

Gordon Mansions Residents Association

From: Clive Henderson, Chair, Gordon Mansions Residents Association
5 Gordon Mansions, Torrington Place, London WC1E 7HE

CLOSING SUBMISSION

from Gordon Mansions Residents Association: November 2017

Re: Public Inquiry for Camden's Torrington Place/Tavistock Place Traffic Order

The Camden (Torrington Place to Tavistock Place) (Prescribed Routes, Waiting and Loading Restrictions and Loading Places) Traffic Order [2017]

Planning Inspectorate Reference: DPI/X5210/17/8

CLOSING SUBMISSION:

Unfortunately, I myself have not been able to generally attend the Inquiry, except briefly. Thus, I have not always followed some of the detailed arguments for and against the Traffic Order.

Nonetheless, we do not think that what the objectors have put forward will resolve the issue of the high volume of future traffic into "western" Torrington Place (as a result of the West End Project when completed), if this Traffic order is not confirmed.

Thus, in making our Closing Submission, I would like to re-iterate our overriding reason for supporting the Torrington Place/Tavistock Place Traffic Order. It will prevent the predicted doubling of traffic (100% increase) in the "western" stretch of Torrington Place (between Gower Street and Tottenham Court Road) from an already high volume (pre-Traffic Trial) of 205 vehicles per hour to an unacceptably high volume of 414 vehicles per hour, when Camden's West End Project is completed, (now assumed to be late 2019).

It needs to be appreciated that Camden's West End Project and the Torrington Place/Tavistock Place Corridor scheme "overlap" for this stretch of Torrington Place.

As stated in our Evidence, GMRA made a Deputation to Camden Council's Cabinet meeting in January 2015 when we cautiously welcomed the proposed Traffic Trial, (whereby west-bound traffic from east of Gower Street would be prevented entering the "western" section of Torrington Place), intended to mitigate the predicted 400 vehicles per hour, to which we and other residents had strongly objected. Thus, for us it is of utmost importance that this aspect of the Traffic Order is confirmed, if not in its entirety.

As we said in our Evidence, the current reduction (and thus the current relative "quietness" and relative low pollution) due to the Traffic Trial is "deceptive" for the future pattern of the "western" stretch of Torrington Place. For the reasons explained in our Evidence, once the West End Project is completed, the previous volume of traffic (of upto 200 vehicles per hour) is likely to return (not just for Monday to Friday but also additionally for Saturdays), but this time from other directions/sources as described in our Evidence. But, this is dependent on the "Traffic Trial" aspect of the Torrington Place/Tavistock Place Corridor Scheme and the Traffic Order being confirmed. Otherwise, this volume of traffic will double (100% increase compared with pre-Traffic Trial) to the unacceptable level of 400 vehicles per hour in "western" Torrington Place if the Traffic Order is not confirmed.

As in our evidence, this part of Torrington Place and the immediate side streets is home to a

Continued to page 2

CLOSING SUBMISSION - *continued*:

Re: Public Inquiry for Camden's Torrington Place/Tavistock Place Traffic Order

large, long-established, residential community of great diversity in some 326 flats with an estimated population of over 1,000 people; and thus it is very important to protect this significant residential part of Fitzrovia/Bloomsbury from further increases in higher levels of traffic congestion, noise & pollution.

As can be seen from the documents in the appendices attached to our Proof of Evidence, we have been having to work hard over the last three years in responding to the road scheme proposals in our area. Thus, we have an in-depth understanding of the complexity of the proposals and their implications for our area and its residential amenity.

Also, as will be seen from these documents, our residents had concerns and objections to other aspects of the two (now approved) Traffic schemes, some of which are not dissimilar to those concerns raised by other parties at this Inquiry. Nonetheless, in supporting this Traffic Order, we think that the benefit of not having the future predicted increase in the doubling of traffic in "western" Torrington Place" to quite unacceptable levels, greatly outweighs the disadvantages.

Corrections:

I would like to take the opportunity to confirm correction of two mistakes in my written Proof of Evidence document:

(1). **Re: 200% increase in traffic in "western" Torrington Place due to West End Project:**

When I presented my Proof of Evidence, I made reference to the future increase in traffic in "western" Torrington Place from 200 vehicle per hour to 400 vehicles per hour: I mistakenly described this as being "200% increase".

As you know, this was queried in cross examination, and I confirmed that it was in fact a "100% increase" or a "doubling" of traffic volumes.

Although I had the image of "doubling" of traffic in my mind when I wrote this, I later realised that I had confused myself with the way that such an increase can be expressed mathematically:

Thus, this change in traffic volume can also be expressed as:

200% of 200 vehicles/hour (i.e. 200% x 200 vehicles) = 400 vehicles/hour.

(In my Evidence, for simplicity, I have rounded down Camden's figures from their Traffic Impact Table to the nearest hundred; e.g. 205 vehicles rounded down to 200 vehicles).

(2). **Re: Wrong date at top of pages in my Proof of Evidence and Appendices.**

I have recently noticed that the Date at the top of pages 2 to 5 of my Proof of Evidence; and at the top of the Title Pages of the various Appendices, has been mistakenly typed as September 2014 - it should, of course, be September 2017.