telephone polling survey)
Appendix D	Full list of themes/ sub-themes from coding of online response from open-responses
Appendix E	Full commentary on themes/ sub-themes from coding of email responses

## 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 1.1 COVID-19 Emergency Transport Response

- 1.1.1 The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly changed the way in which people travel around Lambeth, and London more generally. In particular, the requirement for social distancing has meant that the number of people who can safely use public transport in the capital has reduced.
- 1.1.2 Since May 2020, LB Lambeth has responded to this crisis with their Transport Strategy Coronavirus Emergency Response. The plan has built on Lambeth's existing Transport Strategy, released following borough-wide consultation in 2019.
- 1.1.3 The strategy has identified the parts of the borough which were most in need of new measures to reduce road danger and increase sustainable travel. The plan will see LB Lambeth invest up to £4 million to make it safer to walk and cycle around the borough, to protect public transport for those who need it, and to improve air quality.

### 1.2 The Streatham Hill LTN

- 1.2.1 The Streatham Hill Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) was introduced by LB Lambeth, with the LTN chosen in accordance with Appendix 6 of TfL's Streetspace guidance. In the short term, these measures have been intended to:
- Assist residents in social distancing;
  - Enable essential journeys to be made safely; and
  - Support the local economy with increased footfall.
- 1.2.2 Over the longer term, the introduction of the LTN aims to promote a wider mode shift away from motor vehicle use towards active travel (walking and cycling) and public transport, improving air quality and safety, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- 1.2.3 The LTN was introduced in August 2020, in which planters, signage and Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) were used to create five filters across the area identified in Figure 1 overleaf.
- 1.2.4 The filters stop motor vehicles cutting through the LTN area. However, access is maintained for individuals walking, cycling and wheeling, as well as emergency services and refuse vehicles. All destinations within an LTN remain accessible by motor vehicle, although the route to each destination may change.

### 1.3 Requirement for Public Consultation

- 1.3.1 Following the introduction and ongoing monitoring of the Streatham Hill LTN, LB Lambeth is now considering all the evidence available to inform a political decision regarding whether the LTN should be made permanent.
- 1.3.2 The Department for Transport has advised all authorities to conduct a public consultation alongside considering the results of monitoring data. Therefore, Lambeth Council launched a consultation for the Streatham Hill LTN on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2021 for a period of 5 weeks up

to 19<sup>th</sup> December 2021. This consultation ran in parallel to the Tulse Hill consultation, which has also been introduced in the borough in the past 18 months.

## 1.4 This report

1.4.1 The purpose of this report is to clearly and succinctly set-out the data provided by members of the public following the recent consultation undertaken in Autumn 2021 by LB Lambeth, regarding the Streatham Hill LTN. More specifically:

- Chapter 2 describes the methods through which the consultation was undertaken, including descriptions of:
  - The various response channels available and equalities considerations in delivering a consultation that was accessible to all;
  - The consultation materials and how these were publicised; and
  - The processes employed for analysis and reporting.
- Chapters 3 and 4 represent the main reporting chapters for the consultation data obtained through the different response channels; and
- Chapter 5 provides an overview of the key emerging trends obtained from the surveys, representative polling and email correspondence.

1.4.2 In the final chapter, LB Lambeth outline the next steps in the consultation process, and outline how they intend to respond to the issues raised to date.

**Figure 1. Streatham Hill LTN Area (Source: LB Lambeth)**



## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Consultation Response Channels

2.1.1 The consultation was open to any organisation and any member of the public who wished to provide a response. The primary response channels available during the consultation were:

- An **online version of the consultation survey response form**, managed through SurveyMonkey. The survey link (<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/SHLTNConsult>) could be accessed through Commonplace;
- **Telephone surveys** undertaken by a market research agency with a representative sample of residents living within the area; and
- **Email correspondence**, with emails being received and logged by the Lambeth Transport Strategy Engagement since the LTN programme launched in summer 2020.

2.1.2 Whilst the above bullets represent the primary response channels available during the consultation, they are by no means an exhaustive list. Several other engagement methods were employed to ensure the consultation was as inclusive as possible, including:

- Council staff being available on-street to help residents and visitors to the area complete the survey on tablet, provide paper copies of the survey, or answer quick questions. This made the survey available to complete for those without access to internet. Locations comprised of:
  - 17/11/2021 – 09:00-11:00 – Tulse Hill Station;
  - 20/11/2021 – 12:00-14:00 – Christ Church;
  - 24/11//2021 – 14:00-16:00 – Hillside Passage;
  - 29/11/2021 – 14:00-16:00 – Leigham Avenue/Leigham Court Road junction; and
  - 08/12/2021 – 09:00-11:00 – Wavertree Road/Daysbrook Road junction
- Youth engagement;
- Street visits with Tenants and Resident Organisations;
- Street audits with disabled people, run by Transport for All (a pan-disability, mobility charity); and
- Street activation events to gather feedback on permanent space ideas.

2.1.3 Within the Appendices to this report, **Appendix A** provides the findings from the street visits undertaken by Transport for All.

### 2.2 Consultation Materials

2.2.1 To enable respondents to the consultation to provide informed feedback on the LTN scheme, a series of supporting materials were offered to provide context on the LTN.

2.2.2 The materials provided to prospective respondents included an online commonplace page which provided:

- An overview of the schemes wider context;
- Details of street improvements, including a visualisation of what a permanent change could look like, as well as detailed design maps;

- Data regarding levels of traffic, walking and cycling and pollution – collated from independent consultancies, Lambeth Council Enforcement Team and Transport for London.
- Emergency service and community perceptions data;
- Safety and vandalism data – collated from Academic Research;
- Equalities and accessibility considerations – including engagement by Transport for All, a full Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) and mitigations of concerns raised to date;
- Details of the consultation processes; and
- Details for how prospective respondents could take part in the consultation.

2.2.3 The consultation surveys were designed by LB Lambeth. Respondents were presented with an introductory page that explained why the consultation was taking place, and were provided information on the approach to data protection and access to the relevant privacy policy. The consultation end date was also displayed at the foot of this page. The online response form consisted of approximately 30 questions in total, covering the following topics:

- A series of agree/ disagree statements regarding how the LTN may have impacted upon walking and cycling, access, a sense of place, and pedestrian safety;
- Gauging levels of support for alternative measures;
- Identifying improvements which respondents would most like to see introduced;
- Identifying other potential measures to facilitate an increase in walking, cycling and use of public transport; and
- Demographic/ respondent profile questions.

2.2.4 The telephone polling survey consisted of three short questions, regarding the extent to which respondents agreed with the LTN, alternative measures they may support, and any other improvements they may like to see introduced.

## 2.3 Public Engagement

2.3.1 In order to raise maximum responses and awareness of the consultation, LB Lambeth managed a range of promotional and public engagement activities.

2.3.2 Prior to the launch of the online consultation survey response form, a letter was sent out to all residents living within and around the LTN, to promote participation and to invite them to pre-register for the consultation. Other promotional and public engagement activities were undertaken to raise awareness of the consultation included:

- Digital advertising;
- Email communications;
- Media/ press releases;
- Stalls set up in public locations; and
- Meetings with stakeholders.

## 2.4 Analysis and reporting

### Analysis processes

- 2.4.1 For closed (quantitative) responses for the online consultation response form, our approach was to analyse the results to each question at an overall (full sample) level, to provide an overview of sentiment across all responses. Following this, the data was then analysed by various demographic characteristics, to understand how sentiments varied between different types of respondent. For the polling data, the headline results for three main questions were analysed at an overall sample level for Streatham Hill, with any significant differences compared to other LTN areas identified.
- 2.4.2 For open (qualitative) responses, our approach was to code based solely on what the responses stated, and not to interpret or assess whether their comments were valid. This was to ensure that the process of coding was as objective as possible.
- 2.4.3 Overall, a semi-automated approach was applied to the coding of the open (qualitative) responses. As a first pass of the data, an automated sentiment analysis was run using a Python script, from which key phrases and themes were extracted from the text to identify initial emerging themes. This was subsequently followed by a manual review from SYSTRA researchers to check that all key sentiments from all responses were captured, and ensure that respondent feedback was coded correctly.

### Treatment of duplicate responses

- 2.4.4 Upon the receipt of the raw online response form dataset (2,209 total responses), a small number of responses were identified as being potential duplicates. The steps undertaken by SYSTRA in identifying and processing these duplicate responses are outlined fully in **Appendix B** to this report.
- 2.4.5 The full analysis of the online response form dataset detailed within this report was undertaken on the de-duplicated data file, totalling 2,147 responses.

### Reporting

- 2.4.6 As independent, impartial researchers, we believe that we have a duty to society to ensure that we report findings accurately, and with honesty. In adherence to our industry guidelines, we have not been selective in our reporting, and we provide insight into both commonly and uncommonly cited themes referenced by respondents. Furthermore, this report does not offer any subjective commentary, merely a reporting of the data gathered.
- 2.4.7 Responses to the closed (quantitative) questions, and the open (qualitative) questions which relate to the closed questions, have been reported within the same chapters.
- 2.4.8 In reporting the closed questions, in addition to providing the overall frequency (the high-level results at a full-sample level), results have also been segmented by various respondent profile characteristics, to identify how responses to each question vary between different types of respondent.
- 2.4.9 As with all analysis of qualitative data, it should be noted that:

- The views and opinions reported are the views and perceptions of respondents and are not necessarily factually correct;
- Qualitative data, particularly in instances where the sample is self-selecting, does not provide a statistically representative sample. Instead, it ensures the views and opinions of different types of people are heard; and
- Whilst we have provided numbers to illustrate the prevalence of each sentiment, this engagement process cannot be seen as a ‘vote’ and we do not attempt to draw conclusions about what the ‘best’ suggestion might be, based on the number of people offering positive or negative comments about a particular suggestion.

## 2.5 Response rates

2.5.1 In total, 2,711 responses were received. The number of responses obtained through each channel is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1. Number of responses receive by channel**

CHANNEL	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Online consultation survey form	2,147
Representative telephone polling	215
Email correspondences	349
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,711</b>

### 3. CONSULTATION SURVEY & POLLING DATA: MAIN FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Respondent profile

- 3.1.1 The profile of respondents to the online consultation survey form can be found in **Appendix C1**, whilst the profile for telephone polling respondents is provided in **Appendix C2**.
- 3.1.2 All results reported within the tables in this report relate to the online consultation response from data. Where questions have been asked in both the response form and in the telephone polling survey, the polling results have been included beneath the tables to provide an indication of where results between these two methods either align, or differ.

#### 3.2 Impacts of the LTN

- 3.2.1 Respondents to the consultation were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements regarding the LTN. 3.2.1 below outlines the extent to which respondents agreed with each of the statements presented, with the findings sorted by descending level of agreement.

**Table 2. "The LTN..."**

STATEMENT	NET AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	NET DISAGREE	DON'T KNOW	BASE
Is a positive change	38.9%	3.1%	57.4%	0.6%	<b>2,073</b>
Made the area a better place to live and spend time	38.8%	6.9%	52.8%	1.5%	<b>2,102</b>
Made it feel safer using the street in the day	38.7%	8.6%	51.5%	1.1%	<b>2,097</b>
Made it easier to cycle/ use an adapted cycle or mobility scooter	32.7%	9.2%	39.3%	0.0%	<b>2,084</b>
Made it feel safer using the street in the night	31.3%	10.9%	55.4%	2.5%	<b>2,102</b>
Made it easier to walk/ use a walking aid/ wheelchair	31.2%	10.7%	45.2%	0.0%	<b>2,097</b>
Made me take fewer trips by car	28.4%	9.9%	52.9%	0.0%	<b>2,099</b>
Made it easier for me to make the trips I need to make	27.3%	8.2%	64.1%	0.4%	<b>2,100</b>

STATEMENT	NET AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	NET DISAGREE	DON'T KNOW	BASE
Made it easier for me to get to local shops and services	26.4%	12.5%	60.5%	0.6%	2,093
Made it easier for me to get to friends and family	22.9%	13.7%	62.3%	1.1%	2,099

3.2.2 The responses to each of these statements varied notably by the following demographic characteristics:

○ **The LTN is a positive change**

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (48.2%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (30.8%);
- **Employment:** Those in full time education or training were more likely to agree (57.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (31.5%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Men were most likely to agree (48.5%);
- **Disability:** Those without a disability were most likely to agree (42.8%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (78.3%); and
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (61.5%), whereas drivers (28.6%) and those using a motorbike/moped (23.5%) were less likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (56.7%), whereas those from Black / Black British African / Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (11.6%).

The results from the telephone polling (n=215) varied slightly from these findings, with a lower percentage agreeing that the LTN is a positive change (30.7%). Furthermore, the percentage polled who disagreed that the LTN is a positive change was 52.2%.

3.2.3 Additionally, Table 3 below shows that 44% of those living within the LTN agreed that it is a positive change, compared with 36% living outside of the LTN.

**Table 3. "The LTN is a positive change"**

LOCATION	NET AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	NET DISAGREE	DON'T KNOW	BASE
<b>Within the LTN</b>	44%	4%	51%	1%	<b>838</b>
<b>Outside the LTN</b>	36%	2%	61%	1%	<b>1277</b>

## ○ *The LTN has made the area a better place to live and spend time*

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (48.2%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (31.0%);
- **Employment:** Those in full-time education or training were most likely to agree (57.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (26.4%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Women were more likely to disagree (58.0%);
- **Disability:** Those without a disability were most likely to agree (42.7%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own businesses in the areas were most likely to disagree (70.0%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (60.1%), whereas drivers (28.9%) and those using a motorbike/moped (23.5%) were less likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (47.0%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (9.3%).

## ○ *The LTN has made it feel safer using the street in the day*

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (50.0%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (29.4%);
- **Employment:** Those in full-time education or training were most likely to agree (62.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (29.6%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Women were most likely to disagree (57.3%);
- **Disability:** Those without a disability were most likely to agree (43.0%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (65.7%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (59.7%), whereas drivers (29.4%) and those using a motorbike/moped (23.5%) were less likely;
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (46.2%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (11.3%).

## ○ *The LTN has made it easier to cycle/ use an adapted cycle or mobility scooter*

- **Age:** Those aged 75+ were least likely to agree (16.7%);
- **Employment:** Those in full time education or training were more likely to agree (45.0%), whereas those looking after the home or family (18.5%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Men were most likely to agree (43.4%);
- **Disability:** Those without a disability were most likely to agree (36.3%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who travel through the area were most likely to agree (36.8%), whereas business owners were least likely to agree (22.9%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (59.4%), whereas drivers (24.4%) were least likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (39.3%), whereas those from Black / Black British African backgrounds were less likely (7.9%).

## ○ *The LTN has made it feel safer using the street in the night*

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (44.6%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (22.1%);

- **Employment:** Those in full time education or training were more likely to agree (50.0%), whereas those looking after the home or family (16.7%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Women were most likely to disagree (61.7%);
- **Disability:** Those with a disability were most likely to disagree (62.1%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (70.0%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (50.1%), whereas those using a motorbike/moped (17.6%) were least likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (37.4%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (6.2%).

## ○ *The LTN has made it easier to walk/ use a walking aid/ wheelchair*

- **Age:** Those aged 65-74 were least likely to agree (18.8%);
- **Employment:** Those in full-time education or training were more likely to agree (57.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (11.1%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Men were most likely to agree (41.6%);
- **Disability:** Those with a disability were most likely to disagree (53.2%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (57.1%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (50.2%), whereas drivers (22.8%) were less likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (37.2%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (7.2%).

## ○ *The LTN has made me take fewer trips by car*

- **Age:** Those aged 18-24 were most likely to disagree (64.1%);
- **Employment:** Those looking after the home or family were most likely to disagree (74.1%);
- **Gender:** Men were most likely to agree (36.1%);
- **Disability:** Those with a disability were more likely to disagree (54.4%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (74.3%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who use a mobility scooter were most likely to disagree (85.7%); and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from any White background were most likely to agree (34.1%), whereas those from a Black / Black British Caribbean background were less likely (9.3%).

## ○ *The LTN has made it easier for me to make the trips I need to make*

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (41.1%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (18.7%);
- **Employment:** Those in full-time education or training were most likely to agree (42.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (11.1%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Women were most likely to disagree (70.0%);
- **Disability:** Those without a disability were most likely to agree (30.1%);

- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (82.9%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (47.5%), whereas drivers (16.7%) and those using a motorbike/moped (14.7%) were less likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (32.8%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (6.2%).

○ ***The LTN has made it easier for me to get to local shops and services***

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (42.9%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (14.3%);
- **Employment** Those in full-time education or training were most likely to agree (47.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (11.1%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Women were most likely to disagree (65.3%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (80.0%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (45.4%), whereas drivers (16.6%) and those using a motorbike/moped (13.2%) were less likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (31.5%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (6.2%).

○ ***The LTN has made it easier for me to get to friends and family***

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to agree (41.1%), compared to those aged 65-74 who were least likely to agree (14.7%);
- **Employment** Those in full-time education or training were most likely to agree (47.5%), whereas those looking after the home or family (11.1%) were less likely;
- **Gender:** Women were most likely to disagree (68.0%);
- **Disability:** Those with a disability were most likely to disagree (66.7%);
- **Connection to the area:** Those who own a business in the area were most likely to disagree (78.6%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (40.3%), whereas drivers (13.7%) and those using a motorbike/moped (11.8%) were less likely; and
- **Ethnicity:** Those from White backgrounds were most likely to agree (27.3%), whereas those from Black / Black British Caribbean backgrounds were less likely (5.2%).

3.2.4 Respondents who own a business were subsequently asked whether the LTN had provided a positive impact on their businesses or not. Table 4 below shows that 76.3% of business owners disagree that the LTN has had a positive impact on their business, compared to 13.6% who agreed.

**Table 4. “The LTN has had a positive impact on my businesses/services”**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENTAGE
Agree	8	13.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	5	8.5%
Disagree (conditions for businesses have been made more difficult)	45	76.3%
Don't know	1	1.7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

3.2.5 Responses to this question varied notably by:

- **Age:** Those aged 25-34 were most likely to agree (33.3%);
- **Disability:** Those without a disability were most likely to disagree (77.1%); and
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were most likely to agree (31.6%).

### 3.3 Support for alternative measures

3.3.1 Any respondent who suggested that they did not feel that the LTN was a positive change, was asked to indicate whether there were any alternative measures they might support. Table 5 indicates the level of support provided for alternative measures listed in the survey; whilst the bullet points beneath provide an overview of other suggestions received from respondents to this question.

**Table 5. If you don't think the Low Traffic Neighbourhood is a positive change, what alternative measures would you support? (Multiple Response)**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENTAGE
Improvements on main roads	646	48.2%
No changes	456	34.0%
Timed closures	309	23.1%
Different filters	274	20.4%
One-way	259	19.3%
Other (please specify)	642	47.9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,340</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The results from the telephone polling (n=117) suggest respondents through this channel perceive the measures fairly similarly to those responding through the

consultation form. Whilst 30.8% of polled respondents supported improvements to bus, walking and cycling facilities, just over a quarter (26.6%) supported timed closures, and around one in five (20.5%) would support one-way systems.

3.3.2 The broad themes for ‘other’ suggestions (and number of times this theme was raised) are listed below. Not all suggestions received from respondents related directly to the question proposed by LB Lambeth. A full breakdown of all the suggestions received from respondents within each of these overall themes is provided in **Appendix D**.

- Removal of the LTN (214);
- Improve access/ allowing LTN exemptions for certain groups for (201);
- Public transport improvements (81);
- Concerns around congestion or traffic build-up (64);
- Comments relating to traffic displacement (58);
- Comments on modifications to the LTN scheme (51);
- Traffic calming measures (44);
- Alternative road layout (42);
- Cycle improvements (38);
- Support for the LTN (36);
- Suggestions for enforcement (27);
- Other policies beyond the LTN scheme (25);
- Further information/ monitoring requests (21);
- Reduced car ownership/usage (19);
- Pedestrian/walking improvements (19);
- Comments relating to electric/hybrid/low emission vehicles (17);
- Improve parking provisions (13);
- Need for further consultation (12);
- Road safety concerns (10);
- Improve signage/ wayfinding (8);
- Increase trees/ plants/ greenery (8);
- Comments on the consultation (7);
- No alternative measures suggested (6);
- Improved public facilities (5);
- Comments on the council (2); and
- Anti-social behaviour concerns (2).

### 3.4 Other improvements people would like to see introduced

3.4.1 Respondents were asked to select up to three improvements they would like to see in the area. The findings are below in Table 6, sorted by descending level of popularity.

**Table 6. Please select up to three improvements you would like to see in the Streatham Hill area (Multiple Response)**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENTAGE
Trees and planting	1,201	55.9%
Improved Road/ Pavement Surface	807	37.6%

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENTAGE
Electric vehicle charging points	671	31.3%
Lighting	646	30.1%
Separate cycle lanes	622	29.0%
Better crossings/ drop curbs	428	19.9%
Cycle/ E-scooter/ cargo bike parking	401	18.7%
Mini park space (parklets)	348	16.2%
Play facilities	330	15.4%
Road closures to motor vehicles	327	15.2%
Seating	320	14.9%
Signage	191	8.9%
No other measures	143	6.7%
Other (please specify)	381	17.7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2,147</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### 3.4.2 Responses to this question varied notably by:

- **Age**, with those most likely to state they would like to see the following improvements:
  - Those aged 25-34: trees and planting (66.2%) and separate cycle lanes (40.1%);
  - Those aged 35-44: play facilities (26.2%);
  - Those aged 45-54 electric vehicle charging points (35.5%);
  - Those aged 65-74 and 75+: improved road/ pavement surface (46.2% and 45.5% respectively); and
  - Those aged 75+: seating (29.5%);
- **Employment**: Those looking after the home/ family were most likely to select better crossings/ dropped kerbs (31.5%);
- **Gender**: Men were most likely to select road closures to motor vehicles (22.5%) and separate cycle lanes (35.4%); whilst women were more likely to select lighting (35.6%);
- **Connection to the area**: Those who go to school in the area were most likely to select play facilities (28.0%) and those with a business in the area were most likely to select lighting (42.3%);
- **Mode of travel**: Those who cycle were more likely to select better cycle/ e-scooter/ cargo-bike parking (34.5%) and separate cycle lanes (49.2%); and

- **Ethnicity:** Those from any White background were most likely to select trees and planting (77.1%), separate cycle lanes (41.2%) and better cycle/ e-scooter/ cargo-bike parking (26.8%).

The results from the telephone polling (n=215) were broadly aligned with the consultation response form results, with trees and planting (45.2%), electric vehicle charging points (32.0%) and improved road/ pavement surfaces (30.8%) also being popular improvements for those surveyed through this channel. However, better crossings/drop curbs (9.2%) came out less strongly through the polling results.

3.4.3 The broad themes for ‘other’ improvements that respondents would like to see introduced (and number of times this theme was raised) are listed below. Not all suggestions received from respondents related directly to the question proposed by LB Lambeth. A full breakdown of all the suggestions received from respondents within each of these overall themes is provided in **Appendix D**.

- Removal of the LTN (138);
- Improved public facilities (40);
- Improve access/ allowing LTN exemptions for certain groups (36);
- Pedestrian/ walking improvements (29);
- Comments on modifications to the LTN scheme (29);
- Alternative road layouts (27);
- Traffic calming measures (26);
- Public transport improvements (22);
- Improve parking provisions (21);
- Other policies beyond the LTN scheme (20);
- Cycle improvements (18);
- Unclear sentiment (14);
- Comments on congestion/ traffic build-up (12);
- Increase plants/ trees/ greenery (8);
- Comments on the Consultation (6);
- Reduce car ownership/ usage (4);
- Support for the LTN (3);
- Road safety concerns (3);
- Requests for further information/monitoring (3);
- Anti-social behaviour concerns (3);
- Comments on the council (3);
- No alternative measures suggested (2);
- Requests for further consultation (2); and
- Suggestions for enforcement (1).

3.4.4 Those running/ managing a local business were also asked a supplementary question regarding whether any additional measures would be beneficial for their business. The findings are stated below in Table 7, sorted by descending level of popularity.

**Table 7. Which of the following would be beneficial for your business?**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENTAGE
Support for greener vehicles	22	37.3%
Pavement widening	7	11.9%
Cycle parking	7	11.9%
Planting	6	10.2%
Public seating	5	8.5%
Part/ full pedestrianisation	5	8.5%
Cargo-bike membership	5	8.5%
Parklets	4	6.8%
Public art	3	5.1%
Staff travel planning/ active travel schemes	3	5.1%
E-scooter bays	2	3.4%
None of the above	20	33.9%
Other (please specify)	16	27.1%
<b>Base</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

3.4.5 The broad themes for ‘other’ improvements that respondents would like to see introduced (and number of times this theme was raised) are listed below. Not all suggestions received from respondents related directly to the question proposed by LB Lambeth. A full breakdown of all the suggestions received from respondents within each of these overall themes is provided in **Appendix D**.

- Removal of the LTN (8);
- Comments on electric/ hybrid/ low emission vehicles (2);
- Improve access/ allow exemptions for (2);
- No alternative measures suggested (1);
- Cycle improvements (1);
- Pedestrian/ walking provisions (1);
- Comments on the council (1);
- Comments on congestion/ traffic build-up (1); and
- Improve parking provisions (1).

### 3.5 Other measures to facilitate walking, cycling and public transport use

3.5.1 Respondents were asked whether there were any other measures which could be introduced to support them and their family to walk, wheel, cycle or take public transport. The findings are stated below in Table 8, sorted by descending level of popularity.

**Table 8. Are there other things we can introduce to support you (and your family) to walk, wheel, cycle or take public transport?**

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENTAGE
Cycle storage	606	28.2%
Better route mapping	358	16.7%
Financial incentives i.e reward schemes	329	15.3%
Discounts on council services	302	14.1%
Discounts at local shops	292	13.6%
Subsidised bikes or trainers	238	11.1%
Cycle training	234	10.9%
Walk to school support i.e walking bus	226	10.5%
Street Party	221	10.3%
Cargo-bike loans	206	9.6%
Travel Advice	71	3.3%
A buddy/ mentor who can help you walk, wheel or cycle	48	2.2%
None of the above	598	27.9%
Other (please specify)	419	19.5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2,147</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

3.5.2 Responses to this question varied notably by:

- **Age:** Those aged 24 and under were most likely to select subsidised bikes or trainers (26.8%); whilst those aged 25-34 were most likely to select cycle storage (44.0%);
- **Employment:** Those in full time education or training were most likely to select subsidised bikes or trainers (32.5%);
- **Gender:** Men were most likely to select cycle storage (35.0%);
- **Mode of travel:** Those who cycle were more likely to select better route mapping (25.3%) and cycle storage (47.1%); and

- **Ethnicity**, with those most likely to select the following measures:
  - Those from Black/Black British / Caribbean / African backgrounds: discounts on council services (29.9%); and
  - Those from White backgrounds: cycle storage (33.5%).

3.5.3 The broad themes for ‘other’ improvements that respondents would like to see introduced (and number of times this theme was raised) are listed below. Not all suggestions received from respondents related directly to the question proposed by LB Lambeth. A full breakdown of all the suggestions received from respondents within each of these overall themes is provided in **Appendix D**.

- Public transport improvements (111);
- Removal of the LTN (109);
- Cycle improvements (81);
- Other policies beyond the LTN scheme (37);
- No alternative measures suggested (31);
- Pedestrian/ walking improvements (29);
- Comments on congestion/ traffic build-up (18);
- Comments on modifications to the LTN scheme (17);
- Improve access/ allowing LTN exemptions for certain groups (12);
- Improved public facilities (11);
- Comments on traffic calming measures (10);
- Unable to or do not want to increase walking/cycling (10);
- Improve parking provisions (8);
- Reduce car ownership/ usage (7);
- Road Safety Concerns (6);
- Support for the LTN (5);
- Comments on the consultation (5);
- Measures to support active travel (4);
- Alternative road layout (3);
- Comments on electric/ hybrid/ low emission vehicles (2);
- Anti-social behaviour concerns (1);
- Unable to or do not want to use public transport (1);
- Comments on the council (1);
- Further consultation (1);
- Increase plants/ trees/ greenery (1); and
- Further information/ monitoring requests (1).

## 4. EMAIL RESPONSES: MAIN FINDINGS

### 4.1 Response rates

- 4.1.1 Lambeth Council received 349 email correspondences between the start of the Experimental Traffic Order (21/05/2021) and the end of the consultation period (19/12/2021) regarding the Streatham Hill LTN.
- 4.1.2 As LB Lambeth received multiple correspondence from some individuals, the total of correspondence is larger than the number of individuals who contacted Lambeth.
- 4.1.3 The findings documented within this report are based upon correspondence received to the LB Lambeth designated low traffic neighbourhood inbox, which was widely advertised on mailouts to residents, through ward councillors, online, and on social media: [Lowtrafficoneighbourhoods@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:Lowtrafficoneighbourhoods@lambeth.gov.uk). A full breakdown of the analysis is documented within **Appendix E**.
- 4.1.4 The correspondence received included general feedback, objections to the traffic order, and contact to all Lambeth channels forwarded on to be logged (including complaints and Members Enquiries from Councillors and MPs).
- 4.1.5 All emails were coded by LB Lambeth to thematically understand concerns and benefits noted by email correspondents.

### 4.2 Key themes

#### **Benefits of the LTN noted by email correspondents:**

- 4.2.1 The three most frequently stated benefits within email correspondence were a reduction in traffic, and improved levels of safety.
- 4.2.2 The LTN was also cited as reducing noise and air pollution, improving public realm, and generating improved opportunities for walking, wheeling and cycling.
- 4.2.3 Reduced traffic volumes were also linked to reduced driver aggression, with the theme on improved safety in turn linked to greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as vulnerable road users.
- 4.2.4 Overall, the benefits of the Streatham Hill LTN noted by email correspondents included:
- Reduced traffic volumes (30%),
  - Improved safety (25%);
  - Reduced pollution (23%), with this theme including reference to reductions in noise and air pollution;
  - Improved public realm and placemaking (11%); and
  - Improved opportunities for walking, wheeling and cycling (11%), which were often linked to:
    - Greater space available for walking and cycling;
    - Safety for children to play outside and travel through the LTN; and
    - The ability to walk comfortably through the streets.

**Concerns with the LTN noted by email correspondents:**

- 4.2.5 The most frequently stated concerns within email correspondence were reduced vehicle access, traffic volume increase on particular roads, and increased pollution.
- 4.2.6 Traffic volume increases on specific roads were linked to other concerns in these locations, including pollution, safety of walking and cycling, and the impact on emergency service times if stuck in congestion.
- 4.2.7 Reduced vehicle access and traffic volume increase were also identified as having impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics including disabled people, younger people and older people, people with caring responsibilities. The impact on health was considered to be of greatest concern, which included impacts on both physical and mental health.
- 4.2.8 The final area of concern related to the methodology with which the LTN was introduced and enforced. These concerns included concerns around the evidence base and monitoring, communications and engagement with the local community and the quality of signage and mapping used to communicate the change in road layout.
- 4.2.9 Overall, concerns regarding the Streatham Hill LTN noted by email correspondents included:
- Reduced access for vehicles (18%), with this theme including reference to resident vehicle access, taxis (including longer drop-off/ pick-up times and refusal to enter the LTN), as well as services, essential workers and school runs.
  - Increased pollution (17%), with this theme including reference to increases in noise and air pollution;
  - Increased traffic volumes (16%);
  - Equalities issues (14%);
  - Reduced safety (12%); which included references to:
    - General safety concerns when walking, wheeling or cycling;
    - Quieter streets feeling unsafe, particularly at night, and amongst women especially; and
    - Speeding traffic.
  - Enforcement of the LTN (9%);
  - The impact on emergency services (6%);
  - Impacts on local businesses and deliveries (4%);
  - The data and evidence underpinning the LTN (3%);
  - Communication and engagement with the local community (1%); and
  - Public realm (<1%).

## 5. OVERVIEW OF KEY TRENDS

### 5.1 Overview of key points raised

5.1.1 Overall, sentiments towards the Streatham Hill LTN appear to be highly polarised, with either strong positive or strong negative sentiments being expressed, with few respondents feeling indifferently towards the scheme.

5.1.2 The headline findings from the results to the consultation survey response form, telephone polling data, and email responses are as follows:

#### Impacts of the LTN

- Almost two in five (38.9%) of consultation respondents agreed that the LTN is a positive change to their area, 57.4% disagreed; though the polling data varied slightly from these figures, with 30.7% agreeing that the LTN is a positive change, and 52.2% disagreeing, with a higher share of those who neither agree nor disagree.
- Around two in five consultation respondents agreed that the LTN has made the area a better place to live and spend time, and it feel safer using the street in the day.
  - However, many consultation respondents also disagree with these sentiments, with just over half disagreeing that the LTN has made the area a better place to live and spend time, and it feel safer using the street in the day.
- With regards to businesses specifically, around three quarters (76.3%) felt that conditions for their business have been made more difficult as a result of the LTN, whilst around one in eight suggested the LTN had a positive impact on their businesses.
- Within email correspondence, the five most frequently cited benefits and concerns relating to the LTN were as follows:

#### Benefits (Email correspondence)

1. Reduced traffic volumes
2. Improved overall safety
3. Reduced noise and air pollution
4. Improved public realm/ placemaking
5. Opportunity for active travel

#### Concerns (Email correspondence)

1. Reduced access for vehicles
2. Increased noise and air pollution
3. Increased traffic volumes
4. Equalities issues
5. Reduced overall safety

#### Support for alternative measures

- Of those who did not feel that the LTN was a positive change, around one third (34.0%) stated that they would not support any other alternative measures either.
- By contrast, nearly half (48.2%) suggested they would support other improvements on main roads, whilst a quarter (23.1%) would be in favour of a timed closure.
- Of those who suggested alternative measures, the five most commonly cited themes for measures to be introduced related to:
  - Removal of the LTN;
  - Improve access/ allowing LTN exemptions for certain groups;
  - Public transport improvements;
  - Comments on congestion/ traffic build-up; and

- Comments on displaced traffic.

### **Other improvements people would like to see introduced**

- The most popular improvement that consultation respondents would like to see introduced was trees and planting, requested by 55.9% of respondents.
- The next most popular items were improved road/ pavement surfaces (37.6%), electric vehicle charging points (31.3%), and lighting (30.1%); with these findings being broadly aligned between the consultation response form and the polling data.
- Of those who suggested other improvements, the five most commonly cited themes for other improvements to be introduced related to:
  - Removal of the LTN;
  - Improve public facilities;
  - Improve access/ allowing LTN exemptions for certain groups;
  - Pedestrian/ walking improvements; and
  - Comments on modifications to the LTN scheme.

### **Other measures to facilitate walking, cycling and public transport use**

- Across the full sample, cycle storage was the most popular measure that could be introduced to facilitate walking, cycling and public transport use, with 28.2% of respondents selecting this option.
- The next most popular options were better route mapping (16.7%), financial incentives (15.3%), and discounts on council services (14.1%).
- Of those who suggested alternative measures, the five most commonly cited themes for measures to be introduced related to:
  - Public transport improvements;
  - Removal of the LTN;
  - Cycle improvements;
  - Other policies beyond the LTN scheme; and
  - No alternative measures suggested.

## **6. NEXT STEPS IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS**

### **6.1 Transparency and Decision Making**

- 6.1.1 Following this consultation, a decision report will be prepared by LB Lambeth for the LTN.
- 6.1.2 The report will collate monitoring data on a range of indicators, including traffic levels and air quality, as well all community feedback gathered both prior to and during the consultation. Any objections to the traffic orders that are the legal basis for the schemes will be presented to the decision makers with a suggested response.
- 6.1.3 The decision will be made on whether to make the scheme permanent, to modify or to remove the scheme, and any associated works needed for doing so.
- 6.1.4 Due to the nature of the decision, this will be taken by joint cabinet members for Sustainable Transport, Environment and Clean Air at LB Lambeth.

**SYSTRA provides research and advice on transport, to central, regional and local government, agencies, developers, operators and financiers.**

**A diverse group of results-oriented people, we are part of a strong team of professionals worldwide. Through client business planning, customers research and strategy development we create solutions that work for real people in the real world.**

**For more information visit [www.systra.co.uk](http://www.systra.co.uk)**

**Birmingham – Newhall Street**

5th Floor, Lancaster House, Newhall St,  
Birmingham, B3 1NQ  
T: +44 (0)121 393 4841

**Birmingham – Edmund Gardens**

1 Edmund Gardens, 121 Edmund Street,  
Birmingham B3 2HJ  
T: +44 (0)121 393 4841

**Dublin**

2nd Floor, Riverview House, 21-23 City Quay  
Dublin 2, Ireland  
T: +353 (0) 1 566 2028

**Edinburgh – Thistle Street**

Prospect House, 5 Thistle Street, Edinburgh EH2 1DF  
United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)131 460 1847

**Glasgow – St Vincent St**

Seventh Floor, 124 St Vincent Street  
Glasgow G2 5HF United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)141 468 4205

**Glasgow – West George St**

250 West George Street, Glasgow, G2 4QY  
T: +44 (0)141 468 4205

**Leeds**

100 Wellington Street, Leeds, LS1 1BA  
T: +44 (0)113 360 4842

**London**

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, 5 Old Bailey, London EC4M 7BA United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)20 3855 0079

**Manchester – 16<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Tower**

16th Floor, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza  
Manchester M1 4BT United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)161 504 5026

**Newcastle**

Floor B, South Corridor, Milburn House, Dean Street,  
Newcastle, NE1 1LE  
United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)191 249 3816

**Perth**

13 Rose Terrace, Perth PH1 5HA  
T: +44 (0)131 460 1847

**Woking**

Dukes Court, Duke Street  
Woking, Surrey GU21 5BH United Kingdom  
T: +44 (0)1483 357705

**Other locations:**

**France:**

Bordeaux, Lille, Lyon, Marseille, Paris

**Northern Europe:**

Astana, Copenhagen, Kiev, London, Moscow, Riga, Wroclaw

**Southern Europe & Mediterranean: Algiers, Baku, Bucharest, Madrid, Rabat, Rome, Sofia, Tunis**

**Middle East:**

Cairo, Dubai, Riyadh

**Asia Pacific:**

Bangkok, Beijing, Brisbane, Delhi, Hanoi, Hong Kong, Manila, Seoul, Shanghai, Singapore, Shenzhen, Taipei

**Africa:**

Abidjan, Douala, Johannesburg, Kinshasa, Libreville, Nairobi

**Latin America:**

Lima, Mexico, Rio de Janeiro, Santiago, São Paulo

**North America:**

Little Falls, Los Angeles, Montreal, New-York, Philadelphia, Washington

The SYSTRA logo is rendered in a bold, red, sans-serif typeface. The letters are thick and closely spaced, with a distinctive design where the 'S' and 'Y' are particularly prominent and stylized.