



Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf Crossing

Response to issues raised

August 2018

	Introduction to this report	1
	Next Steps	1
1	The need for a cycle and pedestrian crossing This chapter responds to general comments made about the need for a crossing in the Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf areas. There were questions asked about various crossing types and who should be able to use the crossing.	2
2	Location of the crossing This chapter provides responses to requests for us to consider alternative locations for the crossing. Where possible we have grouped these by areas to prevent duplication.	5
3	Height of a bridge This chapter responds to issues raised regarding the height of a potential bridge.	9
4	Local and environmental impacts of a bridge This chapter responds to issues raised around potential and perceived environmental impacts of the crossing.	12
5	Impact on local communities This chapter responds to issues that were raised regarding the perceived possible impacts on local communities of the crossing.	17
6	Impacts of greater numbers of pedestrians and cyclists This chapter responds to issues raised about the potential extra journeys being made in the areas if a new crossing was built. Including, cycle facilities and impacts on the network.	19
7	The costs and funding for the scheme This chapter responds to issues that were raised about the potential costs of the scheme, Benefit Cost Ratios and funding sources.	22
8	User experience This chapter responds to issues that were raised regarding the users' potential and perceived experience whilst using the crossing. This includes accessibility and the gradient of ramps.	27

Introduction to the report

This report presents our response to the issues that were raised during the first public consultation for the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf river crossing project that ran between 8 November 2017 and 8 January 2018.

We received 6,094 responses to the public consultation, of which 93 per cent strongly supported or supported our proposal for a new crossing in this area. Our preferred option of a navigable bridge was supported by 85 per cent of respondents.

The Northern alignment had the strongest support with many stating this was due to the convenience and anticipated demand being greater at this location. The Central alignment was also well supported with over half of respondents choosing this option due to good connections to the cycle network and convenient access. The Southern alignment received the least support, with less than a third opting for this alignment. Respondents could select more than one option for this question.

With this feedback, along with our early assessments of the alignment options, we have initially concluded that the Northern and Central options offer a number of advantages over the Southern. These include the ability to provide ramps at both landing sites and increased transport benefits associated with onward journey options directly into Canary Wharf. As a result, we have not progressed further work on the Southern alignment option at this time.

During the consultation members of the public and stakeholders raised a variety of issues and questions about our proposals via the online web tool, at the public exhibitions that were held and by contacting us via email and letter. Many people who responded to the consultation stated that a crossing would benefit cyclists and pedestrians, was long overdue and would improve convenience and connectivity for those living, working or travelling to the area.

A full breakdown of the consultation responses is provided in the Consultation Report that was published in March 2018 and can be found [here](#). The points raised have helped to inform the project decision making process and ongoing design development.

We are now in a position where we can answer some of the main issues raised and these responses are in the following chapters in this report. Similar issues and questions have been grouped together to avoid duplication throughout the report.

Next Steps

We will continue to develop our proposals for a new crossing and we will update stakeholders and the public as we progress with development of the project. We are planning to consult again later in 2018 where we will present our latest proposals and more detailed information on a preferred crossing.

1. The need for a cycle and pedestrian crossing

This chapter responds to general comments made about the need for a crossing in the Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf areas. There were questions asked about various crossing types and who should be able to use the crossing if one was built.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

1.1 Good options for people to cross the river exist already. Concerns that a new crossing is not needed.

1.2 Suggestions that TfL should invest in enhancing the existing ferry service.

1.3 Suggestions that TfL should be building a crossing to accommodate vehicular traffic.

1.4 Scepticism about the level of demand for a walking and cycling crossing in this location.

1.5 Why not build a tunnel instead?

1.6 Request that a Navigational Safety Risk Assessment (NSRA) be undertaken to assess alignment, general design and location.

Ref	Issue Raised	TfL Response
1.1	Good options for people to cross the river exist already. Concerns that a new crossing is not needed.	<p>There is a need for new river crossings in the east of London, where there are significantly fewer than west of Tower Bridge. London is growing rapidly and is expected to reach 10.5 million people by 2041. This growth is expected to generate more than 5 million additional trips each day across the public transport network by 2041. This poses a number of challenges for the network, especially in designated Opportunity Areas such as Canada Water and the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar, where the growth in housing and jobs is expected to be significant. Planning for this level of growth is a huge challenge and to meet the Mayor’s target of 80 per cent of trips by foot, bike or public transport by 2041, as set out in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, it is vital that we provide high quality walking and cycling infrastructure to enable people to travel by the most sustainable means. In the consultation, 93 per cent of respondents strongly supported or supported a crossing in this area.</p> <p>Whilst there are existing crossing options, these are not felt to be adequate to support the expected growth in this area or the number of people who will want to travel by foot or by bicycle. For example, the existing environment within the Rotherhithe Tunnel is less desirable for pedestrians and cyclists given the confined space and air quality issues inherent in a vehicle tunnel. Equally, the capacity of the Greenwich foot tunnel is limited and was not designed to accommodate cyclists. Whilst the Jubilee line and DLR offer a good public transport option, the Jubilee line is operating at close to capacity in peak times. A lack of appropriate or sufficient infrastructure to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians wishing to cross the river east of Tower Bridge to access Canary Wharf means there is a good case for considering a new river crossing to cater for this demand, whilst also providing an alternative for shorter journeys.</p>
1.2	Suggestions that TfL should invest in enhancing the existing ferry service.	<p>Enhancing the existing ferry service between Nelson Dock Pier and Canary Wharf was one of the shortlisted options we considered as part of our option development and assessment process. Details of this process can be found in our background to consultation report here.</p> <p>Whilst delivering an enhanced ferry is a potentially cheaper and quicker option to build, our previous assessment concluded that it would not achieve the same long-term benefits as a fixed crossing.</p> <p>One of the main aims of the crossing is to encourage a major shift in behaviour towards more walking and cycling in the area, our analysis suggests that fixed infrastructure such as a bridge would better cater for this and deliver a transformation to the walking and cycling experience.</p> <p>At the time of producing this report, we are not investigating the enhanced ferry as an option for the crossing.</p>

1.3	Suggestions that TfL should be building a crossing to accommodate vehicular traffic.	<p>This crossing is one of a package of river crossings for east London. We are also developing proposals for other river crossings to cater for other modes of transport. This includes a road crossing under the Thames between Greenwich Peninsula and Silvertown to help reduce congestion at the Blackwall Tunnel by providing an alternative. The Silvertown Tunnel will also provide the opportunity for enhancing the cross-river bus network.</p> <p>Pedestrian and cycle crossings allow people to cross the river using different methods, improving their health whilst reducing congestion on the roads and on public transport. Such crossings form part of the Mayor's Heathy Streets agenda, aimed at encouraging more people to walk and cycle.</p>
1.4	Scepticism about the level of demand for a walking and cycling crossing in this location.	<p>The proposed crossing would connect two of London's key Opportunity Areas; the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar and Canada Water. Between them, these two Opportunity Areas are expected to accommodate over 34,000 new homes and 112,000 new jobs, all of which will generate an increase in demand for travel.</p> <p>A number of scenarios have been modelled to understand the likely demand for a crossing in this location. The result showed that a possible 1.4-1.6 million pedestrian trips and 450,000 –900,000 cycle trips would be made on a bridge annually, as set out in Factsheet 2: Crossing options here. This modelling will be updated as the project progresses.</p> <p>Our modelling represents a best estimate of the likely demand, based on the tools and information that we have available at the time. Many factors contribute to pedestrian and cyclist route choice, not all of which we can effectively model. We will continue to refine our modelling as new information becomes available and will present the latest iteration of the demand modelling at the next public consultation.</p>
1.5	Why not build a tunnel instead?	<p>A tunnel option was considered as part of our assessment of the three short-listed crossing options presented as part of the public consultation. Whilst our assessment concluded that a tunnel would offer similar benefits to a bridge, our current forecast indicates that it would cost considerably more, and therefore provide less value for money.</p>
1.6	Request that a Navigational Safety Risk Assessment (NSRA) be undertaken to assess alignment, general	<p>Any crossing option that we take forward will undergo a NSRA to assess the impact of the scheme. This is a requirement set by the Port of London Authority and we are working closely with them throughout the development of this project. We intend to undertake an NSRA in the next phases of work, as we identify our preferred option.</p>

	design and location.	
--	----------------------	--

2. Location of the crossing

79 per cent of respondents to the consultation supported the Northern alignment, 55 per cent support for the Central and 29 per cent for the Southern alignment. Respondents could support more than one location. Some respondents requested us to review other locations for the crossing and landing points.

This chapter provides responses to those requests made during the consultation for us to review other locations for the crossing than the ones we proposed. Where possible we have grouped these by areas to prevent a lot of duplication.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

2.1 Concerns that other river crossings are needed more urgently in other locations.

2.2 Replace the Woolwich Ferry with a bridge.

2.3 TfL should consider alternative bridge alignment options and landing site locations in addition to the three preferred bridge alignments which were previously identified, including:

- A potential alternative alignment from Durand's Wharf to Westferry Circus
- A potential alternative alignment from Nelson Dock Pier to Impound Lock
- Alternative potential landing site locations at Pageant Steps and Rotherhithe Street

2.4 TfL should consider additional bridge alignments that would utilise landing site locations to the south of the three preferred bridge alignments, including:

- Potential landing sites in proximity to Greenland Dock and Greenland Pier
- A potential landing site at Sir John McDougall Gardens

2.5 TfL should consider alternative locations for a bridge crossing on the River Thames, including:

- A potential crossing between the Isle of Dogs and Deptford
- A potential crossing between Canary Wharf and North Greenwich
- A potential crossing in proximity to Wapping

2.6 Bring the design produced by reForm architects forward as a potential final design.

Ref	Issue Raised	TfL Response
2.1	Concerns that other river crossings are needed more urgently in other locations.	<p>There is a need for new river crossings in the east of London, where there are significantly fewer than west of Tower Bridge. As part of a package of measures to improve cross-river connectivity between east and south east London, the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf crossing seeks to provide an alternative means of travel for pedestrians and cyclists. There is a key demand for travel between Canada Water and Canary Wharf and the existing Jubilee line is forecast to remain the busiest public transport link into Canary Wharf. Providing a high capacity alternative and encouraging as many people as possible to travel by foot or bicycle is key to achieving the Mayor's ambitious walking and cycling targets.</p> <p>We are also looking at options for a public transport crossing in the Thamesmead area to support the expected growth in homes and we will be building a new road tunnel under the Thames connecting Silvertown with the Greenwich Peninsula. Equally, the existing Woolwich Ferry service is currently being improved to make the service more reliable and comfortable. In addition, we are working with other stakeholders to explore options for new piers and enhanced ferry services where these represent the best solution.</p> <p>Separate from TfL, Highways England is developing plans for a new lower Thames road crossing between Kent and Essex to help relieve the existing Dartford Crossing.</p>
2.2	Replace the Woolwich Ferry with a bridge.	<p>This project seeks to connect the two Opportunity Areas of Canada Water and the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar, by providing a crossing to improve links between Canary Wharf and the Rotherhithe peninsula.</p> <p>Crossings outside of these locations have not been considered as part of this project, however as part of a wider package of measures to improve cross-river connectivity, we are improving the Woolwich Ferry by making services more reliable and comfortable. This will include the delivery of two new boats to replace the current fleet which will provide step free access and provide more space for passengers and vehicles. Works to improve the service are already underway, and further information about the Woolwich Ferry upgrade is available from: https://tfl.gov.uk/travel-information/improvements-and-projects/woolwich-ferry-upgrade</p>
2.3	TfL should consider alternative bridge alignment options and landing site locations in addition to the three preferred bridge	<p>We are continuing to investigate potential bridge alignment options and landing site locations for the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf crossing. The three alignment corridors presented at the consultation were shortlisted as best meeting a range of assessment criteria following consideration of a much wider set of possible alignments. Following the consultation feedback, we continue to explore a range of options to ensure we propose the optimal location in terms of demand, land, costs, river considerations and environmental issues.</p>

	<p>alignments which were previously identified, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A potential alternative alignment from Durand's Wharf to Westferry Circus • A potential alternative alignment from Nelson Dock Pier to Impound Lock • Alternative potential landing site locations at Pageant Steps and Rotherhithe Street. 	<p>The work will be based on feedback from the consultation, ongoing engineering assessment and continued stakeholder engagement. We plan to consult on our latest proposals later in 2018.</p>
2.4	<p>TfL should consider additional bridge alignments that would utilise landing site locations to the south of the three preferred bridge alignments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential landing sites in proximity to Greenland Dock and 	<p>This project seeks to connect the two Opportunity Areas of Canada Water and the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar, with Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf the target area where we believe the walking and cycle travel option for the crossing is a viable alternative to public transport and private vehicles.</p> <p>In defining the three preferred bridge alignment options presented as part of the consultation, we considered the physical and navigational constraints, a range of engineering criteria including the provision for ramps, and existing land uses. Southern locations at Odessa Street and Lower Odessa Wharf which lie in proximity to Greenland Dock / Pier were assessed as part of this. However, this identified that these locations would be too far to walk to be attractive for those travelling between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf and therefore these landing sites were discounted.</p> <p>A potential landing site location at Sir John McDougall Gardens was also assessed. However, this option was</p>

	<p>Greenland Pier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A potential landing site at Sir John McDougall Gardens 	<p>discounted as a potential landing site on the south side of the river as it would also be too far to walk to be attractive for those travelling between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf.</p>
2.5	<p>TfL should consider alternative locations for a bridge crossing on the River Thames, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A potential crossing between the Isle of Dogs and Deptford • A potential crossing between Canary Wharf and North Greenwich • A potential crossing in proximity to Wapping 	<p>The forecast continuation of a combination of strong growth in cycling across London, employment growth in Canary Wharf, and population growth due to new residential and mixed-use development, particularly at Canada Water, are generating (and will generate in the future) an increase in trips and walking and cycling demand in the area. With the Jubilee line operating at close to capacity at peak times (particularly between Canada Water and Canary Wharf) and a lack of appropriate or sufficient infrastructure to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians wishing to cross the river east of Tower Bridge, there is a case for considering the delivery of a new river crossing to cater for this demand. This project therefore seeks to connect the two Opportunity Areas of Canada Water and the Isle of Dogs and South Poplar, areas of future growth which have been identified in a range of policy documents including the London Plan, Mayor's Transport Strategy and the local boroughs' plans. Crossings outside of these locations have not been considered as part of this project.</p>
2.6	<p>Bring the design produced by reForm architects forward as a potential final design.</p>	<p>The design put forward by reForm presents one bridge type option in one location. As part of our design development we are reviewing a number of different bridge types in several locations, to provide more benefits to users and taking into account a range of issues including structural constraints, opening times, aesthetics, cost and maintenance.</p> <p>No final decisions have been made on the crossing type or landing locations and we will present our updated proposals at a further public consultation later this year.</p>

3 Height of a bridge

During the consultation we asked respondents for their preference to a high or low bridge. Levels of support were reasonably split with 35 per cent preferred the higher bridge option, 27 per cent preferred the lower bridge,

This chapter responds to issues raised regarding the height of a potential bridge.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

3.1 Concerns around a bridge remaining navigable.

3.2 Concerns about a bridge being available for use and communicating openings, especially in peak hours.

3.3 Suggestions around restricting the navigation of larger vessels or restricting the hours within which a bridge could open.

3.4 Could a higher bridge have a higher viewing platform to attract more visitors and users?

3.5 Higher bridge needs access consideration for pedestrians.

3.6 Could a higher bridge have lifts and ramps?

3.7 Provide consideration to users on windy and wet days as a high bridge could feel quite exposed.

3.8 With a navigable bridge, leisure yachts may wait for an opening and block the river to other traffic.

Ref	Issue Raised	TfL Response
3.1	Concerns around a bridge remaining navigable.	We support the River Thames as a sustainable transport route and will ensure that a bridge remains navigable for a range of vessels. We are working closely with the Port of London Authority to develop an acceptable design and means of operation for an opening bridge.
3.2	Concerns about a bridge being available for use and communicating openings, especially in peak hours.	Any bridge would need to open for the largest vessels. However, how often a bridge would need to open for smaller vessels with masts would be determined by the height of the bridge and the means of operation. There is a balance to be struck between ensuring the bridge is an adequate height to allow most vessels underneath without the need to open and the impacts that a high bridge would have on access and the local environment. We are working with the Port of London Authority and have carried out surveys of river traffic to better understand the number and size of vessels to help inform a decision around the optimum height of a bridge.
3.3	Suggestions around restricting the navigation of larger vessels or restricting the hours within which a bridge could open.	We are working with the Port of London Authority to establish a means of operating a bridge to minimise any impact on users of the river. There is a balance to be struck between the impact on users of the river and the users of a bridge and we will use the data from the river vessel traffic surveys we have carried out and the predicted modelling of the bridge users to inform the proposed operational strategy.
3.4	Could a higher bridge have a higher viewing platform to attract more visitors and users?	At the lower bridge heights there would be good views afforded of the surrounding area and the river from the bridge itself. There are no plans at present to provide a high-level viewing platform.
3.5	Higher bridge needs access consideration for pedestrians.	It is important that a bridge could be used by everyone and how users would access a bridge is one of the key considerations in the development of the design.
3.6	Could a higher bridge have lifts and ramps?	All options are being explored as part of the ongoing work to develop a preferred option, based on feedback from the consultation and other environmental and accessibility considerations. The higher the bridge the longer the ramps would need to be to ensure that they are at a gradient that is comfortable to users.
3.7	Provide consideration to users on windy and wet days as a high bridge could feel quite	The comfort of users is an important consideration in the design of the bridge. Wind effects will be modelled and appropriate mitigation provided if needed.

	exposed.	
3.8	With a navigable bridge, leisure yachts may wait for an opening and block the river to other traffic.	We are working with the Port of London Authority to establish a means of operating the bridge whilst minimising the impact on river users. If waiting areas or temporary moorings are found to be necessary these would be positioned so as not to cause an impediment to river traffic or interfere with the operation of the river.

4 Local and environmental impacts of a bridge

This chapter responds to issues raised around potential and perceived environmental impacts of the crossing.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

4.1 Concerns about noise, air and light pollution both during construction and when the crossing is in use.

4.2 Concerns about the visual impact of a bridge and obstructing views of the Thames.

4.3 Concerns about the impact on people's homes / private property.

4.4 Concerns about impact to the river.

4.5 Concerns about the impact to residents and levels of congestions during construction.

4.6 Durand's Wharf has a lot of open land. There must be consideration of the impact on Rotherhithe Street and Salter Road.

4.7 Risk that pier structures might impact habitat if located in the intertidal zone, piers need to be located outside of the intertidal area and kept to a minimum foot print wherever they are located in the channel.

4.8 Impact of scour on mudflats and integrity of flood defences.

4.9 What consideration is being given to managing impacts arising from concurrent construction.

4.10 There should be no detrimental impact on the integrity of the flood defences on either bank for the whole lifetime of the crossing.

4.11 Want more about information about environmental impacts e.g. net CO2 impact.

4.12 Concerned about impacts on local heritage buildings.

Ref	Issue	TfL Response
4.1	Concerns about noise, air and light pollution both during construction and when the crossing is in use.	<p>Local residents and sensitive environmental areas and receptors are being carefully considered as part of the ongoing design work. However, the primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>As options are developed and designs progress, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAo) application to seek consent for the scheme and would be publicly available.</p>
4.2	Concerns about the visual impact of a bridge and obstructing views of the Thames	<p>Local residents and sensitive environmental areas and receptors, are being carefully considered as part of the ongoing design work. However, the primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>As options are developed and designs progress, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAo) application to seek consent for the scheme and would be publicly available.</p> <p>Views to and from the crossing are being carefully considered in the ongoing design work.</p>
4.3	Concerns about the impact on people's homes / private property.	<p>Local residents and sensitive environmental areas and receptors, are being carefully considered as part of the ongoing design work. However, the primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>As options are developed and designs progress, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAo) application to seek consent for the scheme and would be publicly available.</p>
4.4	Concerns about impact to the river.	We are working closely with relevant stakeholders such as the Environment Agency, Port of London Authority, the London Borough of Southwark and the London Borough of Towers Hamlets amongst others, to ensure that

		the design of the crossing takes into account the impacts on the river and appropriate mitigations are identified whichever location and design is taken forward.
4.5	Concerns about the impact to residents and levels of congestions during construction.	<p>Local residents and sensitive environmental areas and receptors, are being carefully considered as part of the ongoing design work. However, the primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>As options are developed and designs progress, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) application to seek consent for the scheme and would be publicly available.</p> <p>The EIA will consider the cumulative impacts of concurrent construction activities and mitigation strategies to avoid / reduce possible traffic congestion and impacts on local residents. A Code of Construction Practice would be developed. The code would include key measures to minimise and control construction impacts on sensitive receptors such as residents, and would set out requirements for considerate construction practices, measures to minimise congestion, noise and disruption to neighbours and site working hours. This would require approval from the local authorities.</p> <p>In addition a Transport Assessment will be undertaken to understand traffic implications of the crossing, this will be submitted as part of the TWAO and will be publicly available</p>
4.6	Durand's Wharf has a lot of open land. There must be consideration of the impact on Rotherhithe Street and Salter Road.	<p>The potential for construction and operational impacts on open spaces such as Durand's Wharf are being considered as part of the ongoing design work, in addition to the potential effects on the surrounding transport network.</p> <p>A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to determine these impacts. This will include assessments relating to the open space and biodiversity. As part of this work we will consider alternative spaces and mitigation measures regarding any potential loss of space and impacts on biodiversity. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) application to seek consent for the scheme and would be publicly available.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment for the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf crossing will consider the road network on either</p>

		side of the bridge and the dispersal of bridge users when leaving the crossing and ensure that any congestion is minimised as far as possible, including on Salter Road and Rotherhithe Street.
4.7	Risk that pier structures might impact habitat if located in the intertidal zone. Piers need to be located outside of the intertidal area and kept to a minimum foot print wherever they are located in the channel.	<p>Sensitive environmental areas and potential sensitive receptors such as marine species and habitats are being carefully considered as part of the ongoing design work. However, the primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>A series of baseline surveys are currently being carried out to better understand the local environmental context. These surveys will inform the design with the aim of reducing and minimising impacts on various identified environmental receptors. Discussions with various stakeholders such as the Environment Agency and the Port of London Authority amongst others have taken place to inform the scope of these surveys.</p> <p>As options are developed and designs progress, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) application to seek consent for the scheme and will be publicly available.</p>
4.8	Impact of scour on mudflats and integrity of flood defences.	<p>The project team are working closely with relevant stakeholders such as Environment Agency and the Port of London Authority to ensure that the crossing would have minimal or no detrimental impact on the integrity of the flood defences at whichever location and design is chosen.</p> <p>In addition, our Environmental team are in the process of developing the requirements for a hydrodynamic assessment which will include assessment on flood risk and scour. The hydrodynamic model that will be used is fully endorsed by the Environment Agency and the Port of London Authority. The model will also be used to inform the assessment of navigational risk.</p>
4.9	What consideration is being given to managing impacts arising from concurrent construction?	<p>The primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will consider the cumulative effects of construction activities from adjacent development. The EIA scoping report will set out which developments will be cumulatively assessed and will be discussed and agreed with relevant stakeholders. Further information will be developed once a preferred option is selected. A Code of Construction Practice would also be developed. The code would include</p>

		key measures to minimise and control construction impacts on sensitive receptors such as residents, and would set out requirements for considerate construction practices, measures to minimise congestion, noise and disruption to neighbours and site working hours. This would require approval from the local authorities.
4.10	There should be no detrimental impact on the integrity of the flood defences on either bank for the whole lifetime of the crossing.	We are working closely with the Environment Agency to ensure that the proposed crossing would have no detrimental impact on the integrity of the flood defences on either side of the crossing.
4.11	Want more information about environmental impacts e.g. net CO2 impact.	<p>The primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve. We are currently developing a number of Sustainability Principles to influence and guide emerging designs. Once a preferred option has been chosen, details such as materials will be discussed as part of the evolving design. A Sustainability Strategy will form part of the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) application to seek consent for the scheme which will set out the project approach to sustainable design considerations.</p> <p>As options are developed and designs progress, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the TWAO application to seek consent for the scheme and will be publicly available.</p>
4.12	Concerned about impacts on local heritage buildings.	<p>The primary purpose of the consultation was to understand public and stakeholder views on the principle of a river crossing and possible locations that it may serve.</p> <p>Sensitive environmental areas and sensitive receptors, including listed buildings, archaeological priority areas and conservation areas are being considered as part of the ongoing design work. Discussions with relevant stakeholders such as Historic England, the London Borough of Southwark and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets are taking place to understand key concerns and considerations for addressing potential impacts on heritage assets. These discussions have been fed back into ongoing design development.</p> <p>As the design is developed, further information regarding likely construction and operational impacts and</p>

		possible mitigation measures will be provided and consulted on. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken to understand these impacts. The EIA would be submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) application to seek consent for the scheme and will be publicly available.
--	--	---

5 Impact on local communities

This chapter responds to issues that were raised regarding the perceived possible impacts on local communities of the crossing.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

5.1 Concerns around increased levels of congestion in Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf both during and after construction.

5.2 Concerns that this will add to congestion on the DLR and Jubilee line.

5.3 Concerns that there is insufficient infrastructure in place in Canary Wharf and Rotherhithe to support more people.

Ref	Issue	TfL's response
5.1	Concerns around increased levels of congestion in Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf both during and after construction.	<p>We would ensure that any disruption caused by the construction of the new crossing is minimised and that any impacts to local communities are mitigated as far as possible and communicated well in advance. We will work closely with the relevant highway authorities to agree how any temporary changes to the road network and public transport network during construction works would be managed. A Code of Construction Practice would be developed. The code would include key measures to minimise and control construction impacts on sensitive receptors such as residents, and would set out requirements for considerate construction practices, measures to minimise congestion, noise and disruption to neighbours and site working hours. This would require approval from the local authorities.</p> <p>The crossing itself would provide an alternative way for people to move between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf on foot and by bicycle. A Transport Assessment would consider any temporary (during construction) and permanent (during operation) impacts on all transport modes (including private vehicles, taxis, buses, pedestrians, cyclists and river traffic). Notably, the Transport Assessment would consider the interaction between vehicles at either side of the bridge where users (pedestrians and cyclists) meet the existing transport network, and ensure that any congestion is minimised.</p>
5.2	Concerns that this will add to congestion on the DLR and Jubilee line.	<p>One of the aims of the project is to provide alternative travel options for people using the DLR and Jubilee line, which are operating close to capacity at peak times.</p>
5.3	Concerns that there is insufficient infrastructure in place in Canary Wharf and Rotherhithe to support more people.	<p>One of the aims of the crossing is to provide this area of London with new infrastructure to support an increase in walking and cycling, as an alternative to driving or using public transport.</p> <p>We are planning for greater levels of walking and cycling more generally and will be working with the relevant highway authorities to ensure that walking and cycling can be safely accommodated.</p> <p>The Mayor recently announced plans for six new cycle routes in London with two connecting Hackney to the Isle of Dogs and Rotherhithe to Peckham. More information can be found via the link: Cycle Routes</p>

6 Impacts of greater numbers of pedestrians and cyclists

This chapter responds to issues raised about the potential extra journeys being made in the areas if a new crossing was built, including cycle facilities and impacts on the network.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

6.1 Concerns around the impact of more cyclists and pedestrians across the network.

6.2 Concerns regarding cyclist behaviour.

6.3 Concerns around the potential increase in the numbers of cyclists will lead to more collisions.

6.4 What will the cycle facilities to the crossing be like?

6.5 Westferry Road is already far too congested to accommodate any volume of cycling traffic joining the road.

Ref	Issue	TfL's Response
6.1	Concerns around the impact of more cyclists and pedestrians across the network.	<p>We are undertaking modelling which will feed into a Transport Assessment to understand the likely impacts of a new river crossing in this location on the surrounding networks for all road users.</p> <p>One of the objectives of this project is to encourage greater levels of walking and cycling. This is part of the Mayor's Healthy Streets agenda for London which aims for 80 per cent of Londoners' trips to be on foot, by cycle or by using public transport by 2041. We are working with the relevant highway authorities to ensure additional walking and cycling can be safely accommodated.</p> <p>There are also plans for six new cycle routes in London with two connecting Hackney to the Isle of Dogs and Rotherhithe to Peckham. More information can be found via the link: Cycle Routes</p>
6.2	Concerns regarding cyclist behaviour.	<p>We promote adherence to the Highway Code by all road users and encourage responsible cycling and mutual respect between all road users. We work to eliminate cycling offences through a combination of police enforcement and educational programmes. For example, TfL contributes funding towards the Metropolitan Police's Cycle Safety Team.</p> <p>We will also work with the relevant highway authorities to ensure that cycling can be safely accommodated into the networks around the crossing. The crossing will accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists and as the design develops we will consider how best to safely provide access for all users.</p>
6.3	Concerns around the potential increase in the numbers of cyclists will lead to more collisions.	<p>Investing in high quality walking and cycling infrastructure, such as the proposed crossing, is likely to increase the levels of walking and cycling, both in terms of trips between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf and also more widely in the local area by encouraging a general shift in travel behaviours towards active modes.</p> <p>The crossing will provide cyclists with a traffic free route to cross the river. Whilst we have undertaken some traffic modelling to understand the routes that cyclists are likely to take to access the crossing, modelling route choice is complex and involves many factors. We will work closely with the relevant highway authorities to understand cyclist route choice and ensure that greater levels of cycling can be safely accommodated.</p>
6.4	What will the cycle facilities to the	A new crossing between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf would enable cyclists to cross the river and to reach a wide area of south and central London.

	crossing be like?	<p>We are working with the relevant highway authorities to understand the likely impacts to the surrounding highway network and exploring options for integrating the crossing into wider cycling and walking networks to enable connectivity with key destinations.</p> <p>Detailed requirements such as the potential volume and location of cycle parking will be considered further as the scheme develops.</p>
6.5	Westferry Road is already far too congested to accommodate any volume of cycling traffic joining the road.	<p>A Transport Assessment (TA) will be undertaken in conjunction with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) required as part of an application for consent under the Transport and Works Act Order. A TA will consider any temporary (during construction) and permanent (during operation) impacts on all transport modes (including private vehicles, taxis, buses, pedestrians, cyclists and river traffic). Notably, the TA for the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf crossing will consider the interaction between the road network on either side of the bridge and bridge users when leaving the crossing and ensure that any congestion is minimised including on Westferry Road.</p>

7 The costs and funding for the scheme

This chapter responds to issues that were raised about the potential costs of the scheme, Benefit Cost Ratios and funding sources.

You can click on the issue listed below to be taken straight to our response.

7.1 Cost of the scheme and the prioritisation of public resources on this particular project. [Covers points raised regarding money being spent on other public services.]

7.2 What are the funding sources?

7.3 What are the costs and benefits of the scheme?

7.4 Concerns about gentrification and rising house prices/rental prices in areas directly served by the crossing.

7.5 How will the operation and maintenance of the bridge be funded?

7.6 Suggestions that this is a vanity project i.e. there is not an underlying need for it.

7.7 What is the Benefit: Cost Ratio of the enhanced ferry?

7.8 What is the Benefit: Cost Ratio of the tunnel?

7.9 What exploratory work was done in advance of the Mayor's announcement regarding the proposal in 2016?

7.10 What was the cost of the project in 2016?

7.11 What does the demand analysis for pedestrians and cyclists show?

7.12 Can the existing ferry service be enhanced prior to a bridge being built?

7.13 What is the predicted cost of the maintenance of a bridge versus tunnel versus ferry?

Ref	Issue	TfL's Response
7.1	Cost of the scheme and the prioritisation of public resources on this particular project over other public services.	<p>We are the integrated body responsible for transport in London and do not have the powers to deliver or direct funding towards other public services such as housing, health care, policing or education.</p> <p>Both Tower Hamlets and Southwark are densely populated inner London boroughs, which have grown rapidly in recent years and are forecast to continue growing in the future. London's growth is expected to generate more than 5 million additional trips each day by 2041 and it is important that we encourage as many trips as possible foot or bicycle. If we do not continue to invest in high quality walking and cycling infrastructure, London's transport network is likely to become increasingly congested and quality of life will decline.</p> <p>As with all projects that we invest in, value for money is a key consideration. When choosing our preferred option, we will balance a range of factors that include - but are not limited to - cost, the anticipated benefits, public and stakeholder opinion, the impacts on local communities, environmental considerations and the technical feasibility.</p>
7.2	What are the funding sources?	<p>Developing a funding package is crucial to the project's success. The final cost of the project and the associated funding package depends on the type of crossing selected and the detail of the design. We are investigating a number of funding options, including potential third-party contributions, and will develop a funding proposal once the detail of the design is known and cost estimates are refined. An update will be provided to the public at the next public consultation.</p>
7.3	What are the costs and benefits of the scheme?	<p>The main benefits of the project which have been quantified at this stage relate to journey time and fare savings, crowding reduction on public transport and the health benefits of increased physical activity arising from the provision of a safe, attractive and direct route for pedestrians and cyclists. There are a number of other benefits and value considerations that are being assessed and have an important bearing on the overall value for money provided. These include wider economic benefits and regeneration benefits. The updated assessment of the benefits will be assessed in the next iteration of the project Business Case.</p> <p>The cost estimates we presented at the public consultation were based on an independent cost review undertaken by third party specialists. These were calculated in terms of whole life costs over a 60 year appraisal period and were considered in a range due to the immaturity of proposals and significant number of variables available within each of the options. As a result, the Benefit: Cost Ratios (BCR) have been presented in ranges and reflect the range of uncertainty at the time of appraisal, as presented in the Background to Consultation Report here.</p>

		We will continue to refine our cost estimate and develop our assessment of the project benefits as the project progresses.
7.4	Concerns about gentrification and rising house prices/rental prices in areas directly served by the crossing.	London as a whole has a shortage of available housing. Whilst we have not specifically identified unlocking housing development as a core objective of this project, the two areas that the crossing will serve are expected to grow significantly. A new river crossing in this location is likely to support and complement new housing development in this area. The Mayor of London, in his draft New London Plan has set ambitious targets for the level of affordable housing to help meet London's housing needs and a new river crossing will help to improve accessibility and connectivity for both current and future residents.
7.5	How will the operation and maintenance of the bridge be funded?	Operating and maintenance costs will be considered as part of our funding package for the scheme.
7.6	Suggestions that this is a vanity project i.e. there is not an underlying need for it.	<p>This project is one of a number of proposed new river crossings for London which are intended to improve cross-river connectivity. A crossing in this location is supported in a number of local policy documents; including, Southwark's Core Strategy, the Canada Water Area Action Plan and the emerging Draft Isle of Dogs & South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework. Moreover, a crossing is referenced in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and would be a key part of the Mayor's Healthy Streets vision which seeks to accommodate the planned growth in population, employment and travel in the most sustainable means possible.</p> <p>There is a need for new river crossings in the east of London, where there are significantly fewer than west of Tower Bridge. The forecast continuation of a combination of strong growth in cycling across London, employment growth in Canary Wharf and population growth due to new residential and mixed-use development, particularly at Canada Water, are generating an increase in travel trips and walking and cycle demand in the area. With the Jubilee line operating close to capacity at peak times and a lack of appropriate or sufficient infrastructure to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians wishing to cross the river east of Tower Bridge to access Canary Wharf, there is a strong case for considering the delivery of a new river crossing to cater for this demand. Whilst a navigable bridge is our preferred option, we have reviewed many crossing options to identify the most appropriate and beneficial one.</p>
7.7	What is the Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR) of the enhanced ferry?	The BCRs were presented in ranges; 1.01:1 to 1.73:1 for the free ferry option and 0.80:1 to 1.32:1 for the ferry with fare option. The range reflects the level of uncertainty at the time of appraisal, as presented in the Background to Consultation Report here .

7.8	What is the Benefit: Cost Ratio (BCR) of the tunnel?	The BCR for the tunnel option was presented in a range; 0.43:1 to 0.79:1. The range reflects the level of uncertainty at the time of appraisal, as presented in the Background to Consultation Report here .
7.9	What exploratory work was done in advance of the Mayor's announcement regarding the proposal in 2016?	A new crossing at this location has been promoted by a wide number of stakeholders for over a decade, including by Sustrans, the sustainable transport charity. Sustrans undertook their own feasibility study for a pedestrian and cycle bridge in this location, using their own assessment methodology. The work undertaken previously by Sustrans informs, but is not part of, the current work; the Mayor, through TfL, is independently reviewing the need and options for a crossing in this area, as reflected in the Mayor's Transport Strategy.
7.10	What was the cost of the project in 2016?	We started investigating and assessing the project in 2016. Any cost estimates undertaken before we began our work were produced by third parties and are not endorsed by ourselves.
7.11	What does the demand analysis for pedestrians and cyclists show?	A number of scenarios have been modelled to understand the likely demand for a crossing in this location. The result showed that a possible 1.4-1.6 million pedestrian trips would be made on a bridge annually and 450,000–900,000 cycle trips made annually. We will continue to update our modelling as the project progresses.
7.12	Can the existing ferry service be enhanced prior to a bridge being built?	This is not an option that we are pursuing at this time. TfL has a limited amount of funding and we are focusing on the crossing option that we believe can achieve maximum value and benefits to Londoners.
7.13	What is the predicted cost of maintenance of the bridge versus tunnel versus ferry?	The annual average operating, maintenance and renewal costs for the three short-listed crossing options were published as part of the public consultation and can be found on page 18 of the Background to Consultation Report here .

8 User experience

This chapter responds to issues that were raised regarding the users' potential and perceived experience whilst using the crossing. This includes accessibility and the gradient of ramps.

8.1 Personal safety and comfort whilst using the crossing.

8.2 Accessibility of the crossing.

8.3 Technology – a bridge should have its own App so users can plan whether to use it or not if it is opening soon.

8.4 Access through the hotel land is a barrier as people do not want to go through it to access the crossing.

8.5 Would any of the crossing alignments be able to open up any more of the Thames path?

8.6 Could there be a steeper ramp with something like a ski lift or escalator alongside it?

8.7 A tunnel would be safer for users.

8.8 A bridge must be segregated between pedestrians and cyclists.

8.9 A bridge should have retail opportunities.

Ref	Issue	TfL's Response
8.1	Personal safety and comfort whilst using the crossing.	Ensuring personal safety when accessing and using the crossing is important to us. It is envisaged that a crossing would be available for use all year round and at all times of day. We will therefore consider the personal safety of all potential users and their varying requirements at different times of day and under different weather conditions in our design development.
8.2	Accessibility of the crossing.	<p>The design will take into account the access needs of all potential users, including those protected from unlawful discrimination under the Equalities Act.</p> <p>As part of our ongoing work to develop the design, we will consider how we can best cater for a range of access requirements for all users. A decision as to how the crossing would be accessed has not been taken and will be considered as the design and engagement with key stakeholders progresses. An Equality Impact Assessment will also be undertaken and submitted in support of the Transport Works Act Order application to seek consent for the scheme.</p>
8.3	Technology - a bridge should have its own App so users can plan whether to use it or not if it is opening soon.	We understand that communicating with users when a potential bridge is in the open position for river traffic is important and we are keen to use different forms of technology to reach as many users as possible. We are continuing to develop our proposed operational strategy and this information is being considered.
8.4	Access through the hotel land is a barrier as people do not want to go through it to access the crossing.	Following feedback from the consultation and ongoing engagement with landowners and stakeholders we are continuing to develop our designs. Maintaining public access to a proposed crossing is a key consideration.
8.5	Would any of the crossing alignments be able to open up any more of the	We support the use of the Thames Path and believe it is an important walking route through London. Ongoing work on the crossing alignment and access points may include connecting to the Thames Path. However, as part of the Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf crossing project we are not actively reviewing further options to open up the path beyond the projects objectives.

	Thames path?	
8.6	Could there be a steeper ramp with something like a ski lift or escalator alongside it?	Following feedback from the consultation and ongoing engagement with stakeholders we are continuing to develop our designs and progress to the best and most appropriate solution for all users.
8.7	A tunnel would be safer for users.	A tunnel option was considered as part of our assessment of the three short-listed crossing options presented as part of the public consultation. Whilst our assessment concluded that a tunnel would offer similar benefits to a bridge, our current forecast indicates that it would cost considerably more and therefore provide poor value for money.
8.8	A bridge must be segregated between pedestrians and cyclist.	Segregation between cyclists and pedestrian was given as one of the most important elements of a bridge design in the consultation feedback. Using this feedback and ongoing engagement with stakeholders we are continuing to develop our design and progress to the best and most appropriate solution for all users.
8.9	A bridge should have retail opportunities.	We are exploring retail opportunities within the boundaries of the crossing, for example in waiting areas, and will continue to do so as the project progresses.