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Executive summary

This document explains the processes, responses and outcomes of our consultation on proposed changes in Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road. The document also presents our responses to issues commonly raised during the consultation.

Between 21 July and 14 September 2016, we consulted on proposals for introducing new sections of bus lane and other highway modifications in Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road as part of our London-wide Bus Priority Programme.

We received 227 responses to the consultation, with 70% of respondents saying they were in favour of the proposals. The breakdown of support was 44% strongly supported and 26% supported our proposals, while 13% of respondents said they strongly opposed and 4% opposed them, with 8% saying they neither supported nor opposed the proposals, and 5% not answering the question.

The main themes raised during the consultation are highlighted below, with a fuller summary of results in Chapter 4 and detailed analysis of comments in Appendix A.

Summary of most frequently made comments

- Calls for protected cycling facilities along the A23 and at major junctions
- Support for proposals to reduce bus journey times
- General positive comments praising the proposals
- Objections to proposals to reduce footways to provide wider bus and general traffic lanes
- Calls for bus lane operating hours to be extended to improve cycling safety
- Comments that bus journeys on this route are slow
- Calls for prioritisation of sustainable and/or non-polluting modes of transport along this route
- Calls for bus lanes to be continuous along this route to benefit bus passengers
- Support for proposals to reduce footways to provide wider bus and general traffic lanes
- Concern that a new left-turn-only except buses lane at Brixton Water Lane would cause straight-ahead motor traffic to be blocked by right-turning vehicles
Next steps

Having considered all responses to the consultation, we have decided to go ahead with the scheme with only minor changes. We are reviewing the scope of works at the top of Brixton Hill in the light of our review of the size and position of the trees and utility pipes and cables under the road surface. The other proposals will go ahead, subject to minor changes that might be made as part of the detailed design. For more information about our responses to the issues raised during this consultation, please see Appendix B.

We plan to start construction in summer 2017, and we will write to affected properties before starting any works.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction

Buses play a vital role in our transport system, providing people with easy access to workplaces, homes, town centres, and so on. We want to maintain a reliable bus network, so we regularly assess bus routes to identify opportunities to implement bus priority measures. We developed proposals to help protect and shorten journey times for passengers on Brixton Hill as part of our London-wide Bus Priority Programme.

1.2 Detailed description

You can view a detailed description of the proposals, including the annotated diagrams of the changes at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/brixton-hill.

1.2.1 Diagrams of proposed changes

The consultation diagrams are reproduced in Appendix C.

1.2.2 Summary of proposed changes

The following text was used to described the proposals:

We are proposing to make changes on Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road in order to improve bus journey times and reliability.

Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road are busy roads served by eight/six bus routes during the day and four/three bus routes at night respectively. Approximately 3,500 bus passengers per hour use northbound bus routes on Brixton Hill during peak periods.

- Widening the carriageway along significant stretches of Brixton Hill to provide wider bus and general traffic lanes. We would make space by narrowing some sections of the footway by up to 1 metre. However, the remaining footway would be at least 2.6 metres wide (and in most cases wider), which we consider to be sufficient for the numbers of people using it and is within design guidelines.

- Providing a central bus lane on St Matthew’s Road to improve the movement of buses onto Brixton Hill. This would require the reduction of right turn general traffic lanes from two to one as well as the removal of a cycle feeder lane which currently leads cyclists into the traffic island when the lights are green. Cyclists would be able to use the new bus lane.
- Narrowing a section of the wide footway on Brixton Hill at the junction with Baytree Road to provide a continuous northbound bus lane along Brixton Hill. The bus lane currently stops before the junction and restarts after the junction, resulting in long delays for bus passengers when there is queueing in the general traffic lanes. The remaining footway at this junction would still be at least 3.5 metres wide.

- Extending the northbound bus lane on Brixton Hill from south of the junction with Lambert Road to south of the junction with Trent Road. This would reduce the number of general traffic lanes from two to one on this section of road. On the northbound approach to the junction with Trent Road, the nearside lane would only be available for use by vehicles turning left and bus lane users.

- Relocating the parking/loading bays on the southbound carriageway of Brixton Hill between the junctions with Josephine Avenue and Arodene Road into the footway as inset bays.

- Moving the parking/loading bays on the northbound side of Brixton Hill between the junctions with St Saviours Road and Blenheim Gardens so that they are no longer on the main carriageway but are changed to on footway bays. This will mean that pedestrians would be able to use these spaces when they are not in use as loading/parking bays.

- On the northbound approach to the junction with New Park Road, the nearside lane would only be available for use by vehicles turning left and bus lane users.

- Providing a new northbound bus lane from the junction with Streatham Place to the junction with New Park Road. This would be achieved through widening the carriageway and would not result in a decrease in the number of general traffic lanes.

- Slightly relocating cycle parking (16 metres south) and a bus stop (10 metres north) on the northbound carriageway of Brixton Hill between the junctions with St Saviours Road and Blenheim Gardens.
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 proposals
- 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 next steps are set out in the Executive Summary and Chapter 5.

2.3 Who we consulted

We consulted relevant stakeholders, along with customers / members of the public identified as likely to benefit or disbenefit from our scheme. These included bus passengers, cyclists and motorists using routes in this area or living in this area.

2.4 Dates and duration

The consultation took place from 21 July to 14 September 2016. An eight-week period was chosen because the consultation took place during the school summer holidays. The consultation was timed to coincide with another bus priority scheme.
that proposed changes to the same bus corridor. Details of this scheme can be found at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/streatham-hill-bus-lanes.

2.5 What we asked

We asked a closed question about the proposals asking respondents to indicate their level of support or otherwise for the scheme. We also gave respondents an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

In addition, we also gave respondents the option to answer our standard set of questions designed to give us more information about respondents such as name, postcode, stakeholder status and so on. All questions are reproduced in Appendix D.

2.6 Methods of responding

We accepted responses through our recognised consultation response channels:

- Via our website’s online survey
- Email to consultations@tfl.gov.uk
- Letter or paper survey sent to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS
- Telephone call to our Customer Service Team

2.7 Consultation materials and publicity

2.7.1 Website

We published materials at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/brixton-hill explaining our proposals.

2.7.2 Letters

Members of the public and stakeholders near the scheme were informed via a consultation notification letter sent on the first day of the consultation. The letter was sent to all properties within 50 metres of the scheme, which included 1,167 addresses. The letter is reproduced in Appendix E.

2.7.3 Emails to public

We emailed customers on our customer database who had been identified as having a potential interest in this scheme. This comprised registered customers who use
bus routes affected by the scheme, or live in the area of the scheme and cycle or drive.

In order to ensure efficiency of administration costs, we sent a single email to notify customers about this consultation and another consultation taking place at the same time on a bus scheme in Streatham Hill. The combined email was sent to 17,246 recipients. The text of the email is reproduced in Appendix E.

2.7.4 Emails to stakeholders

We sent an email notification to 234 stakeholders that had been identified as relevant to bus schemes or schemes in this area. A joint email was sent for this scheme and for the Streatham Hill scheme. The text of the email is reproduced in Appendix E.

2.7.5 Social media

We used our own social media channels to publicise the consultation. For example, we tweeted a link to the consultation encouraging people to respond from @TfLTPH https://twitter.com/TfLTPH/status/770206871231823872. This account has over 10,000 followers.

2.8 Equalities Assessment

We took steps to ensure that all groups in the community, such as elderly, disabled or faith organisations were made aware of the proposals, their potential impacts and how to respond to the consultation. Measures taken included:

- Identifying and emailing relevant stakeholders including but not limited to the British Dyslexia Association, Age UK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute for the Blind, Action on Hearing Loss and Inclusion London, inviting them to respond to the consultation
- Ensuring that the materials were written in plain English, and available on request in different formats (for example, Braille, large print, other languages)

We are fully aware of our obligations under the Equality Act 2010, in particular the effect of the public sector equality duty on our decision-making.

2.9 Analysis of consultation responses

Analysis of all responses was carried out in-house by the consultation specialist leading on the project. We used our standard peer-review processes to verify the coding of comments. Comment analysis can be found in Appendix A.
3. About the respondents

This section presents information about those who responded to this consultation.

3.1 Number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How respondents heard</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email from TfL</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL website</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or relative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC or Lambeth Cyclists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about in the press</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from TfL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*24 respondents put ‘Other’, with 10 indicating ‘friend or relative’ and 8 putting London Cycling Campaign or Lambeth Cyclists. There were 6 additional ‘Others’.

3.3 Methods of responding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of responding</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 **Postcodes of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SW</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 **Interest in the scheme**

We asked respondents to identify what interest(s) they had in the scheme. Some respondents did not answer, while others chose one or more interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resident</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter to or through the area</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor to the area</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed locally</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local but interested in the scheme</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary of consultation responses

4.1 Summary of responses

We received 227 responses to this consultation.

The breakdown of responses to the closed question about the level of support for the proposals is shown below.

4.1.1 Level of support for the proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All responses</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly supported</td>
<td>100 (44%)</td>
<td>99 (43%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>59 (26%)</td>
<td>59 (26%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither supported nor opposed</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly opposed</td>
<td>29 (13%)</td>
<td>28 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227 (100%)</td>
<td>222 (98%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.2 Issues most commonly raised

Of the 227 people who responded to this consultation, 165 also provided a comment. The issues most commonly raised in the comments are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls for protected cycling facilities along the A23 and at major junctions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for proposals to reduce bus journey times</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comments praising the proposals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objections to proposals to reduce footways to provide wider bus and general traffic lanes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for bus lane operating hours to be extended to improve cycling safety</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments that bus journeys on this route are slow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for prioritisation of sustainable and/or non-polluting modes of transport along this route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for bus lanes to be continuous along this route to benefit bus passengers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for proposals to reduce footways to provide wider bus and general traffic lanes | 7 | 0 | 7

Concern that a new left-turn-only except buses lane at Brixton Water Lane would cause straight-ahead motor traffic to be blocked by right-turning vehicles | 7 | 0 | 7

### 4.2 Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the feedback we received from stakeholders. Answers to the closed question about support for the scheme are shown in italics after the stakeholder name.

We sometimes have to condense detailed responses into brief summaries. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes.

**Transport and road user groups**

**Clapham Transport Users Group** – *Not answered*

The group welcomed the proposed improvements to bus services, but expressed concern at a perceived decline in bus journey reliability along bus corridors in Clapham, Stockwell, Vauxhall and Kennington – attributing this to improved cycling provision in these areas and a reduction of space allocated to buses.

**London Cycling Campaign** – *Opposed*

The organisation called for all highway schemes to be designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service rating of 70 or above. They also called for physically segregated cycle tracks to enable safe cycling, and expressed concern that bus lanes do not enable a broader range of people to cycle. They called for the removal of the A23’s “motorway-like” characteristics, and highlighted a lack of alternative parallel cycling routes.

In the event the bus scheme goes ahead without cycling provision, the organisation called for the current scheme to anticipate the addition of segregated cycling facilities at a later date. They also called for bus lanes to be in operation 24/7, removal of parking in bus lanes, and safety improvements to junctions.

The organisation called for modal filter cells for side streets touching the A23, removing through motor traffic. They also called for other traffic-calming measures such as 20mph, raised tables, tight junction radii and entry/exit width, along with “blended crossings”.
London TravelWatch – **Strongly supported**

Welcomed any new bus lanes, but called for them to operate 24/7. The organisation also expressed concern about the cost of moving parking and loading bays into the footway. They called for a trial scheme that left them in the carriageway as off-peak only bays.

**Businesses, employers and venues**

Guava London Ltd – **Strongly opposed**

Expressed concern about the perceived impact of previously implemented changes to Effra Road on motorists. The business also expressed concern that changes to Brixton Hill would displace motor traffic to Effra Road and surrounding roads resulting in longer motor traffic journey times.

**Local interest groups**

Streatham Action – **Strongly supported**

They said there could be a negative impact on pedestrians and cyclists, but supported measures to reduce bus journey times. Supported the reduction of footway near Baytree Road, as beneficial to bus passengers. Expressed concern about the central bus lane in St Matthew’s Road, calling for better training for bus drivers in order that they accommodate cyclists using the lane safely.

### 4.3 Comments from social media

The consultation attracted a relatively low level of activity on social media. However, the London Cycling Campaign, Lambeth Cyclists and Streatham Action used Twitter to encourage people to respond – for example, by posting a link to the consultation: [https://twitter.com/streathamaction/status/773440552218062848](https://twitter.com/streathamaction/status/773440552218062848).

### 4.3.1 Level of support for the consultation

Question 9 asked respondents to rate our consultation, ticking one of the multiple choice answers. This question was mandatory, and the results are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Comments on the consultation

We also asked respondents to comment on the consultation materials and process. 42 respondents (19%) provided a comment, and the significant topics raised are listed below:

- 10 (<1% of all respondents) called for the consultation to be publicised more widely
- 7 respondents (<1%) said the maps were not adequate or difficult to understand
- 7 respondents (<1%) said the maps were good and helped understanding
- 7 respondents (<1%) called for more information to be provided to help to understand the scheme
- 6 respondents (<1%) commented on the scheme, not the consultation
- 5 respondents (<1%) provided a general positive comment on the consultation
- 5 respondents (<1%) said the text explanation was not clear enough
- 2 respondents (<1%) expressed concern that views would not be considered
5. **Next steps**

Having considered all responses to the consultation, we have decided to go ahead with the scheme with only minor changes. We are reviewing the scope of works at the top of Brixton Hill in the light of the size and position of the trees and utility pipes and cables under the surface. The other proposals will go ahead, subject to detail design. For more information about our responses to the issues raised during this consultation, please see *Appendix B*.

We plan to start construction in summer 2017, and we will write to affected properties before starting any works.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of comments

Of the 227 respondents, 159 provided comments on the scheme. We have summarised the significant issues raised below. Percentages below are calculated based on the total 227 respondents.

General comments
25 respondents (11%) provided a general comment on the overall proposals:

- 23 respondents (10%) provided a general supportive comment
- 2 respondents (1%) provided a general negative comment

Impact on cycling
58 respondents (26%) commented on how they expected the proposals to affect cycling:

- 43 respondents (19%) called for the scheme to include protected cycling facilities, either along Brixton Hill or at major junctions
- 12 respondents (5%) called for bus lane operating hours along this route to be made 24 hours to benefit cycling safety
- 11 respondents (5%) commented that sharing lanes with buses created significant risk to cyclists
- 10 respondents (4%) called for prioritisation of sustainable and/or non-polluting modes of transport along this corridor such as cycling
- 7 respondents (3%) expressed concern that slow cycling speeds up Brixton Hill could delay buses, creating an unwelcoming environment for cycling and longer journeys for bus passengers
- 6 respondents (3%) called for stricter enforcement due to motor traffic frequently exceeding speed limits and increasing danger for cyclists
- 5 respondents (2%) objected to the removal of the cycle feeder lane on St Matthew’s Road, saying it would have an adverse effect on cycling safety at this junction
- 5 respondents (2%) expressed concern that when general motor traffic uses bus lanes to undertake other vehicles it creates significant risk for cyclists
  - 2 respondents (1%) expressed concern that insetting parking bays near Josephine Avenue and Arodene Road would encourage motor traffic to undertake dangerously at this location
• 2 respondents (1%) objected to any new measures that would negatively affect cycling

Impact on buses

48 respondents (21%) commented on how they expected the proposals to affect buses:

• 30 respondents (13%) supported the proposed measures to improve bus journey times
• 11 respondents (5%) commented that current bus journeys times along this route were too long
• 7 respondents (3%) called for bus lanes to be continuous along this route to benefit bus passengers
• 4 respondents (2%) expressed concern that buses would be delayed during construction
• 3 respondents (1%) expressed concern that the proposed measures would not prevent bus congestion around Brixton town centre
• 2 respondents (1%) called for measures to improve bus journey times near Brixton station
• 2 respondents (1%) supported proposals to make bus lanes wider to reduce delays
• 2 respondents (1%) said the changes were not necessary to benefit buses
• 2 respondents (1%) called for measures to prevent general traffic blocking buses at the place where bus lanes started
• 2 respondents (1%) called for a reduction in the number of bus stops along this section of the route to improve bus journey times

Impact on pedestrians

27 respondents (12%) commented on how they expected the proposals to affect cycling:

• 16 respondents (7%) objected to proposals to reduce footways to provide wider bus lanes
• 7 respondents (3%) supported proposals to reduce footways to provide wider bus lanes
• 5 respondents (2%) called for measures to encourage more walking
• 5 respondents (2%) supported the proposal to remove a section of footway near Baytree Road to reduce delays to buses
• 4 respondents (2%) expressed concern about reducing the footways when increasing numbers of pedestrians are expected to use Brixton Hill due to access new schools and colleges being built at this location
• 2 respondents (1%) called for wider footways on Brixton Hill

Impact on motor traffic
27 respondents (12%) commented on how they expected the proposals to affect cycling:
• 7 respondents (3%) expressed concern that introducing a new left-turn only lane at Brixton Water Lane would cause straight-ahead motor traffic to be blocked by right-turning vehicles
• 6 respondents (3%) said the proposals would have a negative impact on general traffic
• 5 respondents (2%) objected to the removal of the feeder lane on St Matthew’s Road because it would delay general traffic
• 4 respondents (2%) objected to moving the northbound bus stop on Brixton Hill because this would reduce visibility for traffic using the junction with St Saviour’s Road, increasing risk of collisions
• 4 respondents (2%) called for measures to deprioritise motor traffic
• 3 respondents (1%) called for bus lane operation hours to be consistent to make it easier for motorists to comply

Impact on pollution
9 respondents (4%) commented on how the scheme might affect pollution:
• 7 respondents (3%) expressed concern about air pollution along this route, caused by motor traffic
• 2 respondents (1%) expressed concern about noise pollution

Impact on trees
7 respondents (3%) commented on how they expected the proposals to affect cycling:
• 5 respondents (2%) asked for more details as to where some trees would be relocated
• 2 respondents (1%) objected to the removal of any trees
Appendix B: Responses to issue raised

Impact on cycling

Protected cycling facilities
Some respondents called for protected cycling facilities along the A23, saying that this route is already a busy cycling route but needs improved provision to make it safer for existing cyclists and more welcoming to those people who are currently less likely to cycle in fast-moving motor traffic such as women, children and older people.

We have to consider all road users when developing proposals and providing protected cycle facilities is not considered a feasible use of the limited available road space on the A23. The current proposals provide benefits to cyclists with the improved continuity of bus lanes and consistency of lane widths. These changes will be an improvement on the current situation.

24-hour bus lanes
Some respondents called for the current peak-hour operating times to be extended to 24 hours to make the bus lanes safer for cycling.

The current hours of bus lane operation give priority to buses at peak times, but also help general traffic to move more freely and allow for parking and loading during off-peak times. We are, however, undertaking a review of bus lane hours on the A23 and a decision on this will be made in due course.

Sharing bus lanes with buses, motorcycles and taxis
Some respondents expressed concern about cyclists having to share bus lanes with buses, motorcycles and taxis.

In Greater London, the majority of red route bus lanes can currently be used by cycles, motorcycles, taxis, coaches and buses. We recognise that this requires different modes, sometimes travelling at different speeds, to share road space. However, we are satisfied that this provides a balance between safety and efficient journeys for all bus lane users. Bus lanes normally mean cyclists share space with far fewer vehicles than they would if using the general carriageway.

Speed enforcement
Some respondents called for greater speed enforcement for general traffic to reduce risk to pedestrians and cyclists.
We work with the police to enforce speed limits and encourage safe driving. We review locations to establish whether additional speed control measures are needed. We will continue to monitor this section of the A23 once the scheme has been implemented.

20mph speed limits
Some respondents called for a 20mph speed limit along this section of the A23. We are trialling 20mph speed limits on arterial roads in some locations, including north of St Matthew’s Road, and we will look closely at the results of those trials. However, we have no plans at present to introduce a 20mph speed limit along this section of the A23.

Removal of cycling feeder lane on St Matthew’s Road
Some respondents expressed concern that the removal of the cycling feeder lane on St Matthew’s Road would increase risk of cyclists being involved in a collision with a motor vehicle.

The existing cycle feeder lane leads cyclists into the traffic island when the lights are green and is therefore substandard. Cyclists will be able to use the new central bus lane when turning right from St Matthew’s Road into Brixton Hill.

General traffic undertaking in bus lanes
Some respondents expressed concern about general traffic undertaking in bus lanes, increasing risk to cyclists.

Drivers who undertake are contravening Rule 163 of the Highway Code, which states that “you should only overtake on the left if the vehicle in front is signalling to turn right, and there is room to do so”. We work with the police to encourage safe driving and adherence to the Highway Code from all road users. We review locations frequently to establish whether additional enforcement is needed. We will continue to monitor this section of the A23 once the scheme has been implemented.

Insetting parking bays near Josephine Avenue
Some respondents expressed concern that insetting the parking bays near Josephine Avenue would increase danger for cyclists by making it possible for motorists to undertake in the bus lane during off-peak hours. They argued that the presence of vehicles parked in the existing on-carriageway bays during off-peak hours reduced the likelihood of drivers using the bus lane to undertake vehicles in the general traffic lane, putting cyclists and other road users at risk.
As we said on p21, drivers who undertake are contravening Rule 163 of the Highway Code. We work with the police to encourage safe driving and adherence to the Highway Code from all road users. Inset bays for loading or parking are a common feature in our roads, including where there are bus lanes. While insetting the bays will make it possible for drivers to disobey the Highway Code, we do not believe this is sufficient reason not to implement a measure designed to benefit tens of thousands of bus passengers every day. We review locations frequently to establish whether additional enforcement is needed, and we will continue to monitor this section of the A23 once the scheme has been implemented.

**Impact on bus passengers**

**Delays caused by construction**

Some respondents expressed concern that construction of this scheme would have a negative impact on journeys in this area.

While it is true that there are likely to be some delays to bus journeys and general traffic when we implement this scheme, along with some inconvenience to cyclists and pedestrians, we always aim to minimise the impact of construction. We will minimise the number of lane closures, and will coordinate our works with those of other agencies to minimise disruption.

**Bus delays in Brixton town centre**

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposals would not address congestion and bus delays in Brixton town centre.

We acknowledge that these proposals will not address delays in the busy town centre itself, but we will continue to review the bus and road network for potential opportunities to reduce delays to buses.

**General traffic blocking buses at start of bus lanes**

Some respondents expressed concern that where general traffic lanes change to bus lanes, motor traffic queues during busy times because the number of lanes is reduced.

A small amount of queuing often results where a bus lane begins and general traffic lanes merge, and remedial action is not considered necessary.
**Fewer bus stops**

Some respondents called for a reduction in the number of bus stops to speed up bus journeys.

The distances between bus stops are designed to make bus journeys convenient for all passengers, including those with mobility problems. We are satisfied we have the optimum balance between the accessibility of bus stops and bus journey times along this section of the A23.

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Wider footways on Brixton Hill due to new school and college**

Some respondents expressed concern that reducing footways on Brixton Hill would have a negative impact on the large number of pedestrians that use this route. They also expressed concern that the new school and college being developed on the site of Lambeth College would attract more people to the area, increasing footway congestion.

The eastern footway will remain at least 2.6 metres wide (and in most cases wider), which we consider to be sufficient for the number of pedestrians using it now and in the future, and is within design guidelines. The western footway will not be altered and will remain at its current width.

**Impact on motorists**

**Left-turn only except buses lane at Brixton Water Lane**

Some respondents expressed concern that the new left-turn only except buses lane at the junction of Brixton Water Lane would cause motor vehicles to queue behind right-turning vehicles in the right-hand lane.

We are continuing to review the design for the junction to ensure the best and safest traffic flow.

**Moving northbound bus stop near St Saviour’s Road**

Some respondents expressed concern that moving the northbound bus stop near St Saviour’s Road would reduce visibility for turning motor traffic at this location, increasing risk to all road users.

The detailed design process will take into account the need for visibility from the side road, and we are satisfied this will provide a safe junction.
Longer journey times for general traffic

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposals would increase journey times for general traffic along an already-busy section of road.

Our traffic modelling predicted slight reductions in journey times for northbound general traffic, although there could be slight increases south and westbound at peak times. These short delays are considered acceptable in the context of substantial benefits to tens of thousands of bus passengers using the area.

Consistency of bus lane operational hours

Some respondents called for consistency of bus lane operating hours to prevent confusion among motorists as to when they can legally use these lanes.

The current bus lane hours are consistent along this part of the A23. The current hours give priority to buses at peak times, but also help traffic to move more freely and allow for parking and loading during off-peak times. All bus lane times are marked clearly where bus lanes operate. We are, however, undertaking a review of bus lane hours on the A23 and a decision on this will be made in due course.

Impact on air pollution

Some respondents called for measures to improve air pollution along the A23 through Brixton.

The Mayor of London has made improving London’s poor air quality a priority, and we are working on a number of schemes to reduce bus emissions, as well as those from other vehicles.

For example, we are implementing Low Emission Bus Zones on the most polluted bus corridors, where we will deploy the lowest-emissions buses in an effort to reduce air pollution. The new greener buses, which will be a combination of hybrid and clean buses that meet Euro VI standards, are part of an improvement programme to 3,000 buses outside central London. The Brixton to Streatham corridor will be one of 12 Low Emission Bus Corridors to be established, reducing bus emissions from Stockwell Road, along Brixton Hill, Streatham Hill and Streatham High Road. This will be delivered in October 2017, by which time and around 450 buses travelling on this section of the A23 will meet the Euro VI standard, reducing NOx emissions from buses by over 80 percent.

As part of the Low Emission Bus Zones, a number of ‘Bus Priority Schemes’ will be delivered to ensure buses have priority over other traffic and are able to keep moving, cutting idling emissions and speeding up journey times for passengers. Our Business Plan, published at the end of 2016, includes a £50 million fund to be invested in bus priority schemes, helping attract more people back on to the bus network, and tackling pollution and road congestion.
The Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), currently scheduled for introduction in 2020 will require all vehicles entering central London at any time to meet emissions standards or pay a daily charge. We recently consulted on ideas to improve the Ultra Low Emissions Zone by bringing forward the implementation date to 2019, expanding the zone Londonwide for heavy vehicles (HGVs, buses and coaches), and expanding the zone to the North and South Circular for all vehicles. This would reduce the number of the worst polluting heavy vehicles travelling through Brixton and reduce the number of the worst-polluting cars and vans that use this section of the A23 to access the city centre. Further detailed consultation on firm proposals for changes to the ULEZ will take place later in 2017.

**Impact on trees**

Some respondents expressed concern at the proposed removal of trees, and called for more information about proposed relocations of trees.

We are reviewing the designs to see what benefits we can achieve without removing trees.
Appendix C: Consultation drawings

The following two diagrams were published on our website as part of the consultation materials, and included in the notification letter sent to properties near the scheme.
Appendix D: Survey questions

We asked respondents the following questions, with only Question 1 being mandatory:

1. Do you support our proposals to extend the southbound bus lanes in Streatham Hill?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Partially
   - Not sure
   - No opinion

2. Do you have any comments on our proposals to extend the southbound bus lanes in Streatham Hill?

3. What is your name?

4. What is your email address?

5. Please provide us with your postcode?

6. Are you (please tick all boxes that apply):
   - Local resident
   - Business Owner
   - Employed locally
   - Visitor to the area
   - Commuter to the area
   - Not local but interested in the scheme
   - Other (Please specify)

7. If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name:

8. How did you find out about this consultation?
   - Received an email from TfL
   - Received a letter from TfL
   - Read about in the press
• Saw it on the TfL website
• Social media
• Other (please specify)

9. 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
• Good
• Acceptable
• Poor
• Very poor

Do you have any further comments?
Appendix E: Notification letter and emails

Notification letter

The following letter was sent to all properties within 50 metres of the scheme, which included 1,167 addresses. The letter also included copies of the consultation drawings in Appendix C.

21 July 2016

Dear resident

Re: Proposed changes on Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road

We would like your views on our proposals to make changes on Brixton Hill and St Matthews Road in order to improve bus journey times and reliability.

Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road are busy roads served by eighty-six bus routes during the day and four/five bus routes at night respectively. Approximately 3,500 bus passengers an hour use northbound bus routes on Brixton Hill during peak periods.

Our proposals include:

- Widening the carriageway along significant stretches of Brixton Hill to provide wider bus and general traffic lanes. We would make space by narrowing some sections of the footway by up to 1 metre. However, the remaining footway would be at least 2.6 metres wide (and in most cases wider), which we consider to be sufficient for the numbers of people using it and is within design guidelines
- Providing a central bus lane on St Matthew’s Road to improve the movement of buses onto Brixton Hill. This would require the reduction of right turn general traffic lanes from two to one as well as the removal of a cycle feeder lane which currently leads cyclists into the traffic island when the lights are green. Cyclists would be able to use the new bus lane
- Narrowing a section of the wide footway on Brixton Hill at the junction with Baytree Road to provide a continuous northbound bus lane along Brixton Hill. The bus lane currently stops before the junction and restarts after the junction, resulting in long delays for bus passengers when there is queuing in the general traffic lanes. The remaining footway at this junction would still be at least 3.5 metres wide
- Extending the northbound bus lane on Brixton Hill from south of the junction with Lambert Road to south of the junction with Trent Road. This
would reduce the number of general traffic lanes from two to one on this section of road. On the northbound approach to the junction with Trent Road, the nearside lane would only be available for use by vehicles turning left and bus lane users.

- Relocating the parking/loading bays on the southbound carriageway of Brixton Hill between the junctions with Josephine Avenue and Arundel Road into the footway as inset bays.
- Moving the parking/loading bays on the northbound side of Brixton Hill between the junctions with St Saviours Road and Blenheim Gardens so that they are no longer on the main carriageway but are changed to on footway bays. This will mean that pedestrians would be able to use these spaces when they are not in use as loading/parking bays.
- On the northbound approach to the junction with New Park Road, the nearside lane would only be available for use by vehicles turning left and bus lane users.
- Providing a new northbound bus lane from the junction with Streatham Place to the junction with New Park Road. This would be achieved through widening the carriageway and would not result in a decrease in the number of general traffic lanes.
- Slightly relocating cycle parking (10 metres south) and a bus stop (10 metres north) on the northbound carriageway of Brixton Hill between the junctions with St Saviours Road and Blenheim Gardens.

Please refer to the plan enclosed for further information.

The proposals would reduce journey times and improve the reliability for bus passengers on Brixton Hill and St Matthew’s Road. For northbound general traffic there would also be slight reductions in journey times, although there could be slight increases south and westbound at busy times.

We welcome you views on our proposals. Please visit tfl.gov.uk/brixtonhill to complete our online survey no later than 14 September 2016 or email us at consultations@tfl.gov.uk.

We are also running a consultation on bus priority improvements in Streatham Hill which may be of interest to you. For more information on this, please visit consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/streatham-hill-bus-lanes. This consultation also closes on 14 September 2016.

Yours sincerely,

Claire Allegren
Consultation Specialist
Transport for London
Customer database email

The following email was sent to 17,246 recipients on the our customer database who were identified as having an interest in the consultation. (Note that the images missing from this preview, marked with a red x, were included in the final email.)

Dear Test email recipient,

We would like your views on proposals to make changes to roads and footways on Streatham Hill and Brixton Hill, including altering bus lanes. This is intended to improve bus journey times and reliability between Streatham and Brixton.

For full details on proposals for Streatham Hill, and to share your views, please click here

For full details on proposals for Brixton Hill, and to share your views, please click here

These consultations will run until 14 September.

Yours sincerely

Peter Bradley
Head of Consultation

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

---

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
Stakeholder email

The following email was sent to 234 stakeholders that had been identified as having an interest in the proposals:

Dear Stakeholder,

We would like your views on proposals to improve bus journey times and reliability along Brixton Hill and Streatham Hill, which is an important bus corridor. We are proposing to widen and/or extend some bus lanes, and narrow some footways.

For details of our proposals for Brixton Hill and to give us your feedback, visit tfl.gov.uk/brixton-hill

For details of our proposals for Streatham Hill and to give us your feedback, visit consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/streatham-hill-bus-lanes

Both consultations are open until Wednesday 14 September 2016.

Yours faithfully

Peter Bradley
Head of Consultation
Transport for London
### Appendix F: List of stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>ICE -London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Mobility Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King’s College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambert Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambeth Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambeth Traffic and Transport Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LB of Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Licenced Taxi Drivers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Borough of Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Cab Drivers Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London City Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Lambeth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Lewisham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Older People’s Strategy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Omnibus Traction Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Suburban Taxi-drivers’ Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London TravelWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Heathrow Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motorcycle Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Children’s Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbank BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reigate and Banstead Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMT Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|    | Action on Hearing Loss (formerly RNID) |
|    | Age Concern London |
|    | Age UK |
|    | Alzheimer’s Society |
|    | Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance |
|    | Association of British Drivers |
|    | Association of Car Fleet Operators |
|    | Bankside Residents’ Forum |
|    | Better Transport |
|    | British Motorcyclists Federation |
|    | BT |
|    | Campaign for Better Transport |
|    | Canal &amp; River Trust London |
|    | CCG NHS Central London |
|    | Central London NHS Trust |
|    | Clapham Society |
|    | Clapham Transport Users Group |
|    | Confederation of British Industry (CBI) |
|    | Confederation of Passenger transport |
|    | Cycling UK |
|    | Department for Transport |
|    | Disability Alliance |
|    | Disability Rights UK |
|    | Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee |
|    | EDF Energy |
|    | Enfield |
|    | Eurostar Group |
|    | Freight Transport Association |
|    | Gatwick Airport |
|    | GLA Strategy Access Panel members |
|    | Greater London Authority |
|    | Greater London Forum for the Elderly |
|    | Green Flag Group |
|    | Guide Dogs for the Blind Association |
|    | Herne Hill Forum |
|    | Hertfordshire County Council |
|    | House of Commons |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNIB</th>
<th>Tandridge District Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
<td>Taxi and Private hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail</td>
<td>The British Dyslexia Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail Parcel Force</td>
<td>The Clapham Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Parks</td>
<td>TPH for Heathrow Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense</td>
<td>Unions Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty Plus</td>
<td>Unite Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Vale Property Occupiers</td>
<td>Vauxhall Gardens Estate Tenants &amp; Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Victoria Business Improvement District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke Association</td>
<td>Virtual Norwood Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector</td>
<td>Sustrans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>