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Executive summary

Working with the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Newham, and the London Legacy Development Corporation, we consulted on proposals to enhance the transport links and public realm at Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane.

We received 476 responses to our consultation, of which:
- 65 per cent supported or partially supported our proposals
- 29 per cent did not support them
- 6 per cent said they were not sure or did not give an opinion

Key issues raised by people responding to the consultation included:
- The proposals would improve existing pedestrian facilities
- Concern at the impact of the proposals on existing major traffic flows
- The proposals would improve existing cycle facilities
- The proposals would improve pedestrian access
- The expected increase in traffic delays would lead to increased pollution
- The proposals would improve pedestrian safety
- Cyclists do not pay ‘road tax’ or insurance

Our detailed analysis of responses is included as Appendix A.

Conclusion and next steps

The consultation showed that 65 per cent of respondents were either fully or partially supportive of the proposals. Key concerns raised included increased traffic delays and pollution, as well as some respondents preferring retention of the subway.

We are continuing to develop our proposals following feedback received during this consultation, and will provide an update on the project webpage next year.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction
We consulted in March/April 2017 on initial proposals to enhance the transport links and public realm at two major road junctions in Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane. The proposals would:

- make it easier for people to cross both the A12 and Stratford High Street by providing new or upgraded pedestrian and cycle facilities
- improve access for vehicles
- enable new bus routes
- encourage more walking and cycling
- connect local communities and new developments in the surrounding area
Overview of Proposals

Road layout within the Bromley-by-Bow South site is to be designed and delivered by developers. The layout shown is indicative and subject to agreement with LB Tower Hamlets and TRL. Further information can be found in the Bromley-by-Bow South SPD.
1.2 Purpose
Bow and the wider area are changing. Local regeneration, growth in housing and the legacy development of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park are all expected to contribute to the changing demands on the transport network. Our key aims for the area are:

- Making the A12 Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach easier for people to cross at their convenience. Fast-moving or heavy traffic can make this difficult.
- Supporting growth and local businesses by providing better access to new developments, encouraging more walking and cycling, and connecting communities.
- Creating a more liveable place. People are more likely to use our streets when their journey is interesting and stimulating, with attractive views, buildings, planting, and where other people are using the street.
1.3 Bromley-by-Bow

- **Bromley-by-Bow**

New junction with signalised pedestrian/cycle crossings and right turn in to development site. This avoids the need to access the development site via Bow Roundabout.

- **Road served by potential new bus route**

- **Segregated cycle track and improved footway**

- **Subway removed**

- **Left turn out of St. Leonard’s Street**

- **Left turn out only for general traffic**

- **New two-way bus only link between St. Leonard’s Street and development site**

- **New junction with signalised pedestrian/cycle crossings**

- **Subway made more accessible**

- **Road layout within the Bromley-by-Bow South site is to be designed and delivered by developers**

- **Tesco**
At Bromley-by-Bow, we proposed:

- Two signalised junctions on the A12, to the north of Bromley-by-Bow station, which would provide access to proposed residential and commercial development east of the A12
- Vehicles travelling northbound on the A12 would be able to turn right to access these new developments directly, without having to make a U-turn at Bow roundabout
- Signalised crossings, replacing the existing subway at Three Mill Lane, and improvements to the subway at Bromley-by-Bow station would make crossing the A12 easier and more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists
- The proposals would also give west Bromley-by-Bow better links to the open space around the River Lea, the Lea River Park & Leaway, and the Three Mills historic buildings and park
- A segregated cycle track on the east side of the A12, which would help improve access to the local cycle network, including the Lea Valley Towpath and Cycle Superhighway 2
1.4 Marshgate Lane

- New road connecting Stratford High Street and Marshgate Lane, including a new bus, pedestrian and cycle-only bridge over Bow Back River.
- Road served by potential new bus route.
- New signalised pedestrian/cycle crossing.
At Marshgate Lane, we proposed:

- A new link road, connecting Marshgate Lane with Sugarhouse Lane and creating a four-arm junction with A118 Stratford High Street. This would allow buses, cyclists and pedestrians to cross the Bow Back River via a new bridge, improving access to Pudding Mill Lane station and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park

1.5 Enabling future bus changes

In addition to making the area more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists, the proposals for Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane could enable the creation of a new bus link, or a revised journey for an existing bus route. This could run from the west of the A12 at Bromley-by-Bow, through new developments either side of the River Lea, and north to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. Any potential changes to bus routes in the area would be subject to a separate consultation.
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 for or opposition to the proposals
- To understand any issues that might affect the proposal of which we were not previously aware
- To understand concerns and objections
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 **Potential outcomes**

The potential outcomes of the consultation were:

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

Our conclusion and next steps are set out in Chapter 5.

2.3 **Consultation history**

We previously consulted on the following schemes that affect the scheme area:

- Autumn 2015 – [formalising the temporary eastbound diversion of route 25 via Bow flyover](#)
- Spring 2015 – [pedestrian improvements at Bow Interchange](#)
- Autumn 2014 – [upgrades to Cycle Superhighway 2 between Aldgate and Bow roundabout](#)
- Spring 2013 – [extension of Cycle Superhighway 2 from Bow roundabout to Stratford Town Centre](#)
- Winter 2012 – [further safety improvements at Bow roundabout](#)

2.4 **Who we consulted**

We consulted the public, businesses and stakeholders about our proposals.

To raise awareness among motorists, cyclists, bus users and other public transport users, we targeted individuals who we knew used the route or lived in areas nearby.
(identified from our customer database because they had supplied their postcode to us via Oyster, Congestion Charging, Cycle Hire, or for another reason)

We sent emails to stakeholders likely to be interested in the scheme, including disability groups, organisations representing the elderly, transport user groups, businesses and major employers, trade organisations, statutory organisations, charities, local government, politicians, residents’ associations, healthcare providers, sports clubs and educational establishments, amongst others.

We also provided information about the proposals and the consultation to local and regional media.

For a full list of the publicity channels used, please go to Section 2.8 below.

2.5 Dates and duration
The consultation ran for six weeks from 13 March to 23 April 2017.

2.6 What we asked
The survey questionnaire comprised several closed questions asking people to select an answer that matched their level of support (or opposition) for the scheme overall, as well as the Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane sections. We also gave people the chance to provide comments on the overall scheme and each section.

The only mandatory question we asked was on the respondent’s level of support for the overall proposals (‘support’, ‘partially support’, ‘don’t support’, ‘not sure’, ‘no opinion’). They were also invited to comment on the proposals via a free text responses.

Respondents were also asked to submit their name, email address and postcode, along with information about their travel habits.

Other information, such as the respondent’s IP address and the date and time of responding, was recorded automatically.

A full list of questions asked as part of the consultation is available in Chapters 3 and 4.

2.7 Methods of responding
People were able to respond to the consultation by:

- answering the questions in the survey on our consultation website at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/bromley-by-bow-marshgate-lane/
- sending a letter to FREEPOST TfL CONSULTATIONS
2.8 Consultation materials and publicity
We used a range of channels to raise awareness of the consultation with members of the public and stakeholders. All materials encouraged interested parties to visit our website or contact us to find out more about the scheme and how to respond.

2.8.1 Website
Our website provided detailed information about the consultation, including text explanations of the proposals, maps and computer-generated images helping to explain the proposals.

The website provided people with the opportunity to respond to the consultation by answering our questionnaire.

2.8.2 Letters
A letter and map was sent to over 9,100 addresses in the Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane areas on 13 March 2017. A copy of the letter and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix C.

2.8.3 Emails to public
We sent an email about the consultation to 394,843 people who live locally or use our transport services in the area. The data for the distribution list is extracted from our master database of those who have registered their details with us – for example, through use of Congestion Charge, Oyster Card or Cycle Hire services. The text of the email is reproduced in Appendix D.

2.8.4 Public meetings, events and exhibitions
Public drop-in events
During the consultation period we held three public drop-in events in Bromley-by-Bow. At each event TfL staff were available to answer questions about the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Kingsley Hall, Powis Road, London E3 3HJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Monday 27 March, 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday 8 April, 1200-1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.5 Meetings with stakeholders
We met with a number of stakeholders to discuss our proposals. These meetings took place before and during the consultation. The stakeholders we met included the London Boroughs of Newham and Tower Hamlets, and the London Legacy Development Corporation.

2.9 Equalities
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 such as British Dyslexia Association, Age UK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute for the Blind, Action on Hearing Loss and Inclusion London, and 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)
- Making sure that public events were held in accessible locations and at different times of the day and that large scale materials were available to review
- Considering how best to reach our target audiences and tailoring the way of communicating with them. For example, by preparing hard copies of our online material for those not able to access our website

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.

2.10 Analysis of consultation responses
All closed questions were reviewed and the results tabulated and reported.

All open questions, where respondents provided comments on the overall scheme or parts of it, were read and analysed in detail. Each individual comment was attributed with one or more codes according to the issues raised. This information was also analysed and tabulated. All results are reported in Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Appendix A of this report.

Where more than one response had been submitted from the same person and IP address, these responses were combined before the data was analysed.
3. About the respondents

This chapter provides more information on respondents to this consultation, based on the information they provided to us in our questionnaire.

Where percentages do not add up to 100 per cent, this is due to the rounding that has been applied.

3.1 Number of respondents

476 respondents replied to the consultation. Of these, 431 were via the online consultation portal and 45 were written submissions. Of the 476 responses, 461 were from individual members of the public and 15 were from stakeholders. (Stakeholder responses are those submitted by individuals who identify themselves as representing political entities, organisations, businesses or campaign groups).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

We asked respondents how they heard about the consultation. A total of 429 respondents answered this question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heard about the consultation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on the TfL website</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on another website</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about in the press</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Respondent postcodes

Of the 476 respondents a total of 375 respondents supplied a postcode. The three most reported outward codes accounted for 56% of all codes provided. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Relationship between respondent and scheme area
We asked respondents to describe their relationship to the scheme area using the categories below, with respondents encouraged to tick one or more categories. 628 responses were recorded in total. Percentages are not provided as respondents could select multiple answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resident</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter to the area</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor to the area</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed locally</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local but interested in the scheme</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary of all consultation responses

4.1 About this chapter
To gain feedback on the scheme, we asked respondents three closed questions, allowing them to show their level of support for the overall scheme, and for each of the two individual sections. We also asked three open questions which allowed respondents to comment on the overall scheme, and each of the two sections.

Note that stakeholder responses are included in all the results in this chapter, and percentages are calculated from the number of respondents for each question. Only the question asking for the level of support for the overall scheme was mandatory for online respondents. Detailed analysis of all questions can be found in Appendix A.

4.2 Support for overall proposals and each section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>136 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley-by-Bow</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>131 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshgate Lane</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>90 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Q1: Do you support our overall proposals for Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane?

476 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the overall proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

This question was mandatory for all online respondents. If respondents did not provide an answer to this question (because they submitted an email or letter rather than using our online questionnaire) and there was an obvious expression of support or otherwise for the scheme, then our analysts inferred a response based on the comments provided.
4.4 Q2: Do you have any comments on our overall proposals for Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane?

258 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the overall proposals. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive of the proposals</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve existing pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern at the impact of the proposals on existing major traffic flows</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve existing cycle facilities</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally opposed to the proposals</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve pedestrian access</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expected increase in traffic delays would lead to pollution</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve pedestrian safety</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would increase pollution</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists do not pay ‘road tax’ or insurance</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Q3: Do you support our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow?
441 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses to Q3](chart.png)
4.6 Q4: Do you have any comments on our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow?

185 respondents answered this question asking for comments on our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive of the proposals</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally opposed to the proposals</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expected increase in traffic delays would lead to pollution</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed signalised pedestrian crossings, due to their impact on traffic and congestion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve existing pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve pedestrian access</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve pedestrian safety</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve existing cycle facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would increase pollution</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bridge or second underpass should be built instead of a signalised crossing, reducing the impact on traffic</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7  Q5: Do you support our proposals for Marshgate Lane?
436 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for our proposals for Marshgate Lane. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Q6: Do you have any comments on our proposals for Marshgate Lane?

120 respondents answered this question asking for comments on our proposals for Marshgate Lane. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in response to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally opposed to the proposals</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive of the proposals</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would increase congestion</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve pedestrian access</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve existing pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose the reallocation of road space from general traffic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists and pedestrians should be segregated from general traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of the cycle facilities is dangerous</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated cycle facilities should be installed into the Queen Elizabeth Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian access to the Queen Elizabeth Park should be improved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 What do you think about the quality of this consultation?

430 respondents answered this question on the quality of the consultation process and material, such as the information we have provided, any printed material they received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire. Options to answer were: Very good, Good, Acceptable, Poor, Very poor.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10 Do you have any comments on the quality of this consultation?

We invited all respondents to comment on the quality of the consultation, and the style and content of the information provided. 56 respondents provided comments on the consultation.

Positive comments included:
- The consultation material was of good quality, in particular the maps
- Many respondents felt information provided was clear and easy to understand
- Respondents appreciated being consulted
- The consultation was well structured
- The consultation website convenient for feedback

Negative comments included:
- Consultation responses would not be taken into account due to bias
• The consultation website was difficult to use
• Drawings difficult to understand
• Consultation material lacked critical information such as impacts on traffic and details on new bus routes
• The consultation should have been advertised more widely, for example in the Evening Standard newspaper

Suggestions included
• More diagrams and illustrations should be provided
• Make the online survey more prominent and accessible
• Provide images and other visuals that are interactive

4.11 Summary of comments from events
We held three drop-in sessions during the spring 2017 consultation (see Section 2.8.4). The main themes or issues to emerge from these events were:
• The northern subway should be retained
• The Tesco superstore should not be demolished
• Concerns about the impact on traffic
• Support for improved pedestrian facilities in the area
5. Conclusion and next steps

Conclusion and next steps

The consultation showed that 65 per cent of respondents were either fully or partially supportive of the proposals. Key concerns raised included increased traffic delays and pollution, as well as some respondents preferring retention of the subway.

We are continuing to develop our proposals following feedback received during this consultation, and will provide an update on the project webpage next year.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of comments

All respondents were invited to provide comments through our open questions, but none of these open questions were mandatory. In this appendix we summarise the issues that were raised in these comments.

For each question, we list the main analysis of themes in descending order of frequency.

Q2: Do you have any comments on our overall proposals for Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane?

We invited all respondents to comment on the overall proposals. 258 respondents answered this question, and the issues raised are summarised below.

Pedestrian facilities
We received 161 comments on the overall proposals for pedestrian facilities, including:

- 52 respondents supported the proposals, stating they would improve existing facilities
  - Four respondents stated that more should be done to improve pedestrian facilities
- 30 respondents stated that the proposals would improve pedestrian access
- 18 respondents stated that the proposals would improve pedestrian safety
- 12 respondents opposed the proposed signalised pedestrian crossings, citing the impact they would have on traffic and congestion
- Seven respondents suggested that a bridge or second underpass should be built, rather than installing a second at-grade signalised crossing. This would reduce the impact on traffic
- Four respondents opposed the closure of the subway
  - Two respondents said that, rather than closing it, the subway should be made safer
- Two respondents requested access be improved for wheelchair users
  - Two respondents commented that ramp access should be improved at both ends of the subway next to Bromley-by-Bow Underground station

Other comments and suggestions included:

- Supportive if new crossings do not affect traffic flow
- New pedestrian bridge at Marshgate Lane not required
- Further work required to improve safety and access at Bow School
- Install pedestrian countdown on traffic lights for safer crossing
- Improve pedestrian access to Bow Back River
Impact on traffic / congestion
We received 158 comments on the impact of the overall proposals on traffic and congestion, including:

- 41 respondents expressed concern at the impact of the proposals on existing major traffic flows
- 20 respondents stated that the expected increase in traffic delays would lead to pollution
- 11 respondents said the proposals would improve the flow of traffic
- Eight respondents said the proposals would cause further disruption to traffic using the Blackwall Tunnel
- Eight respondents requested a more detailed traffic impact assessment
- Eight respondents expressed concern that the proposals would mean collisions were likely to increase
- Five respondents expressed concern that ratrunning vehicles would use the new junctions to bypass Bow roundabout
- Three respondents expressed concern at whether adequate measures would be in place to ensure vehicles do not use the bus-only route at Marshgate Lane
- Three respondents stated that taxis should be able to use the proposed bus-only facilities

Other comments and suggestions included:

- Build more access roads to link Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane to other areas
- Existing road network is adequate for new residential developments, and the scheme is unnecessary
- Improve access to Pudding Mill station
- Parking on Priory Street and Franklin Street should be for residents only
- Three Mills would be unable to cope with increased traffic volumes following implementation of the scheme

Cycle facilities
We received 82 comments on the overall proposals for cycle facilities, including:

- 39 respondents stated the overall proposals would be an improvement on existing facilities
- Eight respondents opposed the introduction of new cycle facilities, citing their negative impact on traffic
- Eight respondents stated that any new cycle facilities should be fully segregated
- Three respondents expressed concern that the proposed facilities should be installed and maintained safely, preventing hazards such as large puddles
- Two respondents stated that cycle lanes should have limited hours of operation to minimise their impact on other road users
- Two respondents requested that separate signals should be installed at any junction where traffic can turn left
- Two respondents questioned whether cyclists would use the proposed new cycle facilities

Other comments and suggestions included:
- Concern whether the proposals benefit cyclists in the scheme area
- Cycle parking should be installed at Bromley-by-Bow station
- Cycle hire facilities should be installed at Bromley-by-Bow station and on Stratford High Street
- Cycle facilities should be removed as they add to pollution and congestion
- Cycle facilities are a waste of money

Enabling future bus changes in the area
We received 15 comments on the overall proposals for enabling future bus changes in the area, including:
- Five respondents said the potential changes would improve services
- Four respondents said bus service changes are unlikely to happen due to lack of demand
- Two respondents said current bus services in the area are adequate, and no further changes are required
- Two respondents said they could only support the overall scheme if the future bus service changes are enabled and implemented
- One respondent said they could only support the overall scheme if the future bus service changes are enabled but altered
- One respondent opposed any changes to bus services

‘Road tax’
We received 13 comments on ‘road tax.’ Respondents stated that cyclists do not pay ‘road tax’ or insurance, and therefore cycle facilities should not be installed or improved as cyclists had not paid for them.

Tesco, Bromley-by-Bow Superstore
We received ten comments regarding the overall proposals and the Tesco Superstore at Bromley-by-Bow:
- Five respondents were concerned by the impact the scheme would have on the superstore
- Three respondents opposed the removal of the superstore shopping facility/not adequate for anticipated residents increase
- One respondent said they could only support the overall scheme if the superstore is retained
• One respondent supported removing the superstore

Public transport in the area
We received ten general comments regarding public transport in the area:
• Nine respondents said the proposals would improve public transport in the area
• One respondent said the proposals would not improve public transport in the area

Cost
We received eight comments on issues related to the cost of the scheme:
• Six respondents said the cost of the scheme would outweigh its benefits, and therefore be a waste of public funds
• Two respondents expressed concern at the cost of project, and questioned whether the proposals are necessary

Cyclist behaviour
We received six comments regarding cyclist behaviour. Respondents said cyclists do not obey the Highway Code, exhibiting behaviour such as including jumping red lights and ignoring pedestrian crossings, and caused danger to pedestrians.

Non-specific comments
We received 117 non-specific, general comments on the overall proposals:
• 78 positive comments such as "great"
• 39 negative comments such as "terrible"

Q4: Do you have any comments on our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow?
185 respondents provided comments on our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow, and the issues raised are summarised below.

Pedestrian facilities
We received 81 comments on the proposals for pedestrian facilities at Bromley-by-Bow, including:
• 16 respondents opposed the proposed signalised pedestrian crossings, citing the impact they would have on traffic and congestion
  o Two respondents made general comments opposing the crossings
• 15 respondents supported the proposals, stating they would improve existing facilities
• 14 respondents stated that the proposals would improve pedestrian access
• 12 respondents stated that the proposals would improve pedestrian safety
Nine respondents suggested that a bridge or second underpass should be built, rather than installing a second at-grade signalised crossing. This would reduce the impact on traffic.

Two respondents expressed concern about the safety of pedestrians using the proposed crossings.

Two respondents stated that pedestrians should be provided with separate facilities from cyclists.

**Impact on traffic / congestion**

We received 68 comments on the impact of the Bromley-by-Bow proposals on traffic and congestion, including:

- 36 respondents stated that the expected increase in traffic delays would lead to pollution
  - 10 respondents stated that the proposals would increase pollution
- Six respondents said the proposals would improve the flow of traffic
- 41 respondents expressed concern at the impact of the proposals on existing major traffic flows

Other comments and suggestions included:

- Request for a more detailed traffic impact and environmental assessment
- Vehicles would find it more difficult to turn left and right into A118 High Street
- The details of the proposed road layout are unclear
- The new road layout would have a negative impact on the area surrounding Three Mills Studio, with increased air and noise pollution
- The proposals would increase congestion and pollution either side of the Blackwall Tunnel
- Vehicles accessing the Strand East development would experience longer queues and congestion
- Yellow box markings should be installed at the junctions
- Support for the improved connections to the road network

**Cycle facilities**

We received 23 comments on the proposals for cycle facilities at Bromley-by-Bow, including:

- 11 respondents stated the proposals would be an improvement on existing facilities at Bromley-by-Bow
- Six respondents commented on the proposed cycle track:
  - Two respondents asked whether the track would be two-way
  - One respondent questioned whether the track would be wide enough to accommodate cyclists
  - One respondent questioned whether cyclists would use the proposed new cycle facilities
o One respondent requested that the cycle track be extended as far as Bromley-by-Bow station
o One respondent opposed new cycle facilities as they add to pollution and congestion

Other comments and suggestions included:
- Advanced stop lines are dangerous for cyclists
- A separate cycle crossing should be provided across the River Lee Navigation to Sugar House Lane

Subways
We received 18 comments about the subways at Bromley-by-Bow, including:
- Seven respondents made general comments opposing the closure of the northern subway
- Five respondents stated that the proposals should incorporate upgrades and improvements to the subways, rather than closure
- Four respondents stated that the northern subway is adequate and should not be closed

Tesco, Bromley-by-Bow Superstore
We received nine comments regarding the the Tesco Superstore at Bromley-by-Bow:
- Seven respondents were concerned on the impact the scheme would have on the superstore
- Two respondents stated that the proposed new developments at Bromley-by-Bow should be redesigned so that the superstore is retained

Construction and development in Bromley-by-Bow
We received seven comments about current and future construction and development in the Bromley-by-Bow area, including:
- Insufficient planning had been carried out by both TfL and developers
- Construction of the TfL scheme at Bromley-by-Bow would have a negative impact on the area
- TfL should coordinate any works with current and future development schemes in the area to minimise disruption

Enabling future bus changes in the area
We received six comments on proposals for enabling future bus changes in Bromley-by-Bow, including:
- Any new bus service in the area should serve Bromley-by-Bow station
- Concern at the number of additional buses that would be travelling through the new residential developments
• Concern that future bus changes would have a negative impact on existing routes 488 and D8
• Future bus changes should provide a link from Bromley-by-Bow to Pudding Mill Lane and Stratford

Non-specific comments
We received 77 non-specific general comments on the Bromley-by-Bow proposals:
• 39 non-specific positive comments such as "great"
• 38 non-specific negative comments such as "terrible"

Q6: Do you have any comments on our proposals for Marshgate Lane?

120 respondents provided comments on our proposals for Marshgate Lane, and the issues raised are summarised below.

Impact on traffic / congestion
We received 45 comments on the impact of the Marshgate Lane proposals on traffic and congestion, including:
• 19 respondents said the proposals would cause an increase in congestion
• Five respondents opposed the reallocation of road space from general traffic
• Three respondents commented that measures to reduce traffic speeds should be implemented and enforced
• Three respondents said they would like to see traffic reduced in and around the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park
• Two respondents said that the junction corners at Marshgate Lane should have tighter radii to reduce traffic speeds

Other comments and suggestions included:
• Any improvements to public space should take account of the importance of Marshgate Lane to the movements of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs)
• Concern that this scheme is necessary
• The Bow Interchange scheme should be progressed
• Concern that the Marshgate Lane proposals would increase traffic volumes in the area
• Concern that Sugar House Lane would be unable to accommodate two-way bus and HGV movements unless it is upgraded
• If the Marshgate Lane proposals are approved, site access to Bow East Goods Yard should be maintained during and after construction
• All vehicles should be permitted to use the new road connection
• No vehicles should be permitted to use the new road connection
• Taxis should be permitted to use the new road connection
• Sugar House Lane should not be open to general traffic
• The existing Marshgate Lane road bridge is adequate. No new bridge is required

Pedestrian facilities
We received 27 comments on the proposals for pedestrian facilities at Marshgate Lane, including:
• Eight respondents stated that the proposals would improve pedestrian access
• Six respondents stated the proposals would improve existing pedestrian facilities
• Three respondents suggested that a bridge or underpass should be built, rather than installing at-grade signalised crossings. This would reduce the impact on traffic
• Three respondents said that pedestrian facilities should be separated from other road users
• Three respondents said pedestrian access to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park should be improved

Other comments and suggestions included:
• The proposals would improve access to Westfield Stratford City
• More space should be provided to pedestrians crossing Stratford High Street to access the Strand East development
• Only pedestrians should be permitted to use the new road connection

Cycle facilities
We received 15 comments on our proposals for cycle facilities at Marshgate Lane, including:
• Four respondents stated that pedestrians and cyclists should be separated from general traffic
• Three respondents expressed concern about the design of the cycle facilities. They opposed the introduction of advanced stop lines
• Three respondents stated that new segregated cycle facilities should be provided in the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park
• Two respondents supported the proposals, stating they would improve existing facilities

Other comments and suggestions included:
• Cycle facilities should be introduced without reallocating road space from general traffic
• ‘Hold the left’ facilities should be installed on all arms of the Stratford High Street junction
• New and clear signage should be installed on Marshgate Lane to highlight increased cycle flows
Construction and development in Marshgate Lane
We received eight comments about current and future construction and development in the Marshgate Lane area, including:

- Funding should be directed towards building more housing, rather than new road schemes
- The proposals should focus on improving air quality and planting trees
- Investment should be directed towards the Bromley-by-Bow area and the existing community, rather than the future development of Marshgate Lane
- TfL should coordinate any works with current and future development in the area to minimise disruption, in particular the Strand East scheme

Enabling future bus changes in the Marshgate Lane area
We received two comments on the proposals for enabling future bus changes in the Marshgate Lane area:

- The potential changes would improve services
- The consultation on new bus route changes should have run in parallel with this consultation

Non-specific comments
We received 48 non-specific general comments on the Marshgate Lane proposals:

- 25 non-specific negative comments such as "terrible"
- 23 non-specific positive comments such as "great"
Appendix B: TfL response to issues commonly raised

Pedestrian facilities at Bromley-by-Bow

Some respondents opposed the proposal to remove the northern subway at Bromley-by-Bow. We received suggestions that the subway instead either be retained as it is or upgraded.

The design of the new road layout and junctions, including the new crossings and removal of the existing subway, aligns with the Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan. The development of a new district centre to the east of the A12 Blackwall Tunnel Approach, and the different planned layout for shops and retail units, will change the natural movement and preferred desire line of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the A12. The northern subway is located some distance from the site of these future retail developments. It risks becoming little used once the new proposed crossings are introduced, which would provide more direct access to and from the district centre.

We expect significant increases in pedestrian and cyclist flow and volume once the new district centre and residential developments begin to be occupied. The proposed at-grade, signalised crossings are designed to cater for this increase in demand.

The steps and ramps accessing the northern subway are narrow on both sides of the A12, as is the tunnel itself. This limits our ability to upgrade the subway facility without substantial engineering work, and taking additional lane. The expected increase in pedestrians and cyclists crossing the A12 would strain the capacity of the subway during peak times.

The northern subway also regularly attracts crime and anti-social behaviour, particularly after dark. It is therefore preferable to remove and replace it.

Impact on traffic / congestion

Some respondents were concerned about the impact of the proposals on traffic flow through the area, and in particular the impact of additional signalised crossings. The scheme would improve access for all road users, and link to the new developments to the east of A12 and south of Stratford High Street. The junctions could also facilitate a potential new bus link between Bromley-by-Bow, Stratford and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

The new junction layouts and signalised crossings would introduce additional stopping points for vehicles. However our initial traffic modelling indicates that the junctions would continue to operate within capacity, and delays would be minimised.
The proposed junctions would introduce gaps in traffic queues should they build up during peak times. They would also help reduce speeding and smooth traffic flow.

Other respondents were concerned that the proposals would lead to “rat-running, with vehicles using the new junctions to bypass Bow roundabout. Our initial modelling shows that current traffic will be retained on the A12, rather than local roads. We will continue to work with the local authority to ensure this is delivered.

Our initial traffic modelling analysis has allowed us to review the expected impact on traffic flows through the area. This modelling indicates that there may be minor delays to traffic at certain times of the day, of up to one minute duration. Further, more detailed traffic modelling will be undertaken in the next stage of the design to get a more detailed understanding of the impacts. The results of this more detailed modelling will be undertaken when our design is more developed; we will provide an update on the project webpage next year.

**Cycle facilities**

Some respondents requested cycling facilities be separated from general traffic. At Marshgate Lane it is proposed to make minor changes to the existing Cycle Superhighway 2 (CS2) and to retain the current level of segregation. Further south at Bromley by Bow the aspiration is for developers to provide a 2-way cycle track to connect the development site with the new junctions to enable users to cross the A12 and gain access to Bow Underground Station.

Further north, the network of roads within the development site will ultimately create a link to the CS2, although this is outside the scope of these proposals.

Several respondents requested that cycle facilities should not be provided, citing their negative impact on traffic. The Lower Lea Valley Regeneration area will encourage sustainable forms of transport including walking, cycling and access to public transport services. To support this vision we will need to provide cycle facilities to support this growth.

**Impact on the environment and air pollution**

Some respondents felt the proposals would create a better natural and physical environment, lead to less pollution or ease congestion. Others felt the scheme would increase pollution and commented on the impact this could have on health. It was suggested that idling motor traffic is more of a polluting factor than moving motor traffic and that, by creating congestion, the scheme would become a negative factor in London’s drive to improve air quality.

Our initial traffic modelling analysis indicates that there may be minor delays to traffic at certain times of the day, of up to one minute duration. Further, more detailed traffic
modelling will be undertaken in the next stage of the design to get a more detailed understanding of the impacts.

This scheme is part of our “Healthy Streets” approach, in which we are investing to make London’s streets healthy, safe and attractive places to walk and cycle. Enabling more journeys to be made on foot or by bike can help reduce private vehicle use and associated emissions. Our approach to this is set out in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, which is available to read online at [https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/transport/our-vision-transport/mayors-transport-strategy-2018](https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/transport/our-vision-transport/mayors-transport-strategy-2018).

Air pollution is one of the biggest challenges facing London, affecting the health of all Londoners. It contributes to thousands of early deaths each year and impacts our health over the course of our lives.

The Mayor has already introduced the T-Charge in central London, bought forward the start date of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) for central London to 8 April 2019, and announced a series of measures to clean up London’s bus fleet.

In June 2018 the Mayor announced he would be progressing two further initiatives to improve London’s air. These involve:

- Tightening the standards of the existing London-wide Low Emission Zone from 2020, which affects heavy vehicles – buses, coaches and HGVs and other heavy specialist vehicles
- Expanding the ULEZ for light vehicles (cars, vans and motorcycles) from central London to inner London up to, but not including the North and South Circular roads in 2021 so that all vehicles in this area are subject to emissions standards

**Value for money**

Some respondents questioned expenditure on this scheme. We are in discussions with the London Legacy Development Corporation regarding a joint funding package for the scheme where half of the costs are met by developers. Further details will be included in our next public consultation.

There are a range of positive impacts that would result from delivering the project. These include substantial benefits relating to public transport, walking, cycling, health, the environment, and public realm. The two new junctions on the A12 will improve connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists between the existing community west of the A12 with the people, facilities and infrastructure within the new developments. Pedestrians and cyclists will also benefit from new urban realm and routes within the developments connecting them to the Pudding Mill Lane.
station, the Olympic Park and Stratford International facilitated by the proposed Marshgate Lane junction.

**Impact on the Tesco Superstore, Bromley-by-Bow**
The potential relocation of the Tesco Superstore is part of British Land’s development proposal, and is not as a result of our proposal.

**Impact on safety**
Some respondents felt that the proposals would mean collisions were likely to increase.

We are committed to providing a safer environment for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, and believe that our proposals will deliver this. Rigorous technical approvals and road safety audits will be carried out to ensure that design proposals are robust and safe prior to implementation.
Appendix C: Consultation letters

Monday 13 March 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on changes to the road layout at Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane

We are working with the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Newham to enhance the transport links and public realm at Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane. The proposals would make it easier for people to cross both the A12 and Stratford High Street by providing new or upgraded pedestrian and cycle facilities, improving access for vehicles, enabling new bus routings, encouraging more walking and cycling, and connecting local communities and new developments in the surrounding area.

What are we proposing?
The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed at Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane. Additional information and visualisations can be viewed at tfl.gov.uk/bromley-marshgate.

Bromley-by-Bow
- Two signalised junctions on the A12, to the north of Bromley-by-Bow station, would provide access to proposed residential and commercial development to the east of the A12
- Vehicles travelling northbound on the A12 would be able to turn right to access these new developments directly, without having to make a u-turn at Bow roundabout
- A bus-only link across the A12 would connect Bromley-by-Bow and new developments to the east
- Signalised crossings, replacing the existing subway at Three Mill Lane, and improvements to the subway at Bromley-by-Bow station would make crossing the A12 easier and more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists
- A segregated cycle track on the east side of the A12 would help improve access to the local cycle network, including the Lea Valley Towpath and Cycle Superhighway 2

MAYOR OF LONDON
Marshgate Lane

- A new link road, connecting Marshgate Lane with Sugarhouse Lane and creating a four-arm junction with A118 Stratford High Street, would allow buses, cyclists and pedestrians to cross the Bow Back River via a new bridge, improving access to Pudding Mill Lane station and the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

Public exhibitions

We will be holding the following public exhibitions in Bromley-by-Bow, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Please check tfl.gov.uk/bromley-marshgate on the day of the exhibition before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Kingsley Hall, Powis Road, London E3 3HJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Monday 27 March, 1600-2000       Saturday 8 April, 1200-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 20 April, 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bow Interchange

In June 2016 we opened seven new signalised crossings at Bow Interchange, including two pedestrian/cycle crossings, improving connectivity between Bow and Stratford. We have looked at further options to redesign Bow Interchange and remove both the roundabout and flyover, giving pedestrians and cyclists more direct access to facilities. However, we have now deferred development of this scheme until we can identify the significant funding required to take the plans forward.

Tell us what you think

We are inviting comments on our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane now, so please visit tfl.gov.uk/bromley-marshgate to find out more and fill in the online survey. The deadline for comments is Sunday 23 April.

You can also request paper copies of plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, or calling 0343 222 1155.

Next steps

We will analyse and consider all of the responses received to the consultation and publish our response later this year. If we progress with our proposals for Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane, we would also publish indicative timescales for consultations on the detailed proposals.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Distribution area for Consultation letters
Appendix D: Email to Oyster users on the TfL database

Are our emails displaying well on your device? If not, allow images or view online

Dear email recipient,

We would like your views on proposals to change the road layout at Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane to encourage more walking and cycling and improve vehicle access. The proposed changes include introducing a segregated cycle lanes and new pedestrian crossings.

For full details and to share your views, please visit tfl.gov.uk/bromley-marshgate

This consultation will run until Sunday 23 April.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Nigel Hardy
Head of Project Sponsorship

These are our customer service updates about consultations. 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
Appendix E: Summary of stakeholder responses

Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the 15 responses we received from stakeholders. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes. As well as being summarised here, the stakeholder responses are included in the analysis of overall responses covered in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

Each summary begins with a statement explaining the stakeholder’s level of support based on their response to a closed question in our online survey asking respondents to state their support for the proposals. Where this closed question had not been answered, we show our analysts’ interpretation of each respondent’s level of support based on their comments. Where the level of support was not clear from the comments, our analysts put ‘no opinion’. Where we have inferred the level of support, this is stated in the summary below.

Politicians

Councillor Khales Ahmed (Bromley North ward, LB Tower Hamlets)

*Opposed the proposals*

Councillor Ahmed expressed concern at the impact the proposals would have on long-distance traffic travelling along the A12. He stated that the northern subway should be retained, and a bridge constructed in place of the signalised crossings.

Councillor Rachel Blake (Cabinet Member for Strategic Development & Waste; Bow East ward, LB Tower Hamlets)

*Supported the proposals*

Councillor Blake supported the proposals in principle, and the comments of LB Tower Hamlets officers on the detailed proposals. She stated that further work is required to make access to Bow School safer and easier, and this should remain a priority for TfL.
Councillor Andrew Cregan (Island Gardens ward, LB Tower Hamlets)

Partially supported the proposals

Cllr Cregan noted that he was responding on behalf of The House Mill Trust and the Maltings Close Residents' Association. He said that both groups welcome the proposals put forward in this consultation, but believe TfL can go further in meeting the stated aims of the proposals.

The House Mill Trust is registered charity which owns and manages The House Mill, an 18th century tidal mill and the largest of its kind in the world.

Maltings Close Residents' Association is a voluntary organisation representing the interests of all residents - leaseholders, tenants and landlords - of the 215 apartments in the Maltings Close development on Twelvetrees Crescent.

The response stated that:

- all residents and businesses in Bow, with the interests of the local area at heart, would support TfL's aim of making the A12 Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach easier to cross. The fast-moving and heavy traffic of the A12 are a public health concern - both in terms of air quality and road safety - as well as encumbering the movement of people within their local environment.
- Additional, enhanced and improved access routes across the A12 and Stratford High Street for pedestrians and cyclists would certainly support the growth of local businesses by providing better access to new developments, encouraging more walking and cycling, and connecting communities. Both local residents and visitors would strongly value being able to cross streets at their convenience.
- The proposals could be enhanced in order to better meet those aims through the deployment of diagonal crossings such as that found at Oxford Circus, which allow for a more frictionless pedestrian experience and improve the aesthetic of these locations. This would be welcome improvement to both the four-arm junction at Marshgate Lane, as well as the multi-arm junction at St Leornards / Three Mill Lane.
- TfL should also be considering improvements at Twelvetrees Crescent within this consultation. Both for pedestrians that wish to cross the A12 using the Twelvetrees Crescent underpass, and for pedestrians that wish to make a continuous route alongside the A12 and Gillender Street. TfL should consider traffic calming measures to address both of these pressing issues for local pedestrians, and the removal of a section of the barrier at the top of Gillender Street and the barrier alongside the pavement on the opposite side of the road.
• Safety concerns at Gillender Street should instead be addressed with other measures such as traffic calming measures, a crossing or a combination of measures.

• It is not clear why TfL are looking to close the Three Mill Lane subway. Adding to and enhancing the pedestrian and cyclist crossings of the A12 are to be welcomed however closing the subway, which would serve as an additional crossing would not be welcomed.

• The Bromley-By-Bow subway crossing is in dire need of improvement and so these proposals are warmly welcomed in that regard, however further details should be provided. Importantly, improvement should be made that are lasting, whilst ongoing repairs and maintenance will be crucial.

• Creating a more liveable place is a key aim of these proposals and one that all residents and businesses will keenly support.

• The House Mill Trust would encourage TfL to incorporate signage to The House Mill within these proposals, wherever signage may be called for. The House Mill is a key visitor attraction and feature of the local area serving as a museum, a heritage site, an event venue and a community space.

Councillor Danny Hassell (Bromley South ward, LB Tower Hamlets)

Supported the proposals

Councillor Hassell supported the proposals, welcoming the signalised crossings and improvements to planters. He called on TfL to ensure that people would feel safe when using the proposed crossings, and that the speed of northbound traffic on the A12 approaching the crossings would be reduced accordingly.

Emergency services

London Fire Brigade

No opinion on the proposals

While withholding opinion on the specific proposals, the London Fire Brigade (LFB) stated it supported improvements to London’s infrastructure. The LFB offered its continued support to developers and contractors in order to reduce both the risk to Londoners and the impact of works being undertaken. The LFB noted that its officers had visited the site and confirmed the proposed work would have no effect on the Fire Brigade.

Transport and road user groups

Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

Partially supported the proposals
The association said that the proposed pedestrian/cyclist/bus bridge across the Bow Back River should also accommodate taxis.

**London TravelWatch**
*Supported the proposals*
London TravelWatch commented that the proposals are particularly welcome, given the severance issues presented by the A12. TravelWatch noted that it is aware of ongoing concerns regarding the safety and perception of the northern pedestrian/cyclist subway. It welcomed the proposed new cycle facilities.

**Stagecoach Bus**
*Supported the proposals*
The business supported the proposals. No comments were provided.

**Businesses, employers and venues**

**Fletcher Wilson (Stratford High Street, E15 2PP)**
*Supported the proposals*
The business supported the proposals. No comments were provided.

**London City Locks (Bow Road, E3 2SE)**
*Opposed the proposals*
The business opposed the proposals, commenting:
- The scheme was unnecessary and too complex
- The northern pedestrian/cyclist subway should be retained
- Northbound congestion would increase on the A12

London City Locks also expressed concern at the lack of information provided regarding the future of the Tesco retail site, and questioned whether improvements to local water and river quality would be provided.

**Plot (Bromley-by-Bow) LLP and Lindhill Development (Imperial Street, E3 3EA)**
*Supported the proposals*
The business supported the proposals. No comments were provided.

**Vastint (Stratford High Street, E15 2RB)**
*Supported the proposals*
Vastint is currently developing the Strand East development at Sugar House Lane, and owns land within the wider Bromley-by-Bow South development site, to the east of the A12. Vastint supported the proposals, while expressing the following location-specific concerns:

Bromley-by-Bow
Vastint noted that TfL is yet to make a firm commitment to the junction works, which could have an impact on delivery of the Bromley-by-Bow South development plans. Vastint urged TfL to accelerate its programme to avoid this.

Marshgate Lane
- The Strand East development is accessed principally from the Sugar House junction with the A118 High Street. Vastint stated that the junction capacity should not be reduced to an extent that vehicle movement is restricted into and out of the Strand East site.
- Vastint expressed concern that the current Sugar House Lane layout has not been designed to accommodate two-way bus movements. They noted that the LLDC masterplan design for the Sugar House Lane area caters for this demand, and should be considered should these proposals progress further.

Vastint urged TfL to continue to engage with themselves and other potentially affected landowners and developers so that they could understand the full impact, implications and timescales of the Bromley-by-Bow and Marshgate Lane proposals. TfL should also take account of the developers’ requirements should detailed design commence.

United Asphalt

Supported the proposals
- United Asphalt is currently seeking permission for a rail served asphalt plant to the north of Marshgate Lane at the Bow East Goods Yard. United Asphalt supported the proposals, as they felt they would:
  - Improve pedestrian and cyclist connections in the local area to the benefit of future employees and visitors to the site;
  - Provide additional highway capacity by way of construction of a new road link to and from Bromley-By-Bow (via Sugar House Lane) and crossroads with the A118 High Street, thus reducing through traffic on Pudding Mill Lane;
  - Improve public transport services and connections to the and from the site for future employees and visitors.

While supporting the proposals overall, they noted this was in the context of the existing use of the Bow East Goods Yard site, which has historically accommodated a range of rail related uses including rail served plant.

United Asphalt noted that all public realm enhancements proposed for the area should take account of Marshgate Lane’s historic, ongoing and future use as an important route for rail based Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) movements, and that benefits for other road users should not be to the detriment of HGVs.
United Asphalt requested the following measures be considered during the detailed design stage, and that they are invited for a review before commencement:

- Clear cyclist advisory signs are provided on Marshgate Lane to advise vehicles of the potential increase in cyclists using Marshgate Lane, as a result of the proposed cycle improvements
- Ensure the design of the new road connecting Marshgate Lane to Stratford High Street can adequately accommodate the passing of a HGV and future buses without disrupting traffic flow
- Ensure any future improvements of Marshgate Lane do not prejudice the existing site access to Bow East Goods Yard from Marshgate Lane to ensure its safe and continued use as a freight goods yard.

4.5 Conservation and local interest groups

The Geezers Club (Armagh Road, E3 2HT)

Supported the proposals
The Geezers is a community group of older men in Bow, meeting weekly. While supporting the proposals, The Geezers expressed concern at the impact any prospective construction works might have on people travelling to, from or through the area. The Geezers also identified the current layout of Three Mill Lane as a potential bottleneck.

Woodland Trust

No opinion on the proposals
The Woodland Trust commented solely on landscaping issues. It suggested that more street trees should be planted than had been indicated by the plans and artist’s impressions. This would provide practical benefits, such as improved drainage, air quality and cooling, and help biodiversity and wellbeing. Silver birch in particular was cited as a species that would support wildlife and have a positive impact on capturing particulate pollution.