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Executive summary

We recently reviewed a number of bus routes that run into central London. A set of proposals were identified that rearranged bus services in central London, so that it can continue to support London as a world leading cultural and economic centre.

The proposals involve a combination of changing where some routes terminate, rerouting some routes away from Oxford Street and extending routes to maintain connections.

Our consultation was held between 25 November and 29 January setting out proposals for people to comment on. We received 3,415 responses to the consultation.

This document explains the processes, responses and outcomes of the consultation. All together we consulted on proposals for 23 bus routes. Many of the route proposals are connected. We have presented the information maintaining this grouped order.

Key themes and responses

We asked people if they used the specific bus services being consulted on and have identified users and non-users.

Overall, approximately 20 per cent of respondents were users of the routes concerned. Table A sets out the full breakdown by route.

A number of key themes emerged from the consultation.

- Support for the way in which the review would complement wider initiatives such as the transformation of Oxford Street
- Concern about the loss of direct bus links (for example to and from Victoria), the need to interchange, and risks of overcrowding on bus and Tube services
- Concern about the impact on the more vulnerable users for example those with mobility impairments

Detailed analysis of the results can be found from page 16 onwards of the main report. Tables A and B below summarise the responses:

- Table A shows the proportions of support and opposition for each route proposal amongst all 3415 respondents to the consultation
- Table B shows for each route the numbers of route users and non-users responding and their respective levels of support

Detailed analysis of the results can be found from page 16 onwards.
Table A – Summary results (proportion of all 3415 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to bus route</th>
<th>Support or strongly support</th>
<th>Opposed or strongly opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; N3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, C2 &amp; N22</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 &amp; 452</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 &amp; 425</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 &amp; N73</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – please see individual route entries for absolute numbers and information on those neither supporting nor opposing or not responding on individual routes.
Table B Summary of results (User & non-user breakdown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>User / Non users / no answer *1</th>
<th>Support &amp; Strongly support *2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Users (1-2 times a week; 2-3 times a week; daily/nightly; never; once a week; rarely)</td>
<td>% user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/C2</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/452</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/425</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of respondents</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note *1 – Per cent of user / non-user from the total consultation response of 3415

Note *2 – Support / strong support; full breakdown available in route specific tables
Conclusion

A total of 3415 responses were received. A further review of the proposals and when they should be introduced, in-light of the comments received, has been undertaken.

We intend to go ahead with the proposals as put forward in the consultation except for the proposal to change route 23 at its western end (diversion to Wembley) and the associated change to route 452, which will be considered further in conjunction with stakeholders.

Implementation

We intend to start introducing changes from summer 2017. This is generally somewhat earlier than originally proposed because the overall level of demand on these routes is now appreciably lower than had been anticipated by this stage.

Detailed implementation dates are being reviewed. We are also looking at how the resource saved could used on other parts of the bus network.

Once introduced we will closely monitor travel patterns, demand and reliability.
Table B

What do you think about our proposals? (all data together)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 / N3, 137</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>N15</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>172</th>
<th>242</th>
<th>22, N22 &amp; C2</th>
<th>23 &amp; 452</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>332</th>
<th>25 &amp; 425</th>
<th>73 / N73</th>
<th>390</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>5003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support or oppose</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>11764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>11015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>11587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a total of 3415 responses to each routes question.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction

We recently reviewed a number of bus routes that run into central London. A set of proposals were identified that rearranged bus services in central London, so that it can continue to support London as a world leading cultural and economic centre.

The proposals involve a combination of changing where some routes terminate, rerouting some routes away from Oxford Street and extending routes to maintain connections.

This document explains the processes, responses and outcomes of the consultation. All together we consulted on proposals for 23 bus routes. Many of the route proposals are connected. We have presented the information maintaining this grouped order.

3, 137, N3
6, 15, N15
8, 172, 242
22, C2, N22
23, 452
46, 332
25, 425
73, 390

Our proposals range in scale depending on the route to help us better match future demand with space available on the bus. Many proposals are connected, so we have grouped them to make it easier to understand what is proposed.

The Mayor has committed to improving life in London, by tackling air quality, transforming Oxford Street and introducing the bus hopper ticket and freezing public transport fares. In addition we are encouraging growth in cycling and walking, and establishing measures to help buses get to and through central London quickly and reliably. Ensuring that we have the right level of bus provision is crucial in ensuring central London works well.

The opening of the Elizabeth line from 2018 will further transform how people move about in central London. The line will provide a key east-west link across central London and beyond. Many people will choose to use this faster journey than take a bus.

The Elizabeth line is particularly significant for bus services on Oxford Street, with the two new stations at Tottenham Court Road and Bond Street set to further reduce bus demand on the street. The Mayor is also working with City of Westminster to make Oxford Street more pedestrian friendly. Our proposals for changes to bus
services in central London are therefore also designed to start reducing the number of buses running along Oxford Street. The proposals in this consultation would reduce the number of buses going along Oxford Street by around 40 per cent.

To reflect this, we identified a set of proposals that rearranged bus services in central London, so that it can continue to support London as a world leading cultural and economic centre.

The proposals involve a combination of changing where some routes terminate, rerouting some routes away from Oxford Street and extending routes to maintain connections.

### 1.2 Purpose

Our proposals are designed to streamline passenger services to reflect changing needs. The proposals help us ensure our financial resources are being used in the best way possible.

We have taken account of the number of passengers using each bus route, journey times, and where people are traveling to and from.

Looking forward we have also considered how improved services on the Tube and Overground, including the introduction of the Elizabeth line (Crossrail), and the new one-hour ‘Hopper’ bus fares, will change the way our customers travel.

We have also considered the potential impact of new developments in the area and the aspirations of our stakeholders, for example the impact of bus traffic in the West End and the Mayor of London’s pledge to transform Oxford Street.

These proposals enable our organisation to reallocate funding for re-investment elsewhere in the bus network where demand is growing.

### 1.3 Detailed description

Many of the proposals are connected so we have grouped them to make it easier to understand what is proposed.

Route by route, the changes we proposed were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 3</th>
<th>would be rerouted to serve Russell Square serving Charing Cross Road and Great Russell Street. Buses would no longer run between Regent Street and Trafalgar Square.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night route N3</td>
<td>would be rerouted to serve Russell Square serving Charing Cross Road and Great Russell Street. Buses would no longer run between Oxford Circus and Trafalgar Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 137</td>
<td>would be rerouted to run between Streatham Hill and Marble Arch / Park Lane area. Buses would no longer continue to Oxford Circus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route 6 – would be rerouted to serve Park Lane and Piccadilly instead of Oxford Street and Regent Street. Buses would continue to run between Aldwych and Willesden.

Route 15 - Buses on this route have been temporarily starting and finishing at Trafalgar Square instead of Regent Street since May 2013 due to roadworks and traffic congestion. We propose that the route would start and finish at Trafalgar Square permanently.

Night route N15 – would be extended to Oxford Circus, from its current terminus at Regent Street.

Route 8 – would terminate at Tottenham Court Road permanently, but the terminus arrangements would be altered. Buses would run towards Tottenham Court Road and continue along High Holborn (A40) instead of turning into New Oxford Street, continuing to St. Giles High Street, to stand on Earnshaw Street. Towards Bow it would run via New Oxford Street, Bloomsbury Way and back to the existing route.

Route 242 – would be rerouted to terminate at St. Paul’s station. Buses would no longer run between St. Paul’s and Tottenham Court Road.

Route 172 – would be rerouted to run between Brockley Rise and Clerkenwell for Farringdon station. It would no longer serve stops between Ludgate Circus and St. Paul’s station. Buses would serve Farringdon Street and Farringdon Road for Clerkenwell.

Route C2 – we propose that buses only run to Regent Street, Conduit Street. Buses would no longer run between Victoria and Regent Street.

Route 22 – would be rerouted buses to Oxford Circus. Buses would serve Berkeley Square, Conduit Street and Regent Street.

Route 23 – would no longer run east of Paddington. Buses would run between Lancaster Gate and Ladbroke Grove initially. In the future, the route could be extended to Wembley.

Route 452 – would be rerouted to Harrow Road serving Kensal Road. Buses would no longer run between Kensal Rise and Ladbroke Grove Sainsbury’s.

Route 46 - would terminate at Paddington instead of Lancaster Gate.

Route 332 – would be rerouted to better serve Paddington and Warwick Avenue. Buses would terminate at Lancaster Gate instead of Paddington (Bishops Bridge Road).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 25 – would be restructured to run between Ilford and Oxford Circus every six minutes Monday to Saturday daytime and about every seven to eight minutes evenings and Sundays.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 425 – would be extended from Stratford to Ilford, with buses running every 10 minutes Monday to Saturdays and every 12 minutes each evening and on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routes 73 &amp; N73 – would be restructured to run between Stoke Newington and Oxford Circus. Buses would run about every five minutes (instead of every 3-5 minutes), Monday to Saturday. On Sunday’s buses would run about every seven minutes instead of every six minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 390 – would be rerouted to Victoria and no longer run between Marble Arch and Notting Hill Gate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. About the consultation

2.1 Purpose
The objectives of the consultation were:

- To give stakeholders and the public easily-understandable information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- To understand the level of support or opposition for the proposed changes
- To understand any issues that might affect the proposals, of which we were not previously aware
- To understand concerns and objections
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 Potential outcomes
The potential outcomes of the consultation were:

- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to proceed with the scheme as set out in the consultation
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we modify the proposals in response to issues raised and proceed with a revised scheme
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide not to proceed with the scheme

Our conclusion and next steps are set out in Section 6.

2.3 Who we consulted
The public consultation intended to seek the views of local residents and current users along the routes involved. We also consulted stakeholders including the affected Councils, London TravelWatch, Members of Parliament, London Assembly members and ward councillors.

2.4 Dates and duration
The consultation took place for a period of nine weeks from 25 November 2016 until 29 January 2017. This was longer than our standard six weeks to allow more time for responses because of the Christmas holiday period.

2.6 What we asked
We asked specific questions about the proposals on a route by route basis. We also asked for comments in general and for the respondents views on the quality of our consultation.
2.7 Methods of responding

People were invited to respond to our consultation by completion of an online survey, by email, by telephone or in writing via the use of our Freepost address.

2.8 Consultation materials and publicity

We publicised the consultation online and at bus stops (where space permitted) along key routes that serve roads common with other routes being consulted on. We also emailed customers and relevant stakeholders. Copies of consultation materials can be found in Appendix B: Consultation Materials.

2.8.1 Website

We created a dedicated web page to host the consultation on our website at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/west-end-bus-changes/

2.8.2 Emails to public

We sent 242,000 emails to registered Oyster card users whose travel patterns indicated they travel on bus routes

2.8.3 Emails to stakeholders

We sent 800 emails to stakeholders, including the affected Councils, London TravelWatch, Members of Parliament, London Assembly members, ward councillors and local community groups. A list of the stakeholders we consulted is shown in Appendix E: List of stakeholders consulted.

2.8.4 Press and media activity

A press release was issued by TfL and the Mayor’s office. A number of press articles were published in the Evening Standard and other local papers.

2.8.5 On-site advertising

A notice was displayed at bus stops along a number of key routes that serve corridors, where other routes being consulted on also serve. Notices were placed where space was available. A flyer was also produced and distributed to key libraries and other known busy contact points.

2.8.6 Digital advertising

The proposals took prime place as the ‘featured consultation’ on our home page for the duration of the consultation period, to enable participant’s easy access to our information and our survey.

Information was also displayed on board buses using the iBus next bus stop visual system, and at bus stops using the countdown screens.
2.8.7 Meetings with stakeholders

Local authorities and statutory bodies

- City of Westminster: regular liaison has taken place with regards to this consultation
- London Borough of Brent – Briefing provided at November, Public Transport Liaison Forum
- Just before the consultation launched, the leaders and cabinet members / Chief Officers for the following borough’s were contacted to announce the start of the consultation: Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Brent, Bromley, Camden, City of London, Croydon, Hammersmith & Fulham, Hackney, Haringey, Havering, Islington, Kensington & Chelsea, Lambeth, Lewisham, Newham, Redbridge, Richmond, Southwark, Tower Hamlets, Wandsworth and Westminster

Government departments, parliamentary bodies and politicians

Greater London Authority

- A briefing was provided to members of the GLA Transport Committee on 8 December 2016.
- Andrew Dismore AM, London Assembly member for Camden and Barnet

London Travelwatch

- A briefing was provided to officers prior to consultation launch.
- A briefing was provided to members of the London TravelWatch December board meeting.

London Councils

- A briefing was provided to officers from the London Councils transport team.
2.9 Ensuring the consultation was accessible to all

When planning how to run our consultation we look at a number of different influencing factors.

The period for the consultation is determined around any public holidays or events such as Christmas, Easter or school summer holidays. The consultation was therefore open for nine weeks as set out in section 2.5.

We considered the demographics for the areas the routes serve and how best to provide information about the consultation to them. A range of methods to publicise the consultation were developed. See Appendix B: Consultation materials.

Whilst most of the consultation activity was focused on our web page, we are also able to (and did) provide printed material to those requesting it, speak to people about the proposals on the telephone or by email.

2.10 Analysis of consultation responses

The responses have been examined internally by our Consultation Analysts. Respondents could provide comments on the scheme overall, or on specific routes. These have been reviewed and coded into themes. Unstructured responses have been reviewed and coded using the same framework as derived.
3. About the respondents

3.1 Number of respondents

In total we received 3415 responses from members of the public. In addition we received 52 responses from stakeholders. Table 1 below shows the breakdown with percentages of the respondents.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>3185</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

We asked members of the public how they found out about the consultation. The majority, 1738 respondents (51 per cent) stated that they received an email from TfL, 269 (eight per cent) indicated that they saw bus stop notices, 292 (9 per cent) found out through social media, 150 (4 per cent) found out through the TfL website while 118 (3 per cent) found out through the press. Figure 1 below gives a breakdown of the responses.

There were 388 individuals (11 per cent) who selected “Other” as an option. Figure 2 sets out the alternative ways people heard about the consultation. The most common means specified by respondents in this category was “Word of mouth” with 150 instances, 460 (13 per cent) did not answer this question.
How did you hear about this consultation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw information about it on a bus</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about in the press</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on the TfL website</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Other" sources:
- SEBRA
- Word of mouth
- Barnes Campaign Group/pressure group
- Local Residents Associations/Forums/Community briefings/Other
- Newsletters/Websites
- Bus stop notices
4. Summary of all consultation responses

To help our understanding of those who replied and their thoughts on the routes and proposals, we asked a number of questions. As many of the proposals are connected we have grouped them to make it easier to understand what is proposed. The questions are set out by route.

How often do you use these bus routes?

We asked people if they use any or all of the routes involved in the consultation, and if so how often.

Routes 3 and N3

A total of 1,697 individuals responded to this question. Most respondents, 118 (6.95 per cent), stated that they used route 3 two to three times a week; this was followed by 88 respondents (5.19 per cent) who stated that they used it on a daily basis. There were 57 (3.36 per cent) respondents who used the routes once a week. There were 87 respondents (5.13 per cent) who used it one to two times a month, while 218 respondents (12.85 per cent) said that they rarely used the bus. There were 1129 respondents (66.53 per cent) who indicated that they never used routes 3/N3.

Figure 3 below shows the breakdown.

Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 3/N3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing the breakdown]
At the moment route 3 starts and finishes at Regent Street, Conduit Street and route N3 at Oxford Circus. What do you think about our proposal to extend routes 3 and N3 to Russell Square – creating new connections including between Millbank and Tottenham Court Road?

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 497 (15 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 345 (10 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 746 respondents (22 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 75 respondents (2 per cent) who opposed, while 139 respondents (4 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 830 respondents (24 per cent) who didn’t know and 783 (23 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 4 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Figure 4

| What do you think about our proposal to extend routes 3 and N3 to Russell Square? |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                                 | %   |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Strongly support                | 10% |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Support                         | 15% |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Neither support or oppose       | 22% |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Oppose                          | 2%  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Strongly oppose                 | 4%  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Don’t know                      | 24% |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Not Answered                    | 23% |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Total                           | 100%| 345 | 497 | 746 | 75  | 139 | 830 |

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 5 sets out the results, showing that 156 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 155 supported it, while 42 opposed it and 96 strongly opposed it.
Respondents also had the opportunity to give us comments in their own words. Table 2 below shows the top five comments made in relation to routes 3 and N3. The most frequently mentioned comment (made by 51 respondents) concerned the loss of direct connections to the Oxford Street area.

This was followed by (39) comments made that the route should be left as it is.

Some respondents (23) stated that they supported the proposal and the new connections it would bring, while (17) respondents were against the route being removed specifically from Oxford Circus / Regent Street.

The full list of comments concerning route 3 and N3 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Five Emerging Themes - Routes 3/N3</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support new route and connections</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the terminus being removed from Oxford Circus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Square already overserved by buses</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 137

A total of 1,677 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 137. The majority of respondents, 264 (15.74 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 113 respondents (6.74 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 94 respondents (5.61 per cent) who stated they use the route on a daily basis, while 83 (4.95 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 63 respondents (3.76 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 1,060 (63.21 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 6 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 6
At the moment route 137 starts and finishes at Oxford Circus. What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses to the Park Lane / Marble Arch area?

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 361 (10.57 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 229 (6.71 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 835 respondents (24.45 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 170 respondents (4.98 per cent) who opposed, while 210 respondents (6.15 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 816 respondents (23.89 per cent) who didn’t know and 794 (23.25 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 7 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 3 shows the top comments relating to route 137. A full list of all comments concerning route 137 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 7

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 8 sets out the results, showing that 86 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 134 supported it, while 85 opposed it and 158 strongly opposed it.
Figure 8

What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses to the Park Lane / Marble Arch area - Route 137 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Didn't say how often</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top five emerging themes - Route 137</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support proposed new route</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will lead to overcrowding at Marble Arch</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will lead to overcrowding of alternative routes servicing Oxford Street Corridor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 6

A total of 1,695 individuals responded to this question. Most respondents, 128 (7.55 per cent) stated that they used it on a daily basis, this was followed by 97 (5.72 per cent) who said they use the route two to three times a week. There were 43 (2.54 per cent) respondents who used the routes once a week. There were 82 respondents (5.43 per cent) who used it one to two times a month, while 239 respondents (14.10 per cent) said that they rarely used the bus. There were 1,096 respondents (64.66 per cent) who indicated that they never used route 6.

Figure 9 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment route 6 goes along Oxford Street and Regent Street. What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses along Park Lane and Piccadilly?

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 375 (10.98 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 235 (6.88 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 833 respondents (24.39 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 132 respondents (3.87 per cent) who opposed, while 222 respondents (6.50 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 794 respondents (23.25 per cent) who didn’t know and 824 (23.13 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 10 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 4 shows the top comments relating to route 6. A full list of all comments concerning route 137 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 10

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 10 sets out the results, showing that 106 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 119 supported it, while 64 opposed it and 175 strongly opposed it.
What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses along Willesden, Edgware Road, Park Lane, Piccadilly, Trafalgar Square and Aldwych - Route 6 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn't say how often</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Five Emerging Themes - Route 6</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support removal from Oxford Street corridor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will lead to overcrowding</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded at present</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 15?

We received 1,633 responses to this question with the majority 151 (9.25 per cent) indicating that they used this route one to two times a month. There were 53 (3.25 per cent) respondents who stated they use the route once a week, followed by 50 (3.06 per cent) who use it daily. There were 46 (2.82 per cent) respondents who use the route two to three times a week, while 642 (20.94 per cent) stated they rarely use the route. There were 991 respondents (60.69 per cent) who indicated that they never used route 15.

Figure 12 below shows the full breakdown of responses.

**Figure 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a temporary measure route 15 currently starts and finishes at Trafalgar Square. What do you think about our proposal for buses to permanently start and finish at Trafalgar Square instead?

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 346 (10.13 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 180 (5.27 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 907 respondents (26.56 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 158 respondents (4.63 per cent) who opposed, while 148 respondents (4.33 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 832 respondents (24.36 per cent) who didn’t know and 844 (24.71 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 13 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 5 shows the top comments relating to route 15. A full list of all comments concerning route 15 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>24%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 14 sets out the results, showing that 91 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 147 supported it, while 87 opposed it and 95 strongly opposed it.
Figure 14

What do you think about our proposal for buses to permanently start and finish at Trafalgar Square instead? - Route 15 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn't say how often</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Top Five Emerging Themes - Route 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend to Marble Arch/Paddington</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstate terminus at Regent Street</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend to Oxford St (as for N15)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route N15

A total of 1,549 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route N15. The majority of respondents, 180 (11.62 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 49 respondents (3.16 per cent) stating that they used the route one to two times a month. There were 17 respondents (1.10 per cent) who stated they used the route on a daily basis. There were 19 respondents (1.23 per cent) who used the route two to three times a week and 19 respondents (1.23 per cent) who used the route once a week. There were 1265 (81.67 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 15 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

**Figure 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a temporary measure route N15 currently starts and finishes at Trafalgar Square. What do you think about our proposal for extend the route so that buses start and finish at Oxford Circus instead?

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 383 (11.22 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 266 (7.79 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 897 respondents (26.27 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 92 respondents (2.69 per cent) who opposed, while 68 respondents (1.99 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 868 respondents (25.42 per cent) who didn’t know and 841 (24.63 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 16 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 6 shows the top comments relating to route N15. A full list of all comments concerning route N15 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 17 sets out the results, showing that 47 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 67 supported it, while 29 opposed it and 41 strongly opposed it.
**Figure 17**

What do you think about our proposal to extend the route so that buses start and finish at Oxford Circus instead?" - Route N15
(Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did’nt say how often</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top three Emerging Themes - Route N15</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support extension to Oxford Circus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific route suggestion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend route further</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 8

A total of 1,661 individuals responded to this question. Most respondents, 86 (5.18 per cent), stated that they used route 8 two to three times a week; this was followed by 57 respondents (3.43 per cent) who stated that they used it on a daily basis. There were 56 (3.37 per cent) respondents who used the routes once a week. There were 146 respondents (8.79 per cent) who used it one to two times a month, while 317 respondents (19.08 per cent) said that they rarely used the bus. There were 999 respondents (60.14 per cent) who indicated that they never used route 8.

Figure 18 below shows the full breakdown of responses.

Figure 18

![Figure 18](image-url)
At the moment route 8 starts and finishes at Tottenham Court Road. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Tottenham Court Road permanently, using different arrangements to now?

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 341 (9.99 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 168 (4.92 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 923 respondents (27.03 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 121 respondents (3.54 per cent) who opposed, while 132 respondents (3.87 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 863 respondents (25.27 per cent) who didn’t know and 867 (25.39 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 19 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 7 shows the top comments relating to route 8. A full list of all comments concerning route 8 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

**Figure 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support or oppose</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 20 sets out the results, showing that 88 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 178 supported it, while 76 opposed it and 86 strongly opposed it.
**Figure 20**

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Tottenham Court Road permanently and using different arrangements to now? - Route 8 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn't say how often</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of comments</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Five Emerging Themes - Route 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support proposed new route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/delays on the proposed route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 172

A total of 1,583 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 172. The majority of respondents, 190 (12 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 65 respondents (4.11 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 43 respondents (2.72 per cent) who stated they use the route on a daily basis, while 50 (3.16 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 28 respondents (1.77 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 1,207 (76.25 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 21 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 172</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment route 172 starts and finishes at St Pauls. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Clerkenwell instead of St Pauls? This would create more connections to Farringdon Elizabeth line station.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 399 (11.68 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 222 (6.50 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 881 respondents (25.80 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 72 respondents (2.11 per cent) who opposed, while 81 respondents (2.37 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 887 respondents (25.97 per cent) who didn't know and 873 (25.56 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 22 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 8 shows the top comments relating to route 172. A full list of all comments concerning route 172 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 22

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 23 sets out the results, showing that 99 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 102 supported it, while 15 opposed it and 44 strongly opposed it.
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Five Emerging Themes - Route 172</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support proposed new route and connections</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally opposed/ leave route as it is</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative bus routes too overcrowded to accommodate proposed interchange options</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses terminating early (poor reliability of current service)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 242

A total of 1,654 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 242. The majority of respondents, 270 (16.32 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 124 respondents (7.50 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 73 respondents (4.41 per cent) who stated they use the route on a daily basis, while 83 (5.02 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 53 respondents (3.20 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 1,051 (63.54 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 24 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 242</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 242
At the moment route 242 starts and finishes at Tottenham Court Road. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at St Paul’s instead of Tottenham Court Road? This would create the space needed for route 8 to terminate at Tottenham Court Road, but mean route 172 needs to be changed.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 233 (6.74 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 133 (3.91 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 889 respondents (25.74 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 197 respondents (5.73 per cent) who opposed, while 269 respondents (7.87 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 831 respondents (24.07 per cent) who didn’t know and 863 (25.95 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 25 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 9 shows the top comments relating to route 242. A full list of all comments concerning route 242 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

**Figure 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 26 sets out the results, showing that 49 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 87 supported it, while 100 opposed it and 202 strongly opposed it.
Figure 26

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at St Paul’s instead of Tottenham Court Road? - Route 242 (Users & non users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t say how often</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Five emerging themes - Route 242</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will lead to overcrowding on alternative routes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded at present</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to 242 will lead to overcrowding on route 8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Routes 22 and N22

A total of 1,972 individuals responded to this question. Most respondents, 201 (10.19 per cent), stated that they used routes 22/N22 two to three times a week; this was followed by 171 respondents (8.67 per cent) who stated that they used it one to two times a month. There were 122 (6.19 per cent) respondents who stated they use the routes on a daily/nightly basis, while 114 respondents (5.78 per cent) used it once a week. There were 294 (14.91 per cent) respondents who rarely used the routes while there were 1,070 respondents (54.26 per cent) who indicated they never used routes 22 or N22.

Figure 27 below shows the breakdown of responses to this question.

Figure 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 22/N22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment route 22 starts and finishes at Piccadilly Circus. What do you think about our proposal for buses to be rerouted to Oxford Circus serving Berkley Square and Conduit Street? This would replace route C2 which would no longer run to Victoria, and instead start and finish at Regent Street.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 319 (9 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 222 (7 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 783 respondents (23 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 452 respondents (13 per cent) who opposed, while 439 respondents (13 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 669 respondents (20 per cent) who didn't know and 531 (16 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 28 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 9 and table 10 shows the top comments relating to routes 22 and C2 respectively. A full list of all comments concerning routes 22 and C2 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support nor oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>23%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 29 sets out the results, showing that 158 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 189 supported it, while 311 opposed it and 369 strongly opposed it.
What do you think about our proposal for buses to be rerouted to Oxford Circus via Berkley Square and Conduit Street? This would replace route C2 which would no longer run to Victoria, and instead start and finish at Regent Street? - Route 22/C2 (User & n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you say how often?</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Top Five emerging themes - Route 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rerouteing 22 to Oxford Circus does not compliment the aim of reducing congestion in this area</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / Leave route as is</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/N22: Support: Support proposed new route / connections</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support new route and connections</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Top Five emerging themes - Route C2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of link to Victoria Station (especially at night)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / Leave route as is</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No common stop to interchange with alternative route servicing Victoria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support new route</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, we received suggestions about changing route 22 that were unrelated to our proposals.

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions Route 22</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend to Barnes</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often do you use these bus routes?**

**Route C2**

A total of 1,695 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route C2. The majority of respondents, 296 (17.46 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 147 respondents (8.67 per cent) stating that they used the route one to two times a month. There were 116 respondents (6.84 per cent) who stated they used the route on a daily basis. There were 99 respondents (5.84 per cent) who used the route two to three times a week. There were 966 (56.99 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 30 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

**Figure 30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 23

A total of 1,740 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 23. The majority of respondents, 285 (16.38 per cent), stated that they rarely used the route. This was followed by 161 respondents (9.25 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 150 respondents (8.62 per cent) who stated they use the route daily / nightly, while 133 (7.64 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 68 respondents (3.91 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 943 (54.20 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 31 below shows the full breakdown of respondents.

Figure 31

| How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 23 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily/Nightly                  | 150       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
| 2-3 times a week               | 161       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
| Once a week                    | 150       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
| 1-2 times a month              | 150       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
| Rarely                         | 150       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
| Never                          | 150       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
| Total                          | 150       | 133       | 68        | 161       | 285       | 943       | 1740      |
At the moment route 23 runs east west across central London. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be extended north west towards Wembley, serving Paddington and Harrow Road instead? Once the Elizabeth line starts peoples journeys will change considerably. Our proposals for route 23 and associated change to route 452 would create new journey opportunities for many to and from the Elizabeth line at Paddington.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 308 (9 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 179 (5 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 792 respondents (23 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 160 respondents (5 per cent) who opposed, while 384 respondents (11 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 739 respondents (22 per cent) who didn’t know and 853 (25 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 32 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 12 shows the top comments relating to route 23. A full list of all comments concerning route 23 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be extended north west towards Wembley, serving Paddington and Harrow Road instead? - Route 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 33 sets out the results, showing that 78 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 122 supported it, while 96 opposed it and 311 strongly opposed it.
Figure 33

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be extended north west towards Wembley, serving Paddington and Harrow Road instead? - Route 23 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn't say how often</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Top emerging themes - Routes 23 & 452

**Route 23**

- Direct link broken: 128
- General opposition / leave route as is: 88
- Changes will lead to reduced capacity / overcrowding of services east of Paddington: 41
- Overcrowded at present: 23
- Loss of important tourist route: 15

**Route 452**

- General opposition / leave route as is: 22
- Direct link broken: 21
- Overcrowded at present: 8
- Changes will lead to overcrowding of 52: 5
- Changes will lead to increased congestion / pollution: 4
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 46

A total of 1,622 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 46. The majority of respondents, 242 (14.92 per cent), stated that they rarely used the route. This was followed by 110 respondents (6.78 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 43 respondents (2.65 per cent) who stated they use the route daily / nightly, while 110 (6.78 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 37 respondents (2.28 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 1,133 (69.85 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 34 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 34

How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment route 46 starts and finishes at Lancaster Gate. What do you think about our proposals for buses to start and finish at Paddington, Eastbourne Terrace? The connection between Paddington and Lancaster Gate would be maintained by the proposed changes to routes 23 and 332.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 335 (10 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 175 (5 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 922 respondents (27 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 130 respondents (4 per cent) who opposed, while 154 respondents (5 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 817 respondents (24 per cent) who didn't know and 882 (26 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 35 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 13 shows the top comments relating to route 46. A full list of all comments concerning route 46 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 35

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 36 sets out the results, showing that 77 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 116 supported it, while 55 opposed it and 70 strongly opposed it.
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top emerging themes - Route 46</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded/unreliable at present</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Important connection across North London (opposed to into/out of Central London)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 332

A total of 1,554 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 332. The majority of respondents, 161 (10.42 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 46 respondents (2.98 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 39 respondents (2.52 per cent) who stated they use the route on a daily basis, while 18 (1.17 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 19 respondents (1.23 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 1,262 (81.68 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 37 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

**Figure 37**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment route 332 runs in a large loop at Paddington with buses finishing at Bishop’s Bridge Road and picking up passengers from Praed Street. What do you think about our proposals for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be rerouted to serve Warwick Avenue and Kilburn Park Road? This would mean that the large loop is no longer required with buses no longer running on Praed Street and Edgware Road.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 270 (8 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 181 (5 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 973 respondents (28 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 90 respondents (3 per cent) who opposed, while 105 respondents (5 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 903 respondents (26 per cent) who didn’t know and 893 (26 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 38 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 14 shows the top comments relating to route 332. A full list of all comments concerning route 332 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 38

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 39 sets out the results, showing that 43 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 65 supported it, while 27 opposed it and 29 strongly opposed it.
Figure 39

![Bar chart showing responses to proposals for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be rerouted to serve Warwick Avenue and Kilburn Park Road.]

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top emerging themes (Negative) - Route 332</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose rerouting via Shirland Road &amp; Kilburn Park roads as will increase pollution on residential roads</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded at present</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 25

A total of 1,683 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 25. The majority of respondents, 282 (16.76 per cent), stated that they rarely used the route. This was followed by 171 respondents (10.16 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 116 respondents (6.89 per cent) who stated they use the route daily / nightly, while 103 (6.12 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 64 respondents (3.80 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 947 (56.27 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 40 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily/Nightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do you think about our proposal to change the frequencies on route 25, so that buses run every six minutes Monday to Saturday and every seven to eight minutes on Sunday? Where the route is busiest between Bow and Ilford we also propose to extend route 425 (from Stratford) to ensure there’s enough space for people to travel.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 475 (14 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 324 (9 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 805 respondents (23 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 87 respondents (3 per cent) who opposed, while 98 respondents (3 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 769 respondents (23 per cent) who didn’t know and 857 (25 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 41 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 15 shows the top comments relating to route 25. A full list of all comments concerning route 25 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 41

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 42 sets out the results, showing that 220 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 243 supported it, while 54 opposed it and 69 strongly opposed it.
Figure 42

What do you think about our proposal to change the frequencies on route 25, so that buses run every six minutes Monday to Saturday and every seven to eight minutes on Sunday? - Route 25 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t say how often</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top emerging themes - Routes 25 and 425</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern: Route 25 overcrowded at present</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion: Increase frequency</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition / leave route as is</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern: Extension of 425 will not be adequate enough</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern: Changes will lead to reduced frequency in certain locations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How often do you use these bus routes?**

**Route 425**

A total of 1,570 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 425. The majority of respondents, 190 (12.10 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 52 respondents (3.31 per cent) stating that they used it on a daily basis. There were 37 respondents (2.36 per cent) who stated they use the two to three times a week, while 25 (1.59 per cent) who stated they use the route once a week. There were 1,216 (77.45 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 43 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

**Figure 43**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 425</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

**Route 73**

A total of 1,857 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 73. The majority of respondents, 266 (14.32 per cent) stated that they use the route on a daily basis. This was followed by 246 respondents (13.25 per cent) stating that they used it one to two times a month. There were 206 respondents (11.09 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week, while 110 (5.92 per cent) who stated they use the route once a week. There were 348 respondents (18.74 per cent) that stated they rarely use the route. There were 681 (36.67 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 44 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

**Figure 44**

![Bar chart showing the frequency of bus route usage for Route 73.]

- **Daily/Nightly:** 266 responses (14%)
- **2-3 times a week:** 206 responses (11%)
- **Once a week:** 110 responses (6%)
- **1-2 times a month:** 246 responses (13%)
- **Rarely:** 348 responses (19%)
- **Never:** 681 responses (37%)

Total responses: 1857
At the moment route 73 starts and finishes at Victoria. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Oxford Circus instead of Victoria? Connections between Oxford Circus and Victoria would be maintained through route 38 and rerouted 390.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 309 (9 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 195 (6 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 662 respondents (19 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 309 respondents (9 per cent) who opposed, while 563 respondents (16 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 554 respondents (16 per cent) who didn't know and 823 (24 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 45 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 16 shows the top comments relating to route 73. A full list of all comments concerning route 73 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 46 sets out the results, showing that 127 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 195 supported it, while 195 opposed it and 418 strongly opposed it.
### Figure 46

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Oxford Circus instead of Victoria? - route 73 (Users & non-users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support or oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn't say how often</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16

**Top emerging themes - Route 73**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced frequency</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally opposition / Leave route as is</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded at present</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Newington has no Tube service so this route is a vital link to Victoria</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced frequency between Victoria and Oxford St</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service reduction in Stoke Newington which is already poorly connected</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you use these bus routes?

Route 390

A total of 1,732 individuals responded to the question of how often they used route 390. The majority of respondents, 277 (15.99 per cent) stated that they rarely use the route. This was followed by 170 respondents (9.82 per cent) who stated they use the route on a daily basis. There were 128 respondents (7.39 per cent) who stated they use the route two to three times a week. There were 85 respondents (4.91 per cent) that stated they use the route once a week. There were 931 (53.75 per cent) who stated they never use the route.

Figure 47 below shows the breakdown of respondents.

Figure 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use these bus routes? - Route 390</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment route 390 starts and finishes at Notting Hill Gate. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Victoria instead of Notting Hill Gate but running more often than they do currently? Demand to and from Notting Hill Gate on this route has fallen, rerouting it would maintain the connections between Victoria and Oxford Circus better matching demand.

In this question, we gave respondents a list of pre-set answers to pick from. We received a total of 3415 responses, of these, 413 (12 per cent) indicated that they supported the proposal while 263 (8 per cent) said that they strongly supported it. A total of 751 respondents (22 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the proposals. There were 171 respondents (5 per cent) who opposed, while 305 respondents (9 per cent) who strongly opposed. There were 659 respondents (19 per cent) who didn’t know and 853 (25 per cent) who did not answer the question.

Figure 48 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Table 17 shows the top comments relating to route 390. A full list of all comments concerning route 390 can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received.

Figure 48

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Victoria instead of Notting Hill Gate but running more often than they do currently? - Route 390

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the information from those who said how frequently they use the route we have split responses into those who use the route and those who do not. Those who did not specify how often they use the route have been removed from the split between users and non-users. Figure 49 sets out the results, showing that 152 users of the route strongly supported the proposal and 183 supported it, while 85 opposed it and 222 strongly opposed it.
Figure 49

![Graph](image)

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Emerging themes - Route 390</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct link broken</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition/ leave route as it is</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will cause overcrowding of 94</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded at present</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route is unreliable</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 50 collates the results of all the individual route questions to provide an overview of those respondents, for ease of comparison.
There was a total of 3415 responses to each routes question.
What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)?

We asked respondents to tell us their thoughts regarding the quality of the consultation process itself. In addition to a selection of pre-set answers, respondents had the opportunity to give us comments in their own words. The full list of comments can be found in Appendix D: All public comments received. Table 18 shows the top 10 comments received, and Figure 52 gives a breakdown of pre-set answers received.

There were 3,415 responses to this question. A framework was produced in order to summarise the issues raised. Of these, 775 (23 per cent) stated that the quality of the consultation was ‘very good’, 1,052 (31 per cent) selected ‘good’ while 814 (24 per cent) stated that it was ‘acceptable’. A total of 193 (6 per cent) indicated that the quality was ‘poor’, 96 (3 per cent) selected ‘very poor’ while 485 (14 per cent) of respondents did not answer this question.

Figure 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top emerging themes - Consultation Quality</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much information to go through to comment on specific routes</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive table of contents for survey/skip logic should have been applied</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation not widely circulated/ publicised</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps are ambitious / difficult to interpret</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments about the consultation</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions are too leading/decision made</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses not taken into consideration / acted on</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not very clear</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate being consulted</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey questions do not address frequency</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides copy of the feedback we received from stakeholders. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes.

Local authorities & statutory bodies

London Borough of Brent

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the consultation on proposals to change the bus network in Central London.

Efficient and reliable bus services are a fundamental means of travel for many Brent residents; enabling them to access employment, education and other services across London. In doing so, they perform a vital role in enabling social inclusion and cohesion. Brent Council is therefore committed to increasing mobility and accessibility by bus and welcomes efforts by Transport for London (TfL) to deliver service improvements that will provide the connections in Outer London that Brent residents require.

Of the 22 proposed route changes included in this consultation, four will directly affect Brent residents: Routes 6, 332, 23 and 452. Comments on the proposals for each of these routes are given here.

ROUTE 6

Brent Council supports the proposal to amend Route 6 to divert along Park Lane and Piccadilly rather than Oxford Street and Regent Street. By reducing the volume of buses travelling along Oxford Street, we recognise the potential improvements in air quality and the pedestrian environment on Oxford Street that will result from this. However, to support less mobile passengers access services along Oxford Street and Regent Street on leaving the Route 6 at Marble Arch, we expect to see clear guidance as to how these passengers can continue their journey by bus along these streets should they wish to.

ROUTE 332

Brent Council also supports the proposal to amend Route 332 to be re-routed after Kilburn Station and extended from Paddington Station to terminate at Lancaster Gate. We see no specific reason why this would be of detriment to Brent residents and recognise instead the additional connection for passengers to Hyde Park and Central Line Underground services at Lancaster Gate Station.

ROUTE 23
The proposed extension of the current Route 23 from Ladbroke Grove to Wembley via Willesden Junction and Harlesden will bring benefits to Brent residents in providing an additional connection to Central London. Brent is therefore supportive of this. We note that whilst the exact routing is still to be developed, buses are likely to serve Harrow Road and Harlesden before terminating in Wembley.

Brent Council has five strategic regeneration areas. Of these, the Church End Growth Area would benefit from additional connectivity by bus in order to support the additional homes and infrastructure that are planned for the area. Whilst terminating in Wembley is preferable, we would be interested to see a proposal for Route 23 that took in the Church End area. This could alternatively be achieved through an extension of Route 6 that currently terminates at Willesden Bus Garage or through provision of additional services in the area.

ROUTE 452
With the existing Route 52 serving Ladbroke Grove and Knightsbridge from Kensal Rise, the impact on passengers of the proposed withdrawal of Route 452 between Kensal Rise and Ladbroke Grove in favour of a service to Kensal Road via Harrow Road is not thought to be significant. Brent also recognises the positive impact of reducing the number of bus routes that currently terminate at Kensal Rise, which is an area of high congestion. However, delivering improved reliability of alternative services (namely the 52) is even more important if passengers no longer have the option of the 452.

OTHER COMMENTS
Given the number of potential Brent residents that will be affected by these changes and their dependence on specific bus routes, we would like to see a clear plan detailing TfL’s intentions to raise awareness of the changes once they have been implemented and assist passengers who may require additional support to re-plan their journeys.

TfL has made clear that the opening of the Elizabeth Line from 2018 will mean that many people will use this east-west link to cross London rather than taking a bus. Though the Elizabeth Line will provide essential additional capacity to London’s transport system, cross-London bus routes will remain important for those Brent residents who choose not to pay an additional cost to transfer from bus to train.

This is also applicable to some disabled residents for whom travelling by tube or train is more challenging than travel by bus, even with step-free access. For those who do, straightforward interchanges from buses at Marble Arch, Paddington and Lancaster Gate is imperative.

We believe we have made our thoughts clear through the comments provided above. However, if further clarification is needed on any of the items raised, please contact Rachel Best, Transportation Planning Manager, on 020 8937 5289 or Rachel.Best@brent.gov.uk. Thank you for consideration of these comments.
London Borough of Camden:

Thank you for the invitation to comment on TfL’s proposals for bus route changes in central London.

Camden accepts that it is appropriate to review bus services in central London given improvements in other public transport services and changing patterns of passenger demand. Many of these services have remained substantially unaltered for many years and the presence of significant numbers of underused buses travelling through the centre of the city has a negative impact on the local environment. We also welcome the introduction of the Hopper ticket, which will make journeys more affordable for Londoners on lower incomes who disproportionately rely on bus services. For these reasons, we do not wish to formally object to TfL’s proposals.

In addition, we wish to add some further comments that we would ask TfL to consider. Route 390 is a key link in Camden, serving the new Kings Cross Central development site, which is a major growth area, and beyond into areas of the borough further north. Camden has worked with Argent to secure financial contributions to improve this route to respond to increasing demand, and TfL must maintain this important service between Camden and the West End as part of the longer-term investigation into the transformation of Oxford Street.

It is not clear whether the impacts of Camden’s West End Project (WEP) have been taken into account for the proposed new alignment for Route 3 via Great Russell Street and to Russell Square. For the southbound journey, the banned right turn from Bloomsbury Street into New Oxford Street as part of the WEP will result in a longer journey via St Giles loop, which could affect journey times in the future. Terminating the route at St Giles may therefore be of benefit for buses.

Another reason for this suggestion is that Camden has longer-term aspirations for the Holborn area including our ambition to close Great Russell Street to traffic which would require identifying new alignments not only for route 3, but also route 10. While these proposals are very much in the early stages, we believe they would significantly enhance this important area of London for the benefit of local residents, major cultural institutions, the business community, and the tourist economy. We therefore want to highlight our current thinking and ask TfL to integrate this aspiration for Great Russell Street into its forward planning for transport services in the area, especially bus routing.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.
City of Westminster:

The City Council welcomes the opportunity to respond to the above consultation and it’s acknowledged that officers and Cabinet Members have been working constructively with TfL, the GLA and our West End Partnership stakeholders on the proposals for some time.

Therefore at this stage the proposed network reductions and re-routing of services are noted and the City Council will be interested to see the outcome of this consultation exercise in due course.

And with regard to the forthcoming relocation or removal of Bus Stands and the prospect of additional network reduction, this will require further and significant discussion, so we look forward to working on such detail in the near future.

Councillor for West End ward: I object to the plans to take the 23 bus service on an alternate route. Many West End residents use it and it would be very unfortunate to see this service go out of our area.

London Borough of Hackney

THE ROLE OF THE BUS IN HACKNEY

Public Transport, and in particular the bus, plays a critical role in facilitating movement for residents in Hackney and to support wider growth and regeneration in the borough. The Transport for London Travel Demand Survey for 2013-2016 shows that 33.4% of Hackney’s population use public transport for the majority of their trips, compared to 19.4% by car/motorcycle. 20.6% of these travel by bus, the third highest total in London. Some parts of Hackney, however, predominantly in the east, north and north west and areas of social housing have poor access to public transport services. There are particular problems in the King’s Park area of the borough which is only served by one bus route, the 242. When problems arise with this route many thousands of people are left without access to the public transport network in their immediate area.

The ability to travel safely by bus allows children and young people to get to school or college, the elderly to travel around London and has an important role to play in facilitating independent living by disabled people, especially in view of the fact that almost the entire bus network is now accessible. Although improvements have been made to a number of the borough’s railway stations, the lack of step free access remains a barrier to many travellers, so for many the bus is the only alternative.

HACKNEY RESIDENTS’ COMMUTING PATTERN

In relation to other inner London Boroughs Hackney has a low job density. This means that the borough’s residents are more likely to travel outside the borough to
access employment than their counterparts in neighbouring boroughs. Job density is even lower in the north of the borough in places such as Clapton, Dalston and Stoke Newington reflecting an obvious need to travel in these areas to access employment.

Analysis of the 2011 Census travel to work data showed that 75,550 (80%) of Hackney’s working residents travel out of the borough to work. The majority of Hackney’s commuters travelled into Central London and neighbouring boroughs to access their place of work. Hackney is also, like many London boroughs experiencing a growth in population with a number of new developments being approved as being ‘car free’. This will put further pressure on the local public transport network.

RATIONALE FOR THE CHANGES

Although we understand the rationale for the changes it is at this stage not known if the recent dip in bus patronage (following a steady increase for a number of years) is likely to continue given London’s increase in population and a huge growth in tourism. Much of this has been put down to disruption caused by roadworks associated with the construction of cycle super highway schemes and other major projects. Some of this disruption continues and this remains a cause for concern as this is having a continuing effect on bus journey speeds and making the bus as a mode of travel less attractive. This must also have been a contributory factor to the overall drop in demand for bus services across a number of London boroughs including Hackney (down 6.6%). However, it is noted that this figure is an overall average and may not be representative of all corridors. Some corridors, for example along Southgate Road to Old Street roundabout and Liverpool Street are currently resulting in overcrowding and, although outside the scope of these changes, we would like TfL to address this issue. It is also noteworthy that the rationale for many of the changes is the lack of bus stand availability and we would suggest that discussions take place particularly with Camden and the City of Westminster to alleviate these problems. Perhaps a more wider study of the network with the linking together of routes could also assist.

It is also worth looking at the Travel to Work data for the 2011 Census which provides relevant data on Hackney bus trips. It notes, for instance that:

Hackney has a large proportion of residents from black ethnic groups and these are substantially more likely to travel by bus to work

• Hackney residents working in hotel and catering services are more likely to take the bus to work. Many of these workplaces are in the West End

• Use of public transport is more common in the NW of the borough and in the centre (Hackney Downs and Hackney Central)

• There are high concentrations of Hackney residents working in Westminster, City of London and Shoreditch
The information for bus trips shows ‘a high proportion of residents travelling by bus to work in Westminster and South Camden’

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

We note that an equality impact assessment has not been published. Given the MoL’s focus on social inclusion and the fact that the bus network is particularly used by low paid workers, the disabled and the elderly we are disappointed not to see any reference to the impact on these groups of the need to change routes. We note that the Hopper fare will in many instances take away the cost penalty of interchange but would suggest that this may have little impact on passengers making long bus journeys of over an hour with more than one change.

OVERALL COMMENTS ON THE CHANGES

Our main comments relate to changes to Routes 242, 425, 73 and N73. The changes to Route 8 are of a minor nature and we make no comment.

Route 242

This route which runs from Clapton Park to Tottenham Court Road is the only route to serve the King’s Park area of the Borough. It provides a 24 hour service. It is the subject of regular complaints from local residents and councillors. None of the stops on the Clapton Park Estate are fitted with Countdown displays which does not help passengers waiting for the service, many of whom will be making trips in the early morning or late evening.

It is stated that over the past 5 years usage on Route 242 has decreased by 17% on weekdays, 17% on Saturdays and 14 % on Sundays. Usage of the Night Service has decreased by 20% on weeknights and 60% at weekends. We would request further analysis of these figures in order to understand how many trips are made to/and from Hackney, the origins and destinations of these trips and what percentage of the reduction is attributable to trips to/from Hackney.

As has been stated, the 2011 Census data showed a high proportion of Hackney residents travelling by bus to work in Westminster and South Camden, areas served by Route 242 which includes Holborn which has a number of hotels and offices.

We note the suggested curtailment of the service at St Paul’s as a stand is made available there but we do not consider this to be a proper traffic objective and one offering poor interchange. Consideration needs to be given to the convenience of an interchange with the provision of bus shelters, Countdown etc and also pavement capacity as this is an issue in a number of areas at times. There could also be capacity issues on buses especially if the next bus is full. As the 242 is a 24 hour service the route would be terminated there at all times. We consider that this would particularly inconvenience passengers who work in the catering, security and cleaning trades, many of whom are low paid and use the bus in the early mornings to get to and from work. Whilst we understand the issues affecting bus stands around
Tottenham Court Road we would suggest that the existing High Holborn bus stand could be used as an alternative. If this requires any modification then this should be discussed with the relevant borough.

Route 425

This route which runs from Stratford City to Clapton (Nightingale Road) links a number of communities within Hackney. Between Bow Road and Stratford it provides both resilience and additional capacity for Route 25. The route currently serves Well Street market in one direction and although outside the scope of this consultation the Council has requested a re-routeing on Saturdays to facilitate the growth of the market there. We would be happy to discuss a re-structuring of the service. The consultation proposals suggest an extension to Ilford. We fail to understand the rationale for this given that the Route 25 corridor has seen a large drop in passengers. We are further concerned at the potential unreliability which could occur with an extension to an area where the demand from Hackney residents is currently unknown and not stated. We therefore object to this but may be minded to reconsider if we receive further justification.

Route 73/N73

This route is well established within the borough and provides a frequent service to and from the West End and main line railway termini useful for many residents. It is also used by a number of tourists. We note the 11% patronage drop and the proposed frequency reductions on Monday to Saturdays and on Sunday as well as the proposal to curtail the service at Oxford Circus. Again we would ask for a breakdown of the trip reductions so that we can judge how many of these are from Hackney residents. We are also in discussion with yourselves about the route as part of the proposals to remove the Stoke Newington gyratory and as a Council have long expressed a wish to see a service restored to Stamford Hill. At a meeting of Hackney Council on 25th January a motion calling for the restoration of the service to Stamford Hill was passed with a request that TfL consider reintroducing this at the earliest possible opportunity possibly to coincide with the above changes.

Our main concerns on the changes relate to the withdrawal of the Oxford Street to Victoria section particularly in the late evening and early morning as well as trips operated as Route N73. Given that buses in Hackney are used for travel to and from work by one in five of the local population and that many low paid workers travel to work to and from the West End we feel that the proposals would cause hardship to local residents and therefore object. We would suggest, as an alternative that Route N73 be retained running to Victoria with additional early morning and late evening journeys (perhaps running between Stamford Hill and Victoria) to compensate for the withdrawal of the 73. This would still realise some savings.
We hope you will give our comments due consideration and look forward to receiving your response to the points made. Should you wish to discuss these comments further with officers and elected Members then we would be happy to engage.

London Borough of Hackney – Councillor for Hackney Central Ward

I am writing to object to some of the changes proposed for the central area bus services.

I understand and support the reductions in capacity associated with changes in demand because Crossrail is being built, but not the shortening of bus services to facilitate the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street.

Buses are really important to Hackney and London residents. They are the only mode that operates 24/7, across the whole of London are affordable and are fully accessible. It is therefore disappointing that bus services will be variously shortened and passengers have to either walk, interchange or choose an entirely different route. These changes will, in part, mean less bus journeys and more Uber journeys. Buses support pedestrian journeys rather than hamper them. This is an unforced error.

I understand the desire to pedestrianise Oxford Street. Whilst I have no in-principle objection to reducing motor vehicle use in central London, indeed I support that, I think the removing the most space efficient mode, the bus, from central London is a mistake. Instead of targeting bus services it is private vehicles, taxis, PHVs and white van man that should be removed / restricted / priced out of the central area.

In my view there are many streets in central London that should be pedestrianised, including all of those trafficked side roads off of Oxford St. Less efficient modes for example Uber will fill the gaps and take passengers from buses.

As examples I use the 73 and 242. I can now catch the 73 home from Selfriges and the 242 into town. In future I will not be able to make these journeys without changing. The terminus of the 242 at St Paul’s is bizarre. No one from Hackney will see this as a destination!

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Route 22 is the only affected one that serves the borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.

Overall the proposal gives a small improvement, with more central London destinations served directly.

London Borough of Islington
TfL’s consultation on central London bus service proposals for routes 46, 73, N73, 172 & 390

Thank you for engaging with Islington Council about the proposed changes to central London bus services. The Council welcomes changes that enhance the lives of and opportunities for our residents by ensuring future bus provision matches future demand and improves bus journey reliability. Bus services provide an essential and affordable means of transport, particularly for those who need to avoid the additional cost of using the Underground or rail network for part of their journey, and those who need to travel when these services are not available.

We have some concerns regarding the proposed bus route changes; in particular for routes 46, 73, N73, 172 and 390 that run through Islington.

The proposed route changes for routes 73 and 390 will result in passengers having to change buses to complete their journey, not only during the day, but in particular at night on Monday to Thursday, when the frequencies of both services are reduced to every 30 minutes. The Council understands that the Hopper Fare will help our residents to change buses without incurring additional travel costs. However, we are concerned that this new requirement on bus passengers to change buses disproportionately affects people with mobility impairment. I urge TfL to carry out an equalities impact assessment of these proposals to better understand the impacts of the proposed changes.

The Council would furthermore welcome assurances from TfL that the impacts of these proposed changes will be carefully monitored, particularly to establish their impact on vulnerable users in terms of accessibility, journey time and cost. We would like TfL to advise passengers how to avoid additional costs when completing longer journeys which would require interchange as a result of the proposed changes. For example, passengers travelling from Stoke Newington to Oxford Circus could be advised to interchange to the Route 38 at Angel. We would also like TfL to explore the use of on-board announcements to provide bus interchange information about connecting services, as well as the arrival times for connecting buses (in particular at night).

The proposed change to route 172 improves bus connectivity in Clerkenwell and to Farringdon Station, which would benefit the area. However, I would like to better understand how the already congested local area will accommodate the needs of a terminating bus service. I urge TfL to work closely with the Council to ensure any such changes do not conflict with the Council’s aspirations to redesign Clerkenwell Green, the proposed extension of the North-South Cycle Superhighway and the Cycle Quietway being developed for Clerkenwell Road leading to Old Street.

The Council welcomes the proposed increased service frequencies on route 390. There is scope to deliver further improvements to this route by extending the route to Whittington Hospital, which I am pleased to see TfL and the Council are already
investigating. This would provide a more accessible link to this important north London health service.

The King’s Cross Gyratory proposals are likely to have an impact on some of the routes considered in this consultation. As the King’s Cross proposals progress, I would like the Council to continue to work with TfL to ensure that both strands of work are developed and progressed to the benefit of bus passengers.

Lastly, shift workers on lower incomes, who carry out jobs outside normal office hours, are often dependant on Night Buses to access work. I was pleased that proposed reductions in frequency of the N91 were dropped, and that there are no proposed reductions in frequency for the N73. However, as pointed out above, I would like to see better on-bus interchange information to help people with their night journeys and interchanges at night.

I look forward to working with you to ensure that the bus network continues to provide a good service to our residents, paying particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups who disproportionally depend on the local bus network.

London Borough of Lambeth – Councillor for Ferndale Ward

I am concerned about the proposed changes because currently Kennington residents, including myself, have the choice of both the 159 and 3 to travel to Oxford Circus. If these changes go ahead we would only be able to take the 159 to John Lewis. I have a zones 2 to 5 travel card and much prefer to use the buses rather than the tubes in zone 1 as I have to pay extra to use the tube. The 59 serves Russell Square very well.

London Borough of Redbridge:

L.B. Redbridge is disappointed that the number of services on route 25 serving central London is being reduced. It is accepted that the extension of the 425 will broadly compensate for the majority of the reduction in the 25 service and that there should be little material impact on the Borough's residents.

It is requested that the situation be further reviewed in the future and that consideration be given to reintroducing further journeys into central London. The 25 provides an affordable alternative to the Elizabeth line and underground services.

London Borough of Richmond

Thank you for giving the opportunity to comment on the above proposals. I am responding on behalf of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
The Council has no specific comments on the details of the proposals, as apart from the N22 service we are not served by the routes identified. However, we would strongly urge TfL to re-invest any savings on bus services in Central London in relieving overcrowding and poor connectivity, in Richmond and adjoining boroughs, arising from new developments and the rapid growth of places at key borough schools. In particular we would wish to highlight:-

1. The need to strengthen/extend direct routes between Twickenham, Teddington and Hampton, and provide services to a relatively isolated part of Ham.

2. The lack of any direct bus service to serve Whitton town centre from the West

3. The need for a review of bus services in Barnes, particularly the town centre, to reflect the changing priorities of the travelling public and to serve Putney Bridge and Fulham

4. Long standing issues which we have raised in discussions with TfL Buses regarding provision of peak services along or near the A316 corridor serving colleges, St Marys University and new and existing schools.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further details.

Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea

Thank you for consulting us on the proposed changes to 23 bus routes serving central London. We welcome TfL’s willingness to undertake a strategic review of bus demand, though we feel unable to reach an informed view on the proposed service changes, based on the information provided in the consultation, and we have asked your colleagues to provide more information. In this consultation there are five routes (22/N22, 23, 137, 390 and 452) which run through the Royal Borough, and we have concentrated our comments on these routes.

General comment on all routes

We continue to look for ways to improve the air quality in the borough, as we have some of the most polluted roads in London. We are delighted that the Mayor has recently announced that part of Kensington High Street will be a Low Emission Bus Zone (LBEZ), and we look forward to seeing the new and much cleaner Euro VI buses running along this important corridor. Of the five routes that are the subject of this consultation, only the route 452 will be included in the new LEBZ. There will still be 13 of the 34 bus routes in the borough which will not be operated with Euro VI vehicles. We would like TfL to ensure that all buses running through our most polluted areas, such as Notting Hill Gate and Knightsbridge, are Euro VI within the
next two years. We would also be pleased to see the introduction of fully electric double decker buses in the Royal Borough.

Although the consultation material includes details of how many existing trips will be broken for each of the proposals for the route as a whole, we would like to understand more about what these figures mean for passengers travelling within the borough and would welcome further discussion on this.

Route 22/N22 – Putney Common to Piccadilly Circus

It is proposed that the route 22 will be extended to terminate at Oxford Circus instead of Piccadilly Circus. There are no changes to either the frequency or routeing within the borough. We therefore do not have any comments on this proposal.

Route 23 – Westbourne Park to Aldwych

There are two stages to this proposal, with a short term restructuring of the route so that it operates to Aldwych only without continuing to Liverpool Street. In the longer term, once the Elizabeth Line opens, it is proposed that the route 23 will be further restructured so that it operates between Wembley and Lancaster Gate via Ladbroke Grove, north of Westbourne Grove. The route will change within the borough so that it will no longer run along Kensal Road to Westbourne Park where it currently terminates. Instead it will continue along Ladbroke Grove and then on to Wembley. We have heard from residents that they are concerned about the reduction in the number of direct buses serving the west end from the north of the borough. Also, the route map in the consultation suggests that the route 23 will no longer serve the Ladbroke Grove Sainsbury’s bus stop in Canal Way. We have already heard from some residents in the Golborne Ward that they are concerned about the removal of the route 23 from Kensal Road as it provides a direct link to the Sainsbury’s store for older and less mobile passengers and the proposal for the route 23 would mean that there is a reduction of 7.5 buses per hour serving the Sainsbury’s bus stop in Canal Way. As the route will continue to travel along Ladbroke Grove we would like it to continue to serve the Sainsbury’s as this is where many of residents want to go. When the Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Transport and Arts, Cllr Coleridge, met John Barry from London Buses recently it appeared that the map was incorrect and the 23 would be serving the Ladbroke Grove Sainsburys. We would like this detail confirmed.

We recognise that it is also proposed to change route 452 so that it would travel along Kensal Road and will therefore continue to provide this link to Sainsbury’s for residents. However, with both proposals we would like reassurance from TfL that there will be no overall loss of service for residents living between Westbourne Park and Ladbroke Grove Sainsburys and that the restructuring will not affect the overall reliability. For example, in the consultation material it is mentioned that there will be 2,400 weekday broken trips if the proposal for the route 23 goes ahead, which is 12 per cent of the route total. Of these two thirds will be within the borough, in the
Westbourne Grove area and Ladbroke Grove. Although the route 452 will pick up some of these broken trips, we do not know what the total number of broken trips will be if both proposals are implemented.

In the medium term, there is likely to be a need to review all of the bus routes that serve the Ladbroke Grove Sainsburys. The Council has published consultation plans for the Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area, including a proposed Elizabeth Line station and up to 5,000 new homes. It will be essential to ensure good bus access to the site from all parts of North Kensington.

Route 137 – Streatham Hill to Oxford Circus

It is proposed that the route 137 will change so that it runs from Marble Arch to Streatham Hill, therefore removing the bus route from Oxford Street. There are no changes proposed to the frequency of the route. We are concerned that passengers from Chelsea are losing the only direct bus link into Oxford Street, which is a popular destination. This is reflected in the high number of broken trips that are detailed in the consultation material. The data shows that there will be 2,300 broken trips (10 per cent of total route) by removing the route from Oxford Street. Of all the changes proposed in the consultation, this is the second highest number of broken trips after the route 23. We therefore oppose this change and urge TfL to retain the existing route for the 137.

Route 390 – Notting Hill Gate to Archway

Currently this route terminates at Notting Hill Gate but it is proposed that it would in future start at Victoria, and would not serve any part of the Royal Borough. We appreciate that the routes 94 and 148 will continue to provide frequent links from Notting Hill Gate to the West End for passengers who may have previously used the route 390, although they would face longer waiting times as there would be seven fewer buses an hour travelling along Bayswater Road. There may be some small air quality benefits in reducing the number of buses through the centre of Notting Hill Gate which is one of the most polluted areas in the borough. We note that the 390 bus stand will be removed from the northern end of Kensington Church Street which we welcome.

Route 452 – Kensal Rise to Vauxhall

It is proposed to restructure the route 452 so that it terminates on Harrow Road, via Westbourne Park, rather than the northern end of Ladbroke Grove to Kensal Rise. The route will change through the borough and will serve Westbourne Park and Kensal Road rather than Kensal Rise before continuing on the existing line of route to Vauxhall.

We note that the 52 would continue to provide links from both Ladbroke Grove and Notting Hill Gate to Kensal Rise. As mentioned above, we would like to understand
more about how many trips would be broken in the borough with this proposal and would welcome further discussion with TfL on this.

If any of our response requires further clarification please do not hesitate to contact me. I would be interested to see all the comments you receive from this consultation on the five routes above and would be grateful if you would please forward these to me after the consultation closes. I look forward to hearing from you.

London Borough of Wandsworth

I refer to your consultation published on 25 November 2016. Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your proposals.

Wandsworth Council has no comments on the details of the proposals, but would strongly urge TfL to re-invest any savings on bus services in Central London in relieving overcrowding and poor connectivity in Wandsworth and adjoining boroughs arising from new residential and commercial developments along the southern side of the Thames. TfL are reminded about:-

1. Overcrowding & unreliability of route 170 along the Lombard Road corridor in Battersea
2. The lack of any bus service to serve the new Wandsworth Riverside Quarter, to link it to Putney.
3. The need for a bus service along the southern side of the Thames from Putney to Battersea & Vauxhall, to link together all the new developments in this corridor.
4. Long-standing requests for a direct bus service from the Trinity Road corridor to Fulham, over Wandsworth Bridge.

London Councils

London Councils represents London’s 32 borough councils and the City of London. It is a crossparty organisation that works on behalf of all of its member authorities regardless of political persuasion.

Introduction

We welcome that TfL is reviewing the bus network in central London, as we know that the provision of bus services is a transport matter that boroughs are concerned about. As one of the more agile forms of fleet vehicle, bus networks can change and adapt as communities do, unlike rail, tube and trams which are fixed. We note that there will be further consultations on the future of Oxford Street.

We do however have a series of concerns about the approach TfL has taken to its review, which we outline in this response.

Lack of strategic approach
We note that the principle driving these changes has been a desire by the Mayor of London to transform Oxford Street and reduce the numbers of buses using this route. We note that TfL was already considering the impact that the opening of the Elizabeth line would have in 2018/19, which we welcome; and that bus patronage is generally falling in central London.

We are disappointed that wider factors have not been taken into consideration, and as such we feel the ambition has not been high enough. For example, a major reason for reducing the numbers of buses using Oxford Street is due to poor air quality, but only once is ‘air quality’ mentioned in the West End Bus Review document1 and at no point does the review consider the impact on air quality of changes to routes or changes to termini, which is disappointing; and nor is consideration given to bus routes serving the Clean Bus Zones. Regardless of the introduction of the ULEZ and the general improvement to TfL’s bus fleet through retrofitting and the purchasing of a cleaner bus fleet, we feel that air quality impacts should have been part of the review process.

We also feel that opportunities to promote greater cycling and walking have been missed. There are references to ‘broken links’ (which we consider would have been better described as ‘broken journeys’) but only in a handful of places are references made to people being able to continue their journey on foot. We feel these have been portrayed as reducing inconvenience, rather than a positive encouragement to design a bus service that encourages walking. We also seek commitment from TfL that where it has identified buses ‘stopping short’ of previously termini, it will introduce clearly signed walking routes where this is clearly the expected behaviour (for example from Marble Arch to the middle of Oxford Street, a distance of 0.8 miles taking an indicative 16 minutes).

In addition, no stated consideration has been given as to whether there is adequate provision of walking infrastructure in these places (for example wide enough pavements, or that pavements are not already full in peak hours).

In addition TfL could have used its review to give greater consideration to buses serving the Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas in London. Instead, only one route proposal, route 23, will be changed to serve Wembley Stadium to support the regeneration in that Opportunity Area; and one additional service, route 425 will now serve Ilford.

We feel that TfL could have been far more strategic in its approach, rather than narrowly focusing on Oxford Street changes. As a stakeholder, London Councils has continually called for TfL to be more holistic and this was a good opportunity to do so.
The outcomes of the review

Using the maps provided as part of the review, we note the following outcomes for the key stops in and around Oxford Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Now (November 2016)</th>
<th>Proposed (for 2017)</th>
<th>Percentage reduction in buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marble Arch (bus stop)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Street (bus stop)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Circus (bus stop)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham Court Road (bus stop)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street (road)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst we acknowledge the reduction of buses running along Oxford Street itself is close to the stated 40 per cent reduction, we are concerned that the wider benefits are minimal. We doubt that this represents a significant improvement of the pedestrian experience in the whole of Oxford Street, and have concerns about the displacement of air pollution to different areas. No mention of this is given in the consultation documentation.

Introduction of the changes

We seek further clarification from TfL on when it plans to introduce the changes to the bus network. The maps provided as part of the consultation are labelled 2017 network; whilst other parts of the consultation documentation suggest phasing. The Elizabeth line has a phased opening with most of the line opening in December 2018 but the whole of the line not fully operational until December 2019. We would therefore be extremely concerned about changes that would be introduced in advance of this. Discussion with TfL officers indicates that infrastructure requirements, including driver facilities, are what will determine when the changes happen. Whilst we acknowledge the importance of this, we seek strong assurances that there will not be a detrimental bus provision for passengers prior to the opening of the Elizabeth line. We are also concerned by TfL’s assumption that it is acceptable for people to be required to change buses, as there is no longer a financial penalty due to the Hopper fare. We acknowledge this is the case, but only within a single hour and at present only on two journeys. We note both the plans to extend this to unlimited journeys within one hour from 2018 and that a bus daily cap exists, which is £4.50. The research we commissioned with Trust for London and London TravelWatch on the affordability of travel means we know that bus journeys are often used instead of train or tube journeys because they are cheaper. We believe that there may already be people who undertake two bus journeys, one from home into central London, and another within central or inner London. Breaking this second journey may lead people to incur a financial penalty, as the third journey may take place after an hour of the first journey. We do not consider the daily cap of £4.50 to be adequate when a person travelling both ways could previously have
achieved two journeys for £1.50 but may now have to pay £3 for three bus journeys. If the same is true of their return journey, whilst they will cap out at £4.50 each day, they could have paid £3 in total. We have examined some of the longer-distance routes TfL has included in its consultation, and note that journey times are already approaching one hour on some of these services, before consideration of early termination is taken into account.

TfL also assumes that price is the only inconvenience for passengers. Alighting from one bus to stand in the pouring rain or freezing cold is not given any consideration; and we ask that TfL gives consideration to its provision of bus shelters and whether changing buses will require a walk to a nearby bus stop. We welcome information from TfL officers that where possible, onward journeys will be from the same bus stop where this is practical. We feel this should have been referenced in the consultation.

We also note there is no discussion of a trial period, or any review once the changes have been introduced. We want to see TfL give consideration to how it will review the success or otherwise of the changes, particularly on routes were significant changes are taking place, for example routes 13 and 23. TfL must also provide effective messaging so that people understand what is changing, and when.

**Justification for the changes**

We note that some of the proposals create new routes, for example route 23 going to Wembley, route 13 going to Victoria, route 425 going to Ilford, route 3 going to Russel Square. However, there is no justification given in the consultation documentation for why these changes are beneficial – the assumption appears to be that new route equals benefit. We wish to understand further whether there is any more sophisticated modelling behind this; for example, is there evidence that people in North Finchley wish to get to Victoria by bus, and evidence that people living in Crystal Palace wish to get to Russell Square? Having discussed this issue with TfL officers, it would seem that TfL does have data indicating demand for travel to these changed routes. This information should have been part of the consultation documentation so that stakeholders and individuals could scrutinise the benefits and disbenefits.

Further we are disappointed that the messaging around the proposed changes is all about “making better use of our [TfL] resources”. Whilst we acknowledge that TfL must operate its business more cost-effectively, the justification for the changes should also have been about making journeys better or more reliable for passengers and reducing poor air quality.

**Night buses**

We note that a reduction in Night Bus services along Oxford Street is also proposed. This will impact on Londoners who rely on the bus for their journey to and from work, many of them low paid. Many work in catering, cleaning and security trades around
Oxford Street and Marble Arch as well as the many government offices around Victoria. The consultation document mentions the Night Tube as a replacement but this does not run Sunday to Thursday and so we want TfL to give further reassurance about the impacts for night workers of these changes.

**Impact assessment**

We note that an equality impact assessment has not been published. Given the Mayor’s focus on social inclusion and that the bus network is particularly used by lower-paid Londoners and disabled and elderly passengers because it is more accessible than the tube network, we are disappointed not to see any reference to the impacts on these groups of needing to change routes.

We also note from the paragraph below, that TfL concludes that overall there is disbenefit to passengers. Further detail on how some of this is mitigated should be provided.

“The benefits of the proposals are mainly to TfL in that they save money. This would release funding to be re-invested elsewhere in the network where demand is growing. Overall there is disbenefit to passengers due to lower frequencies and broken links. There are some increases in passenger benefit, predominately due to the provision of new direct links and some frequency increases like on route 390.”

**Conclusion**

Overall, London Councils supports efforts by TfL to look at appropriate bus provision in the West End with the opening of the Elizabeth line. However, this work has become a consultation that preludes work to transform Oxford Street into a better place for pedestrians. As a result, TfL has focused too narrowly on the opening of the Elizabeth line and Oxford Street changes, when there were greater benefits possible under the review. As such we do not feel the proposals are ambitious enough, and they do not achieve the wider objectives that London wants to see, including improved air quality, greater walking and cycling, and a better connected city.
Government departments, parliamentary bodies and politicians

Transport and road user groups

The Clapham Transport User Group

Please find the Clapham Transport User Group response to the TfL proposals for Oxford Street bus services. In the interests of brevity I have concentrated on the two proposals which affect Clapham: namely the redirecting of the 452 to Harrow Road away from Kensal Rise and the cutting of the 137 to Marble Arch.

We note that Oxford Street will be bus-free once pedestrianisation takes place. However we feel it is wrong to axe the 137 from Oxford Street in the meantime, as Clapham/Battersea residents will be disadvantaged and force to change buses with heavy shopping. This impact upon reduced mobility shoppers and the elderly. Clapham is not on Crossrail and therefore the convenience of a direct bus from Clapham through Oxford Street is key.

We argue instead that the 159 -which serves areas like Brixton which has uncrowded trains and an accessible Tube, should be rationalised instead. We argue that when full pedestrianisation takes place the 137 be instead of cut back to Marble Arch, extended to Paddington and Baker Street via Marylebone, so opening new bus links for Clapham/Battersea and Streatham as compensation.

We also argue that redirecting the 452 away from Kensal Rise is retrograde and should be kept in its current form

The Clapham Transport Users Group (CTUG) is a voluntary stakeholder body advocating on behalf of public transport users across all modes in the Clapham area.

The Context of Oxford Street

Oxford Street is one of Britain’s leading retail areas, attracting Londoners and visitors from within the UK and beyond to its shops as well as nearby areas.

The consequence is that many shoppers will have bags of goods requiring more ‘door to door’ type of transport instead having to descend into the Tube stations of Bond Street, Marble Arch and Oxford Circus, the latter of which has severe congestion often resulting in entrances being closed. For reduced mobility and elderly shoppers, the bus service is critical.

Oxford Street has suffered from congestion since pavements were widened in the late 1970s causing a constriction of the main traffic thoroughfare. A large concentration of bus routes in turn makes Oxford Street traffic flow slow and inconsistent.
The net result are useful but slow bus journeys resulting in poor air quality. The opening of Crossrail will provide accessible TfL Tube stations and render a number of east-west bus routes such as the 25 (Ilford-Oxford Circus) redundant.

This would lead to a rationalisation of buses using Oxford Street whilst preserving key routes for point-to-point journeys undertaken by passengers who are not near a Cross rail (and therefore accessible station) back home. However, this has been superseded by the Mayor’s intent to pedestrianise Oxford Street altogether. As part of this process, some bus routes are being redirected and cut. We discuss the main proposals which affect Clapham below.

The Key Proposals

The main Clapham specific proposals are to cut the 137 back from Oxford Circus to Marble Arch and redirect the 452 from Kensal Rise to terminate at Harrow Road.

We are opposed to these plans, notwithstanding that all buses will eventually be removed from Oxford Street.

The cutback of the 137 to Marble Arch will force elderly or reduced mobility shoppers to have to change buses with heavy shopping, in potentially inclement weather, so having to make longer less convenient journeys. Clapham residents and especially other commuters on the 137 in Battersea are not connected to Crossrail.

We are also puzzled as to the rationale for redirecting the 452 from Kensal Rise, as Kensal Rise connects with the London Overground to Watford Junction and onward travel.

We note that TfL has not proposed reducing the 159 bus which parallels the 137 in the opposite direction, but terminates at Marble Arch via Oxford Street. The 159 serves Brixton, Kennington and Waterloo. Brixton has an accessible Tube station which has no crowding problems, whereas Clapham Common and Clapham North are narrow island platform stations. The 137 serves many areas without Tubes also such as Battersea and Clapham Park.

It would seem that if rationalisation is to take place, cutting the 159 holds less onward negative impact than the 137.

Furthermore we also believe that when Oxford Street becomes pedestrianised, rather than simply offering cuts, TfL should be more imaginative and create new bus links for Clapham as compensation. We believe that the 137 should instead be redirected and extended beyond Marble Arch to Baker Street via Paddington and Maryleone, opening feasible direct bus links to key areas and transport hubs.

Therefore our response is as follows:
• The 137 should be kept to Oxford Circus until pedestrianisation begins in earnest and the 159 be cut back to Oxford Circus (so removing the 159 from Oxford Street).
• When Oxford Street is eventually closed to buses, the 137 be extended from Marble Arch up Edgware Road to Paddington and Baker Street
• The 452 be kept in its current form and not re-directed from Kensal Rise on account of the key transport interchange Kensal Rise offers to rail connections to Watford Junction and onward links.
• TfL should look in the meantime to banning taxis in order to free up road capacity for buses which carry far more passengers

East Surrey Transport Committee

Please find the comments from East Surrey transport Committee on Central London Routes 73, 390 and C2.

Routes 73 & 390
We represent public transport user in the south of the Boroughs of Croydon and Sutton and in Northeast Surrey. Many of the people we represent use Victoria Railway station as their, main access in to central London and for onward journeys to parts of central and north London and for cross London journeys to Euston station. At present the 73 bus provides a frequent and useful step-free alternative to the tube for accessing Euston station from Victoria. It is also a useful services for passengers who have problems and concerns about using the tube. We are not opposed to the withdrawal of route 73 from Victoria and being replaced by route 390. However, we believe that the 390 should be at the same frequency as the 73. Also this would be a good opportunity for route 390 to serve Euston Bus station in the southbound direction to improve interchange with Euston Station.

Route C2.
We have concerns regarding this proposal to remove this bus route from serving Victoria and shorten it back to Conduit Street. At present route C2 provides a number of useful links from Victoria Station to parts of London not served by the tube or other bus routes from Victoria such as Berkley Square, New Bond street, New Cavendish Street, Great Portland Street and station and Regents park.

The withdrawal of route C2 would result in passengers having to use two buses instead one and adding to the journey time. It would also add extra inconvenience for wheelchair and other passengers mobility difficulties.
Friends of Capital Transport Campaign:

Changes are driven by the mantra of too many buses on Oxford Street but a more important principle is that buses should turn at major objective points so that they are well filled at ends of the route. Too many buses turning at one point works against this - that is the real issue at Oxford Circus. So object to proposed termini for C2, 22 & 73.

137 - not sure this relates to the 3; important that the 159 is retained

15 - this makes sense only if the 23 is left alone. What is proposed is a completely different route. Should measure the effects of changing the 15 before looking at the 23.

46 - might make sense but needs to be paused along with the 23

452 - Vauxhall is an improvement; the west end needs to be paused.

"242" was part of the 22. only route from Homerton, passengers deserve to be able to go further than St. Paul's. It has space to turn buses but is a poor terminus from a passenger point of view. Camden's desire to take back the bus stand is a poor reason for changing a major bus route.

172 - sensible to link a bus route into the hub station on Crossrail.

C2 - the extension of this route has proved useful. No benefit in the changes to the 22.

390 - object to the loss of Notting Hill Gate, although a better option would be to restore the 12 to this destination. It was only curtailed to accommodate Hendy's Bendies.

The effect of the 390/73 switch is to reduce buses KX-SN and increase buses on York Way to Archway. no figures given to justify this. Recent reduction in pvr on route 38 may result in more use of the 73, suggest you measure this first.
Living Streets

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to TfL's proposals for changes to bus routes in the West End. I am responding on behalf of London Living Streets. London Living Streets is a community group that seeks to represent those on foot across the Greater London area. We believe that there is a unique opportunity to remake London in favour of those on foot in order to make London’s residents, workers, businesses and visitors safer, heathier, wealthier and happier. Overall we are extremely supportive of the role of buses in Central London and their importance in reducing reliance of private motorised traffic.

We emphasise that it is important to have a holistic view of transport and the public realm, when making changes to any element of London's transport system (such as buses).

We highlight the fact that, since most bus users are also pedestrians, pedestrians are in effect the life-blood of buses. It is therefore important not to overlook the needs of pedestrians, who comprise the main group of London Buses passengers.

In making any changes to London's buses, it is important to take into account the Mayor's 'Healthy Streets' agenda. This links to our point above about the need for officers involved in developing London's bus network to take a holistic perspective, which will necessitate early discussions with other parts of TfL, including the Surface Strategy and Planning Directorate. Local consultation is also needed on proposed changes to bus routes or bus priority systems, in order to best capture benefits, alongside potential unintended consequences and how these might be mitigated.

We have long advocated for and very much welcome the Mayor's commitment to pedestrianise Oxford Street. We think that the bus hopper ticket, by reducing/removing the financial penalty of changing buses, will help achieve this. In line with our comments above, we have a particular concern about the potential for detriment to pedestrians of services starting/ending at Oxford Circus. Specifically, we would not wish to see Cavendish Square used as a place for 'stacking' buses. We therefore call on TfL to make best use of technology to ensure that bus stacking is not needed as part of changes to any bus services. We also have a similar concern about the potential effects on the 'place' function of Berkeley Square resulting from the proposed routeing of more buses through Berkeley Square. In essence, our concerns are that TfL Bus Division may wish to stack buses in, or send more of them through, attractive places for pedestrians where there there is clear scope for improvements, e.g. Cavendish and Berkeley Squares, and the proposed new square at Centre Point.

We propose that TfL should look at ways in which to decrease other motor traffic on bus routes in Central London, for example by creating 'mode filters' at junctions with side roads. Modal filters on side roads where they join bus routes could create a better environment for pedestrians and speed up buses by stopping other traffic.
entering and leaving the bus route. Alternatively, reduced motor traffic flow through side road junctions could enable re-timing of signals to give much more priority to pedestrians, thus improving access to bus stops.

We highlight recent developments which benefit buses and pedestrians, such as the far-sighted decision to close Bank Junction to all motor vehicles except buses. Could this be repeated elsewhere?

In considering the positioning of bus stops of realigned routes, it is important to maximise convenience for pedestrians. Connectivity needs to be maximised so that passengers are able to change from bus to or from rail, or from bus to bus, with minimal walking, dovetailing with the bus ‘hopper’ fare initiative. Bus stops form a key element of London's bus system, and their design, facilities and positioning are important determinants of the attractiveness of bus use.

We make these comments in the context of TfL’s Business Plan which we note places heavy reliance on increasing bus ridership across London. We thank you for the opportunity to comments on these changes. We would be grateful if you could confirm safe receipt of this consultation response.

London TravelWatch:

Further to our recent board meeting, I am writing to set out London TravelWatch’s response to your recent consultations on changes to Central London bus routes.

General comments

London TravelWatch acknowledges the reasoning behind the proposals to restructure bus services in central London, however, we note that a very large number of journeys will now require a change of bus or mode en route and so it will be very important to ensure that the waiting environment is of a good quality and meets passengers needs where interchange will now be necessary. This includes shelter, seating and information provision and to ensure that passengers have same stop interchange, and do not have a financial penalty from changing induced by this change. These interchange points would include St.Pauls: Trafalgar Square, The Strand, Hyde Park Corner, Marble Arch, Paddington and Green Park.

In addition, measures need to be put in place to ensure that excess waiting times are minimised, requiring improvements in bus priority measures throughout the length of the bus routes that would be affected by these changes.

We would also like to know whether you have done any analysis of ‘mixed mode’ journeys made by passengers to and from Oxford Street e.g how many people arrive by tube on an inward journey but return by bus, such as rail and tube journey from Dalston Kingsland to Oxford Circus but returning on route 73 from Selfridges. Reduction in bus access to stopes around Selfridges for example could lead to
diversion of demand to other shopping areas. We also note that certain groups of passengers would be more disadvantaged if their alternative route would be by rail/underground e.g. Children aged 11-18 rather than bus. This could potentially lead to diversion of demand away from Oxford Street and more to the shopping centres at White City, Stratford (inc City), Brent Cross and others.

We are also concerned that as has happened previously, when a reduction in bus traffic on Oxford Street has been implemented that this freed up capacity is then used up by additional Taxi and Private Hire vehicle traffic that has previously been supressed. We would like to see measures in place to ensure that this does not take place.

Route specific

We would also urge you to consider altering your proposals to reduce the number of ‘broken links’. These include

• Withdrawal of route 242 west of St.Paul’s would reduce connectivity between parts of Hackney and Holborn. However, this should result in better reliability at the Homerton and Hackney end of the route, where for many years complaints have been made about buses being turned short in order to maintain frequencies at the Tottenham Court Road end of the route. Passengers could still make their journeys by interchange with other services en route using the ‘Hopper’ fare or by changing to the Central Line at Liverpool Street. A rerouting of either routes 55 or 243 that serve parts of the 242 route in the Farringdon area could also be considered.

• Withdrawal of route C2 south of Oxford Circus would reduce connectivity between parts of Camden to Green Park, Hyde Park Corner and Victoria. Its replacement would be route 22 also terminating at Oxford Circus. However, it might be feasible to combine routes C2 and 22 as these operate at roughly the same frequencies. This would have the advantage of retaining many broken links and also reducing the numbers of buses terminating at Oxford Circus and their consequent traffic impact in that area. This would also have a benefit of connecting the shopping areas of Kings Road, Knightsbridge, Oxford Street / Bond Street / Regent Street and Camden Market with one single service.

• Restructuring of route 23 east of Paddington would reduce connectivity between Westbourne Grove and Oxford Street, Piccadilly and the City. However, access to Oxford Street and the City will be maintained by interchange at Lancaster Gate with the Central Line, and at Paddington with the Elizabeth, Circle, Hammersmith & City and Bakerloo lines or route 7 to Oxford Street using the ‘Hopper’ fare. However, it may be worth recommending that route 23 continue beyond Lancaster Gate to terminate at Marble Arch to maintain connectivity to the western end of Oxford Street directly and also to replace route 390 which is being withdrawn between Notting Hill Gate and Marble Arch. This is particularly important given that Lancaster Gate station is going to be closed for lift replacement for eight months in 2017.
• Route 73. We are aware of previous requests to reinstate the previous extension of this route between Stoke Newington and Seven Sisters and we would ask that you use this opportunity to revisit this issue.

If you have any queries on this response please do not hesitate to contact me.

London Cycling Campaign

Please find below the response to TfL’s consultation on proposed changes to the bus network in central London from London Cycling Campaign. Apologies it is slightly late. I hope our views can still be incorporated into the officer’s report etc.

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital’s leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on plans. The response was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC’s Infrastructure Review Group and from the Chair of LCC’s Policy forum.

The proposals should come as part of a far more strategic and wide-ranging process regarding the role of buses in central London, their routing and their interaction with other transport modes. To whet:

LCC policy is that cycling flows should be separated from motor vehicle traffic (or motor vehicle traffic should be reduced) where motor vehicle traffic flows exceed 2,000 PCUs daily. In other words, cycling routes either work on streets where cycle flows are physically segregated from motor vehicle traffic, or on streets where motor vehicle traffic volumes and speeds are low. Many bus lanes in central London exceed 2,000PCUs motor vehicle volumes daily – some solely through the sheer volume of bus movements, some that allow taxis and/or motorcycles in them and therefore cross the 2,000 PCU threshold, some both.

Bus lanes do have some value for many people who currently cycle in London – as they are often quieter and less aggressive to ride in than the main roads next to them. But LCC policy is there because above 2,000PCUs, bus lanes and streets become a barrier to much broader adoption of cycling – they are not suitable for children, the elderly and for many others to cycle in. In other words, they offer some benefits to those who currently cycle, but little benefit in increasing cycling numbers and diversity.

In a similar vein, it is not just Oxford Street where the sheer weight of bus movements (with or without a lane) dominates the street scene, reduces the attraction of walking and causes large amounts of pollution. This has reduced the vitality of many iconic central London streets.
Therefore LCC proposes that TfL urgently carries out a far wider and more systemic review of its bus network that not only seeks to reduce buses on Oxford Street, but holistically considers areas of central London such as the west end, assessing:

- Where bus routes should go considering current and potential other public transport routes, interchanges and networks (Underground, Crossrail etc.), current and potential walking and cycling routes, “desire lines” for key routes and future mode shares for them, splitting short journeys from long etc. and likely shifts in journeys, populations etc.
- Where likely high-quality cycle routes, and where separately private motor vehicle routes should go, again on the basis of the above information.
- How bus lanes and bus priority schemes should be configured in relation to cycling infrastructure and PCU counts – and therefore which bus lanes will offer any significant amenity to those cycling and which won’t.
- Most bus lanes (busy, and on main roads) do not represent good quality cycling infrastructure. Nor does putting taxis, motorbikes, PHVs or even those cycling in bus lanes represent the best quality space for bus passengers. The default should be either cycle tracks provided separate to bus lanes, or bus and cycle routing should be separated onto different streets entirely. (On some routes, the removal of motor vehicle traffic may be sufficient to create both a high-quality bus priority scheme and cycling scheme on one bus/cycle road, where total motor vehicle numbers fall below the 2,000PCUs threshold and bus speeds are low).
- Where rerouting is to take place, the LCDS demonstrates how quickly cycling gains are removed by deflection of a route. Therefore, the assumption should be that of parallel cycling and bus routes, on separate streets, the cycle route should be the more direct.
- Rerouting of bus networks should not have the effect of decreasing amenity for cycling and walking – including by introducing large bus “stacking” areas or creating street designs that lock in bus schemes and lock out future cycling and walking improvements.
- Rerouting of buses also represents an opportunity to redesign the road network for private hire, taxi and private motor vehicle movements – and restrictions to these modes by location, to create streets more suitable for cycling and walking and to provide bus priority should be considered.
- The aim for any cycling route should be that it is not just direct and high-quality, but joins often (e.g. every 250m) to other routes to create a high-quality network of routes where those cycling do not face complex or fraught interactions with motor vehicle traffic travelling from origin to destination – this network is vital to enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling and a far higher “modal share”.
- Another point of interaction between those cycling and buses is at stops – often current designs of bus lanes ensure that buses stopped in a “bus cage” force those cycling out into the next lane, or to squeeze between the bus and traffic, or to wait. Bus stop “bypasses”, “boarders” or other designs that maintain physical
separation between buses and cycle tracks are to be encouraged throughout any replanned network.

- Given this, it is likely a fairly radical redesign of the bus network is appropriate. And now, given the successful introduction of the “Hopper Ticket”, would be an appropriate time to consider this. Options include creating a grid of low pollution buses in central London with outer London buses terminating and returning at the edge of this grid – rather than going directly through central London. This could encourage more walking and potentially cycling (via Hire Cycle etc.) and could be integrated with “Hopper Ticket” etc. payment approaches. This review of the bus routes provides an opportunity to ensure buses and cycling, the two most efficient and sustainable modes, are catered for in unison.

- In the short term, it’s vital the proposed reroutings take into full account current proposed major Highways schemes – such as Baker Street Two Way, The West End Project, CS11 – as well as likely and potential near-future schemes such as the “Clerkenwell Boulevard” idea of improving the route from Old Street to Tottenham Court Road stations for walking and cycling (including Old Street, Clerkenwell Road, Theobalds Road and New Oxford Street) etc.

General points about cycling schemes:

- LCC requires schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. In terms of providing maximum efficiency for space and energy use, walking, cycling, then public transport are key.

- As demonstrated by the success of recent Cycle Superhighways and mini-Holland projects etc., people cycle when they feel safe. For cycling to become mainstream, a network of high-quality, direct routes separate from high volumes and/or speeds of motor vehicle traffic is required to/from all key destinations and residential areas in an area. Schemes should be planned, designed and implemented to maximise potential to increase journeys – with links to nearby amenities, residential centres, transport hubs considered from the outset.

- Spending money on cycling infrastructure has been shown to dramatically boost health outcomes in an area. Spending on cycling schemes outranks all other transport mode for return on investment according to a DfT study. Schemes which promote cycling meet TfL’s “Healthy Streets” checklist. A healthy street is one where people choose to cycle.

- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with an aim for a Cycling Level of Service (CLoS) rating of 70 or above, with all “Critical Fails” eliminated.
Save our buses

Central London Bus Service Proposals

Save Our Buses (SOB) raises concern over proposals to reduce bus services in the Central London area. The reasons given include reduced passenger numbers and Crossrail (Elizabeth Line) introduction in 2018.

Passenger numbers on some bus services have fallen in the last few years. Increased journey times, slow journey’s, traffic congestion, and roadworks have all contributed to slowing the buses down.

With some of the above in mind SOB has put together a response to the consultations.

Route 3 and N3
TFL want to reroute this service to Russell Square via Charing Cross Road and Tottenham Court Road Station. SOB supports this proposal.

Route 6
TFL want to reroute this service via Park Lane and Piccadilly between Marble Arch and Piccadilly Circus. SOB supports this proposal.

Route 8 and N8
TFL proposes to keep these shortened routes terminating at Tottenham Court Road Station. SOB believes this service should be extended to terminate at Trafalgar Square via Charing Cross Road. This would provide a 24-hour accessible service from the heart of the West End toward the City, Shoreditch and Old Ford.

Route 12
SOB proposal route 12 – Dulwich Library to Parliament Hill Fields. Daily. SOB suggests extending this route from Oxford Circus to Parliament Hill Fields via Albany Road and Camden Town. This could replace route C2 over this section. It will also remove buses from the busy and overcrowding terminals at Oxford Circus.

Route 15
TFL is proposing to keep the shorten service structure between Trafalgar Square and Blackwall.

SOB proposal – East Ham to Trafalgar Square (Daily)
SOB is concerned that passenger numbers have dropped with the repeated shortening of this service over the years and accompanying overlapping routes. We suggest the re-routing of the 15 bus at Poplar to run to East Ham replacing route 115 over this section.

Route 22 and N22
It is proposed to reroute this service via Mayfair and Conduit Street to terminate at Oxford Circus.

Route 22 SOB proposal - Putney Common – Covent Garden Station Daily Route N22 Fulwell to Covent Garden - Nightly

SOB does not support TFL’s proposal as this would mean yet another service terminating at the overcrowded Oxford Circus bus stands. We believe TFL should extend this route from Piccadilly Circus to Covent Garden via Shaftesbury Avenue and then in a loop via Endell Street, Long Acre, Drury Lane. TFL should work with both Camden and Westminster Councils to trial a routing. Covent Garden suffers from overcrowding around the Piccadilly Line Station. This would bring buses nearer to the Museums, Royal Opera House, theatres and Covent Garden markets from the West.

Route 23

TFL is proposing to cut this route daily between Aldwych and Paddington. SOB proposal route 23 – Westbourne Park – London Bridge Station. Daily Route 23 suffers two areas of traffic congestion. These being Oxford Street and Fleet Street towards the City. SOB believes TFL should take a more positive approach and introduce new links.

Route 23 should be re-routed at Marble Arch to run via Park Lane to Hyde Park Corner then Piccadilly to Piccadilly Circus. From here buses would continue to London Bridge Station via Trafalgar Square, Northumberland Avenue, Embankment, Blackfriars Station, Mansion House, Cannon Street and London Bridge. This would provide a new link from Park Lane into Piccadilly and Trafalgar Square. It would also provide a daily bus link along the Embankment. This route would be attractive to commuters from London Bridge heading into the West End and tourists visiting the Thames, Monument and attractions around the London Bridge area. Note – Route 7 should continue to maintain the link from Ladbroke Grove and Paddington into Oxford Street.

Route 73

TfL’s Proposal: Oxford Circus - Warren Street - Euston - Kings Cross - Angel - Stoke Newington

Set against a background of persistent service failures and serious overcrowding on the Victoria Line, SOB believes TFL’s proposal to axe Route 73 between Oxford Circus and Victoria is seriously flawed. The high frequency 73 bus provides a realistic alternative to the Victoria Line through Central London. Removing the Victoria - Oxford Circus link undermines this at a time when Victoria Line trains and stations display the hallmarks of being at maximum capacity.
TfL should take a much more positive and pro-active approach to Route 73. It could be re-routed via Green Park and Mayfair, avoiding the worst of the delays on the Western part of Oxford Street and the rest of the service targeted for enhanced priority. The aim should be to reduce journey times and delays to the point where taking the 73 for journeys in Central London once again becomes a viable option.

The 73 bus is already a well-known brand for many. Active marketing of the service as an alternative to the Victoria Line would bring the route to the attention of more people and doubtless attract more patronage of the popular route. Extending the positive message to Victoria Line trains and stations would better inform tube passengers of other public transport options available for completing their journey.

As part of a whole route package SOB suggest projecting the 73 on from Stoke Newington to Seven Sisters, thereby establishing a connection with the Victoria Line at its Northern end.

Route 115
SOB suggests replacing this service with restructures of routes 15 and 330 providing a service on the Commercial Road from Aldgate to East Ham.

Route 137
It is proposed to withdraw this service between Marble Arch and Oxford Circus via the Western end of Oxford Street.

SOB does not support this proposal for route 137. We believe TFL now needs to trial a rerouting of this service to Oxford Circus via Portman Square, Wigmore Street and Cavendish Square. TFL should work with Westminster City Council to enable this to become a reality. This could maintain access to Oxford Street for those less able to walk long distances or use tube services.

Route 172
TFL is proposing this service would be diverted at Ludgate Circus to Farringdon Station.

SOB supports this proposal. A further extension needs to be evaluated from Farringdon to Kings Cross to serve HS1 (High Speed) at St Pancras.

Route 242
TFL is proposing to remove the 242 between St Pauls and Tottenham Court Road Station. SOB proposal Route 242 – Homerton Hospital – Victoria via Embankment (24-hour service)

SOB is still concerned that a large route between the East of the City and the West End is still not served by buses. This is the area along the Embankment. We believe there is scope to open up new bus corridors to speed up buses across the Central
area and provide new links. We propose the re-routing of the 242 at Bank Station to run to Mansion House Station, Queen Victoria Street, Blackfriars Stations, Temple Station, Embankment, Westminster, Victoria Street to Victoria Station.

This route would be attractive to commuters from Liverpool Street heading into the West End and tourists visiting the Thames, Monument and attractions around the City area.

Route 330
SOB proposal Route 330 – Wanstead Park – Aldgate via Blackwall Stn (Daily)

SOB believes a restructure of routes 15 and 330 between Aldgate and Canning Town should now be considered. Route 15 would provide the service from the West End (Trafalgar Square) through the City and the Tower to East Ham replacing the 115 fully. Route 330 should be extended daily from Canning Town to Aldgate via East India Dock Road, Leamouth Road, Aspen Way, Cotton Street, Blackwall Station, Cotton Street, Poplar, Limehouse Station and Commercial Road.

Routes 25, 46, 332, 425, 452 and N2
SOB offers no comment on these proposals. Route 390 TFL proposes to withdraw this service between Notting Hill Gate and Marble Arch and reroute to Victoria on a much-reduced level to replace the 73. SOB is opposed to this and suggests this route remains in place. Consideration should be given to rerouting away from Oxford Street to Oxford Circus via Portman Square, Wigmore Street and Cavendish Square. TFL needs to work with Westminster City Council to enable this to become a reality.

Route C2
SOB believes this service should be withdrawn. The 73 should be diverted at Oxford Circus, replacing the C2 to Victoria. Route 12 should be extended along the Oxford Circus to Parliament Hill Fields section of the C2

Sense with roads

Travel to Oxford Street is important. Switching to Underground is unattractive. Changing buses is a real curse, but going down underground is worse still. Bus travel to Oxford Street is important. Switching to Underground is unattractive. Changing buses is a real curse, but going down underground is worse still. Hard to read maps online while responding
Transport for All

We are opposed to the proposals as we believe they will have a negative impact on the accessibility of the transport network.

Large sections of the underground network still remain inaccessible to Disabled transport users and moving towards pedestrianisation, or less bus services will only reduce their already limited options for transport in the centre of London.

Any changes to London’s transport network should be done in a way that increases, not decreases accessibility and transport options.

The majority of the proposed changes will require passengers to make additional changes in their journeys. Changes can be extremely challenging for disabled and older passengers, particularly if they have to travel as a pedestrian to alternative bus stops as is the case for route 46.

In the case the proposals to route 137 access to the tube via Bond Street and Marble Arch stations is cited as possible alternative routes. However, neither of these stations have step free access. There are clear not sufficient accessible alternative routes for this route to be changed.
Local interest groups

**Better Bankside**

We welcome the review of bus services in the West End and the through appraisal of what this will mean for different routes.

We note this focuses on the area most effected by the introduction of the Elizabeth Line and the proposed changes to Oxford Street. However, we would very much welcome a similar exercise to take account links between the West End & City and Bankside, Waterloo and London Bridge.

Research carried out in 2016 shows that 79% of our BID members would like Better Bankside to prioritise air quality, with concerns about improving streets for walking and cycling closely following. At the same time, we are seeing increased levels of development, with greater numbers of both employees and residents in the area.

We are therefore keen to understand how bus services could be reviewed to reduce demand for taxis and PHVs, congestion and air pollution whilst improving accessibility.

**Barnes Community Association**

I am dismayed that you are considering extending the 22 Bus towards Oxford Circus. There are more than enough buses in central London. The need is for the 22 to be extended westwards to include Barnes now and eventually to Mortlake when the Brewery site is developed.

TfL must listen to the travelling public and act on their needs.

**Bloomsbury Central Baptist Church**

I am writing on behalf of Bloomsbury Central Baptist Church, Shaftesbury Avenue, and a number of the elderly members of our congregation make regular use of the east-west bus corridor, particularly the 73 and the 390. We are concerned that proposals to reduce the directness of these services, and introduce additional changes, will be detrimental to their ability to attend events at our church
Camden Town Unlimited

What do you think about our proposal to extend routes 3 and N3 to Russell Square - creating new connections including between Millbank and Tottenham Court Road?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses to the Park Lane / Marble Arch area?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses along Willesden, Edgware Road, Park Lane, Piccadilly, Trafalgar Square and Aldwych – creating new connections between Park Lane and Piccadilly?:
Neither support nor oppose

What do you think about our proposal for buses to permanently start and finish at Trafalgar Square instead?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal to extend the route so that buses start and finish at Oxford Circus instead?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Tottenham Court Road permanently and using different arrangements to now?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Clerkenwell instead of St Paul’s? This would create new connections to Farringdon Elizabeth line station.: 
Neither support nor oppose

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at St Paul’s instead of Tottenham Court Road? : 
Oppose

What do you think about our proposal for buses to be rerouted to Oxford Circus serving Berkley Square and Conduit Street? : 
Neither support nor oppose
What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be extended north west towards Wembley, serving Paddington and Harrow Road instead?:
Support

What do you think about our proposals for buses to start and finish at Paddington, Eastbourne Terrace?:
Neither support nor oppose

What do you think about our proposals for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be rerouted to serve Warwick Avenue and Kilburn Park Road?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal to change the frequencies on route 25, so that buses run every six minutes Monday to Saturday and every seven to eight minutes on Sunday?:
Oppose

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Oxford Circus instead of Victoria?:
Support

What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Victoria instead of Notting Hill Gate but running more often than they do currently?:
Support

What do you think about our proposals to extend the route to start and finish at Marylebone, to better match the day service?:
Support

What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)?:
Very good

**Carers Action**

We strongly oppose the changes proposed to bus route 6. People from the W10/NW10 area need to get to Oxford Street/Regents Street. Park Lane, Piccadilly suits tourists, not Londoners getting about their daily lives. This change is totally unwelcomed. Maybe reroute via Wigmore Street at the most if you wish to avoid Oxford Street but what’s the point going via Park Lane.

Changes to bus 23 or 452 are not welcomed either.
Croydon Mobility Forum

Route 73 and 390

Following the invitation for comments on your proposals regarding changes to Bus routes 73 and 390, we would like to make the following observations on behalf of our membership:

Currently the 73 bus provides a useful step-free alternative to the tube for accessing Euston station from Victoria bus and railway stations as it provides direct access to Euston bus and Railway stations. For Croydon residents wanting to travel to Birmingham and the North who travel via Victoria and then cross London to Euston.

We are not opposed to the withdrawal of route 73 from Victoria and being replaced by route 390. However we believe that this provides the opportunity for 390 to serve Euston bus station in the Southbound direction to improve the connection between the station and the 390 southbound especially for passengers with mobility difficulties and wheelchair users. This could be achieved by following the route of southbound route 59 from Euston Road to Upper Woburn Place via the Euston bus station, then Endsleigh Gardens and Gower Place.

Route C2.
Our concerns regarding the proposal to remove this bus route from serving Victoria, is that it has not addressed the benefit that it provides to many parts of London that are not easily accessible nor yet have step free access by tube. Without this service passengers would not be able to make direct journeys and it would be necessary to change at least once to another bus. Antagonist

With Regards on behalf of the Chair and Members of the Croydon Mobility Forum.

The Crown Estate

The Crown Estate has invested about £25 million in improving the public realm in Westminster over the last decade. This has included:

• Oxford Circus diagonal crossing
• New Burlington Place
• Regent Street footway widening
• Glasshouse Street
• Piccadilly two-way scheme; including Piccadilly Circus
• Regent Street St James’s/Waterloo Place/Haymarket
• St James’s Market
This investment has been largely about improving conditions for pedestrians. We have also been working hard to reduce the impact of vehicles on the West End with the following initiatives:

• Regent Street retail delivery consolidation scheme: this reduces vehicle movements to the 40 participating stores by over 80%.

• Quadrant and Swallow Street refuse schemes: these schemes keep unpleasant restaurant waste off the street, reduce refuse collections by 75%, and maximise recycling.

• Other deliveries: we have been working to reduce office deliveries with less success to date but will continue to work at this, both ourselves directly and jointly with the BIDs.

Looking forward we are hoping to undertake further public realm improvements:

• Jermyn Street (hopefully starting early 2017)

• In parallel with the Jermyn Street public realm improvements we are developing servicing and refuse systems for that street and the wider St James’s area

• Regent Street between Oxford Circus and Mortimer Street

• Glasshouse Street: further animation works.

Our approach:

• Long term

• To create attractive places people enjoy and want to visit, work in and live in.

Our strategy

• Less noise, pollution, congestion & dislocation

• More space for people

• More attractive spaces

• Sustainable and healthy environment

• World class services.

Our position

• Key to all our ambitions is a substantial reduction in traffic numbers. We are in the vanguard of doing this. This is popular with residents & businesses alike.
• Air quality: achieve WHO limits as soon as possible. The only way to achieve this is to reduce the number of vehicles; relying just on cutting emissions per vehicle will not do it.
• Less traffic also means streets are safer and more attractive.
• It is essential to the economic success of London.

Oxford Street

Endorse Mayor’s wish to see a “shift to greener, safer, more sustainable forms of transport…” (Mayor’s introduction to TfL Business Plan)

Endorse the need to adopt a strategic approach over the whole West End; to achieve a shared vision. (London Assembly Transport Committee, Chairs letter to the Mayor dated 5 September 2016)

Key is to start with the pedestrian (customer): provide space where they need it. Not to start with vehicles and give pedestrians what’s left.

The West End is not just Oxford Street.

Adopt a comprehensive approach to buses: not just Oxford Street. Keep them out of the most crowded spaces (adjoining Oxford Circus and Crossrail stations).

As Oxford Circus has highest pedestrian flows in London, start here.

Regent Street

a) We would like to bring forward proposals for Regent Street between Great Marlborough Street and Margaret Street including Oxford Circus as far east as Great Portland St that:

• Create space where it is most needed; where there are the most crowded footways (PCL B+ for all year except Christmas; PCL C during peak Christmas)
• Create an attractive point of arrival, particularly for Elizabeth line passengers
• Avoid creating a dangerous crossing between east and west Oxford Street
• Unlocking the latent value of east Oxford Street
• Improve walkability: between Mayfair, Marylebone, Fitzrovia and Soho
• The Crown Estate would be prepared to underwrite the costs and use our consultants to develop the scheme in collaboration with WEP team
• Does not simply transfer traffic from Oxford Street to other streets
• In the light of tragic events in Nice & Berlin, it is important to protect high pedestrian areas from vehicle attacks
b) We would like to see Regent Street closed to traffic on every Saturday & Sunday during retail hours.

Buses Review

Following through the above principles to the Bus Reviews we have summarised our comments in a table attached as appendix A. They are also shown on the attached plan.

Generally we are supportive of the proposals, with the following exceptions:

Route 6: we welcome the changes proposed to this route. It currently runs from Aldwych, via Trafalgar Square, Regent Street and Oxford Street west to Edgware Road. It is proposed to reroute it via Piccadilly and Park Lane. We propose a further refinement to this by instead of using Regent Street St James’s, Piccadilly Circus and then Piccadilly the route runs along Pall Mall and up St James’s Street to Piccadilly.

Routes 22 & N22: this route currently terminates at Piccadilly Circus and it is proposed to extend it to Oxford Circus. We oppose this extension as it will put another route on to Regent Street and will run an unnecessary route through Oxford Circus.

Routes 25, 73 & N73: these routes currently run from the east along Oxford Street east. It is proposed that they terminate at Oxford Circus.

The current arrangements for routes coming from Oxford Street east terminating at Oxford Circus is for them to turn left at Oxford Circus into Regent Street, right into Hanover Street, Hanover Square, Harewood Place, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, Mortimer Street. Regent Street & back to Oxford Street east. This is undesirable because it channels buses past the crowded footways in Oxford Street adjoining the Oxford Circus tube station exits, through the heavily populated Oxford Circus, through Hanover Square and Harewood Place conflicting with passengers going to and from the Bond Street east Elizabeth Line station, through the busiest part of Oxford Street, through Cavendish Square with its high residential population, and along Mortimer Street where air pollution levels are already substantially above WHO target values.

We would ask TfL to examine alternative arrangements which avoid these buses travelling through Oxford Circus. These could include:

- Terminating at Tottenham Court Road;
- Turning close to, but east of, Oxford Circus using Gt Portland Street, Mortimer Street and Wells Street.
Route 390: it is still proposed to route along Tottenham Court Road and Oxford Street. This route could be usefully rerouted away from the West End, perhaps along Marylebone Road and Edgware Road.

Route 113: it is proposed to extend this route which currently terminates at Marble Arch to Oxford Circus. This seems an unnecessary extension which will cause unnecessary complications for the Oxford Street proposals.

However in the spirit of undertaking a comprehensive review of West End bus routes, as recommended by the London Assembly Transport Committee, we have additionally examined all routes running along Regent Street, not just the ones that also run along Oxford Street.

Route 12: this currently terminates at Oxford Circus after crossing Oxford Street. To avoid this we suggest you terminate at Piccadilly Circus. As part of the P2W2 public realm scheme, undertaken by us jointly with TfL and Westminster City Council, Jermyn Street between Regent Street St James’s and Haymarket was reversed and this could be used to reverse buses here without needing to go into Piccadilly Circus.

Route 94: to avoid a clash with the Oxford Circus proposals, terminate at Marble Arch.

Route 139: to avoid a clash with the Oxford Circus proposals, terminate at Portman Square.

Route 159: This route runs from Streatham to Paddington; along Regent Street and Oxford Street. Like the proposals for Route 6, this could be rerouted along Pall Mall, St James’s Street Piccadilly and Park Lane.

Route 55: This is similar to Routes 25 & 73 above and needs to terminate east of Oxford Circus.

These proposals seek to terminate routes before they traverse Oxford Circus. The only routes which would pass through Oxford Circus after these changes are 2 routes, 88 & 453, which both travel through straight ahead, north-south. This will facilitate much more pedestrian and cyclist friendly proposals for Oxford Circus.

Disabled People Against Cuts

On behalf of our members who travel either regularly or occasionally through central London we are writing to express our concerns about the proposed changes to buses that Transport for London are currently consulting about. It is suggested that there will be a reduction in the number of buses in Central London and changes to some routes and terminuses. This is very bad news for disabled people due to the lack of alternative accessible transport options in the city.
Many journeys across London already require disabled people to change buses, however adjustments to the line of route, and shortening of the routes will make bus changes, and lengthy waits in the dark, cold and rain far more likely. Routes like 73 from Stoke Newington to Victoria and 390 Archway to Victoria are examples of routes that would be adversely affected by these changes.

In particular, getting from Euston and Kings Cross to parts of London where there is no accessible tube service is a major issue and in zones 1 and 2 – much more difficult.

Transport for London are justifying this planned change as they claim more people are using the tube. This is not an option for disabled people as only 15% of Central London tube stations have step-free access and often not to all lines/directions. Central London stations which still do not have step-free access include numerous major hubs such as Bond Street, Oxford Circus, Leicester Square, Covent Garden, Tottenham Court Road, Vauxhall, Victoria, Euston, and Charring Cross.

Across the whole of London only 33% of tube stations have step-free access and often not to all lines.

Further, despite promises from TfL and the Mayor of London, that the closure of ticket offices would improve services for disabled travellers up to October 2016 the number of lifts being out of service due to staff shortages increased by a massive 118% compared to the previous year. In some cases lifts were closed for 20 hours.

On top of all of that there are often planned closures of lifts for maintenance work lasting months and with no alternative usable tube stations nearby.

TFL state in their consultation that the opening of the Elizabeth line (Crossrail) will reduce the need for buses. However, given the issues with acceptable levels of staffing at existing stations to provide lifts, and the fact that Crossrail will not be level from the platform to the train, requiring a bridging ramp, can disabled people trust that they will be able to access the new line’s services?

In most areas of central London Blue Badges cannot be used so disabled drivers are unable to park there. For those in work with a Motability vehicle who might need to travel into central London for work by taxi due to the lack of parking available this too is no longer an option as Access to Work will no longer provide taxis for those who have a Motability vehicle – not even so they can work.

At peak time, buses are often delayed due to traffic, or are so full that drivers refuse to allow wheelchair users onboard, meaning commutes are harder, longer and more arduous for disabled people.

These proposals risk causing disabled people more difficulties accessing the community, their places of work, and will reduce their ability to undertake leisure activities.
As usual the needs of your many disabled passengers seem to have been totally disregarded. We would like to ask you how TfL intend to address the needs of disabled passengers and continue to provide a service suitable for the 21st century.

Fitzrovia West Neighbourhood forum

Your bus maps for the West End bus consultation are confining. Where, for example, is the 88 and 453 route on the map?

As chair of the Fitzrovia West Neighbourhood Forum I write to register our objection to the reduction of buses running along Great Portland Street and Portland Place. We are a business forum representing businesses AND residents in Fitzrovia.

Fitzrovia is a densely populated residential area. We have many elderly and disabled residents who rely on the buses. (And can't take the tube which has too many steps) In addition car ownership in the West End is very low. West End Residents need buses more than outer London residents.

Sending one or two buses through the residential areas is sensible.

Yet it seems that you might have forgotten West End residents and local business in your planning. In general we want to get about the West End, (not in and out of it). We use the bus to access local services, Westminster City Hall (where we have to go to access services) our workplaces, the hospitals and supermarkets. In addition we need to be able to access the railway hubs. We don't want or need to take long journeys, so the tube is largely irrelevant to us. Buses are far more convenient for short journeys.

In addition our businesses and their employees use these buses regularly to carry out local journeys.

Many people rely on the convenience of the bus to the inconvenience of the tube for short journeys within the City of Westminster.

We use the c2 very regularly to access Victoria. It is our only route to Victoria Station, Victoria Street and Westminster City Hall, which is our administrative hub. The c2 is one of the few routes that serves Mayfair, using different streets. We don't see any benefit in cutting it. In fact we support the dilution of bus routes with one or two services taking smaller streets (as long as the buses on these routes are smaller and eventually become electric, rather than diesel powered.)

There is a dearth of 'hopper' type transport in the West End where it is desperately needed for residents and businesses alike.

Your planning seems to overlook the local impact of such changes.
Grosvenor Britain and Ireland

Grosvenor Britain & Ireland (GBI) welcomes the opportunity to offer its views on Transport for London (TfL)’s consultation. GBI creates and manages high-quality neighbourhoods across the UK and Ireland. Its diverse property development, management and investment portfolio includes Grosvenor’s London estate, comprising 300 acres of Mayfair and Belgravia, in which it has a £1bn planned investment programme. Other developments include Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Southampton and Bermondsey in London. GBI is part of Grosvenor Group, a privately owned property group active in some of the world’s most dynamic cities.

Given the well documented and growing pressures on London’s infrastructure and quality of life, the West End’s continued success cannot be taken for granted. Oxford Street already reflects many of those pressures. Half a million people walk down it every day but it has high levels of traffic, poor quality public realm and inadequate amenities. Air pollution is three times higher than the EU’s legal limit, and the street’s western section is the site of the country’s top three pedestrian accident hotspots.

So we welcome the ambition being shown by the Mayor to transform Oxford Street’s public realm, starting with a substantial cut in vehicle traffic. We would like to see a 40% cut in bus traffic underway shortly and delivered in time for the opening of the Elizabeth line. And we would like TfL to propose this year further bus reductions of up to 100%.

We believe these changes in traffic must come with renewed public sector placemaking leadership. The West End’s potential to host jobs, growth and fundamentally better places should be unlocked with a clear vision and coordinated investment plans to deliver it that integrate these fundamental cuts in traffic in Oxford Street.
Kensal Rise Residents’ Association (KRRA)

I am the Chair of Kensal Rise Residents’ Association (KRRA) in Kensal Rise, London, NW10. For a long time now, we have been calling on TfL to consider re-routing 452 away from Kensal Rise as this route duplicates an existing route - 52.

Due to this duplication, 452 largely operates as a ghost route - it travels to and from Chamberlayne Road for miles more or less empty. However, it causes a lot of congestion on Chamberlayne, contributes significantly to the serious Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) problem that prevails on Chamberlayne and Kensal residential areas, as all the buses on this route are diesel-powered.

Re-routing 452 will certainly help ease the problems of NO2, congestion, very poor road safety that blight Chamberlayne, a narrow single carriageway which cuts through a largely residential area / small neighbourhood – Kensal Rise.

TfL operates 12,041 diesel double-decker buses, attached to 7 routes, weekly on Chamberlayne / Kensal Rise. Bus dominance and a very poor air quality environment are a serious problem in Kensal Rise. TfL should not just stop at 452 – it should also consider re-routing the other 2 ghost routes - 302 and 28 – as these either duplicate an existing route or there is just simply not enough passenger demand along Chamberlayne and surrounding Kensal area.

Re-routing 302 via Donnington Road back to Willesden Garage, as opposed to terminating it in Kensal, would certainly help reduce bus induced congestion on Chamberlayne, thereby improving journey reliability for the other bus routes - 6, 52, 187 and 316, lead to better use of these resources in areas where there is poor bus provision, and so yield better value for money for taxpayers. Terminating 28, a confirmed GHOST ROUTE, would also deliver the aforementioned benefits as 302 re-routing would.

We hope that TfL will be bold and in addition to 452, review 302 and 28 as the presence of these ghost routes in the Kensal area compound the NO2 problem. As the Deputy Mayor for Transport has said, it is unacceptable for a public organisation as is TfL to be instrumental in shortening and harming the lives of residents with its NO2 operations.

It is clear that TfL needs to modify its bus model, as at current one is designed for the benefit of bus operators and not passengers. Bus Planning should be about MOVING PEOPLE and not HOW MANY BUSES AN OPERATOR CAN MOVE BY THE MINUTE, as is TfL’s current model. This model is endemically flawed and that is why London’s streets are flooded with GHOST BUSES, for which bus operators are bonused / financially rewarded for operating such! It is is the taxpayer who is clearly the loser as well as bus users.
And with thousands of diesel powered GHOST BUSES roaming London streets and in areas like Kensal Rise, that is why we have life threatening AIR QUALITY ENVIRONMENTS!

DO NOT STOP AT 452; REVIEW MERITS & DEMERITS OF SENDING GHOST ROUTES 302 AND 28 TO AND FROM KENSAL RISE. Current arrangements are a scandalous waste of taxpayers’ monies and great dis-service to London bus users.

Kensal Triangle Residents Association

Following the recent consultation, the KTRA is happy to support the revised plans for the revamp of Chamberlayne Road and clean-up of harmful emissions. However, we are very concerned about the proposal to change the 452 bus route from its current route up to Kensal Rise. We are aware that the consultation is also in part due to changes in public transport infrastructure - and the opening of the Elizabeth Line (Cross Rail) through Central London (which is thought will soak up a lot of the east/west passengers and the desire to remove traffic from Oxford Street). However, the Elizabeth Line will not serve Kensal Rise directly as the 452 bus route currently does and the loss of this route will badly affect many bus uses in Kensal Rise and Green areas.

We also fail to see how this will do anything to remove traffic on Oxford Street, as it doesn’t go anywhere near it, and the other end of this route will remain unaffected.

It will also remove the bus from serving a busy London Overground station - Kensal Rise.

At peak times the 452 & the 52 buses are packed full. We have even had reports from elderly residents that they find it difficult coming up from Ladbroke Grove at peak times as they have to stand as both routes are so full.

The current consultation plan suggests the 452 will no longer serve Kensal Rise station but would be re-routed to go down Kensal Road and on to Westbourne Park. This re-routing will present issues for many of those currently travelling on the 452 especially at peak times, as the 52 bus (which overlaps the route along part of Chamberlayne Road) will not be sufficient to meet the demand that is currently present on the 452. It is unclear from the figures in the ‘Urban Flow Report’ how they arrived at the so-called numbers of people affected, it doesn’t seem to tally with the reality of what we see.

A rerouting of the 452 bus would mean that north to south from Sainsbury’s/Ladbroke Grove to Kensal Rise will be served by only ONE bus - the 52. One of the biggest issues for Kensal Green/Rise is going north/south on local buses. School runs will be$ affected; many school children take the 452 to/from Kensal Rise down Ladbroke Grove so their options will be limited to the 52 route which is already
full to capacity at peak times. The 452 also provides a valuable link to get to the central line at Notting Hill Gate, especially at peak times.

If the 452 were re-routed then the 52 would simply NOT be able to cope with the demand during these times, unless the frequency of the 52 was increased to keep the number of buses per hour the same as that currently supplied by both the 52 and 452 at present.

If TFL is genuinely trying to get people onto public transport – then increasing traveler capacity on this routing north/south really needs to be addressed and not to remove existing capacity.

This also will stop the 452 serving a major station - i.e. the London Overground, at Kensal Rise, which seem’s utterly ridiculous.

It will cause more traffic congestion turning right into Kensal road, when it comes out of Sainsbury’s

A number of buses do this already, and as they nearly always have to stop while half turning, to let the traffic go, going south down Ladbroke Grove. They also block the traffic going north over the canal while doing this quite frequently.

By doing this, it effectively doubles the route back on itself, which hardly seems like a good move. People wanting to use a bus out of central London to get to Westbourne park are not going to use the 452, they would use an 18. So it seems a bit of an odd change, if it is indeed in the name of efficiency. Doubling back on a route is hardly that.

The more we looked at this, the more crazy it seems that this is even being proposed. It just does not make any sense.

Buses need to feed the remainder of the train or tube network or link up with significant other bus route’s.

This change does none of these things, in fact it does the reverse, as it removes the interchange at Kensal Rise, at the end of the current 452 route.

A survey carried out by the KTRA, showed that a large majority our residents did not want any reduction in the number of buses and routes serving the area but instead wanted all buses to be replaced with cleaner emission types. Indications are that APRATA, another local Resident’s Association, in Kensal Rise, also do not want to see any reduction in the number of bus routes serving the Kensal Rise area.

APRATA has commented that the ‘Urban Flow Report’ proposes having no buses terminating at Kensal Rise but elsewhere, however as far as the 452 is concerned, elsewhere should be beyond Kensal Rise, not before Kensal Rise. The KTRA are also of this opinion.
The buses only make up 8% of road traffic along Chamberlayne Road, therefore, the difference made by the removal of the 452 is likely to be insignificant particularly if the buses are replaced with hybrid or Euro VI buses which TFL has committed to. Some residents are concerned about air quality and they are right to raise these concerns but with the forthcoming introduction of cleaner buses by TFL, there should be more thought directed at the capacity issues. Lack of capacity on this north/south route could put more cars onto the road and the resulting emissions and volume of traffic could increase, which would be counterproductive for the air quality, which is already very bad in this area.

**Kings College London**

**Transport for London Consultation Response**

I am writing to you today to formally respond to the consultation on 'proposed changes to buses in Central London'. At King's College London we are passionately committed to building on our position as a civic university at the heart of London. What this means is that any opportunity for us to better serve the city in which we were founded, is an opportunity that we should not miss.

The context in which you are considering potential changes to some of the most popular bus services in the world is a tough one. London’s exponential growth is a challenge, which all of us who live, work and visit London must engage with. Bold decisions will have to be continually made to design, build, and maintain a transport system already under immense strain, to cope with future growth. The drive to encourage more people to use a greater diversity of transport systems has to be a logical one.

As you know, King's research suggests we need to be equally bold is in tackling this city's air pollution. You will be well aware; King's plays an active role in the monitoring, and research of London's air quality. I greatly welcome your recent announcement of £875 million up to 2021/22 in tackling the capital's poor air quality.

Additionally I believe that your proposed changes to the bus routes offer a direct and tangible opportunity to improve health, wellbeing and safety of our students and staff at King's and in the wider London community, particularly if you consider some wider changes.

The attached report demonstrates that we understand the rationale, proposed changes, and the impact this would have on King's College London. It also outlines where we believe that further consideration of removal/repurposing more of the routes that run along, and stand on the Strand, together with pedestrianisation proposals, will have a real, and positive impact for thousands of Londoners, students and tourists who use the area every day.
We would be delighted to discuss our proposals further with either yourself or appropriate members of staff within TfL and your Mayoral Team. As a Civic University, we are committed to serving London, and will always work with you to support any improvement in the lives of Londoners.

The London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Consultation on West End Bus services

1. This response is made on behalf of the London Forum of Civic & Amenity Societies. The Forum is the umbrella group for over 130 Amenity societies. All of them have members who use buses in central London.

2. This response is largely confined to consideration of the broad principles behind the consultation. Where we refer to a particular bus route, it is to illustrate where we believe sound principles are upheld or breached.

3. We understand that the review is prompted by three factors: a recent decline in bus use in central London; the desire to reduce or remove empty buses from Oxford Street, and the need to address air quality issues.

4. We believe the decline in bus use has come about because of prolonged disruption to bus routes. The long term benefits of Crossrail and of Cycle Superhighways inevitably come at a short term cost. Nonetheless, the impact of construction work has been far greater in the past five years than at any other time. Many journeys formerly made by bus are now quicker to walk; longer journeys are being made on the Underground despite its severe overcrowding.

5. If there is to be continued growth – and every Mayor and every London plan has endorsed that – it is not sustainable for the bus network not to absorb some of the increased travel that results. Crossrail will provide a temporary respite in congestion, but some estimates are that it will only last for three years. After that time the bus network must be able to cope with renewed growth.

6. The phenomenon of lightly loaded buses was the direct result of the privatisation of 1987, when London Buses felt compelled to split routes which operated well from two garages at either end. The result was too many routes terminating around Oxford Street. Terminating buses are inevitably empty.

7. There are ample places to park buses around Oxford Street, but as far as passengers are concerned it is a poor place to terminate buses. Passengers board and alight in roughly equal numbers at all times of the day. The ideal terminal point is one at which large numbers board or alight in the morning and perform the reverse operation in the evening.
8. We are therefore disappointed that it is proposed to increase the number of routes terminating there from five to six. Removing lightly loaded buses from Oxford Street would improve its air quality, but increasing the amount of dead mileage would worsen it.

9. In particular, the 12, which has gradually been shortened, was only curtailed at Oxford Street rather than Notting Hill Gate because of a problem with bendy buses. Now that the bendy buses have gone the route should be restored. It is a far better option for passengers than the 23. You refer to a decline in use of the 73. If it becomes a still shorter route that decline will accelerate. Although we prefer longer routes that obviate the need to change buses, we see little merit in extending the 22 and adding it to the phalanx of empty buses at Oxford Circus.

10. The changes proposed for the 73 and 390 reverse the improvements that made the introduction of the congestion charge so successful. TfL should be looking at what needs to be done to reinvigorate the Congestion Charge scheme. We would suggest reviving the western extension, as a separate zone, and improving bus services to make it work, would be the way to go. The income from the CGZ should pay for the necessary improvements to buses.

11. We strongly reject the idea that the hopper fare justifies shortening bus routes. The people who benefit most from through routes – those with poor mobility – are not paying fares and do not benefit from the hopper fare. The boarding time is a greater proportion of the total journey time for wheelchair users, and doubling the dwell time has an adverse effect for all users. A more constructive way forward would address the issues of mobility. Could changes to bus design, or bus stop layout, be made to reduce the impact of changing buses on dwell time? Is there scope for bringing bus stops closer together where interchange between the two takes place, or providing more stops? The stopping arrangements in Oxford Street were drawn up when almost all buses had an open platform and boarding an alighting took place between stops.

12. We feel it would be wrong to anticipate the effects of the Crossrail line. Many of the journeys where you anticipate a resultant reduction of bus use can currently be made using the Central line. In particular, the proposed 23 bears little resemblance to the current route of that number, which is basically the western arm of the old 15. TfL should await the experience of three months of Crossrail before advancing proposals related to its effect, and should remain mindful that once usage grows to the level of that of the Central Line, travellers will turn again to the bus.

13. There are on the other hand several proposals which improve the bus network. The changes suggested for route 3 provide useful new links. We welcome the proposals for the 25/425. The 172 is given a terminus which better meets our criterion of serving passenger interests. Taking the 452 to Vauxhall is sensible: this has been the least successful of the CGZ related routes. Curtailing the 137 seems reasonable as long as the 159 is to continue in its present form.
Marble Arch Partnership

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Proposed Changes to buses in Central London

I am writing on behalf of the Marble Arch BID to respond to your consultation on the changes to buses in central London. As a BID we have been formally established since 1 April 2016. Our area extends from Marble Arch in the south to the Marylebone flyover in the north with Edgware Road as our spine. In our BID Proposal, on which businesses voted last February, we stated our ambitions to make the location safer for pedestrians and to improve their safety as they move along and across Edgware Road and Marble Arch. We also want to make more of Marble Arch itself and improve the visitor journey and experience in this prime tourist location.

We welcome this review of bus routes in Central London and the beneficial impacts it will have on Oxford Street, particularly on air quality.

However, I am concerned about the proposal to create an additional bus stand for the 137 bus route at Marble Arch. There are already multiple bus and coach stands at Tyburn Way and Cumberland Gate and stops and stands on Park Lane. These damage the setting of The Marble Arch, a grade 1 listed national monument, and impede visitor flow and enjoyment of the space. The park surrounding Marble Arch is designated Metropolitan Open Land and attracts millions of visitors each year, with adjacent Hyde Park providing a natural continuation from Marble Arch.

We understand the technical challenge with the differentiation between stops and stands, but would urge you to consider a new approach at Marble Arch.

We strongly object to the addition of a further bus stand at Marble Arch.

Yours sincerely

Kay Buxton
Chief Executive
Mile End Old Town Residents Association

My comments refer to the alterations to the number 25 and 425 routes. I find the information very difficult to understand. More buses west of Mile End and more east of Stratford but less in between? How is this going to be achieved?

If this means buses terminating at Mile End and using the turn around in Grove Road then I strongly oppose the scheme. I have noticed large numbers of number 25 buses parking up in Grove Road (which ISN'T part of its route) and this is causing considerable extra congestion and pollution as the rest of the traffic has to wait whilst they use the turnaround. Since the CS2U upgrade traffic in Grove Road has got MUCH worse and these changes appear to compound the problem.

The vast majority of the survey is irrelevant to this part of London and so the survey expects folk to wade through large parts of it clicking "don't know" or "neither agree or disagree" and this will surely mean the data is heavily biased. Most of respondents aren't going to care about anything but their own patch and so that can be interpreted as supporting the proposals when it in fact means it is just irrelevant to them.

The survey gives scant info on how things are going to be achieved and in the case of the 25 route implies buses are going to magically appear and disappear along the route.? If this is going to be achieved by terminating in residential areas then it must be stated.
New West End Company

New West End Company represents retailers and property owners in Bond Street, Oxford Street and Regent Street. The consultation on changes to bus routes represents a step in the right direction towards revitalising the heart of our nation’s retail capital on Oxford Street. We nonetheless hope that this consultation is just the starting point in this regard and options for further reductions of up to 100% during certain periods of the day are also brought forward in the next few months to meet the aspirations of the Mayor and shared by our members.

Our retailers and property owners strongly support the creation of vehicle free areas during specific periods within the day and evening across Oxford Street. We would also like to see the delivery of the 40% reduction outlined in this consultation to commence as soon as possible this year and believe this would also offer best value to the tax payers and demonstrate tangible delivery of the Oxford Street transformation.

We believe this longer-term approach to bring forward a radical reduction in all traffic to the area is essential if we are deliver a vibrant economy for the West End’s retail district that maximises its full commercial potential delivering growth whilst balancing accessibility, safety, and environmental improvements for citizens, shoppers, employers and employees. We see this as the first step in that direction.

We consider that our proposals would also complement the forthcoming opening of the Elizabeth Line with our members’ ambitions in this regard are to achieve:

1) At least a 50% reduction of all traffic entering Oxford Street and Regent Street by the end of 2018

2) Remove the worse polluting vehicles from our streets and for all public transport and service vehicles entering the area to only use electric power by the end of 2018

3) Bring forward the ultra-low emission zone to be in place by the opening of the Elizabeth Line

We must also stress that we do not support options that simply lead to the re-direction of traffic down neighbouring residential or commercial streets. We are keen to work with the Mayor and Westminster City Council through the West End Partnership on future modelling and would naturally expect all options to undergo full economic and operational assessments.

In the meantime, we welcome the direction set out in the current consultation, particularly the reduction of eight routes on the western end of Oxford Street, the reduction of buses on Regent Street and the proposed measures to enhance the relationship between nearby Park Lane and Maida Vale. We would therefore ask that Transport for London expedites the proposed changes with as early a date for reduction as possible, in advance of a more significant wide-ranging review of routes to achieve the objectives outlined above.
Northbank BID
The Northbank BID seeks to enhance the public realm of the Strand, Aldwych and Trafalgar Square. The area is a busy transport interchange with many buses providing essential service for residents, workers and visitors. We would support measures to improve the efficiency of the bus service such as reducing the number of empty buses, waiting times and smarter timetabling while retaining an appropriate level of capacity and a resilient network. The BID supports measures to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality to provide healthy streets in the Strand and Aldwych area.

Air Quality
Strand Aldwych has some of London’s worse air quality caused by large numbers of diesel vehicles many of which are buses. The BID works with Kings College to monitor the pollution levels with apportionment analysis indicating that buses are contributing 30% of the NOx. The BID would welcome more initiatives to improve the air quality such as considering Strand Aldwych for Clean Bus Corridor programme which would prioritize low emission buses for the routes in the area.

Top 10 sites exceeding mean limit of 40 ug/m3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>NOx Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth - Putney High Street</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth - Brixton Road</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster - Strand (Northbank BID)</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth - Putney High Street Facade</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London - Walbrook Wharf</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster - Marylebone Road</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden - Euston Road</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster - Oxford Street</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London - Beech Street</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea - Earls Court Rd</td>
<td>120 ug/m3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Realm
Bus stands and waiting bays also lessen the quality of public realm for pedestrians which can limit the number of crossing points. The Northbank BID is currently working with TfL and Westminster City Council on the Aldwych Vision which sets out a framework of public realm improvements that would be unlocked by the removal of the Aldwych traffic gyratory. Scheme options are being developed, with consultants NRP and Publica, which incorporate a review of: bus stands, waiting bays and travel times. The proposals seek to enhance pedestrian movement, encouraging active travel, reduce conflict points and improve safety.
The existing traffic network creates conflict points. The cyclists are proceeding on a green signal but need to navigate hazardous bus traffic. North west Aldwych footways are subject to the high levels of footfall drawn by the area’s cultural attractors and employment uses.

Simplification of bus routes in the area will help to improve safety and road layouts are being considered to provide more space for pedestrian movement.
Aldwych’s north west section has high footfall. Pavement space is reduced and pedestrian crossings are restricted where buses stop.

Buses Northbank area (Strand & Aldwych)
The bus review proposes route changes to the following bus routes that travel through the Northbank area.

6       Edgware Rd to Aldwych
15      Aldwych / Blackwall
23      Great western road
172     Brockley rise – Aldwych – St Pauls
N3      check changed
N15     check changed

Route 6 is diverted via Park Lane to Piccadilly Circus, terminating at Aldwych. We would support the reduction buses waiting and terminating in Aldwych to release space for pedestrians and understand from the proposals that routes 6, will continue to terminate and stand at Aldwych.
Route 15, buses on this route have been temporarily starting and finishing at Trafalgar Square instead of Regent Street since May 2013 due to roadworks and traffic congestion. TfL proposes the route start and finish at Trafalgar Square permanently.

We would like to reduce buses waiting and terminating in Trafalgar Square to improve the pedestrian environment and reduce pollution.

Routes 13 and 23 are re-routed away from Strand and Aldwych so result in a corresponding reduction in the volume of buses passing through and terminating/standing at Aldwych. We welcome this reduction which will assist in releasing kerbside space at Aldwych.
Route 172, changes would not affect the Strand Aldwych area.

Route N3, retains the service via Trafalgar Square and Charing Cross.

Route N15, retains the service via Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross and Aldwych.
The proposed changes for West End buses will increase efficiencies and maintain a vital service for prosperity and economic sustainability. The BID would support initiatives to reduce pollution and congestion. The BID also seeks to enhance the public realm to make the streets healthier and safer.
consultations@tfl.gov.uk

26 January 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Proposed Changes to buses in Central London

I am writing on behalf of the Paddington BID to respond to your consultation on the changes to buses in central London. As a BID we have been formally established since 1 April 2005 and we are currently in our third term. Our area includes the area around Paddington station, Praed Street, Eastbourne Terrace and Sussex Gardens. Since being established, we have worked towards making the area safer and more welcoming and improving people’s onward journeys as they emerge from Paddington Station.

We welcome this review of bus routes in Central London and the beneficial impacts it will have, and recognise that the completion of the Elizabeth Line in 2018 will mean a change in people’s journeys from Paddington into the West End.

I understand that the main changes to bus routes in our area are the Numbers 23, 46 and 332.

The change to route 23 effectively creates a brand new bus route to Wembley rather than Aldwych. It would be helpful to know more about the thinking for this route and the expected journey time to Wembley. Our area suffers from a degree of anti-social behaviour when there are big sporting events on in London as people arrive from the west into Paddington and often break their journey before going on to the actual event. A direct bus route to Wembley from Paddington might result in more incidents of anti-social behaviour as people break their journey at Paddington to/from Wembley via the proposed bus route, with buses much more prone to this type of behaviour compared to underground services.

My only concern as regards Route 46 is the specific location where the bus stands before it starts its journey. This is proposed for Eastbourne Terrace, which is set to re-open to all traffic in December 2018. At the moment there is just one lane in each direction. It would therefore be helpful to know where the bus will stand and what planning is in place prior to December 2018.

In terms of the loss of the two routes from Praed Street (332 and 23), we do continue to have concerns about patient access to St Mary’s hospital, and would like to see the passenger data for people starting and ending their journeys on Praed Street for these two routes.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Kay Buxton
Chief Executive
Paddington Residents’ Active Concern on Transport (PRACT)

Response to TfL consultation on reducing buses in Oxford Street

PRACT is a consortium of four wide-area amenity societies, all recognised by Westminster City Council. Their combined area covers most of the previous London Borough of Paddington.

Comments on route changes affecting our area (see above)

These are routes 6, 23, 46, 332 and 390.
(Our comments are mostly written in terms of inbound journeys, but the same points generally apply to journeys in the opposite direction)

Three general points
1. We believe that you have over-estimated the extent to which people using bus services from points of origin within Zones 1 and 2 will choose to transfer to Crossrail at Paddington. If their destinations are close to the Crossrail stations at Bond Street/Oxford Circus or Tottenham Court Road, a transfer to Crossrail at Paddington will usually entail paying a second fare (unless on a Zone 1 and 2 season ticket), all for an only small shortening of the journey, at best. For such destinations, bus to bus transfer in the Paddington area is much more likely, when a direct bus service is lost. Has this effect on the loading of surviving bus services along Oxford Street been adequately allowed for?

2. We are generally concerned that some of the newly required interchanges will necessitate walking from one bus stop to another, at points where stops are separated according to destination. This will be hard for the elderly and disabled.
3. As regards Edgware Road especially, we think it most important, particularly in the new situation now proposed
   a. to improve enforcement of illegal stopping, where such obstructions regularly cause delays, particularly in peak hours.
   b. to extend the prohibition of stopping/ unloading to a 24 hour basis.

Route 6
Proposal – between Marble Arch and Piccadilly Circus, reroute the 6 bus via Park Lane and Piccadilly, instead of via Oxford Street and Regent Street, as now.

Our attitude – generally supportive, but it is not clear whether Regent Street could be reached with only one change of bus. Oxford Street could be reached with a single change of bus at stops in Edgware Road, but would a walk from one stop to another be needed, because of different destinations? This would be hard on the elderly and disabled.
Route 23
Proposal (a) – extend route northwards towards Wembley, to provide a connection with Crossrail at Paddington.
Proposal (b) – it would no longer run from Paddington onwards to Liverpool Street (via Oxford Street and the Strand). It would terminate at Lancaster Gate station.
From points west of Paddington, connections are proposed, to route 7 (an unchanged route), in Eastbourne Terrace (or at earlier stops), which will work for destinations as far as Oxford Circus. An alternative connection is proposed to route 94 (also an unchanged route) at Lancaster Gate station, which will work for destinations as far as Piccadilly Circus.

Our attitude on route 23.
1. No comment on a. As regards b., there have been numerous objections from our members, who are opposed to the need for a change of bus (or two changes, if going to points beyond Piccadilly Circus). PRACT objects strongly on the same grounds. A journey starting within Zones 1 and 2 that would involve two changes of bus, because of the proposed changes, could exceed the one hour limit at the second point of interchange.

2. A further important point is whether the interchanges are at the same stop – OK for the change from route 23 to route 7, but a walk and a crossing of Bayswater Road is probably needed for change to route 94, at Lancaster Gate station.

3. Furthermore, many elderly passengers board or leave route 23 at the stops for St Mary’s Hospital. For these people, interchange from route 7 to other routes serving points Regent Street, Piccadilly Circus and beyond would probably have to be in Oxford Street, where a walk from one stop to another is probably needed. (As regards interchange from route 7 at stops in Edgware Road, interchange to route 98, which goes east of Oxford Circus, would be possible without a walk, but it seems – because of the re-routeing of bus No. 6 – that there would be no bus going directly from stops in Edgware Road to Regent Street.)

4. We request consultation, later, on where the stand at Lancaster Station will be, whether this will be a combined stop/stand and if not where the last alighting point and first boarding point will be.

5. See below comment on route 332.

Route 46
Proposal - terminates/starts at Paddington (Eastbourne Terrace) rather than at Lancaster Gate station.
1. It is essential that good alternative connections are provided between Lancaster Gate station (from both the Central Line and the stops for routes 94 and 148) and the Paddington Station area. This appears to be the case, given the proposal for routes 23 and 332, but we request further consultation on where the stops/stands will be in the Lancaster Gate station area and on where the stands for all three routes 23, 46 and 332 will be – will they be combined stops/stands and if not where will the last alighting point and first boarding point be?

2. As regards the stand for the changed route 46, where will this be? The route diagram shows a circuit: Craven Road westbound, Westbourne Terrace, Sussex Gardens and Spring Street, and there appears to be no suitable location for a stand anywhere along this circuit.

3. See below comment on route 332.

Route 332
Proposal (a) - Re-routeing away from Praed Street, and Maida Vale, now to go by way of Warwick Avenue, Shirland Road and Kilburn Park station as far as Kilburn High Road.

Proposal (b) – No longer does the loop around Paddington Station and now terminates/starts at Lancaster Gate station.

Our attitude on route 332
1. It is essential that the changes to routes 46 and 332 are implemented together, so as to continue providing a direct link between Lancaster Gate Station and Warwick Avenue stations.

2. Before any decision is taken, we need to know where the stops for Warwick Avenue station, in both directions, will be on the re-routed bus 332.

3. On proposal a., there would now be a double-decker bus passing along Warwick Avenue, added to the existing single-decker bus (route 46). This will damage the amenity of residents, especially in the quiet but narrow section of Warwick Avenue between the Harrow gyratory and the intersection with Blomfield Road. This is objectionable.

4. On proposal b., there would now be two double-decker bus routes in Craven Road (westbound), in the southern-most section of Westbourne Terrace southbound and in Spring Street, in place of one single-decker route now, the 46. This is a regrettable change from the present situation, but previously there was also the double-decker bus 436, as well as the 46.
5. We request consultation later on where its stand will be. Will this be a combined stop/stand and if not where will the last alighting point and first boarding point be?
Route 390
Proposal – No longer serves Bayswater Road. (The 390 will still serve Oxford Street beyond Marble Arch, but will be diverted to Victoria.)

Our attitude on route 390
1. There have been strong objections from members whose are opposed to the need to change buses if going further east than Oxford Circus, e.g. to King’s Cross. PRACT objects on the same grounds, also see 2. below.

2. The 94 bus, an unchanged route, will be available from Bayswater Road only as far as Oxford Circus. For points on the 390’s existing route further east, interchange from the 94 to the 390 or other bus will be needed in Oxford Street, where the stops used for interchange are likely to be separated.

Residents of Chesney Court, Media Vale
I do not agree with re-routing the No 6 bus via Park Lane. We already have bus 414 from The Chippenham and Shirland Road that takes us down Park Lane. The bus 6 is important for us to get to Oxford Circus as some of us are Senior Citizens and rely on this bus route to get us to the area without having to change buses. I hope that you will take this into consideration when planning to re-route the No 6 bus.

Tavistock Crescent Residents Association
I am writing on behalf of Tavistock Crescent Residents Association regarding your proposal to stop the 23 bus service to central London and the City.

We are an estate of 121 households on the 23 route. Many of our residents live on low incomes and depend on busses for cheap, accessible transport. We also have several residents with disabilities that reduce their mobility.

As Chair of the Residents Association, I alerted our residents to your plans. Their views are below. Not one resident was in favour of the plan to get rid of the 23. Respondents were unanimously against the plan and gave the following reasons.

We therefore ask that the changes not go ahead and the existing route 23 remain otherwise the most vulnerable transport will be the ones who suffer most.

REDUCTION IN SERVICE
- The bus service is being reduced with no increase in the other routes (such as route 7). This will result in the 7s being twice as crowded as now and longer waiting times.
- It's not proposed to increase any other public transport in our area. The proposal is a reduction which will force former bus users onto existing overcrowded tube services.
• The 23 currently accesses London between Oxford Street and the river. If this route is cut it will require two or more changes to get to places like Piccadilly, Covent Garden, or the City which can now be reached on a single bus.

SLOWER JOURNEYS
• By making us make more changes, our journeys into London will become even slower.
• If I have to get two or three busses to get to the same place, I face delays on three busses instead of one.

HIGHER COST
• A return bus journey to Liverpool Street costs £3. The same journey by tube costs £4.80 and £5.80 at peak times. Almost double the cost to me.
• The suggested alternatives of the underground and trains are significantly more costly that travelling by bus. I rely on affordable mode of transport like busses.
• I can make one bus transfer within an hour but if I have to take a 3rd bus I will be paying twice for what is now a single journey.

ACCESSIBILITY
• The 23 bus offers level access for those with mobility or other disabilities.
• Busses are accessible for prams, wheelchair users and can be used by guide dogs.
• For those with disabilities getting on and off busses is physically exhausting and time consuming (delaying the service). Keeping the single 23 route is a better option than forcing us to change from bus to bus to get to the same place.
• The tube isn't an alternative. Neither Ladbroke Grove nor Westbourne Park have disabled access. Both stations have long flights of stairs so can't be used by those in wheelchairs or with prams. Even climbing the stairs is difficult for people with health problems.
• Guide dogs need special certification and training before they are allowed on the underground. I can get a bus with my guide dog but we can't use the tube

Victoria Business Improvement District

The Victoria Business Improvement District (BID) was established in April 2010 following a successful ballot of local businesses. Since then, we have been working with our BID members and partners to improve the area and create a sustainable business environment. In February 2015 BID members voted for the BID to continue for a second term.
The proposed changes will see the bus routes 73, 82, C2 (24-hour) removed from Victoria, and new routes 13 and 390 introduced (both 24-hour).

Victoria BID is supportive of efforts to review the bus network to ensure it is fit for a future London. However, our support is tempered by the fact that an unknown exists as to how the changes will affect the overall frequency of buses departing from or arriving at Victoria regardless of which bus routes will be operating after the changes have taken effect. Information regarding bus frequency pre and post the proposed changes has not been provided as part of the consultation. Our overarching request therefore is that TfL should be prepared to increase frequencies quickly where long delays arise for passengers (for example, greater than 10 minutes, less during rush hour) after the changes have been put into effect.

We are also concerned that footways may not be wide enough to cope with growing crowds that will build up where bus passengers have to wait for long periods for their buses to arrive. The problem can be particularly acute already on the eastern side of Lower Grosvenor Gardens where bus passengers and pedestrians jostle for space and often step into the roadway to bypass one another.

Given poor levels of air quality in Victoria we would also like to see *all* buses departing from and arriving at Victoria using the latest zero or low emission technologies, preferably all-electric, and TfL’s Legible London 5-minute and 15-minute walking maps in all bus shelters so as to encourage those who may be waiting for a bus to walk.
Local businesses

Almacantar Limited

Almacantar Ltd is currently redeveloping a large site at each end of Oxford Street. At the western end the new Marble Arch Place scheme is currently under construction and at the eastern end the Centre Point scheme is nearing completion. This means that we have a strong interest in the bus proposals for central London, particularly Oxford Street, proposed by TfL.

We have examined the bus proposals together with our transport consultants, Steer Davies Gleave. Overall, we are supportive of the proposals and the way they will contribute to an improved environment along Oxford Street without significantly affecting accessibility, although we are interested to see the detail and proposals for resolving concerns on impacts to the area surrounding.

As part of the redevelopment of our schemes we have had regular discussions with TfL about transport issues and we would like this to continue. At Marble Arch, we have recently started the GLA Pre-Application process for a new facility on the traffic island in the middle of Marble Arch Gyratory and we look forward to working with TfL to help improve the environment in this small but forgotten part of London.

At Centre Point, for the past three years we have been meeting each month with TfL, LB Camden and others as part of the St Giles Circus Working Group. This has involved many discussions concerning bus services to facilitate the removal of bus services from St Giles High Street and changes on Earnshaw Street. We will continue to liaise with LB Camden as they implement their West End Project.

Heart of London Business Alliance

The Heart of London Business Alliance supports the principles of rationalising and improving the effectiveness of bus routes in central London. We are particularly supportive of the proposals for route 3 which would reduce the traffic on Regent Street St James's and Haymarket which have recently been transformed with wider footways and a narrower road. We are also keen to see more fundamental reforms in the future to reduce the impact of bus stops, emissions and improve air quality, particularly on Haymarket and Regent Street St James's.

We are also keen to ensure that future plans for Oxford Street would not lead to buses being re-routed onto Regent Street St James's, Haymarket and Piccadilly.

As part of more fundamental reforms, we would also welcome TfL reviewing existing bus stops and the location of bus stands.

We regularly receive feedback from businesses that these could be more appropriately sited, such as by Charles II Street, a location which is frequently used.
London First is a non-profit business membership organization set up 25 years ago with a mission to make London the best city in the world to do business. Our members include the capital’s leading employers in key sectors such as financial and business services, property, transport, ICT, education, creative industries, hospitality and retail. A full list of our members can be found here.

As the most used public transport mode in London by far, bus is of critical importance to the city’s transport offer. That in turn makes it an important contributor to the city’s economic vitality and its qualities as a place to do business.

After multiple concurrent years of strong passenger number growth (on the back of substantial investment), bus ridership in London has reversed in many places in recent years, particularly the last 12 months or so and particularly in central London. This in itself would merit a review of central London bus services. But it also comes ahead of major infrastructure changes for central London: the phased openings of the Elizabeth Line; the major road projects planned for the West End; the junction changes brought forward by the Corporation of London; and the heightened importance attached to high quality public realm which continues to shrink available road space. All of which is against a backdrop of London’s continued population and economic growth. In our view, this mandates a reconsideration of central London’s buses.

Our focus is not on individual bus routes – though it is clear from the supporting documents that TfL’s work has been evidence-led and included a thorough examination of the existing and potential networks. Our comments here are at a principle level.

Given the context, rationalizing routes, particularly through routes, in central London, is a necessary feature of any refresh. Quality of place in central London is an important enabler of London’s global competitiveness, and reducing the amount of traffic (including buses) going through key retail, leisure and office destinations (such as Oxford Street and Regent Street) is fundamental to making them better places to be. This must of course be balanced with the connectivity of those places, and the measures proposed here seem to us to strike a sensible balance in general. The key goal must be a high-performing bus network that gets people where they want to go as efficiently and pleasantly as possible. This does not necessarily have to be achieved on journeys that go through central London, so the thinning-out proposed in this consultation is something we see in principle as a necessary step. As the
recent falls in ridership in central and inner London have shown, through journeys are not attractive propositions when speeds drop, journeys lengthen and unpredictability of journey time grows. The new Hopper ticket has further bolstered the case for this sort of reform.

Breaking what are currently one-bus journeys is an inevitable consequence of that, and we urge TfL to ensure that the net disruption for passengers is minimized. This partly means striving for same stop changes where possible (which does seem to have got attention from TfL). It also means optimizing interchange where it is not possible to change services by using just one bus stop. Some recent changes to bus stops at redesigned junctions have seen this aspect of interchange worsen, and we ask TfL to carefully consider how to optimize non-same-stop interchange for bus passengers whose through journeys will be removed by these changes. This is a blend of physical location of stops, quality of local signage and online information and frequency of services.

In relation to Crossrail specifically, we ask that TfL pay attention not just to the dramatic effects that Crossrail’s phased openings will have on areas surrounding stations but also to the inbound and onward travel demand by bus from Crossrail services. There are signs of this in the detailed work underlying this consultation, but it would be reassuring to see Crossrail’s integration with the bus network demonstrated at an overall level for central London. And while many passengers will use high-performance rail alternatives such as Crossrail there remains a significant price gap between bus and rail travel, so TfL must retain a focus on those passengers who will only use bus, regardless of improvements to other modes.

In conclusion, we see a compelling case for reforming bus services in central London to help them thrive. These proposals will not be the last word on this topic, but given what we know now of current and future demand, we think they make sense.

Octavia

We are a local employer, with around 375 staff situated on Kensal Road. The plan to move the 23 bus route would greatly affect our staff getting to work. A large percentage of staff in our Head office (around 200) use this service daily as well as volunteers, and those who access our services.

We also run a an extra-care home next door, which provides housing and care services to older people, many of whom have dementia and the vast majority with mobility issues. The change to stop the 23 bus from running down Kensal Road would significantly impact on their quality of life and ease of getting to and from the scheme.
6. Next steps

A total of 3415 responses were received. A further review of the proposals and when they should be introduced, in-light of the comments received, has been undertaken.

We intend to go ahead with the proposals as put forward in the consultation except for the proposal to change route 23 at its western end (diversion to Wembley) and the associated change to route 452, which will be considered further in conjunction with stakeholders.

Implementation

We intend to start introducing changes from summer 2017. This is generally earlier than originally proposed because the overall level of demand on these routes is now appreciably lower than had been anticipated by this stage.

Detailed implementation dates are being reviewed. We are also looking at how the resource saved could used on other parts of the bus network.

Once introduced we will closely monitor travel patterns, demand and reliability.

We understand that many people raised concerns and objections to the proposals. We have categorised these and responded to the most commonly raised points in our ‘Response to issues raised’ document.
Appendix A: Consultation questions

Questions about our proposals

All the questions were optional:

- Q1. How often do you use these bus routes?

- Q2. At the moment route 3 starts and finishes at Regent Street, Conduit Street and route N3 at Oxford Circus. What do you think about our proposal to extend routes 3 and N3 to Russell Square – creating new connections including between Millbank and Tottenham Court Road?

- Q3. At the moment route 137 starts and finishes at Oxford Circus. What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses to the Park Lane / Marble Arch area?

- Q4. At the moment route 6 goes along Oxford Street and Regent Street. What do you think about our proposal to reroute buses along Park Lane and Piccadilly?

- Q5. As a temporary measure route 15 currently starts and finishes at Trafalgar Square. What do you think about our proposal for buses to permanently start and finish at Trafalgar Square instead?

- Q6. As a temporary measure route N15 currently starts and finishes at Trafalgar Square. What do you think about our proposal for extend the route so that buses start and finish at Oxford Circus instead?

- Q7. At the moment route 8 starts and finishes at Tottenham Court Road. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Tottenham Court Road permanently, using different arrangements to now?

- Q8. At the moment route 172 starts and finishes at St Pauls. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Clerkenwell instead of St Pauls? This would create more connections to Farringdon Elizabeth line station.

- Q9. At the moment route 242 starts and finishes at Tottenham Court Road. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at St Pauls instead of Tottenham Court Road? This would create the space needed for route 8 to terminate at Tottenham Court Road, but mean route 172 needs to be changed.
• Q10. At the moment route 22 starts and finishes at Piccadilly Circus. What do you think about our proposal for buses to be rerouted to Oxford Circus serving Berkley Square and Conduit Street? This would replace route C2 which would no longer run to Victoria, and instead start and finish at Regent Street.

• Q11 At the moment route 23 runs east west across central London. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be extended north west towards Wembley, serving Paddington and Harrow Road instead? Once the Elizabeth line starts peoples journeys will change considerably. Our proposals for route 23 and associated change to route 452 would create new journey opportunities for many to and from the Elizabeth line at Paddington.

• Q12 At the moment route 46 starts and finishes at Lancaster Gate. What do you think about our proposals for buses to start and finish at Paddington, Eastbourne Terrace? The connection between Paddington and Lancaster Gate would be maintained by the proposed changes to routes 23 and 332.

• Q13 At the moment route 332 runs in a large loop at Paddington with buses finishing at Bishop’s Bridge Road and picking up passengers from Praed Street. What do you think about our proposals for buses to start and finish at Lancaster Gate and be rerouted to serve Warwick Avenue and Kilburn Park Road? This would mean that the large loop is no longer required with buses no longer running on Praed Street and Edgware Road.

• Q14 What do you think about our proposal to change the frequencies on route 25, so that buses run every six minutes Monday to Saturday and every seven to eight minutes on Sunday? Where the route is busiest between Bow and Ilford we also propose to extend route 425 (from Stratford) to ensure there’s enough space for people to travel.

• Q15 - At the moment route 73 starts and finishes at Victoria. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Oxford Circus instead of Victoria? Connections between Oxford Circus and Victoria would be maintained through route 38 and rerouted 390.

• Q16 – At the moment route 390 starts and finishes at Notting Hill Gate. What do you think about our proposal for buses to start and finish at Victoria instead of Notting Hill Gate but running more often than they do currently? Demand to and from Notting Hill Gate on this route has fallen, rerouting it would maintain the connections between Victoria and Oxford Circus better matching demand.
Questions about the respondent

All questions were optional:

- What is your name?
- What is your email address?
- Please provide us with your postcode
- If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name
- How did you find out about this consultation? Bus stop notices; Received an email from TfL; Saw information about it on a bus; Read about in the press; Saw it on the TfL website; Social media, Other (please specify), Not Answered
- What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)?
Appendix B: Consultation materials

A copy of our email to registered Oyster card customers. The emails are targeted to people who have tapped in to particular routes:

Dear Test email recipient,

We would like your views on proposed changes to buses in central London, including bus routes 332 and N73.

These changes are intended to help meet customer demand, reduce congestion on Oxford Street and improve air quality.

For full details, and to share your views, please click here

This consultation will run until 29 January 2017.

Yours sincerely,

Sam Monck
Head of Borough Projects and Programmes

These are our consultation customer service updates. To unsubscribe, please click here

MAYOR OF LONDON

Copyright in the contents of this email and its attachments belongs to Transport for London. Any unauthorised usage will infringe that copyright. © Transport for London
A copy of our bus stop poster and leaflet:

### Have your say

We are proposing changes to bus services in central London, which would help to meet customer demand, improve reliability, reduce congestion on Oxford Street and improve air quality. Changes are proposed to routes:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>N15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22</td>
<td>N73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can find out more route specific details and have your say by visiting [tfl.gov.uk/west-end-bus-changes](http://tfl.gov.uk/west-end-bus-changes), alternatively email us at [consultations@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@tfl.gov.uk), write to us at [FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS](http://www.tfl.gov.uk) or phone us on [0343 222 1234](tel:03432221234)

To have your say, please contact us by **29 January 2017**
A screen grab of our dedicated webpage

Overview

London is growing, with an estimated 10 million people expected to live here by the early 2030s. Transport is an essential part of life in London and we're investing so that as the city grows, everyone who lives, works or visits London has the transport they need. The impact of a growing London will be felt most acutely in central London and the West End, where bus and Tube services are concentrated.

The Mayor has committed to improving life in London, by tackling air quality, transforming Oxford Street and introducing the bus hopper ticket and freezing public transport fares. In addition we are encouraging growth in cycling and walking, and establishing measures to help buses get to and through central London quickly and reliably. Ensuring that we have the right level of bus provision is crucial in ensuring central London works well. This consultation sets out our proposals to change the bus network in central London, so that it can continue to support London as a world leading cultural and economic centre.

Recent investment in upgrading the Tube network has made it much more reliable and attractive for many to use. Over four million journeys are made each day on the Tube network and this number is rising. The Victoria and Northern lines are now among the highest frequency services in Europe, with a train every two minutes at the busiest times. Night Tube services are now running on the Central, Victoria and Jubilee lines with the Northern line commencing in November and the Piccadilly line later in 2016.
These improvements mean that demand for some bus routes has reduced. The 73, for example, which closely follows the route of the Victoria Line, has seen up to eleven per cent reduction in demand since 2011. By operating slightly fewer services, we will be able to operate them faster and more reliably.

The opening of the Elizabeth line from 2018 will further transform how people move about in central London. The line will provide a key east-west link across central London and beyond. Many people will choose to use this faster journey than take a bus. We need to ensure that the right number of buses serve each station on the new line, both in central London and at other stations.

The Elizabeth line is particularly significant for bus services on Oxford Street, with the two new stations at Tottenham Court Road and Bond Street set to further reduce bus demand on the street. The Mayor is also working with City of Westminster to make Oxford Street more pedestrian friendly. Our proposals for changes to bus services in central London are therefore also designed to start reducing the number of buses running along Oxford Street. The proposals in this consultation would reduce the number of buses going along Oxford Street by around 40 per cent.

In this context we have carried out a review of routes to and from the West End including routes 3, 6, 8, 15, 22, 23, 25, 46, 73, 137, 172, 242, 332, 390, 425, 452, C2, N2, N3, N8, N15, N22 and N73. Our proposals range in scale depending on the route to help us better match future demand with space available on the bus. We welcome your views on any or all of the details as set out on the following pages. More information on our longer term plans to transform Oxford Street will be available in the near future, and is not in the scope of these proposals.

Contents

What is proposed?

How will passengers be affected?

When would these changes start?

Have your say
Many of the proposals are connected so we have grouped them to make it easier to understand what is proposed. Using the links below you can find out more about each proposal.

1. Routes 3, 137 and N3
2. Routes 6, 15 and N15
3. Routes 8, 172 and 242
4. Routes 22, C2 and N22
5. Routes 23, 46, 332 and 452
6. Routes 25 and 425
7. Routes 73 and 390
8. Route N2

Although our proposals put forward here concentrate on bus routes serving the West End; we (or our partner agencies) have also recently undertaken consultation on routes serving the ‘Baker Street corridor’, on changes to bus routes at Liverpool Street and changes to routes 100 and 386, on proposals to make Baker Street & Gloucester Place two way and proposals to make Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street two way.

Our geographic maps have been drafted to show the proposals based on the current bus and road network. Our overview spider map illustrates the current network and future proposed network taking account of changes put forward in the other central London schemes mentioned above.

**How will passengers be affected?**

We know that each of our proposals will impact on some passengers. Many will gain new opportunities for direct connections not previously available, while others may have to change bus to complete their journey. The new Hopper fare means there is no longer a financial penalty for changing buses.

We measure these passenger journeys by looking at trip patterns from Oyster card information alongside other data. Our proposals mean some passenger journeys will change. The table below summaries how many people would need to change bus on a typical weekday, if the schemes were implemented.

Alongside this consultation we have also published a bus network report that sets out further detail on passenger journey patterns.
Appendix C: Overview and scheme maps
## Appendix D: All public comments received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about potential longer journeys/longer walks/ waiting times at bus stops</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that changes will mean some journeys may not be eligible for the Hopper Fare (3 buses /&gt;1 hour)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that the assumption Elizabeth Line will reduce passenger numbers is incorrect or overestimated</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional interchanges can be dangerous at night</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will just shift congestion / pollution elsewhere</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that changes will increase congestion / overcrowding at Marble Arch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that decrease in passenger numbers (especially during peak) is incorrect</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Hopper Fare could be removed in the future</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about increased buses on Park Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that road space released by changes will just be taken up by cars and taxis etc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General: Information requested</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the additional cost to people using the Elizabeth line as alternative to existing bus routes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks figures and measurements to justify (some) changes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over accuracy of passenger journey data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Scope: Cycle schemes leading to increased congestion / slower journey times for buses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Scope: Hopper - 1 hour is not long enough / increase window</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Comments / Oppose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not everyone uses underground services / underground is more expensive/Not all stations are step free</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will make more journeys unsafe for vulnerable users</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing buses is inconvenient</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing buses is inconvenient / difficult for some people</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will exacerbate overcrowding of the tube</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes will reduce bus options that area an alternative to the tube</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes penalise / disadvantage areas where access to the tube is already limited</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer buses serving Oxford St/ Victoria Station/ Liverpool St Station</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General opposition</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses offer a flexibility (hopping on/off) that tube doesn’t</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose transformation of Oxford St</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses stopping short of advertised destination</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses becoming unusable in London due to congestion / traffic schemes prioritising other modes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New routemasters allow people to enter through back without swiping on</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes make it more expensive for Travelcard holders etc</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes are based on politics / revenue - not serving the public</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in services to Central London from West London</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General: Negative: New developments in areas served by these routes will increase demand/usage</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced connection between North and West London</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses along Oxford Street will suffer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to reduced frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School journeys will be more difficult/School children inconvenienced</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New routemasters too hot in summer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in services to Paddington too severe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion caused by road layout, not the routes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive Comments / Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fewer buses on Oxford St</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support transformation of Oxford St</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support initiatives that will reduce congestion</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support initiatives that will improve air quality</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support new Hopper fare</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support proposed changes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London has best bus service in the world</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggestions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do more to tackle congestion</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Corridor - ban taxis and cars opposed to altering routes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swap existing buses for low emission buses (moving them doesn't reduce pollution)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Corridor - introduce a hopper bus for shoppers if reducing number of buses</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait until Crossrail is open before making changes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses a priority again / invest in bus priority / manage traffic better</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase bus services / add more routes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement hopper style system for interchanges between bus and underground/Santander cycles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify bus network (fewer routes, less duplication, shorter routes etc)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Corridor - allow use by buses and taxis only</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Corridor - apply phased frequency reductions opposed to altering routes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Corridor - use low/zero emission buses opposed to altering routes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce empty bus running/off peak services to free up road space &amp; reduce pollution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better cycling provision to encourage cycling and less reliance on buses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better layout of stops required to make one hour hopper fare feasible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not run buses along residential roads due to increased noise/pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have two termini and alternate buses between them</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Corridor - allow use by buses and delivery vehicles only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend transformation to adjacent areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved planning processes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E: List of stakeholders consulted

#### Local Authorities and Statutory Bodies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority / Statutory Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London TravelWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Bromley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Redbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Alliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Government departments, parliamentary bodies and politicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Grayling MP</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jones MP</td>
<td>Harrogate &amp; Knaresborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rosindell MP</td>
<td>Romford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Name</td>
<td>Constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Slaughter MP</td>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Gardiner MP</td>
<td>Brent North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Blackman MP</td>
<td>Harrow East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stewart MP</td>
<td>Beckenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine West MP</td>
<td>Hornsey and Wood Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Walker MP</td>
<td>Broxbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Gillan MP</td>
<td>Chesham and Amersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Grayling MP</td>
<td>Epsom and Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Philip MP</td>
<td>Croydon South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuka Umunna MP</td>
<td>Streatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Efford MP</td>
<td>Eltham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crispin Blunt MP</td>
<td>Reigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Evennett MP</td>
<td>Bexleyheath and Crayford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gauke MP</td>
<td>Hertfordshire South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lammy MP</td>
<td>Tottenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Warburton MP</td>
<td>Somerton and Frome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Butler MP</td>
<td>Brent Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Abbot MP</td>
<td>Hackney North &amp; Stoke Newington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Raab MP</td>
<td>Esher and Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mathias MP</td>
<td>Twickenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Laing MP</td>
<td>Epping Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Thornberry MP</td>
<td>Islington South and Finsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Pickles MP</td>
<td>Brentwood and Ongar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona MacTaggart MP</td>
<td>Slough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Johnson MP</td>
<td>Dartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Thomas MP</td>
<td>Harrow West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Barwell MP</td>
<td>Croydon Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Shapps MP</td>
<td>Welywn Hatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Hands MP</td>
<td>Chelsea &amp; Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Harman MP</td>
<td>Camberwell and Peckham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Alexander MP</td>
<td>Lewisham East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Hayes MP</td>
<td>Dulwich and West Norwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Duncan Smith MP</td>
<td>Chingford and Woodford Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Berry MP</td>
<td>Kingston and Surbiton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brokenshire MP</td>
<td>Old Bexley &amp; Sidcup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Clappison MP</td>
<td>Hertsmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Ellison MP</td>
<td>Battersea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Corbyn MP</td>
<td>Islington North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dowd MP</td>
<td>Lewisham West and Penge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Johnson MP</td>
<td>Orpington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Ryan MP</td>
<td>Enfield North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cryer MP</td>
<td>Leyton &amp; Wanstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McDonnell MP</td>
<td>Hayes and Harlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Cruddas MP</td>
<td>Dagenham &amp; Rainham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Greening MP</td>
<td>Putney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Buck MP</td>
<td>Westminster North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hoey MP</td>
<td>Vauxhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Osamor MP</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keir Starmer MP</td>
<td>Holborn and St Pancras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwasi Kwarteng MP</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn Brown MP</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Hodge MBE</td>
<td>Barking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Field MP</td>
<td>Cities of London and Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Offord MP</td>
<td>Hendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Pennycook MP</td>
<td>Greenwich and Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Hillier MP</td>
<td>Hackney South and Shoreditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Fallon MP</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Freer MP</td>
<td>Finchley &amp; Golders Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gapes MP</td>
<td>Ilford South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Coyle MP</td>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Scully MP</td>
<td>Sutton and Cheam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Harrington MP</td>
<td>Watford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Neill MP</td>
<td>Bromley and Chislehurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupa Huq MP</td>
<td>Ealing Central and Acton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Cadbury MP</td>
<td>Brentford &amp; Isleworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Gyimah MP</td>
<td>East Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seema Malhotra MP</td>
<td>Feltham &amp; Heston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhain McDonagh MP</td>
<td>Mitcham and Morden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Creasy MP</td>
<td>Walthamstow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hammond MP</td>
<td>Wimbledon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Pound MP</td>
<td>Ealing North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Timms MP</td>
<td>East Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reed MP</td>
<td>Croydon North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Pearce MP</td>
<td>Erith and Thamesmead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Villiers MP</td>
<td>Chipping Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Brake MP</td>
<td>Carshalton and Wallington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulip Siddiq MP</td>
<td>Hampstead &amp; Kilburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Foxcroft MP</td>
<td>Lewisham Depford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Borwick MP</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virendra Sharma MP</td>
<td>Ealing, Southall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Streeting MP</td>
<td>Ilford North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zac Goldsmith MP</td>
<td>Richmond Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosena Allin-Khan</td>
<td>Tooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Burrowes MP</td>
<td>Enfield Southgate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Greater London Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bacon AM</td>
<td>Londonwide,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennette Arnold AM</td>
<td>Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Duvall AM</td>
<td>Greenwich and Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Shah AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Gavron AM London Wide</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>Croydon and Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Arbour AM</td>
<td>Hounslow, Kingston upon Thames and Richmond upon Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Bailey AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemi Badenoch AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sian Berry AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonie Cooper AM</td>
<td>Merton and Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmesh Desai AM</td>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham, City of London, newham and Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Devenish AM</td>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea and City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Eshalomi AM</td>
<td>Lambeth &amp; Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kurten AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Prince AM</td>
<td>Havering &amp; Redbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Russell AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Whittle AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Boff AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Copley AM</td>
<td>Londonwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Dismore AM</td>
<td>Barnet and Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne McCartney AM</td>
<td>Enfield and Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onkar Sahota AM</td>
<td>Ealing and Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency Services and Healthcare

- Barking and Dagenham NHS Care Commissioning Group
- Barking & Dagenham Safer Transport Team
- Barnet NHS Care commissioning Group
- Barnet Safer Transport Team
- Basildon and Brentwood NHS Care Commissioning Group
- Bexley NHS Care Commissioning Group
- Brent Safer Transport Team
- Bromley Safer Transport Team
- Camden Safer Transport Team
- CCG Central London (WESTMINSTER)
- CCG City and Hackney
- CCG Croydon
- CCG Enfield
- CCG Greenwich
- CCG Havering
- CCG Hounslow
- CCG Islington
- CCG Kingston
- CCG Redbridge
- CCG Wandsworth
- Central London NHS Trust
- City of London Police
- Croydon Safer Transport Team
- Ealing Safer Transport Team
- Enfield Safer Transport Team
- Greenwich Safer Transport Team
- Hackney Safer Transport Team
- Hammersmith & Fulham Safer Transport Team
- Haringey Safer Transport Team
- Harrow Safer Transport Team
- Havering Safer Transport Team
- Hillingdon Safer Transport Team
- Hounslow Safer Transport Team
- Islington Safer Transport Team
- Kensington & Chelsea Safer Transport Team
- Kingston Safer Transport Team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton and Sutton Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Heathrow Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Camden Care Commissioning Group (CCG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS CCG Bromley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS CCG Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Ealing Care Commissioning Group (CCG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Newham CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Tower Hamlets CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Middlesex Hospital PPI Patients Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West London Hospitals NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Disability Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Hearing Loss (formerly RNID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Better Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Better Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DABD (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability Alliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability Rights UK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability Voice Bromley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edmonton CLP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater London Forum for the Elderly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guide Dogs for the Blind Association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham Action on Disability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harrow Association for Disabled People (HAD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Mobility Unit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London Older People's Strategy Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Children's Bureau</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RNIB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RNIB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixty Plus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Mobility Forum Croydon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Mobility Forum Merton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Mobility Forum Merton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Mobility Forum Richmond</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Mobility Forum Wandsworth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stroke Association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The British Dyslexia Association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport for All</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport and road user groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Freight Transport Association</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addison Lee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airline Operators Committee Heathrow</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of British Drivers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of Car Fleet Operators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAA Heathrow</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BBC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Airways</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Motorcyclists Federation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bromley Cyclists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canary Wharf Management Ltd</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carlton Motors Ltd</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chauffeur &amp; Executive Assn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chauffeur and Executive Association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of London Access Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of British Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC, the national cycling charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-a-Cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurostar Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart of London Business Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced Private Hire Car Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced Taxi Drivers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Taxi Drivers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cab drivers Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London City Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Brent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Camden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Camden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Croydon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Croydon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Hackney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Hammersmith and Fulham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Haringey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Islington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Kensington and Chelsea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Lambeth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Lewisham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Newham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Redbridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Richmond)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Tower Hamlets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Wandsworth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Westminster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Suburban Taxi-drivers’ Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pensioners Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West London Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of Blind Afro Caribbean’s (OBAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Hire Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC Motoring Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Taxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank and Highways Representative for Unite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail Parcel Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bank Employers’ Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bermondsey Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi and Private hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Consultancy Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Driver-Guides Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPH for Heathrow Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unite The Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business groups**

| Angel London                                    |
| Baker Street Quarter Partnership                |
| Better Bankside                                 |
| Brixton BID                                     |
| Bromley BID                                     |
| Camden Town Unlimited                           |
| Cheapside Business Alliance                     |
| Clapham Business Community                      |
| Ealing Broadway BID                              |
| Fitzrovia Partnership                            |
| Hammersmith London                              |
| Heart of London Business Alliance                |
| In Holborn                                      |
| inmidtown (previously inholborn)                 |
| inStreatham                                      |
| Kingston Town Centre Management Limited         |
| Marble Arch London                              |
| New West End Company                            |
| Northbank BID                                   |
| Paddington Now                                  |
| South Bank BID                                  |
| Stratford Original                              |
| Team London Bridge                              |
| Vauxhall One                                    |
| Victoria                                        |
| We Are Waterloo                                 |