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1 Introduction

We recently consulted stakeholders and the public about a proposal to extend route 42 to East Dulwich Grove via Red Post Hill. We also proposed to convert buses along the whole route from single deck buses to double deck to increase capacity. The consultation ran between 25 January and 6 March 2016.

Route 42 currently runs between Demark Hill and Liverpool Street via Tower Bridge and Aldgate. The route runs within the Ultra Low Emission Zone area and would therefore need to use electric buses if it were operated with single deck buses. The stand at Denmark Hill is not suitable for the operation of double deck buses. Southwark Council has previously requested improved links to the large Sainsbury’s on Dog Kennel Hill. This supermarket is located adjacent to Dog Kennel Hill and is currently served by routes 40, 176, 185 and 484.

We proposed to extend route 42 via Red Post Hill, East Dulwich Grove, Dog Kennel Hill to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s. The extension would improve links to both East and North Dulwich and to the supermarket. Sunray Avenue would no longer be served by buses. After considering the feedback received from this consultation, we would like to progress with this proposal from 1 October 2016.

This report explains the background to the proposal, the consultation and summarises the responses received.

2 The consultation

This consultation was designed to enable us to understand local opinion about the proposed changes to route 42.

The potential outcomes of the consultation are:
- We decide the consultation raises no issues that should prevent us from proceeding with the scheme as proposed
- We modify the scheme in response to issues raised in consultation
- We abandon the scheme as a result of issues raised in the consultation.

2.1 Consultation objectives
The objectives of the consultation were:
- To highlight the benefits of extending route 42 to East Dulwich Sainsbury
- To be transparent with scheme impacts including the introduction of double deck buses and buses no longer serving Sunray Avenue
- To raise awareness of the consultation and encourage stakeholders to provide us with their views

2.2 Who we consulted
The public consultation intended to seek the views of people who live near to the proposed route, current users of the service and other potential users. We also consulted stakeholders including Southwark Council, traffic police, London TravelWatch, Members of Parliament, Assembly Members and local interest groups. A list of the stakeholders we consulted is shown in Appendix C and a summary of their responses is given in Section 4.
2.3 Consultation material, distribution and publicity
The consultation was published online where a dedicated webpage included the details and background to the proposal.

We wrote to residents living within 400 metres from the proposed route extension.

We also raised awareness of the consultation by sending targeted emails to oyster/CPC customers who use route 42 and live in SE5, SE21, SE22 and SE24.

We sent an email to key stakeholders as identified in Appendix C of this document. In addition to the emails we displayed notices at bus stops served by the route. Copies of the consultation material are shown in Appendix A.

People were invited to respond to the consultation using a variety of methods. They could respond by emailing us at consultations@tfl.gov.uk or by accessing the online consultation and survey via the following website link: https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/bus-route-42

We also issued a press release on 8 June 2015.

We asked 11 questions (9 general and 2 specific). Of the general questions we asked respondents for their name, email address, postcode and if they were responding on behalf of an organisation.

There were four closed questions (questions 1-4), and two open questions (questions 5 and 11).

The following four closed questions specifically asked respondents about the scheme:
- Question 1: Do you currently use route 42?
- Question 2: How often do you use route 42?
- Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to extend route 42 to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s?
- Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal for route 42 to stop serving Sunray Avenue?

The following open question specifically asked respondents about the scheme:
- Question 5: Do you have any further comments regarding our proposals?
- Question 11: Please tell us what you think about the quality of this consultation

2.4 Meetings and site visits (if appropriate)
A meeting with TfL, Helen Hayes (local MP), and residents took place on 5 April 2016 which aimed to listen to their views and concerns.
3 Responses from members of the public

We received 495 responses from members of the public. Of these, 441 (89 per cent) of the responses were submitted online and 54 (11 per cent) were received by email.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1. Do you currently use route 42?

Four hundred and fifty eight respondents answered this question, of which, 37 (7 per cent) had no response to this question. Three hundred and seventy two respondents (75 per cent) indicated that they currently use route 42, while 86 (17 per cent) said they did not.
Q2. How often do you use route 42?

Four hundred and forty respondents answered this question. Ninety two (19 per cent) indicated that they used it 1-2 times a month. An additional 92 (19 per cent) said that they used the bus 2-3 times a week, while 76 (17 per cent) said that they used it daily.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do you use route 42?
Q3. Do you agree with our proposal to extend route 42 to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s?

Four hundred and ninety one respondents answered this question. Three hundred and eighty nine (79 per cent) were in favour of the proposal, while 15 (3 per cent) stated that the extension did not affect them. Thirteen (3 per cent) were not sure while 74 (15 per cent) stated that they were opposed to the proposal.
Q4. Do you agree with our proposal for route 42 to stop serving Sunray Avenue?

Four hundred and fifty people responded to this question. Two hundred and fifteen (43 per cent) indicated that they are in favour of this proposal. One hundred and thirty nine (28 per cent) said that the proposal did not affect them, while 72 (15 per cent) indicated opposition. Twenty one (4 per cent) were not sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree with our proposal for route 42 to stop serving Sunray Avenue?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Doesn’t affect me</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Do you have any further comments regarding our proposals?

We also asked for any comments on the proposals. A summary of the key issues and themes is provided in Appendix B. The table below indicates the top seven issues raised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>No. of times raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments against the scheme - current route: 42 has reliability/frequency/capacity issues</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment against the scheme: 42 should continue serving Sunray Ave</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment against the scheme: Concerned about parked cars on Red Post Hill as it is narrow with parking on both sides</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment supporting the scheme: This will be very convenient for getting to Dulwich Sainsbury’s</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment supporting the scheme: Double deckers will reduce congestion especially at peak times</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment supporting the scheme: An extension into East Dulwich would make the world of a difference</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion: Increase frequency</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequently mentioned comments (48) talked about the current poor service of this route, citing reliability, frequency and capacity issues.

Twenty nine people also indicated that the bus should continue serving Sunray Avenue while another 29 were concerned about a double decker going down Red Post Hill because it is a narrow road with cars parked on both sides of the road.

Seventy eight people were very supportive of the route being extended to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s.

*NB Questions 6 – 9 asked personal information about the respondents which has not been included as part of this analysis.*
Q10. How did you hear about this consultation?

We asked the respondents how they heard about this consultation. Four hundred and twelve 412 people responded to this question with the majority (105 responses, 21 per cent) indicating that they received an email from TfL. One hundred and three people (21 per cent) received a letter from TfL, 50 people (10 per cent) from Social Media, per cent) while 35 (7 per cent) saw it on the TfL website.

One hundred and two respondents (21 per cent) indicated that they received the consultation through ‘other’ means/ forums. These included:

- Word of mouth
- Community forums
- Dulwich Society newsletter
- Southwark cyclists
- Notice at bus stop
- Local newsletter
- Residents groups
A petition signed by 54 residents of Red Post Hill was also received. This can be viewed in Appendix D. It objects to reduction in traffic calming measures, increased traffic, increased vibration and reduced parking along the road.

Q11. We also asked for comments on the quality of this consultation. The table below indicates the top emerging themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top issues/themes</th>
<th>No of times raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Good/Informative/clear/easy to respond to</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Some residents on a street that could potentially be affected were not consulted</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Not adequately publicised</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further information required: Rationale for choices made by TfL</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Poor with insufficient details</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Responses from statutory bodies and other stakeholders

We received nine responses from key stakeholders to the consultation which are summarised below:

**Southwark Council - Councillor Tom Flynn**  
Supports the extension to Dulwich Sainsbury’s and increased capacity on the route, but requests that performance and reliability along the whole of the route is improved. Specifically, that bus services are not curtailed early.

**Southwark Council – Councillor Octavia Lamb (South Camberwell Ward)**  
Cllr Lamb expressed concerns raised by constituents regarding the introduction of services along Red Post Hill and the change to double deck buses. Cllr Lamb also requested that the traffic calming measures on Red Post Hill are retained.

Requests further information about perceived environmental impacts resulting from buses operating on Red Post Hill.

**Southwark Council – Councillor Michael Mitchell (Village Ward)**  
Cllr Mitchell supported the extension of route 42 to operate in both directions along Sunray Avenue.

Suggests that the introduction of double decked buses on Red Post hill would result in increased vibration, reduced parking and would engage overhanging trees.

**Red Post Hill Resident Committee (chair)**  
Suggested that the proposed extension is not needed due to adequate pedestrian access to Sainsbury's.

Does not support the scheme because they believe that parking will be reduced, the traffic calming measures on Red Post Hill will be impacted and suggests that more buses operating along the road will increase congestion.

Suggests that rerouting P15 might be a suitable alternative.

**London TravelWatch**  
Supports proposals to extend route 42 to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s and for route 42 to stop serving Sunray Avenue

**NHS Southwark Clinical Commissioning Group**  
Welcomes the extension of the 42 bus route and states that the proposals would significantly improve the public transport links between the new health centre and the Camberwell area.

**The Walworth Society**  
The Walworth Society supported the proposals to change from single deckers to double decker buses and extension of the route to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s.
The Dulwich Society
Supports the extension of route 42 and suggests that this will improve links with a new secondary school on the Dulwich Hospital site on East Dulwich Grove.

However, the Dulwich Society does not support changing the routeing from Sunray Avenue to Red Post Hill. Suggests that double deck buses will experience difficulty operating along this road.

London Assembly – Valerie Shawcross (Member for Lambeth & Southwark)
Supported proposals to improve bus links to Dulwich Sainsbury’s and supports the proposals in principle.

Requested that we investigate operating buses along Sunray Avenue as an alternative route to Red Post Hill and also asked that we look at retaining traffic calming measures. Requested that we also consider operating single deck buses along Red Post Hill In the event that Sunray Avenue is an unsuitable alternative route
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Bus stop poster

London Buses

Proposed extension of route 42

We are proposing to extend route 42 via Red Post Hill, East Dulwich Grove, Dog Kennel Hill to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s. The extension would improve links to both East and North Dulwich and to Sainsbury’s.

Sunray Avenue would no longer be served by buses.

Single deck buses would also be replaced by double deck buses along the whole of route 42.

We would propose that the changes would be introduced from autumn 2016.

For further details, or to let us know your views:
Visit: tfl.gov.uk/route-42
Email: consultations@tfl.gov.uk
Write to: FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS
Phone: 0343 222 1234

To have your say, please contact us by Sunday 6 March 2016.
Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Proposed extension of route 42

The London bus network is kept under regular review. As part of this, we develop proposals for changes to services.

We are proposing to extend route 42 to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s and would like to hear your views.

At present, route 42 operates between Liverpool Street Station and Denmark Hill (Sunray Avenue). We are proposing to extend the route via Red Post Hill, East Dulwich Grove, Dog Kennel Hill to East Dulwich Sainsbury’s. The extension would improve links to both East and North Dulwich and to Sainsbury’s.

This proposed change would mean that Sunray Avenue would no longer be served by buses. Single Deck buses would also be replaced with double deck buses along the whole of route 42.

Please refer to the attached illustrative map for more information about the proposed extension.

Subject to feedback from the consultation, we are proposing to implement the changes in autumn 2016.

In order to facilitate the extension along Red Post Hill, we would need to make alterations to the traffic islands to enable buses to use the road. We would also need to extend the double yellow lines at the bottom Red Post Hill junction with Sunray Avenue, to enable buses to easily continue serving along Red Post Hill.

The length of the disabled parking bay on Red Post Hill junction with Denmark Hill will need to be reduced. However, this reduction in length will still allow one vehicle to park in this bay.

We would like to know what you think about our proposal. You can let us know your views online at tfl.gov.uk/route-42, in writing at the above address or by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk.

Please let us know your views by Sunday 6 March 2016.

This letter is part of the process which fulfils the requirement for TfL to consult under Section 183 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999.

Yours faithfully
**Appendix B – All issues raised for questions 5 & 11**

**Q5: Do you have any further comments regarding our proposals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comments</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope/negative comment re: 37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't understand the logic behind avoiding Sunray Avenue in order to extend</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments against the scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments against the scheme</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current route: 42 has reliability/frequency/capacity issues</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current route: 42 sometimes terminates before reaching destination</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion on East Dulwich Grove as it is too narrow</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 should continue serving Sunray Ave</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change not required/bus underused/area has sufficient bus provision</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about parked cars on Red Post Hill as it is narrow with parking on both sides</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned over use of double decker on some parts of the proposed route</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current congestion/unreliability will be exacerbated if frequency not increased</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double decker buses will cause vibration to properties on RPH</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on quality of life/character of RPH residents</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the service instead as useful for school runs &amp; getting to work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased congestion on Lordship Lane/Grove Vale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased pressure on routes 68 &amp; 468</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will lead to congestion on Red post Hill</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of disabled parking bays</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing of RPH islands will exacerbate speeding</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change not required/bus underused/area has sufficient bus provision /not needed</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution/noise/contravenes environmental &amp; health policies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor layout around Sainsbury’s will cause conflict between buses &amp; cyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer single decker bus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Post Hill is a residential road which is already overburdened with traffic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concern: General</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concern: School children</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concern: Security &amp; privacy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some bus stops too close together</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change will make the route more inconvenient</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed route to Sainsbury’s is a bit circuitous</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a very good walk-through between Denmark Hill (already served by the 42) and Sainsbury’s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic islands on RPH are dangerous &amp; could lead to accidents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees to high on RPH for double decker bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair on Sunray Avenue residents especially those with mobility issues</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates better links with local hospitals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service withdrawal from Sunray Avenue</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An extension into East Dulwich would make a big difference</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial for children in the local schools</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial to elderly/parents with buggies/people with mobility issues</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better local links reducing reliance on personal cars/taxis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double decker proposal is great</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double decker buses will reduce congestion especially at peak times</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension is welcome alternative to unreliable rail service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great to take a direct route from East Dulwich to Liverpool St</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be used more</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining up North Dulwich and Denmark Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of the traffic islands on RPH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will be very convenient for getting to Dulwich Sainsbury’s</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be beneficial for northbound commute</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Current conditions: Speed bumps on East Dulwich Grove effective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment-current route: 42 is a useful route as the only one that goes up the steep hill</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection from Denmark Hill to Brixton Tube Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you implement the double decker earlier than autumn 2016</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure double decker buses are hybrid</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend past Sainsbury’s towards Dog Kennel/Grove Lane to create a loop</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend to another destination not on the proposal</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian crossings around the junction of Sunray Avenue and Red Post Hill</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase frequency</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce a replacement on Sunray Avenue</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep extension of double yellow line to a minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make 42 a night bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only allow parking on one side of the road on Red Post Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route it via Sunray Avenue southbound and Red Post Hill northbound to ease congestion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run the double decker buses via Sunray Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Further Information required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further Information required</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further information required: Map showing other routes with which 42 will overlap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further information required: Map showing the route and timetable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further information required: Rationale for choices made by TfL</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Negative comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment/opposed: Not adequately publicised</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Better maps should have been provided</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Biased online survey lacking questions that allows data to be disaggregated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: General negative comment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Inadequate consultation period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Information on weight of the bus should have been provided</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: More questions needed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Need more details on reasoning behind proposal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: No analysis on pedestrian safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: No information on changes to traffic islands/map of planned new double yellow lines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Poor with insufficient details</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Proposal focuses on one aspect of 42 ignoring previous feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Reliability &amp; frequency issues should have been addressed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Sceptical about whether feedback will be taken into consideration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Some residents on a street that could potentially be affected were not consulted</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: TfL should have consulted on use of double decker bus not just route ext.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Website too slow/broken links/hard to find the proposal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment: Would have preferred a face to face consultation at a meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant comment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Glad TfL is constantly assessing the needs of its customers and is initiating a useful consultation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Good quality map</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Good/ Informative/clear/easy to respond to</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Very pleased to be engaged by TFL</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Website is fine</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment: Well publicised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a detailed consultation with RPH residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider pre-consulting to get options to consult on</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide handouts or printed materials to local residents in order to gain their responses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C – List of stakeholders consulted

London TravelWatch

**Elected Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Johnson AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bacon AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Jones AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Tracey AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne McCartney AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Coply AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad Qureshi AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Shawcross AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan McDonagh AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Berry AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McGreevy AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Coyle MP</td>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Haynes MP</td>
<td>Dulwich and West Norwood MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Perry MP</td>
<td>Parliamentary Under-Secretary - Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McLoughlin MP</td>
<td>Secretary of State for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hammond MP</td>
<td>Wimbledon, Raynes Park, Moden and Motspur Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt Hon Baroness Kramer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr James Barber</td>
<td>East Dulwich Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Rosie Shimell</td>
<td>East Dulwich Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Charlie Smith</td>
<td>East Dulwich Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Peter John</td>
<td>South Camberwell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Sarah King</td>
<td>South Camberwell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Octavia Lamb</td>
<td>South Camberwell Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Anne Kirby</td>
<td>Village Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Jane Lyons</td>
<td>Village Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Michael Mitchell</td>
<td>Village Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Police & Health Authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Southwark Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Ambulance Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport Groups**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London TravelWatch</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age UK</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer's Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Bankside BID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal River Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of British Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Civil Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced Taxi Drivers Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London City Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacMillan Cancer Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Post Hill Residents Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNIB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dulwich Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northbank BID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Walworth Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria BID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unite the Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Signed petition

News on 42 Bus Route - Proposal from TFL to run Double Deckers in both directions on Red Post Hill

If TFL can get agreement to make this change we will have:
- More double decker coaches running along this route
- More noise, pollution and vibrations all day and night
- More double deckers and no buses parking

Red Post Hill is charming because it is NOT major thoroughfare. This could be about to change. We believe that this kind of heavy traffic will completely change the character of this street.

What can we do?
- Support the TFL Consultation: [link to consultation page]
- Complete the survey: [link to survey page]
- Write to our MP at Peter.Turner@parliament.uk
- Write to your Ward Councillor: [link to councillor’s email]
- Write to the Southwark Council: [link to council’s email]
- Keep informed by joining the TFLLondon Residents Google Group, to join please email TFLLondon Residents@gmail.com.

Please sign below if you object to Double Decker buses on Red Post Hill – ID: Our objection is NOT about extending the route to Lambeth but to having double decker vehicles on our street.

[Table of signed petition signatures]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]