

APPENDIX A

Supporter / Objector	Present at Inquiry ?	Comments	Officer Response
Supporter 1 (local resident)	No	The scheme should be made permanent. Footfall is greater and the atmosphere, both socially and in terms of air quality in the town centre, is greatly improved. It is a more pleasant place to shop and conduct business since buses and cars stopped using the town centre. As a pensioner I feel much safer with the removal of through traffic.	
Objector 1 (local business)	No	My business is on Swan Street yet I have never been consulted or asked my opinion of the project. I am not in favour of this pedestrianised zone as I feel it was more beneficial to my business when cars were able to pass by the shop as well as pedestrians. Furthermore we have a constant battle with delivery drivers unable to work out where they can and can't pull up to deliver goods.	All affected properties received 2 hand delivered letters about the ETRO. Parking was not allowed on Swan Street before the town centre was pedestrianised so allowing cars to drive past will have no bearing on passing trade.
Supporter 2 (local resident)	No	I have lived in Loughborough for 50 and the town centre pedestrianisation has been the biggest improvement that I have seen. To be able to walk freely between shopping areas is so much nicer than negotiating traffic. It's safer and cleaner and overall adds to the attractiveness of the Town. Lemington Street isn't a vast distant from the Market Place and sits on the edge of the shopping areas. Allowing buses back through will once again split the town in half. I can easily walk within a couple of minutes to the relocated bus stops through a particularly attractive shopping area. Please don't be swayed by the few objectors. Loughborough Town Centre is more attractive and safer without traffic going through the middle. It's working well. I love it.	
Supporter 3	No	Keep full pedestrianisation. To allow anything through totally	

APPENDIX A

(local resident)		defeats the object. Buses can pick up and drop off in the High St and if they go through The Rushes there are bus stops outside Wilkinsons. Keep it traffic free.	
Supporter 4 (local resident)	No	<p>Not all bus services use Lemyngton Street and stop on High Street, which is closer to the town centre. The stops on Baxter Gate are convenient for the new cinema. Arriva have chosen deliberately to employ a convoluted route for the 126/127 whereby they turn right out of Bridge Street onto Derby Road, then left onto Regent Street and then a most difficult right turn onto Ashby Road. This misses the alternative to turn left out of Bridge Street onto Swan Street with the opportunity to collect passengers in Swan Street and then Ashby Square. In my opinion the bus companies are creating their own problems in an effort to bring passengers to heel and speak out in their favour.</p> <p>The High Street from Leicester direction is signed as for access only yet is abused on a monumental scale by all and sundry</p>	The use of High Street by unauthorised traffic is being investigated as part of remedial measures agreed with the two bus operators.
Objector 2 (local resident)		The scheme has caused congestion on peripheral routes such as Meadow Lane. Pollution levels may be down in the town but it is worse on outer roads where there are many schools and residential areas. The relocated bus stops are too far from the town for my elderly mother. Most older people cannot vote or voice their opinion as they cannot use a computer. Any voting should have been carried out in strategic places in the town where folk can have easy access. Even someone with a clip board at the bus stops.	Traffic signals on the IRR have not been operating as efficiently as possible due to a technical issue. Steps have already been taken to address this but further work is required in order for a system of joined-up traffic signal control, which will be fully functional by April 20156. Vehicle emissions have been drastically reduced in those areas with the greatest concentration of pedestrians. The IRR will reduce congestion in the town centre. Unlike the previous route (along Swan Street), it has been designed to cater for the current level of traffic.

APPENDIX A

<p>Supporter 5 (local resident)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Loughborough town centre is safer and more pleasurable. Yet again it is bus companies who want to turn the centre into a free for all!! Why can buses not turn left from Bridge Street instead of right, which would bring them closer to the shopping centre, and then along Ashby Square as they did before pedestrianisation .To allow buses through the centre of town middle again would be dangerous for pedestrians who now enjoy the freedom of the town centre.</p>	
<p>Supporter 6 (local resident)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The removal of all traffic, including buses from the town centre makes for a very pleasant and safer experience. There is obviously less pollution and traffic noise. If the buses were reintroduced, it would be one every 3 minutes. Obviously this would make it more dangerous for pedestrians, there would be more pollution with the buses belching out toxic diesel emissions. The town should continue to be traffic free for the benefit of the people of Loughborough.</p>	
<p>Supporter 7 (local resident)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The decision should take into account the large numbers of residents who walk into and around town and not just the convenience and profits of the bus companies. Most of us support the town centre pedestrianisation. It is a vast improvement and has greatly improved the town centre. The space can be used for extending the market and for other events drawing people into the town. We maintain that any current decrease in footfall and bus usage is due to the effect of austerity on people's buying power and that things would be even worse without pedestrianisation. We enjoy the freedom to walk round the middle of town. Shopping at the weekly markets is now enhanced, and the town centre has a much more friendly, cohesive feel. No longer do we need to carefully consider where and how we cross the A6, as there is no traffic impeding our way</p>	<p>A period of six months was allowed for representations to be made.</p>

APPENDIX A

		and demanding priority. The return of frequent buses would greatly negate that improvement. Buses travelling through the middle of town would make life more difficult for many people including parents with prams/ buggies, senior citizens, and particularly difficult for disabled residents and partially sighted and blind pedestrians. Bus operators could make certain bus routes more convenient for the town centre. I deplore that such a short time was offered for objection to allowing buses through the middle of town. Only support for buses has been encouraged. We have suggested that the deadline should be extended.	
Supporter 8 (local resident)	No	I readily accept that a relatively small number of people find the new siting of bus stops inconvenient but I strongly feel that they are being used by the bus companies to support their case for bus access. On the other hand, there is an even stronger case for the protection of the safety and health of the pedestrianized area of Loughborough market place. The pedestrianisation has been a major step forward in the development of the town centre. It has created a safe, clean and low air pollution area which has much improved the shopping experience in Loughborough.	
Supporter 9 (local resident)	No	It is a pleasurable experience to visit Loughborough town centre now that we, as pedestrians do not have to suffer the fumes from the traffic and it makes the town 'united' instead of being divided by the A6 and it is so much safer. Allowing buses through the area is a recipe for disaster and when other vehicles see buses using the High Street they will surely follow. A lot of vehicles choose to still use the High Street and Baxter Gate rather than joining the new road on Leicester Road despite of a sign clearly stating they shouldn't.	High Street is also being monitored, as agreed as part of the mitigation works agreed with the two bus operators. Action will be taken as appropriate.
Supporter 10 (local)	No	The decision must take into account the large numbers of residents who walk, cycle or drive into and around town and not	

APPENDIX A

<p>residents' association)</p>		<p>just those who access the town by bus or operate bus services. The topic of town centre pedestrianisation and implementation options has been discussed at a number of our meetings, and our submission summarises the overwhelming majority of views. We supported the trial of no buses through the pedestrianised area and feel it has been a great improvement in the amenity, cohesion and feel of the town centre. The extended pedestrianised area has been a vast improvement and has created a lovely town centre. The space has enabled the extension of the market activities and other event use. Shopping at the Saturday and Thursday markets is now much better, and the town centre has a much more friendly, cohesive feel. The new pedestrianised centre is very nice and we enjoy the freedom to walk round the middle of town without having to worry about buses.</p> <p>We support permanent pedestrianisation of Loughborough town centre. Buses through the middle would make it more difficult for all groups of pedestrians which include parents with prams or buggies, senior citizens and particularly difficult for disabled residents and partially sighted and blind residents and visitors. In short, buses being allowed back in would be very negative to the improvement already achieved.</p> <p>We believe that bus companies could have been significantly more co-operative in their efforts to make the new pedestrianised system workable and change their routes so they are more convenient for the town centre.</p>	
<p>Objector 3 (local resident)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Buses and cars do not mix very well on the IRR. Bus users are forced to use Church Gate and cross the road (forcing the car traffic to constantly stop at the pedestrian controlled traffic lights). Worse the bus stop where the relief road joins the A6 causes car</p>	<p>It isn't possible to provide a lay-by at all bus stops so in some instances, traffic may have to pass a stationary bus or wait until the bus moves on. No problems have</p>

APPENDIX A

		<p>traffic in the left lane to move out into the right lane in order to pass the stationary bus, an accident waiting to happen. The buses should come through the town where they are more convenient for bus passengers.</p>	<p>been reported regarding this arrangement on the IRR, which is wide enough in most places to allow vehicles to pass a stationary bus.</p>
<p>Objector 4 (Campaign for Better Transport)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The scheme actively penalises bus users by requiring them to walk much longer distances to and from their buses than was previously the case. Those using the southbound bus stop on Lemyngton Street are required to cross a busy road, having adverse implications for people with disabilities. The airport bus stops here and people don't realise that this is the town centre bus stop. This scheme has resulted in longer, slower, less reliable journeys for bus passengers. It also impacts on the punctuality of all services, causing frequent delays. This may impact on the viability of local businesses by putting some of their customers off from trying to get to them. Buses should be allowed through with a pinch point or rising bollards in the middle of the road, a method adopted in Hinckley town centre. This is a safe system which works perfectly well by allowing buses to serve the street safely, using on street bus stops, without isolating, or making things more difficult for, anyone.</p>	<p>A limited number of services use the Lemyngton Street stop, most of which are through services to Leicester. The new pedestrian crossing allows passengers to cross the IRR safely and walk along the pedestrianised Church Gate to the town centre. Pedestrian signage to /from Lemyngton Street is being looked at as part of the remedial works agreed with the bus operators. The bus operators didn't provide specific figures about punctuality or journey times. The new route along the IRR is an increase of 400m. However, this route is less congested than the old A6 and traffic flows more freely. Buses, if allowed in the pedestrian area, would be limited to 5mph. General traffic is now being reinstated in Hinckley town centre at the request of businesses. Furthermore, shops are concentrated on Castle Street, which is not on a bus route.</p>
<p>Objector 5 (CTC)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The former proposal had been to restrict motor vehicles in Loughborough town centre but not cycles. There was no consultation on removing cyclists from the town centre. The alternative route via the IRR is substandard, cyclists cannot get to toucan crossings, the Fennel Street cycle lanes are narrow and</p>	<p>The scheme has been introduced using an experimental Traffic Regulation Order. Legally, the consultation period commences once the restrictions are in place and it isn't necessary to conduct any</p>

APPENDIX A

		<p>frequently parked up by disabled motorists. Cyclists have difficulty getting from Bridge Street to Fennel Street and turning right from Bridge Street into Derby Road. The exit from the Toucan crossing at this junction is dangerous. LCC's Equality response ignores disabled cyclists who cannot dismount and walk through the closed section.</p> <p>When cycling on High Street you are often intimidated by motor vehicles illegally using it as a rat run. The contra flow cycle lane on Baxter Gate is often blocked by parked cars, and general enforcement is a problem.</p> <p>Cycling is allowed within the pedestrian zone on Bell Street, Wigston.</p> <p>The improved bus facilities offer no improvement on what was there before. The bus shelters are worse. The Lemyngton Street stop is too far from the town centre and is not signposted. The bus stop exceeds the recommended 200m to facilities as published in DfT guidance. Connections to the train station are poor.</p>	<p>prior consultation. The decision to remove all vehicles (including cyclists) from the pedestrian zone was made at the Cabinet meeting of 1st October 2014 on the basis of the level of support for this option. Cycle facilities have been provided on the new section of the IRR. Other cycle routes are outside the scope of the ETRO.</p> <p>The misuse of High Street is being looked in to as part of the mitigation works agreed with the two bus operators. As are the signing issues relating to the Lemyngton Street bus stop. Likewise, a double yellow line has recently been painted on Baxter Gate to discourage parking in the cycle lane. Town centre parking restrictions are routinely enforced.</p> <p>Pedestrian / cycle activity is much lower on Bell Street when compared with Swan Street, and the level of potential conflict therefore greatly reduced. The Lemyngton Street bus stop is used by a limited number of services, most of which are through-routes. It is 330m from the centre of the market but conveniently located for other facilities such as The Rushes and the new Cinema on Baxter Gate, which does not have a car park.</p>
Supporter 11 (local	No	High Street, Baxter Gate and lower Market Place were identified as having two of the four worst air-quality hotspots in	

APPENDIX A

<p>residents' association)</p>		<p>Leicestershire and Loughborough was designated an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The scheme was designed to address this issue. Any back-tracking to allow buses back into the market place would be a very retrograde step and may be in breach of what was agreed with the DfT in terms of scheme funding. I much prefer the pedestrianised market place and the traffic free area. I think it is healthier!</p>	
<p>Objector 6 (local resident)</p>		<p>Pedestrianisation has created much longer bus routes and the relocation of bus stops has severed connectivity between services. Bus users are now using the car as it is more convenient. Lemyngton Street is too far from the town centre and exceeds maximum walking distances set out by the DfT. The County Council neglected its public sector equality duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and failed to make reasonable adjustments to remove barriers for disabled people. This is important given that 54% of bus users are concessionary pass holders who are either disabled or elderly. The Equalities Questionnaire only considered pedestrians, whereas bus users are the only pedestrians affected by the decision of whether or not to exclude buses. Bus stops are no better than before and seats are unusable as they are too low and tilt backwards. The shelters also get wet when it rains and provide little shelter from the wind. We had better shelters previously. There are no longer any number flags on the shelters which makes it difficult to identify the right stop, especially if in a hurry or partially sighted. If you live on the south of the Market Place there is now no bus service to and from the train station or University, whereas before you would have merely crossed the road. Now you have to walk considerably further. Before pedestrianisation a bus went into the hospital; This was</p>	<p>Much of the complaint directed at bus services/ operators and outside of the scope of the ETRO. There is no evidence to suggest a modal shift from buses to the car. Buses remain well used. When interviewed as part of the AECOM study, there was no consensus amongst bus passengers about the location of bus stops in relation to the town centre. Whilst the Lemyngton Street stop is argued to be remote from the town centre, the disabled parking bays just across the road on Church Gate are always well used. It is also conveniently placed for The Rushes and the Baxter Gate cinema. The Ombudsman considered the Council's actions under the Equalities Act and found no fault with the Council's actions. Parking restrictions are routinely enforced. The misuse of High Street may be a consequence of the traffic signal timings on the IRR, which is in the process of</p>

APPENDIX A

		<p>discontinued as there wasn't time. Parking restrictions are seldom enforced, particularly during evenings and weekends. Unauthorised traffic regularly uses High Street / Baxter Gate. The council should remove complete pedestrianisation by allowing buses through, as was promised in their bid for funding application.</p>	<p>being rectified. The Council has agreed to look into this due to its potential impact on bus services, and will take appropriate action if necessary.</p>
<p>Objector 7 (local resident and business property owner)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The location of the Inquiry is remote from Loughborough. This restricts the right of the public to attend, especially those bus users without personal transport and therefore most affected by the Inspector's decision. Buses are delayed in Baxter Gate by local authority waste collection lorries. This has a knock-on effect on bus timetables. The Leymington Street bus stop is too far from the valued independent retail shops in Devonshire Square, Wards End and Bedford Square. Trade in these areas has suffered . There has been an increase in car use and parking requirement as a direct consequence of the bus trial. This is polluting and causes congestion. The re-routing of both buses and traffic has resulted in a marked decrease in footfall and trade across the town, as indicated by our tenants. Our tenants and ourselves are all BID members, but contrary to the decision of BID's executive board, we do not support the pedestrian area becoming permanent.</p>	<p>A suitable venue was not available in Loughborough on those dates where an Inspector was available. The Council is not aware of any problems with refuse collections however your observations will be reported to Charnwood Borough Council. 4. High St & Ashby Square stops are still used by many services. No specific information received to confirm decline in trade on Devonshire Square, Wards End & Bedford Square. 5. Increase in car use is unsubstantiated. Agreed, use of some car parks has increased but this may be due to the new/preferred 'pay on exit' system or motorists changing their parking habits. It does not necessarily mean that car use has increased. Marked decrease in footfall and trade is not substantiated. Where are the three businesses located? Why have they not contacted us directly?</p>
<p>Objector 8</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>I frequently travel into Loughborough town centre for business</p>	<p>Lemyntgon St stop is as close as</p>

APPENDIX A

<p>(Shepshed resident)</p>		<p>and leisure. Before the flow of traffic was restricted in Swan Street it was possible for passengers travelling towards Leicester to board and alight from buses close to the Market Place. These bus users now have to walk 330 metres (via Churchgate) to or from the new bus stop in Lemyngton Street, which is difficult for those with mobility problems. During the planning of the pedestrianisation of Swan Street, either insufficient attention was given to bus stops and routings or the restriction of buses was not considered in the early stages.</p> <p>Rather than recommending that the experimental orders be made permanent, some bus movements should be permitted.</p>	<p>practicably as possible to the town centre, taking into account the route chosen for this service. Bus operators regularly review and change their routes in response to customer demand. The rerouting of service 16 is one such example which was diverted along Ashby Square / Derby Square last month in response to customer complaints that buses on this route stopped too far from the town centre.</p>
<p>Objector 9 (Loughborough & District Cycle Users Campaign)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>There was no prior consultation about banning cyclists in the pedestrianised area. Prior to these orders no consultation took place about the banning of cycles, only about buses, and we received assurances that cycles would not be restricted on this route. We believe that cycles should be free to use this route and no evidence has been produced to show any adverse effects from allowing them to do so. Disability scooters provide a higher level of threat to pedestrians than cycles. We wish to draw the attention of the inspector to a CTC document, which states that cyclists and pedestrians are able to interact far more harmoniously than is often thought.</p> <p>Surveys show that ‘perceived’ conflict between pedestrians and cyclists is often much worse than ‘real’ conflict. They also show that the majority of pedestrians are not much concerned about sharing with cyclists - those who raise strong objections to shared use are very much a minority voice.</p> <p>The Cycle Infrastructure Design document (DfT, 2008) states “It can be contentious to reintroduce cycling into vehicle restricted areas (VRAs) but, as these areas are often prime destinations</p>	<p>The scheme has been introduced using an experimental Traffic Regulation Order. Legally, the consultation period commences once the restrictions are in place and it isn’t necessary to conduct any prior consultation. Assurances about cyclists being allowed to cycle through the pedestrian zone were given at the time when bus access was also to be permitted. Cyclists are banned from cycling through the adjacent Market Place between 10 and 4 (and for a longer duration on Market days), so the new restriction is consistent with established practices.</p> <p>Conflict between pedestrians and cyclists may well be a ‘perceived’ problem. However, the interaction of 20,000 pedestrians with in excess of 200 cyclists</p>

	<p>where shops and services are located, good cycle access is desirable. Where new vehicular restrictions are to be introduced, serious consideration should always be given to retaining cycle access”</p> <p>Also a Traffic Advisory Leaflet (TAL) published by the Department of Transport in 1993, summarised research from the Transport Research Laboratory on cycling in pedestrian areas. It said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation revealed no real factors to justify excluding cyclists from pedestrianised areas, suggesting that cycling could be more widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians. • A wide variety of regulatory and design solutions exist to enable space to be used safely and effectively in pedestrianised areas. • Pedestrians change their behaviour in the presence of motor vehicles, but not in response to cyclists. • Cyclists respond to pedestrian density, modifying their speed, dismounting and taking other avoiding action where necessary. • Collisions between pedestrians and cyclists were very rarely generated in pedestrianised areas (only one pedestrian/cyclist incident in 15 site years) in the locations studied. • Where there are appreciable flows of pedestrians or cyclists, encouragement to cyclists to follow a defined path aids orientation and assists effective movements in the area. At lower flows, both users mingle readily. <p>We do not believe that the current ban is justifiable and that an economic case, based on expenditure in local shops and the market, for the banning of cycles and buses from using this route has been made. We advocate allowing cycles and buses to use this route for a trial period of 6 months to enable a proper comparison to be made. In addition people with disabilities use both buses and cycles to access the town centre. These have</p>	<p>per day (as counted during recent surveys) would lead to a greater level of risk than perhaps encountered in other pedestrian areas which were not formerly used as a through route. In fact, a large number of cyclists are using the pedestrian zone as a through route rather than for shopping, hence the ‘prime destination’ argument presented in the 2008 document is not entirely relevant.</p> <p>The TAL referred to is 23 years old and whilst this may still be a current document, the concept of shared spaces is a more recent development and may not therefore be a true reflection on the interaction between different user groups.</p> <p>The Council has considered disabled access as part of its EHRIA review.</p>
--	--	--

APPENDIX A

		been adversely affected and we believe that this amounts to discrimination against them.	
Supporter 12 (Nicky Morgan MP)	No	<p>I am strongly in favour of the Loughborough town centre pedestrianisation being confirmed. The scheme meets the council's original aim of improving air quality for pedestrians and reducing congestion in Loughborough. Allowing buses back through the pedestrianised area would only impact on the Arriva 126/ 127 Southbound service, the Skylink southbound service and the Sprint service from the university campus to the station. All other routes remain unaffected by moving to Options A or B. The huge disadvantage of buses coming back through the newly pedestrianised area is that it would render that space completely unusable for events, activities and performance. It will reintroduce a barrier to free movement across the town centre and one of the most frequent comments I now hear about Loughborough is just how "joined-up" the town centre now feels without the A6 acting as a barrier.</p> <p>I hope the County Council will introduce a common regime which applies to the whole of the Market Place, including the new area. This would enable use of the whole area on market days for special events.</p> <p>I have seen Loughborough town centre becoming more vibrant and successful and in December 2015 we had the lowest town centre vacancy rate since the Loughborough BID was formed in 2011. Loughborough is holding its own against nearby city and town centres but clearly this is an ongoing issue and having stability now for town centre businesses is very important.</p> <p>Attendance at Christmas 2014 events held in the town centre was up (16,000 people attended the Christmas lights switch on which is a 15% increase from 2013) and a number of the town's leading</p>	

APPENDIX A

		retailers and food and drink outlets have reported increased sales to me. I await the 2015 figures.	
Supporter 13 (Loughborough BID)	Yes	<p>Love Loughborough, the Loughborough Business Improvement District (BID), was established in 2012 following a vote of businesses in the BID area which covers Loughborough Town Centre. The BID represents the 600 businesses in the area. Its purpose is to promote and improve the town centre and to increase footfall and trade to the benefit of businesses and the public alike.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix E for a full commentary from Loughborough BID. In summary:</p> <p>In addition to the evidence suggesting an increase in footfall, increased car park usage and reduction in retail vacancy rates, the pedestrianisation trial has also brought about safety and environmental improvements within the town. The new environment allows pedestrians to move freely between destinations that were previously segregated by the A6.</p>	
Objector 10 (Hathern resident)	No	I am in favour of allowing buses both ways through the pedestrian area. The removal of buses has resulted in a far greater walking distance between the bus stop and Tesco.	This bus service no longer uses the bus stops on Swan Street.
Objector 11 (local resident)	No	There is a need for bus stops to be closer to the town centre, particularly for the mobility impaired. The bus stops at the eastern end of the Market Place provided such a facility, and were much used. For this reason I am totally opposed to the ban on buses through Loughborough town centre. This does not mean that other traffic must also be permitted. I cite the West Bridgford pedestrianisation scheme as an example where cars are banned but buses are permitted.	The Lemyntgon St stop is as close as practicably as possible to the town centre for buses that use this route. These stops are only used by 4 of the towns many services. Under the options for allowing buses through the pedestrianised area, it was always proposed for the bus stop within the Market Place to be removed. West Bridgford is not comparable as it hasn't been pedestrianised (i.e. it retains a separate carriageway and footway) and

APPENDIX A

			hence pedestrians/vehicles do not share the same space.
Supporter 14 (local resident)	No	Initially, the market seemed quieter but now it seems very busy and new shops have opened in the town. The buses are busy and there is no evidence of decline in patronage. The overall effect that I have noticed is to make visiting Loughborough town centre a much safer and enjoyable experience than hitherto and I am whole-heartedly in favour of it continuing. The only small criticism is that crossing Baxter Gate near its junction with the High Street can be a bit hazardous and would benefit from a controlled crossing (such as a "Pelican" crossing) although this would probably not be needed if the "access only" restriction at the south end of the High Street were to be enforced.	A crossing point is being investigated. The unauthorised use of High Street is also being monitored, as agreed as part of the mitigation works agreed with the two bus operators. Action will be taken as appropriate.
Objector 12 (local resident)	No	Lemyngton Street bus stop is too far away, particularly for disabled and elderly passengers	Lemyntgon St stop is as close as practicably as possible to the town centre for the 4 bus services which choose to operate on this route.
Supporter 15 (Mountsorrel resident)	No	Please do not reopen the bus and car route through the centre of Loughborough. Shopping there is a pleasure now as people are able to move freely from one side to the other without dodging buses and cars, also trying to catch a bus outside the Halifax building society was impossible and dangerous with people trying to pass by as people were trying to get off and on buses.! Catching the bus on Lemyngton Street is no problem at all and while getting to the bus stop I have discovered shops I previously didn't know about.	
Objector 13 (Leicester City resident)	Yes	Verbal Representation. Loughborough bus services are poor, particularly during the evening. The Lemyngton Street bus stop is too far from the town centre for some passengers, in particular the elderly and disabled.	The timing of buses is an issue for the bus operators to consider. Lemyntgon St stop is as close as practicably as possible to the town centre for the 4 bus services

APPENDIX A

		<p>Allowing bus services back through the Market Place would improve bus services and connectivity. The scheme encourages car usage and increased pollution around the town.</p>	<p>which choose to operate on this route. Although car park usage has increased, this could be attributed to a number of factors including an overall increase in visitors to the town centre and a revised charging regime in the Council owned car parks.</p>
<p>Objector 14 (Market Trader)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verbal representation. Generally supportive of full pedestrianisation but objection to the loss of the bus stop and the lack of a replacement facility to serve the weekly market, which has reportedly led to a drop in trade. It was argued that the scheme favoured development and regeneration on the northern side of the Market Place/Swan Street at the expense of the area to the south where the weekly market is held. It was argued that a new bus route serving the Wards End area should be considered in order to increase footfall at the market.</p>	<p>Existing bus routes were not under consideration as part of the ETRO and that bus operators could review or add services were it was felt that there was sufficient demand.</p>