

**From:** Mark Frost [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 February 2017 18:08  
**To:** Futch John  
**Cc:** Deacon, Lee  
**Subject:** Re: Church Street

John -

Some answers from me, let me know if you want more context.

- Is the Church Street experimental scheme funded via LIP? *The closure itself isn't funded by LIP, however some of the enhanced monitoring of Twickenham Road is. I would note that it was likely we may have undertaken this monitoring anyhow irrespective of the trial closure (particularly on air quality).*
- Net bus impact of Church Street plus Twickenham Road bus priority proposals - *Lee is working on this.*
- Rough timescales for Twickenham Road - *We are looking to consult in the summer. If the schemes are supported then detailed design could follow (if funding was available to progress). Implementation could feasibly occur in 2018/19 if funding was available.*
- Net change in traffic flows in area (I have seen quotes of a reduction of 2,000 vehicles – can you confirm? *This was the differential reported at the 15 September 2016 area forum meeting when comparing Nov 2014 with May 2016. The differential between Nov 2014 and Nov 2016 is far less, however it should be noted this is in the context of growing traffic generally in outer London.*
- Any details about how the closure impacts on the local community e.g. street markets, festivals etc. *The closure has given space for the local community to have a monthly street party that includes various food and beverage stalls, local craft stalls etc with all proceed to local charities. I would note though that the wider community is largely opposed to the closure however. Some local business, particularly those based in Syon Park, have also expressed concerns about impacts on trade.*

Kind regards,

Mark Frost  
Head of Traffic & Transport

---

**From:** Futch John <[J](#)> [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 February 2017 14:27  
**To:** 'Lee Deacon'; Mark Frost  
**Cc:** Plaskowski Bron (ST)  
**Subject:** Church Street

Hi Mark and Lee,

I have been asked to input into a response for Will Norman on the above.

To assist, it would be great if you clarify a few things:

- Is the Church Street experimental scheme funded via LIP
- Net bus impact of Church Street plus Twickenham Road bus priority proposals
- Rough timescales for Twickenham Road
- Net change in traffic flows in area (I have seen quotes of a reduction of 2,000 vehicles – can you confirm?)
- Any details about how the closure impacts on the local community e.g. street markets, festivals etc.

If you could get me something early next week that would be helpful.

Thanks,

John

**John Futchter | Regional Manager North and West |  
Borough Projects and Programmes | Surface Transport**

**Mail:** Zone 11Y5, Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NJ

**Phone:** [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

**Email:** [REDACTED]



**From:** Mark Frost [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 04 March 2017 11:01

**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)

**Subject:** Re: Church Street

Dear Will,

Thank you for copying me in to your helpful response on this matter. The officer recommendation to the local area forum will be to retain the closure, however councillors are under huge pressure to remove it, with c60% of people opposed to its retention. I am hopeful that the potential to develop the route as a 'quietway' and the consequent opportunity to use funding from that programme to mitigate the impact on bus journey times on Twickenham Road will be enough of a package to allow the officer recommendation to pass, but we won't know until the night.

I am sure you have found your calendar filling up very rapidly since your appointment but if you are free you may find it useful to attend on the 23 March to witness these matters in person - it may give you a valuable insight into the challenges that boroughs face in progressing the Healthy Streets agenda, particularly in outer London. As an aside I would also note that most of the council's cabinet, and the leader, also sit on this area forum.

Kind regards,

Mark Frost  
Head of Traffic & Transport  
Environment, Regulatory Services & Community Safety  
**REDe**

[REDACTED]

[www.hounslow.gov.uk](http://www.hounslow.gov.uk)

Follow us online: Twitter: [@LBofHounslow](https://twitter.com/LBofHounslow) and Facebook:

[www.facebook.com/HounslowCouncil](https://www.facebook.com/HounslowCouncil)

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)

[REDACTED]

**Sent:** 03 March 2017 17:10:12

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** Gareth James; Mark Frost

**Subject:** Church Street

Dear Vicki,

Thank you for your email of 22 February about the experimental closure for motor vehicles on Church Street.

I welcome the London Borough of Hounslow's efforts to make this part of the Thames Path healthier, safer and more attractive for walking and cycling. I am also pleased that the local community have taken the opportunity to use the temporary closure of Church Street for other purposes such as a regular street market. This type of project is very much in line with Transport for London's (TfL's) recently launched Healthy Streets Approach (<http://content.tfl.gov.uk/healthy-streets-for-london.pdf>). Through Healthy Streets, we want to make the environment of London's streets more appealing for everyone to enjoy and to encourage active travel as part of every journey. Increasing the number of people walking, cycling and using public transport has the potential to transform London and improve the lives of everyone who lives and works in and visits London.

As you are probably aware, the roads concerned are primarily borough roads and the decision for any permanent solution sits with the Council. As with all projects, there are likely to be residents and other stakeholders for and against the changes, depending on the traffic and environmental impacts that they experience. It will be for the borough to take these different views into account as well as assessing the various impacts on the area as part of their decision making process. That being said, this is a scheme that I hope can be made permanent.

The Council has shared recent monitoring data with TfL, which highlights a significant increase in walking and cycling on Church Street as well as a reduction in traffic in the wider area. This data is very encouraging and demonstrates how simple changes to streets can make big changes in active travel behaviour and can open up areas to walking and cycling. However, the data does show some delays to bus journeys including on Twickenham Road and TfL has made it clear to the Council that any permanent scheme must also include measures to mitigate these delays as far as possible.

At this stage, I would suggest that you continue to engage with the Council and the local community to develop support for any permanent changes to Church Street or the wider local area. TfL will continue to discuss with Hounslow the ongoing experimental restrictions as well as their impacts on all road users.

Thank you again for taking the time to write to me.

Yours sincerely,

**Dr Will Norman**

Walking and Cycling Commissioner

**From:** Mark Frost [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 February 2017 16:44  
**To:** Futch John  
**Cc:** Plaskowski Bron (ST)  
**Subject:** RE: Church Street Isleworth Filtered Permeability

John –

Attached is the report from SDG on the potential improvements at Twickenham Road J/w Mogden Lane and j/w Worton Road (conversion from signals to roundabout + zebras)

Below is the journey time savings predicted from the Vissim. The Twickenham Road journey time was tested from South Street to the Cole Park Road junction.

*The **AM-peak** model shows that the scheme would offer journey time improvements on all main movements in the study area. Northbound and southbound movements along Twickenham Road would see journey time savings of approximately 25%, whilst there is also a significant journey time saving (in excess of 90s) eastbound on Worton Road. The*

Mogden Lane eastbound movement also shows a smaller journey time saving of approx. 20%.

*The **PM model** shows a more noticeable improvement in journey times, with the higher north south traffic flows in the PM peak causing higher journey times, and therefore the potential for greater savings with highway improvements. Both the northbound and southbound movements on Twickenham Road show significant savings, with the proposed option showing journey times approximately half of those existing, particularly noticeable in the northbound direction where the journey time decreases by 222s. Further savings are shown on both Mogden Lane and Worton Road, with journey times on Worton Road again roughly half of that in the base.*

Important to note that ped journeys also benefit from reduced waiting time through provision of zebra crossings.

The main recorded additional bus journey time when comparing November 2015 (pre church street closure) and Nov 2016 (trial closure in place) was 86 seconds in the AM peak (northbound) and 162 seconds in the PM peak southbound. It is worth noting this is the impact recorded across a longer section of the route than that modelled above.

The two proposed junction improvement schemes at Worton and Mogden would therefore reduce journey times in the AM peak northbound by 75 seconds and reduce journey times on the PM peak southbound by 72 seconds. Whilst this may not wholly counteract the delay that may be attributable to the church street closure in those peak time periods (particularly southbound in the PM peak), it would reduce the quantum of that delay markedly and many other bus journey times (outside of the two time periods noted above) would also improve (including the H20 which uses Worton Road). This would likely have the effect of a net improvement in average bus journey times against the current situation with the trial closure in place.

Kind regards,

Mark Frost  
Head of Traffic & Transport

**From:** Mark Frost  
**Sent:** 09 February 2017 14:28  
**To:** 'Futcher John'  
**Cc:** Plaskowski Bron (ST)  
**Subject:** RE: Church Street Isleworth Filtered Permeability

John –

SDGs additional analysis is attached. It doesn't really show a lot except, to my reading, that the majority of the delay is south of Twickenham Road/South Street junction. There is an impact on the PM southbound journeys between Syon Lane and South Street however. We are looking to get some more data etc.

Is TfL likely to be able to give an official response to the experimental order?

Kind regards,

Mark Frost  
Head of Traffic & Transport

**From:** Futch John [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 February 2017 09:51  
**To:** Mark Frost [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Plaskowski Bron (ST) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Church Street Isleworth Filtered Permeability

Hi Mark,

Thanks for keeping me updated. I agree, the increase in walking and cycling is certainly good news!

It will be interesting to see what SDG can identify in their iBus assessment as it would be helpful if you can bring forward proposals to address bus delays, the 267 seems to be taking a hit both northbound and southbound during the peaks.

Thanks,

John

**From:** Mark Frost [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 31 January 2017 12:48  
**To:** Futch John  
**Cc:** Plaskowski Bron (ST)  
**Subject:** RE: Church Street Isleworth Filtered Permeability

Hi John –

Attached is the latest (still draft) monitoring report from SDG.

Whilst there does appear to be a spike in the journey times southbound on the 267, there has also been a reduction in traffic flow in that direction compared to the previous report. That suggests to me that the delay is actually occurring south of the Twickenham Road/South Street junction where we have some proposals to improve traffic flow. In addition, vehicles using this section of road would do so irrespective of the trial closure.

SDG are trying to cut the iBUS data to see what that can tell us about that.

I think you will agree the data on ped/cycle counts is encouraging.

Kind regards,

Mark Frost  
Head of Traffic & Transport

**From:** Futch John [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 January 2017 09:44  
**To:** Mark Frost <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Plaskowski Bron (ST) <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: Church Street Isleworth Filtered Permeability

Hi Mark,

I hope all is well.

Before we consider this further, how have you progressed the bus issues? I think you said you were looking at potential changes to traffic signals to reduce delays to buses?

It would also be good to see the next round of monitoring, will you have additional months of bus data?

Thanks,

John

**From:** Mark Frost <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** 18 January 2017 at 09:07:05 GMT  
**To:** Matson Lilli <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Church Street Isleworth Filtered Permeability

Hi Lilli –

As you may be aware we have in place a trial road closure on Church Street Isleworth. The route, a B Road but largely residential in nature, was previously subjected to heavy through traffic which had a particular impact on the amenity of the area, and perceived safety for vulnerable users, given the constrained nature of the highway geometry. Residents were also very concerned about highway safety and pollution etc.

The road carries the Thames Path national walking trial and is on the old LCN route 75, the effect of closing it appears to have led to significant increases in walking and cycling as a consequence (40% based on data provided in May). Displaced traffic appears minimal (although there is some additional journey time recorded on adjacent roads heading southbound and this has had some impact on buses), with some 2000 vehicles currently unaccounted for when comparing post and pre closure monitoring of the area. A further monitoring report is due next month.

A decision on the permanent arrangement for the road is set for March, though may be delayed. Given the apparent relevance of such schemes given the general direction of the new MTS and the Healthy Streets agenda I was wondering whether TfL or, preferably, the Deputy Mayor may wish to make a representation to the council on the policy compliance of such a scheme for consideration by our elected members alongside the other feedback received?

Kind regards,

Mark Frost

Head of Traffic & Transport

**From:** Mark Frost [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 November 2015 19:52  
**To:** Plaskowski Bron (ST)  
**Subject:** RE: Church Street Isleworth Trial Closure/Twickenham Road Impacts

Hi Bron - Its mainly funded by s106, but the TDM elements associated with come out of LIP. We may top up a bit from the Local Transport Fund too.

Yes you are correct on the motive - it is to reduce through traffic to improve quality of life for residents. It may also help promote more walking and cycling (it is on Capital Ring).

Kind regards,

Mark Frost  
Head of Traffic & Transport

**From:** Plaskowski Bron (ST) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 November 2015 15:12  
**To:** Mark Frost  
**Subject:** Church Street Isleworth Trial Closure/Twickenham Road Impacts

Afternoon Mark

Regarding the above closure I've been asked to check whether this is one of your LIP schemes. I've looked through the 2015/16 ASS but can't see it specifically named in there though did notice there was a Twickenham Rd corridor scheme, is this tied into that or is it a project under a different work stream?

I believe the reason for the closure is to cut out rat-running on Church St is that correct and is it still on course for implementation in early December?

Thanks  
Bron

**Bron Plaskowski | Senior Borough Programme Officer**