Transforming Vauxhall Cross
Consultation report
Contents

1 Executive Summary ............................................................................................................. 5
2 Background .......................................................................................................................... 6
3 Introduction ........................................................................................................................... 6
4 The consultation ..................................................................................................................... 7
5 Overview of consultation responses ...................................................................................... 11
6 Responses from members of the public ................................................................................ 11
7 Responses from statutory bodies and other stakeholders .................................................... 45
8 Conclusion and next steps ...................................................................................................... 60
Appendix A – Response to issues raised ................................................................................ 61
Appendix B – Copy of the consultation leaflet ....................................................................... 65
Appendix C – Leaflet distribution area ..................................................................................... 68
Appendix D – List of stakeholders consulted ......................................................................... 69
Appendix E – Transport survey results .................................................................................... 75
1 Executive Summary

In order to support the development of a new District Centre at Vauxhall, Transport for London (TfL) has been examining the possibility of removing the existing one-way system. This will reduce severance, improve road safety, enhance facilities for vulnerable road users, and promote regeneration. Transport for London have developed outline plans for how the road network and bus station could be reconfigured to achieve these aspirations, and in advance of more detailed design work, both TfL and the London Borough of Lambeth sought the views of the local community.

The plans are still at an early stage. This first consultation on our initial proposals ran from 10 November 2014 to 2 January 2015. It was designed to enable TfL and Lambeth to understand local opinion about the proposed changes. Although we wanted to find out what the overall view was about the scheme, we also wanted to know which elements of the scheme affected people the most (either positively or negatively) to inform the next stage of design.

The public consultation intended to seek the views of people living close to the junction and within the wider Vauxhall area. We were also keen to seek the views of local businesses and commuters who regularly use the transport interchange.

We consulted stakeholders including the London boroughs of Lambeth, Wandsworth and Southwark and the City of Westminster. Also consulted were the Met traffic police, London TravelWatch, Members of Parliament, Assembly Members and local interest, transport and business groups including developers and landowners. A list of the stakeholders we consulted is shown in Appendix D and a summary of their responses given is in Section 6.

The questions were structured to provide TfL with an understanding of the level of support for proposals, to help identify any specific local issues and to understand how respondents used the gyratory.

This consultation was on the general principles of the scheme and as a result it didn’t include detailed plans or journey time impacts. The responses have been positive with broad support demonstrated. For example,

- 77% of respondents indicated that they either support or strongly support the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall, while 13% opposed or strongly opposed changing the gyratory to two-way roads.
- 65% supported the conversion of the gyratory to two-way.
- 63% supported our proposals around the bus station.

We received 2,181 comments expressing a variety of views that provide important and insightful information that will help to inform the next stage of the design of the scheme at Vauxhall.
Analysis of these responses indicates that there are a range of issues relating to elements of the scheme. Some respondents wanted more detailed information in order to comment fully on proposals, giving us a good indication of the information required for the next stage of more detailed consultation.

TfL and the London Borough of Lambeth will now use the outcomes of this consultation to inform the development of detailed proposals for further consultation later in 2015. We have committed to engaging with key stakeholders during this next stage of project development to address issues raised and help shape the developing proposals.

2 Background

Vauxhall is at the centre of Nine Elms on the Southbank, one of Europe’s major areas of regeneration and a vital part of the Mayor of London’s plan to deliver jobs and homes for London’s growing population. The Nine Elms development will bring 25,000 new jobs and 20,000 new homes to the area. Yet Vauxhall’s potential to flourish is constrained by the dominance of traffic in the area.

We want Vauxhall to continue to benefit from this regeneration. We are working with the London Borough of Lambeth on ambitious proposals to create a thriving centre for Vauxhall, to make it a better, safer, more vibrant place for everyone who lives, works and travels through it.

The proposals include removing the one-way traffic system at Vauxhall Cross and returning the streets to two-way working, and making improvements to the rail, bus and Tube interchange. This will create a safer environment for the growing number of pedestrians and cyclists in the area.

The plans are still at an early stage and the response to this consultation will help improve the designs TfL and Lambeth take forward during the next year. A second consultation in late 2015 will provide more detailed information on the benefits and impacts of any final proposed changes.

3 Introduction

We recently invited the public and key stakeholders to comment on the principles of the scheme which proposes to remove the one way traffic system at Vauxhall and help create a safer environment for cyclist and pedestrians.

3.1 Principles of the Scheme

Two-way working on the streets immediately surrounding the transport interchange – Wandsworth Road, Parry Street, Kennington Lane, South Lambeth Road to make routes through the area simpler and safer;
Reversal to the one-way system at Harleyford Road, Durham Street, Kennington Lane

Maintaining and improving the rail, Tube and bus interchange: Changes would be required to the current bus station, but buses would continue to run through the centre of the area to retain the benefits of short walking distances between rail, Tube and bus stops: bus stops would still be kept together, with weather-cover, good travel information and other facilities.

New and improved public spaces: Through the changes to the road layout we would be able to provide new public spaces including more places to eat, drink, shop and spend time within the centre of Vauxhall and along Albert Embankment, bringing new opportunities for existing local businesses and new ones. These public spaces will be linked by safer and better walkways throughout the centre and improved connections to the river.

3.2 Descriptions of the proposals
The proposals are broken down to show how they affect different users of the area:

Pedestrians – New wide pedestrian crossings with signals for safe crossing between bus, Tube, and rail stations, the river, and the local Vauxhall and Nine Elms area. This would mean the footbridge over Kennington Lane could be removed in due course

Cyclists – Dedicated cycle-only routes separated from the road throughout the majority of the new road layout. The new cycle facilities will be fully integrated with the proposed Cycle Superhighway 5 route and wider cycle improvements for the area

Bus Passengers – Keeping a centralised bus interchange to maintain effective connections to the Tube and rail stations but improving where possible existing facilities such as shelter, waiting areas and real-time information.

Drivers – By converting the main Vauxhall gyratory to two-way streets, routes through the area would be simpler and safer.

4 The consultation
The consultation, which ran from 10 November 2014 to 2 January 2015, was designed to enable TfL and Lambeth to understand local opinion about the proposed changes. TfL wanted to find out what the overall view was about the principles of the scheme, and also which elements of the scheme affected people the most (either positively or negatively) in order to inform the next phase of design.

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

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 changes
- 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

4.1 Who we consulted
The public consultation intended to seek the views of people living close to the junction and within the wider Vauxhall area. We were also keen to seek the views of local businesses and commuters who regularly use the transport interchange.

We also consulted stakeholders including the London boroughs of Lambeth, Wandsworth and Southwark and the City of Westminster. Also, traffic police, London TravelWatch, Members of Parliament, Assembly Members and local interest, transport and business groups including developers and landowners. A list of the stakeholders we consulted is shown in appendix C and a summary of their responses given is in Section 6.

4.2 Consultation material and distribution

The consultation was mainly hosted online. A link to the consultation was emailed to key stakeholders across four boroughs and to a database of Oyster card users who use Vauxhall as a transport interchange or travel through it. We also produced a leaflet which was distributed to around 25,000 addresses. We hosted three drop in sessions whilst the consultation was open to allow people to come and talk to the project team and find out further information.

Responses for the consultation survey were also sought directly through face to face surveying with targeted groups that prior research had shown to be less engaged. These groups included younger residents, Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) residents and social and private tenants.

The consultation was advertised in the press through both a press release and advertising space.
The material was available in all formats including Braille, audio and large font versions of the consultation material, as was a translation service to other languages. A request was made for a Portuguese translation which was provided.

A copy of the leaflet is shown in Appendix A and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix B.

As part of our pre-consultation, which included stakeholder meetings and focus group discussions, we also carried out a survey of transport users travelling through Vauxhall. This was done via email and used our Oyster Card database. It was done to give us a wider understanding of how people used and experienced the current transport setup before going out to wider consultation on the proposals. The results are shown in Appendix E.

For the consultation, we outlined the key potential impacts, issues and benefits of the scheme and asked the following questions, each with a tick for strongly support, support, neither, oppose strongly, oppose and a free text box.

Q1. Do you support or oppose the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall around the central transport interchange?

Q2. Do you support or oppose our proposal to convert the one-way gyratory to a two-way road system around the Vauxhall Cross interchange (Parry Street, Wandsworth Road, Kennington Lane & South Lambeth Road)?

Q3. Do you support or oppose our proposal to reverse the direction of the Kennington Lane/Durham Street/Harleyford Road one-way system?

Q4. Do you support or oppose our proposal to change the layout of the bus station whilst maintaining or improving public transport interchange and facilities?

Q5. Do you support or oppose our indicative proposal to improve provision and safety for pedestrians?

Q6. Would you support or oppose our indicative proposal for improving provision and safety for cyclists?

Q7. When considering future plans for Vauxhall, please rank from 1-5 how important the following features are to you? (Where 1 is not important at all and 5 is extremely important)?

Q8. The wider regeneration of Vauxhall and Nine Elms will result in a number of benefits for residents, businesses and workers. From the list below, please rank in order 1-3 the top three benefits that you think are most important.

Q9. Finally, we want your views on where the boundary for Vauxhall’s retail and commercial area should be drawn. This will ensure that Lambeth council
and residents can have more influence over how spaces for new shops and businesses are built.

The attached map represents our new proposals for the boundary for Vauxhall’s district centre including retail and commercial space. Do you agree with boundary?

Q10. Do you have any further comments?

We invited people to respond by using the TfL website https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/vauxhall-cross, by emailing STEngagement@tfl.gov.uk, by freepost or by calling Customer Services, or in person at the drop in sessions.

The leaflet was also made available at Vauxhall Bus Station and Lambeth council offices in Vauxhall. We also distributed posters and leaflets at libraries, local businesses, Doctors surgeries and community centres. Lambeth and VNEB delivery team also circulated details through their stakeholder lists where people had registered for updates.

4.3 Meetings and site visits
We carried out pre-consultation engagement with stakeholders in January 2014 to find out initial thoughts about the scheme. These discussions helped us to produce the first set of high level designs which formed the basis of the main consultation.

As part of the main consultation, we held three public drop in sessions at the times and locations shown below.

- Saturday 22 November 11:00 – 16:00 at St Peters Church, 310 Kennington Lane, SE11 5HY.
- Wednesday 26 November 18:00 – 21:00 at the Wheatsheaf Hall, Wheatsheaf Lane, SW8 2UP.
- Tuesday 9 December 10:00 – 18:00 at the Carmelita Centre, 41 Vauxhall Walk, SE11 5JT.

We also attended a public meeting organised by the Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum which was held after the public drop in session on 9 December. Members of staff from TfL and the London Borough of Lambeth were available to answer any questions raised. This included a request for TfL to review alternative proposals (outlined in the response to issues raised in appendix A) and also for retention of the current bus station and canopy. There were also issues raised about the validity of the consultation process and materials.

The feedback from all drop in sessions and the public meeting were also used to help inform the consultation.
5 Overview of consultation responses

We received a total of 2,181 consultation responses. Of those 2,142 were from members of the public and 39 were from stakeholders/stakeholder groups.

1057 of the total responses were obtained through face to face surveying with targeted groups that prior research had shown to be less engaged. These groups included younger residents, Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) residents and social and private tenants.

Below is a summary of the key findings for all respondent groups. The following sections of this report analyse the responses and emerging themes in more detail for each respondent group.

The responses have been positive with broad support demonstrated. 77% of respondents indicated that they either support or strongly support the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall. Respondents would like to see the road network made safer for all users. People also feel that the area could benefit from the development of a real centre for the area bringing better open spaces and connections and retail opportunities.

There were also some specific areas of concern about plans to change the bus station, the lack of depth in the proposals around Kennington Lane, Durham St, Harleyford Rd triangle and the possible impact on journey times and added pollution. The details around these and other key areas that require a response are highlighted in Appendix D.

6 Responses from members of the public

We received a total of 2,142 responses from members of the public.

Analysis of Respondents:

These can be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (including those received through the targeted consultation)</td>
<td>1097 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an individual and person who travels through or works in the area</td>
<td>521 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an individual and resident of the area</td>
<td>509 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a representative of a community or organisation</td>
<td>11 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a representative of a business</td>
<td>4 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We asked respondents their gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1174 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>823 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>144 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked respondents their age range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>281 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>1032 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>528 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>113 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>39 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>148 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did members of the public respond to the consultation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street survey</td>
<td>1057 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online questionnaire</td>
<td>1015 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>50 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following charts show level of support for each of the main questions we asked:

**Analysis of responses**

Q1. Do you support or oppose the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall around the central transport interchange?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall aim</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Neither / no opinion or answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Do you support or oppose our proposal to convert the one-way gyratory to a two-way road system around the Vauxhall Cross interchange (Parry Street, Wandsworth Road, Kennington Lane & South Lambeth Road)?
Q3. Do you support or oppose our proposal to reverse the direction of the Kennington Lane/Durham Street/Harleyford Road one-way system?
Q4 Do you support or oppose our proposal to change the layout of the bus station whilst maintaining or improving public transport interchange and facilities?

Q5 Do you support or oppose our indicative proposal to improve provision and safety for pedestrians?
Q6 Would you support or oppose our indicative proposal for improving provision and safety for cyclists?

![Bar chart: Provision and safety for cyclists](chart1.png)

- **49%** Strongly support
- **31%** Support
- **3%** Oppose
- **3%** Strongly oppose
- **13%** Neither / no opinion or answer

Q9 We want your views on where the boundary for Vauxhall's retail and commercial area should be drawn. This will ensure that Lambeth council and residents can have more influence over how spaces for new shops and businesses are built. Do you agree with the boundary?

![Bar chart: Retail and commercial area boundary](chart2.png)

- **38%** Strongly support
- **19%** Support
- **6%** Oppose
- **6%** Strongly oppose
- **31%** Neither / no opinion or answer
Questions about which factors people felt were important –

We asked the question: When considering future plans for Vauxhall, please rank from 1-5 how important the following features are to you? (1=not important at all, 5=extremely important)

The following table shows the breakdown of the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving safety at crossings</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving safety on roads</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the area more accessible for vulnerable users such as people with disabilities, children and older people</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of changing between bus, rail and underground</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More shops and services (e.g. banks, dry cleaners)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cafes/restaurants</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More, and better quality, open spaces</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental improvements, including reducing air pollution</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better connections to the river and the rest of Vauxhall including parks and open spaces</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

363 respondents additionally cited a feature in the “Other” free text box.
Importance of benefits

We then asked the question: The wider regeneration of Vauxhall and Nine Elms will result in a number of benefits for residents, businesses and workers. From the list below, please rank each benefit in order of how important they are to you. The following table shows the breakdown of the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important... (1 is the most important, 3 is the least)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More job opportunities for local people</td>
<td>1208 (56%)</td>
<td>498 (23%)</td>
<td>287 (13%)</td>
<td>149 (7%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training opportunities for local people</td>
<td>1089 (51%)</td>
<td>564 (26%)</td>
<td>297 (14%)</td>
<td>192 (9%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for local and new businesses</td>
<td>1105 (52%)</td>
<td>592 (28%)</td>
<td>283 (13%)</td>
<td>162 (8%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for young people, such as jobs and training and leisure pursuits</td>
<td>1209 (56%)</td>
<td>488 (23%)</td>
<td>276 (13%)</td>
<td>169 (8%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More investment in parks and open spaces</td>
<td>1078 (50%)</td>
<td>544 (25%)</td>
<td>387 (18%)</td>
<td>133 (6%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More investment in health facilities</td>
<td>1022 (48%)</td>
<td>594 (28%)</td>
<td>330 (16%)</td>
<td>191 (9%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More investment in education facilities</td>
<td>1066 (50%)</td>
<td>559 (26%)</td>
<td>320 (15%)</td>
<td>197 (9%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More investment in cultural activities</td>
<td>973 (45%)</td>
<td>616 (29%)</td>
<td>381 (18%)</td>
<td>172 (8%)</td>
<td>2142 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

223 respondents additionally cited a benefit in the “Other” free text box.
Detailed analysis of written responses to each question

Q1 Do you support or oppose the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall around the central transport interchange?

There were 817 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>651 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>155 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>817 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made), and a postcode analysis of all those respondents who provided post codes.

Further analysis

The 153 local resident miscellaneous suggestions and requests span a very wide variety of issues, and are difficult to place into a small number of categories as none are cited more than a handful of times. Issues such as the need to have traffic calming measures like speed limits, affordable homes, more parking, an underpass, wishes to retain old buildings, bring back the tram and many more fall into this category.

Four commonly cited local resident positive impacts (total 124 in table below) are regarding more/better retail and services (24), having a town centre/place to stop off (23), creating a better environment/appearance (16), and a boost for the local economy and jobs (15).
Four commonly cited local resident negative impacts (total 115 in table below) are that prices will go up and local people will be adversely affected (21), concerns about traffic congestion and slower journeys (19), concerns about more shops and the type of retail that may come (16) and overcrowding in the area (12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous suggestion / request</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Miscellaneous suggestion / request</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Miscellaneous suggestion / request</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific positive impact of proposals</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Negative comment about current state of affairs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Bus station related comment or request</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific negative impact of proposals</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Specific positive impact of proposals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Specific negative impact of proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment about current state of affairs</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Specific negative impact of proposals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Negative comment about current state of affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Criticism of question or other part of the proposal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Specific negative impact of proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment about current state of affairs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bus station related comment or request</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Specific positive impact of proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans are vague and in need of development</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of question or other part of the proposal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Comment about the cost of the plans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus station related comment or request</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Plans are vague and in need of development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Positive comment about current state of affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q2 Do you support or oppose our proposal to convert the one-way gyratory to a two-way road system around the Vauxhall Cross interchange (Parry Street, Wandsworth Road, Kennington Lane & South Lambeth Road)?

There were 696 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>544 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>143 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>696 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further analysis**

72 local residents would support this proposal if a condition they stated was met. The three most commonly cited conditions relate to quality of traffic flow (17), safety/convenience for pedestrians (15), and quality of bus facilities (13).

51 of the 63 comments that were about a traffic related negative impact talked about the possibility or probability of increased congestion, delays or journey times. 7 mentioned increased pollution.

The 60 comments that the current system worked well most often talked in general terms, for example ‘it’s fine as it is’.

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Other suggestion, request or comment</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system works well</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Current system does not work well</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other suggestion, request or comment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other suggestion, request or comment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system does not work well</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Current system does not work well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Positive impact for cyclists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Current system works well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestion, request or comment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Positive impact on general safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on traffic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about cost of proposed scheme</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Comment about traffic speed or driver / cyclist behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest additional provision for cyclists</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest additional provision for pedestrians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 Do you support or oppose our proposal to reverse the direction of the Kennington Lane/Durham Street/Harleyford Road one-way system?

There were 517 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>421 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>90 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>517 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis

There were 70 comments classified as ‘More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed’. These were mostly made up of a declaration of inability to answer the question without more information or justification for the proposed change.

There were 68 comments relating to general opposition. These are mainly short comments with a clear preference for retaining the status quo – ‘keep it as it is’, ‘leave it as it is’ are common.

The 44 ‘Proposals won’t affect me’ are made by respondents who have simply stated that they don’t use the roads in question, or do not drive.

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Make roads two way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals won't affect me</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suggestion, request or other comment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positive impact, traffic related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion, request or other comment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Needs additional provision for cyclists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suggest additional provision for cyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system works well</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Make roads two way</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact, traffic related</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Negative impact on business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals don't seem to make much of a difference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Suggestion, request or other comment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make roads two way</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Comment / proposal about traffic speed, driver/cyclist behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact on general safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you support or oppose our proposal to change the layout of the bus station whilst maintaining or improving public transport interchange and facilities?

There were 808 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>673 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>125 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>7 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>808 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis

The 131 suggestions, requests or other comments span a wide variety of issues. Three commonly cited ones are requests for additional / improved facilities other than bus services (30), navigation and accessibility (28), and comments about roof / canopy / solar panels / aesthetics (25).

There were 121 comments about a specific negative impact. Four common ones are that the total bus experience will be slower or more inconvenient (40), there will be a reduction in space / will be busier / too congested (25), there will be a negative impact on safety (14), there will be disruption (7).

There were 97 comments that it currently works well. These tended to be general comments like ‘it’s fine as it is’

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion, request or other comment</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Suggestion, request or other comment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Suggestion, request or other comment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Specific negative impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific negative impact</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Negative comment about current functionality</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Negative comment about current design/style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Criticism of a part of the consultation process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comment that it currently works well</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Specific negative impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Negative comment about current functionality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific positive impact</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Specific positive impact</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>General comment that it currently does not work well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Comment about the cost of the plans</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>General comment that it currently works well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment about current design/style</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment about the cost of the plans</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>General comment that it currently works well</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Specific negative impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Positive comment about current design/style</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Specific positive impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment about current functionality</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Positive comment about current functionality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modelling/analysis needs to be done/showed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Negative comment about current design/style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modelling/analysis needs to be done/showed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Would you support or oppose our indicative proposal for improving provision and safety for cyclists?

There were 669 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>515 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>148 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>669 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further analysis**

There were 110 comments that expressed general support. These tend to be short statements of mild or strong support, for example ‘better for cyclists’, ‘good idea’ etc.

There were 98 negative comments about existing provision for cyclists. 61 of these explicitly mentioned a lack of safety, with several more perhaps hinting at it, for example ‘busy roads with lots of cyclists - difficult with cars’, ‘roads too small’ etc.

There were 63 comments categorised as ‘Other request / comment / suggestion’. These cover a wide variety of subthemes including cycling not confined to the proposal area and suggestions that the balance of provision is perhaps being weighted too heavily towards the cyclist.

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Negative comment about existing provision for cyclists</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Other request / comment / suggestion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment about existing provision for cyclists</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Negative comment about existing provision for cyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other request / comment / suggestion</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Specific suggested provision for cyclists in proposal area</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Positive impact for cyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact for cyclists</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Other request / comment / suggestion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Specific suggested provision for cyclists in proposal area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific suggested provision for cyclists in proposal area</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cyclist behaviour is poor / should be improved / regulated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion of high quality / better cyclist segregation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Suggestion of high quality / better cyclist segregation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist behaviour is poor / should be improved / regulated</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>More modelling / analysis / detail needs to be showed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support for indicative proposal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Negative impact for cyclists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact of proposals for other road users and</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Negative impact for other road users and pedestrians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals don't make enough of a difference for cyclists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Would you support or oppose our indicative proposal for improving provision and safety for pedestrians?

There were 249 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>145 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>97 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*please note this question was not asked in the face to face survey due to an administrative error

Further analysis

Nearly half (15) of the 31 ‘General oppose’ comments relate to safety not improving.

Of the 23 comments containing specific suggested provision to benefit pedestrians, 10 cite ideas to improve crossings, and 4 mention better traffic control.

There were 22 comments relating to the current system not working well. 12 explicitly mentioned a lack of safety, and 6 talked about it being unpleasant.

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Current system does not work well</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Current system does not work well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Specific suggested provision to benefit pedestrians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific suggested provision to benefit pedestrians</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system does not work well</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>General support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other request / comment / suggestion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Specific suggested provision to benefit pedestrians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system works well</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Keep footbridge or add subway / bridge to separate pedestrians from others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other request / comment / suggestion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Current system works well</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better segregation required (not related to bridge or tunnel)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Better segregation required (not related to bridge or tunnel)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of the question</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prefer one stage crossings over multi-stage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians are a priority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>More modelling / analysis needs to be done / showed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrians are a priority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 We want your views on where the boundary for Vauxhall's retail and commercial area should be drawn. This will ensure that Lambeth council and residents can have more influence over how spaces for new shops and businesses are built.

There were 588 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>510 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>73 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>588 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis

The 93 comments that request specific facilities / retail / leisure cover a wide range. Three of the most common requests are for shops (33), independent / local businesses or a desire not to have chain stores (19), facilities for the young (19), and cafes (17).

There 69 comments that ‘Need more info to help form opinion’ usually relate to a lack of information on the likely impacts of the proposal. The 69 other suggestions / requests are very diverse with no prevailing subthemes.

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for specific facilities / retail / leisure</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Need more info to help form opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Need more info to help form opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Criticism of a part of the consultation process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more info to help form opinion</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Boundary should include / exclude (named place)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other suggestion / request</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miscellaneous positive impact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestion / request</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Other suggestion / request</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for specific facilities / retail / leisure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous positive impact</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Request for specific facilities / retail / leisure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact - economic, business and housing concerns</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Miscellaneous negative impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support if a condition is met</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Negative impact - economic, business and housing concerns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on jobs / local economy / business</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Doesn't affect me / little impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous negative impact</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Boundary size - it's too large</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary should include / exclude (named place)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>General oppose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request concerning housing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Miscellaneous positive impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary size - it's too small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive impact on jobs / local economy / business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Do you have any further comments on any or all of these proposals?

There were 397 written responses to this question, broken down by respondent type as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Number of responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident in the area</td>
<td>230 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel through or work in the area</td>
<td>139 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a business, community or organisation</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents who left a comment</td>
<td>397 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local resident analysis**

Comments covered by the three most popular themes are very diverse with no prevailing subthemes.

The following table shows the top 10 comment themes by respondent type (ranked by number of comments made).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local resident</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Travel through or work in area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representative of a business, community or organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous request / suggestion / comment</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>General positive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Criticism of a part of the consultation process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miscellaneous request / suggestion / comment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Miscellaneous request / suggestion / comment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>General negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support for current bus station / against proposal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General negative</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>General negative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Miscellaneous request / suggestion / comment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic, negative impact</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of a part of the consultation process</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cyclists, general comment / request</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pedestrians, negative impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposals need more detail</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for current bus station / against proposal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pedestrians, general comment / request</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Support for current bus station / against proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General negative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment about leisure / retail facilities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>General comment about bus station/public transport</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Criticism of a part of the consultation process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built and natural environment, general comment / request</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Support for current bus station / against proposal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cyclists, negative impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals need more detail</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Built and natural environment, general comment / request</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pedestrians, negative impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians, general comment / request</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Traffic, general comment / request</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cyclists, general comment / request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, general comment / request</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Comment about leisure / retail facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traffic, general comment / request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists, general comment / request</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Responses from statutory bodies and other stakeholders

We received a total of 39 responses from stakeholder groups.

Common issues include:

- The bus station works well currently; there is concern that its overall convenience/quality could be adversely affected if plans are implemented
- Proposals are light on detail. Comment or opinion, particularly about the bus station and altered traffic flows, is often difficult without more detail and information on likely impacts
- Some support for two way traffic
- Some support for the aim of developing Vauxhall as an area
- Concern over shared pedestrian/cyclist spaces for safety reasons – comments range from strong opposition to suggestions on how they could work more effectively
- Concern about access and journey times, for pedestrians, private vehicles and business traffic
- Criticism of aspects of the consultation process (for example, the questionnaire)

Below is a summary of the submissions from stakeholders.

Statutory Stakeholders

Metropolitan Police

Highlighted crime statistics in the area and made specific suggestions to refine proposals from the point of view of safety (e.g. additional street lighting, CCTV facilities, design of new interchange area and seating, taxi facilities and more). Believe that the revised district centre boundary is a positive approach that will enable a more strategic approach to be taken to safety and security.

Richard Tracey AM

Supports overall aim. Feels it is vital that the transport interchange works smoothly and efficiently for the large number of people who use it, otherwise the plans will have failed.

Nine Elms is in Wandsworth and that must not be forgotten. This must not be an attempted land grab.

Valerie Shawcross AM

Strongly supports the current proposals. Thinks they will make Vauxhall more hospitable. Believes that previous works to the area and the continued existence of the gyratory as it stands increases risks for all road users and hampers the potential of the area to be a welcoming and sustainable transport interchange.
Feels that converting the roads to two-way traffic is vital, and the needs of more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists are should be put first.

Accepts that some changes will be needed to the current bus station, but believes the area should remain as a formal identifiable bus station, rather than just an interchange. Bus stops should be grouped together. Any relocation of bus stops and stands should be fully communicated to passengers.

Hopes the new scheme will compliment the new Cycle Superhighway 5 route.

Wandsworth Council

Request that the quality of interchange should not be made any worse than at present. They are concerned that the current good layout could be replaced by a conventional high street type arrangement with limited pavement width, a line of congested bus stops and limited passenger information.

They are also concerned about possible adverse impact to traffic in this and surrounding areas, especially with works on the Thames Tideway Tunnel and Northern line Extension creating substantial additional lorry movement through the area.

They question the likely environmental impact, particularly air quality - a detailed environmental assessment of the proposals should be made.

Wandsworth Council also commented that it is unclear as to what the justification is to extend the Vauxhall District Centre boundary by such a great extent, and that it is an issue that should be addressed by Lambeth Council. It isn’t inappropriate to consult on this within a TfL consultation.

Campaign Groups

Confederation of Passenger Transport

Feel that two-way roads will create further congestion and increased journey times for buses and coaches, resulting also in increased pollution and possibly higher coach fares.

Remarked that there are no stops /pick-ups / set downs, or any other coach facilities in the proposals.

Also stated the importance of mitigating delays during any construction.

CTC London (Cyclists’ Touring Club)

Generally welcoming of any improvements to help and encourage cycling. They have a few questions/suggestions.

- Could a link be made from Harleyford Road to Goding Street?
- The loading and disabled bay at the south east side of the road looks potentially dangerous for cyclists – can it be moved to the west side?
- The Kennington Road crossing by Meadow Road is likely to be congested (it is shared-use). Can Meadow Road be widened at the Oval to help?

Guide Dogs

Shared space between pedestrian and cyclists is a source of concern, increasing the risk of collisions or confidence-shaking near misses for blind or partially sighted pedestrians who cannot see cyclists approaching.

Safe and convenient routes should be provided for cyclists on the carriageway. Where this is not possible off-carriageway routes for cyclists should be separate, or clearly segregated from, pedestrian routes.

Shared facilities where pedestrians and cyclists share a path should have a central raised white line and corduroy paving to denote each side, laid in a ladder-like pattern for the pedestrian and tram-like pattern for the cyclist.

They stated that any temporary changes to the bus station must be communicated effectively with vision impaired people so they can locate bus stops easily.

Lambeth Cyclists

Support the overall aim. Support two-way roads, but would like to see a part of the main road layout reduced - perhaps a section of South Lambeth Road could be made inaccessible to general motor traffic.

Prefer segregated cycle lanes to be created on the main road, not on the pavement taking away from pedestrian space. Against staggered pedestrian crossings.

They believe that bus journeys will be longer under the new layout, and would like to see Harleyford Road/Durham Street section be made less of a gyratory.

They think that widening the Vauxhall District Boundary is sensible but the zone may still be too small as residents of the poorer residential hinterland appear to be excluded from the decision making while the retailers, property developers, businesses and wealthy owners of residential buildings (whether residents or absentee landlords) have a say.

Plans make no mention of the linear park from Battersea to Vauxhall and hopefully beyond.

NEF Consulting

Stated that the current plan is extremely high level and that it is therefore difficult to assess impacts on people and the environment. Generally, a lot more detail is required – areas where detail is needed were given and include:
- Is it necessary to remove the whole canopy
- What will the impact of increased construction traffic be
- What is the construction phase disruption/inconvenience to various groups
- How will access to the river be improved
- Could public space include landscaping, seating, outdoor art
- Future of the railway arches

They note that the plan features many traffic islands/pedestrian refuges and believe they can be unsafe in areas where there is a lot of traffic. Pedestrian footpaths and crossings should all be widened to accommodate anticipated increased pedestrian use.

Cyclist/pedestrian shared space should be clearly marked, and be large enough to accommodate the increased number of cyclists using Cycle Superhighway 5.

Once any changes have been made, confusion and unfamiliarity regarding altered road network may become a health and safety risk for pedestrians, drivers and cyclists. Detail on how this will be mitigated and monitored would be useful.

It would be great to see how local people could potentially be involved in any construction work available.

More detail is required on how the public space will be used. The idea is to encourage business, but it will be important to ensure that independent businesses and the local community are represented, rather than (just) high street chain stores. A local fruit and vegetable market (ensuring that its prices cater for all residents) may be a good addition to this public space.

**Sustrans**

Welcome removal of the gyratory, but believe that the plans are still too focussed on carrying high volumes of motor traffic with only limited improvements to facilities for cyclists and pedestrians.

Specific comments about crossings are summarised as follows:

- Support a road level crossing to replace the footbridge, but the proposed staggered crossing is not a practical solution
- Prefer one-stage or straight-across crossings. These would also improve access to the new town centre
- The recent Cycle Superhighway 5 proposals showed relatively good cyclist provision at the crossing between Kennington Lane and South Lambeth Road. However, the Vauxhall Cross plans show a proposed crossing at this location that appears to have a reduced standard of provision. There is additional clutter and crossing complexity. The cycle crossing design is not specified but it needs to be 6 metres wide to match Cycle Superhighway 5 proposals

Specific comments about cyclist provision are summarised as follows.
• The two-way cycle tracks are a welcome improvement (provided they are at least 4 metres wide), but they present difficulties at junctions concerning shared space with pedestrians.
• The right turn from Wandsworth Road just before Albert Embankment is dangerous, specifically cyclist positioning and movement on the approach. Segregation is required here.
• There is no provision for cyclists on Kennington Lane, ease of South Lambeth Road.
• The current cycle route through the bus station should not be removed.

Other comments are summarised as follows.

• Reduction of footway on Wandsworth Road also not conducive to the creation of a town centre.
• The Kennington Lane/Durham Street/Harleyford Road mini-gyratory should be removed, not just reversed.

Local Community Groups

Battersea Society

Detail of possible locations for bus stops and routes is lacking, so hard to assess how easy it will be to change between modes.

In particular, they have made the following comments about the bus station and interchange.

• All bus stops should be covered, but the artist’s impression shows a large gap in roof cover.
• There should be plenty of seating space, litter bins, real time information displays and public toilets.
• Essential not to have bus stops on the eastern side of Bondway, so pedestrians don’t have to cross to reach a stop.
• Concerned that there may be some stops on Wandsworth Road – not pleasant to wait there.
• There is potential for conflict on the two-way bus access road between Bondway and Wandsworth Road – a dedicated pedestrian crossing should be considered here.
• Total bus station area under proposal appears to be considerably smaller – could give rise to future congestion for pedestrians at peak times.

The Society has also expressed general concern about modelling of the projected traffic flows and public transport demand/interchange numbers at Vauxhall. They questioned whether proposals have fully taken account of the impact of the major changes occurring in the area, and are extremely concerned about traffic flows and public transport demand between Battersea Bridge and Vauxhall.

Other comments include:

• Concern about cycle/pedestrian shared areas – more detailed planning work is needed.
- When proposals are developed further, the planning area should be extended further south west to show pedestrian/cycle access from river to the linear park
- On Nine Elms Lane, it is unclear which areas are dedicated to buses and which to cycles – this detail is needed in order to be able to assess impact

**Clapham Transport Users Group (CTUG)**

Bus Station – CTUG stated some benefits of the bus station, before expressing their concern and bewilderment at proposals to close or dramatically cut the size and facilities of the bus station. Such proposals are against London’s commuting needs and would result in an inferior facility impairing convenience for disabled / mobility impaired users in particular.

They stated that the proposals go against TfL’s key role to provide effective mass transport, and that downgrading facilities for private commercial development would arguably be illegal as it represents state aid for businesses that would occupy space vacated by a truncated bus station. They are furthermore concerned that new businesses would be chain shops and late night licence bars, damaging the existing local economy and causing other problems.

They also feel that a truncated bus station would breach the Equality Act 2010, in that it would, though remaining accessible technically, represent a far less convenient facility for disabled passengers and as such net accessibility would be impaired.

CTUG also commented that future demands are at odds with reducing facilities now.

Cyclist/Pedestrian shared spaces - strong opposition to this for reasons of safety, citing examples of collisions occurring. Pedestrian protection should be underpinned by law, and not just cycling codes of conduct. Risks are higher for pedestrians who have sensory deprivation or reduced mobility and who cannot necessarily hear or see a bicycle coming their way.

CTUG were very unimpressed by aspects of the consultation, saying there were a number of leading questions and that the presentation of images was biased.

They closed their response by criticising general transport policy and summarising that they believe in axing the gyratory and retaining the bus station in its broad current form, while supporting positive steps to make cycling safer while not worsening pedestrian safety.

**Fentiman Road and Richborne Terrace Residents Association**

Stated the benefits of the current bus station and hold the view that any alternative must be as good or better. They find it confusing that the debate about the future of the bus station seems to have been caused by a desire to have more shops. They note a lack of detail given, and would like reassurance on.

- Position and size of the proposed bus station
- A canopy that will cover all bus stops
• Bus stops clustered close together
• No stops to be placed on neighbouring roads
• Buses going in the same direction will have the same or adjacent stops
• New bus station to have room for growth in bus passengers and movement

For pedestrians, they note that:

• At the moment it is still necessary to cross roads used by buses and cycles in order to interchange between bus and mainline rail
• There are kerbs to traverse
• Cycles and pedestrians mix very dangerously in the area leading up to the crossing of Kennington Lane on to Albert Embankment
• The crossing times at that junction are barely adequate for the numbers waiting to cross
• The crossing times from the central island across Wandsworth Road do not align

They would welcome improvements but remain very sceptical whether the current proposals would lead to such an improvement.

On the gyratory, they have commented that there is little hard evidence that the new traffic flows will be better for all, and there is worry that it will be worse based on conditions before the gyratory was created. The view of the residents is that any new traffic scheme must be demonstrably as good or better for vehicles as well as for cyclists and pedestrians.

They also criticise the consultation process, saying that questions were worded to encourage responses which support TfL’s plans.

In conclusion, they ask that:

• Clear reasons be given as to why the bus station must be demolished to allow improvements to the gyratory
• No part of the public realm should be sold off to developers.
• The needs of the public for an effective, safe and sheltered bus, tube and train interchange should have absolute priority
• A "no-change" option be worked up showing the consequences of keeping the present bus station when changing to two-way working
• The plans for any proposed “new bus station” be shown in a new consultation. These plans should preserve the valued features of the present bus station. Its site, size, clustered bus stops and other features should be clearly and convincingly articulated as part of the consultation process

**Landsdowne Residents Association**

Stated the benefits of the current bus station, and requested more detail about proposals to change the status quo. They would like reassurance on:

• Position and size
• A canopy that will cover all bus stops
• Bus stops clustered close together
• No stops to be placed on neighbouring roads
- Buses going in the same direction will have the same or adjacent stops
- New bus station to have room for growth in bus passengers and movement

They believe that the public needs an effective, safe and sheltered bus, tube and train interchange, and this should be the first and foremost priority. More shops / a high street isn’t a priority.

On the gyratory, they note that improvements for cyclists and pedestrians should not be at the expense of worse conditions for buses, cars and other road vehicles. There has been little evidence presented to show that new traffic flows will be better, and they note that traffic flows better now than before the gyratory was built.

They also criticise the consultation process, saying that questions were worded to encourage responses which support TfL’s plans, and that images were biased.

In conclusion, they ask that:

- Clear reasons be given as to why the bus station must be demolished to allow improvements to the gyratory
- No part of the public realm should be sold off to developers
- The needs of the public for an effective, safe and sheltered bus, tube and train interchange should have absolute priority
- A “no-change” option be worked up showing the consequences of keeping the present bus station when changing to two-way working.

The plans for any proposed “new bus station” be shown in a new consultation. These plans should preserve the valued features of the present bus station. Its site, size, clustered bus stops and other features should be clearly and convincingly articulated as part of the consultation process.

**Stockwell Partnership**

Welcome the proposal of a large retail and commercial area, but would like Wilcox Road to be added also.

**Business/Land Owners**

**Battersea Power Station Development Company**

Stated support for the proposals to improve the current set-up. Believe plans should aim to make Vauxhall safer and more attractive, with an identifiable centre and improved connections around Vauxhall Cross, to the river and to surrounding current and future open spaces.

They feel that the current transport interchange is unsafe and congested. They believe that the proposals as a minimum should retain the number of existing bus stops and stands, and acknowledge that future bus requirements in this and the wider area should be met.

They stated that the proposal map and one of the artist’s impressions could be seen to be misleading – they do not show the approved two-tower scheme. The map should also show connections to the river, Vauxhall Gardens and the Linear Park.
If proposals are implemented careful consideration of temporary impacts should be made alongside other works in the area.

**Berkeley**

Support the replacement of one-way traffic with two-way as it will help with general accessibility and provide significant pedestrian and cycle improvements. Pleased to see better facilities for cyclists.

Noted the pedestrian route from Harleyford Road and Kennington Lane to Vauxhall station currently only requires two crossings, though under the proposed layout it will be three.

**Brunswick House – Grade II* building on Wandsworth Road**

Support overall proposals, and requested pull ins/lay bys on Nine Elms Lane and Wandsworth Road to assist with servicing and events at the building.

**Covent Garden Market Authority (CGMA)**

Stated support for the overarching proposals, subject to the evolving detailed design and the results of the proposed highway capacity modelling.

Other comments include:

- For the majority of deliveries from the market to destinations in central London, the proposal would reduce overall journey mileage
- It is important that the traffic conditions created by the scheme are fully evaluated to ensure that journey times are not significantly affected, particularly during the morning peak period from 0700-1000 as a significant number of time-critical journeys are made from or to the Market during this time
- There is concern about the precise form of the shared pedestrian/cyclist footways proposed around the junction of Wandsworth Road, Parry Street and Nine Elms Lane, with a worry of a conflict between the two user groups. The proposals should be extended south along Wandsworth Road towards the entrance to the Linear Park, the new Sainsburys and tube station, as it is important to see how pedestrian links from Vauxhall to this new growth area will work
- The land shown for development on the Vauxhall Island development site is shown as being very close to the proposed edge of carriageway, with no footways shown. CGMA has been required, through its masterplanning of the market site for development, to dedicate significant land to the public realm. It is appreciated that footways may be separated from the roadway, but CGMA asks TfL and Lambeth Borough to ensure that a proportional area within that site is also dedicated to public realm to ensure continuity of routes from the bus and rail stations. Within this area, pedestrian routes around the bus station/railway station should be indicated and the relationship between the bus only area and the new shopping centre at Vauxhall needs clarification
DSDHA

Commented that the proposals don’t go far enough/cover the right areas – they lack an overall vision to increase usable, high quality space for people, and to reduce the dominance of the road system. DSDHA go on to explain this vision in more detail.

They also state that the proposals do not include any acknowledgment of negative impacts to existing housing, businesses, or institutions in the area. They believe that removing the gyratory brings little benefit given the considerable work needed to carry out the plans, and that detail is missing from the proposals and images.

Other comments include:

- Keeping the one-way system on Kennington Lane/Durham Street/Harleyford Road will not reduce pollution, in fact it may make it worse with increased stationary traffic - especially serious as there is a primary school here
- The plans proposed in this area make it worse for pedestrians and cyclists
- Bus station removal will result in an overall loss of pedestrian space and pavements that are too narrow
- Pedestrian routes around the area will be more complex
- There are considerable and significant negative impacts on their business.
- There will be a negative impact on local heritage

John Lewis (Waitrose)

Support the idea to enhance the area. Believe that traffic flows reasonably well around the gyratory at present and request information about the impact of changes at various points around the system.

Support proposals to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety, but particular concern about servicing arrangements which need to be improved on the current system.

KFF

Emphasise the importance of being able to make deliveries in London efficiently, and that more research into impacts on journey times is needed.

Knight Frank

Believe that all the land currently used for the bus station should continue to be used for transport and public infrastructure such as landscaped walkways. They disagree with any attempt to reduce the width of the high street.

They also believe that cyclists should be given dedicated cycle lanes (one for each direction). These lanes would also serve as a natural extension to the Linear Park connecting Nine Elms to the transport hub at Vauxhall.

On the proposed district boundary, Vauxhall will be a new town centre and it will only be successful if it is focussed on a smaller area, such as Bondway. Expanding the area will only serve to dilute the offering and its commercial success.
The square to the north of the high street should also have significant secure cycle parking infrastructure.

**LASSCO**

Support the removal of the bus station.

Welcome proposed improvements for pedestrians, and suggested that bicycles be banned from the road when an alternative cycle path is available.

Said the first question in the consultation regarding the overall aim is biased.

Supports the idea to increase the Vauxhall District Boundary.

**Love Architecture**

Propose that the glazed canopy shown in the artist’s impressions can be extended over a much larger area, for better weather protection. They could incorporate solar panels.

They think that many more trees and greenery should be added.

**Murray John Architects Ltd**

They welcome the new cycle facilities and are delighted to see traffic calming works proposed.

They hope to see an improvement in Lambeth’s conservation areas.

They would like to develop the area outside the café at 383 Kennington Lane and have included a proposal.

**St George PLC**

Support improvements that are proposed for pedestrians, and encourage greater accessibility to the river. Also welcome the enhanced routes proposed for cyclists and general aspirations to make the area more attractive.

They believe that the proposals will make public transport interchange easier, safer and more accessible, and recommend that one of the proposed crossings on Wandsworth Road be three metres further towards Nine Elms Lane/Parry Street for safety reasons.

**St James Group Ltd**

Support proposed redevelopment of the gyratory and measures to significantly improve safety.

They make a number of comments relating to specific aspects of the proposals.

- Allow two way movement of vehicles out of St George Wharf on Nine Elms lane – currently it is left turn only.
- The bus only area may benefit from an additional crossing point.
• The Cycle Hire Station on the opposite side of the road from Vauxhall Station may benefit from relocation to the transport interchange area.
• It may be beneficial to upgrade and rationalise Underground station entrances, if public space replaces bus lanes in that area

Sainsburys

Support the proposals. Proposed new layout suits travel patterns of local store customers, while complementing their development at Nine Elms.

They are concerned that current plans do not provide replacement servicing arrangements for their local store.

Shell

State that the proposals do not allow continuous left hand turning for traffic, which would considerably improve traffic flow and reduce tailbacks.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd

Stated that they have no objections in principle to the proposals, but raised some issues regarding possible implications of plans on the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.

WRN Broadcast

They support the overarching proposal as they believe that Vauxhall currently has little sense of identity, centre or appeal.

Support measures to improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclist through traffic calming.

Believe that the bus station, transport interchange and facilities need improvement.

Believe that the clear and unambiguous separation of cyclists and pedestrians is an important safety issue. Dedicated cycle lanes, preferably with physical separation from other traffic and pedestrians, would be welcome.

They also wonder whether the proposed Vauxhall District Boundary is too big and ambitious.

Wendover Group

Believe that the proposal can create a vibrant town centre, combining a transport interchange and open space/retail to benefit a wide range of users. Bondway should remain the main artery linking into and out of Vauxhall and the transport interchange. This new 'high street' should have dedicated cycle lanes, and not be narrowed – every effort should be made to avoid reducing the feeling of space or landscaping. Bondway should be the chosen route to access Nine Elms to ensure traders get the full benefit

Wild Search
They believe that the gyratory system can be improved, but giving up the bus station for further development is not the solution – they oppose this.

The majority of residents and families in the Vauxhall area think that the abolition of the bus station will be detrimental to quality of life and is being advanced to meet the demands of developers

They criticised two of the consultation questions as being leading.

Road User Groups

Association of British Drivers

Based on past experience, they think that removing gyratory systems in London creates a lot more traffic congestion.

Believe that the reversal of traffic flow on Harleyford Road could increase traffic queues approaching from the south. The lack of traffic modelling information leads to a suspicion that this may be the case.

They commented that it is difficult to judge effectiveness of proposal without traffic modelling information and cost/benefit analysis. They criticised the consultation for leading questions, and not having more than one alternative proposal with more emphasis on maintaining capacity and traffic flow. Said it was altogether a very defective consultation.

The Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

Support the proposal to convert one way traffic flow to two-way, provided there are no significant increases in journey times for traffic.

The two taxi ranks, one in South Lambeth Place and the other in South Lambeth Road, should be retained or re-sited so that they can continue to provide a service to passengers at Vauxhall Station and the transport interchange and also to provide service to residents and local businesses including the night-time economy.

Other

London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

Stated that it would be desirable to increase the number of shops, cafes/restaurants and other services in Vauxhall, but space in the immediate vicinity of the transport interchange is limited.

The Forum supports an objective of making provision for motor traffic less dominant, subject to evidence about the practicability of proposals in terms of traffic volumes/flows and design of junctions.
Bus station - regarding the bus station, it is impossible to support or oppose the proposal without further information about what is proposed. They support keeping a centralised bus station to maintain effective interchange and to improve existing facilities.

However, they state that present proposals do not plot the paths to be taken by particular bus routes. Whatever layout is proposed for the bus station it must provide full weather protection and not give rise to conflicts between movements of buses and movements of pedestrians.

They do not agree with moving any bus stop outside the central bus station area.

Pedestrians - they support the proposals for new and improved pedestrian crossings. They are concerned, however, that not enough attention has been paid to the potential scale of pedestrian movement and from surrounding areas, including the northern part of the proposed district centre, the green link through Spring Gardens to Lambeth Bridge and the sites being redeveloped along Nine Elms Lane. They are also concerned at the absence of a firm commitment to remove the pedestrian footbridge over Kennington Lane. They propose that, in addition to the planned pedestrian crossing on Kennington Lane, an additional entrance should be constructed from the east side of Albert Embankment to the sub-surface concourse of the underground station.

Pedestrian/cyclist shared use space needs further thought to how it could be safely and satisfactorily managed.

Cyclists – further development of the proposals is required at certain points, and a clear indication of links between cycle lanes in this area and other routes needs to be given.

Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum (KOVF) including Michael Keane –

KOVF support the idea of two-way roads to help give the area a smaller, more local feel and improve connections to the river, open spaces and surrounding areas. They have additional ideas that they think will bring significant benefits:

- Closure of South Lambeth Road to through traffic
- Two way traffic on Harleyford Road/Durham Street/Kennington Lane

KOVF set out their detailed analysis and reasons for these suggestions. In summary, these include potential for an indoor market or similar creating local jobs, increased safety, quicker bus journeys, easier access and egress, reduced noise and pollution.

Some KOVF members criticised aspects of this consultation. A number of examples were given:

- Misleading statements: The consultation leaflet states “New and improved public spaces”. The plans presented appear to result in an overall reduction of public space. Space occupied by new commercial premises is different in planning terms and should not be considered as a public space
• Misleading images: Images appear biased to improve the impact of the proposed changes. The image depicting what the area could look like shows bright weather and a flattering perspective, whereas the image of the current situation shows a relatively lifeless, rainy scene.

• Lack of transparency: The consultation leaflet does not mention potential adverse affects (e.g. slower journey times, effects on some local businesses), and likely benefits for property owners and developers.

• Use of leading questions: “Q1. Do you support or oppose the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall around the central transport interchange?” is a question that invites ‘support’ as it is unlikely that any reasonable person would oppose having a thriving centre and a central transport interchange. It undermines the validity of the rest of the questionnaire and adds weight to the tone that no alternative exists.

• Consultation methodology: There is concern that the impacts of these changes require more effective consultation. The choice of venue for public exhibitions and their hosting times reached only a very small number of people. Also, some people attending did not think their views were being captured effectively.

• Consultation contact details: These are unsatisfactory. There is no named contact person and the telephone number is the general TfL number that is commonly used for journey advice and other general enquiries. A KOVF board member has written to the general consultation enquiry line on more than one occasion but no response was received.

Note Point – The suggested layout outlined above is one of two alternative proposals. The second was received by a member of public. The TfL response to both layouts is covered in Appendix A: Responses to Issues Raised.
8 Conclusion and next steps

- Prior to the consultation TfL’s work had shown that it would be possible to remove the gyratory and return to two-way streets in order to create a real centre for Vauxhall. This would require changes to the current configuration of the bus station, with the commitment to maintain or improve on the current transport experience.

- This first consultation was on these broad principles underpinning the scheme. The responses have been positive with broad support demonstrated. For example, 77% of respondents indicated that they either support or strongly support the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall, while 13% opposed or strongly opposed changing the gyratory to two-way roads.

- We received a large number of written comments expressing a variety of views that provide important and insightful information that will help to inform the next stage of the design of the scheme at Vauxhall.

- Analysis of these responses indicates that there are a range of issues relating to elements of the scheme. Some respondents wanted more detailed information in order to comment fully on proposals, giving us a good indication of the information required for the next stage of more detailed consultation.

- TfL and the London Borough of Lambeth will now use the outcomes of this consultation to inform the development of detailed proposals for further consultation later in 2015. TfL and Lambeth are committed to engaging with key stakeholders during this next stage of project development to address issues raised and help shape the developing proposals.

To keep in touch with the engagement programme please visit Lambeth’s website: http://www.lovevaux.com/

You can register to receive updates here:

https://vauxhall.nationbuilder.com/login
Appendix A – Response to issues raised

The response to common issues raised during this consultation are listed below.

1) Alternative arrangements proposed
Two individuals, supported by local residents, suggested alternative arrangements as follows:

Proposal a) - Closure of South Lambeth Road to through traffic and two way traffic on Harleyford Road/Durham Street/Kennington Lane.
Proposal b) – Closure of South Lambeth Road to all traffic except buses

TfL and LB Lambeth are conducting a review of the two alternative arrangements in terms of alignment with the project objectives and their technical feasibility. This will be followed by a meeting with the individuals to discuss and better understand their proposals and the intended benefits.

Initial investigation suggests that both alternatives may have significant adverse impacts but there may be certain ideas and elements that can be taken forward into the next stage of project development.

2) Pedestrian issues
A number of respondents felt that not enough of the pedestrian crossings are straight across and that staggered crossings will lead to pedestrian frustration and people crossing on a red man signal. A few more cited concerns at shared pedestrian/cyclist space, particularly at junctions. This was mostly raised in the question about our indicative proposal for improving provision and safety for cyclists.

In converting the gyratory to two way operation, TfL is looking to improve the experience for pedestrians at Vauxhall. Road crossings have been removed between the bus, rail and underground stations and this interchange area is linked by new wide signalised pedestrian crossings to the river and the surrounding residential and commercial area, in particular to the spine linking to Nine Elms.

During the next stage of design TfL will be refining the layout and will test whether straight across crossings can be substituted for staggered crossings without a disproportionate impact on traffic and environment. It should be noted that, although straight-across crossings allow people to cross the road in one movement, there is often an extended period of time in which people must wait (compared to staggered crossing) before the green man appears.

Comments regarding the shared use footways will be considered by the designers during the next stage, with the objective of maximising safety and minimising potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.

3) Cycling issues
Some concerns were raised about lack of segregation/separation, either overall or at specific locations. There were also concerns about poor cyclist behaviour.
The scheme is looking to provide a consistent and connected cycle network that will enable cyclists of all ages and confidence levels to travel safely through Vauxhall. This may involve improving cycle routes adjacent to Vauxhall gyratory itself in order to provide safer facilities on less heavily trafficked roads. Additional work and engagement will be undertaken in the next stage of design to further develop the cycling provision, ensuring that it is joined up with the wider cycle network for the area and also to ensure that facilities are available for cyclists travelling to Vauxhall as a destination as well as for those travelling through it.

The concerns raised about some cyclist behaviour are acknowledged. TfL promotes adherence to the Highway Code by all road users and encourages ‘responsible cycling’ and mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. We work to eliminate offences such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement, and cycling at night without lights. We do this using police enforcement and education programmes, as well as through marketing and engagement campaigns. Providing a dedicated and consistent cycle network at Vauxhall will help to discourage poor cycle behaviour and will also help other road users by letting them know where to expect high volumes of cyclists. The design objective will be to maximise safety and minimise potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.

4) Traffic issues (see also response 8)

86 respondents were concerned that traffic will be slower and there will be more congestion and more pollution and that it will impact on pedestrian safety.

Prior to the next stage of public consultation, TfL will be undertaking detailed traffic modelling in order to fully assess the benefits and impacts of the scheme. This assessment will consider congestion, journey times, operation of the strategic road network, road safety and air and noise quality. It will also assess any likely impact on local roads and the possible need for monitoring or mitigation measures.

5) Reversal of Kennington Lane, Durham Street, Harleyford Road gyratory

Respondents were unclear why reversing the Kennington Lane, Durham Street and Harleyford Road one way gyratory is proposed and are concerned that it might have a negative effect on the community and businesses in this area.

The road layout that was consulted upon sought to minimise any adverse impacts on general traffic and bus journey times by reversing the Kennington Lane, Durham Street and Harleyford Rd gyratory. However, in light of the consultation responses and the revised Cycle Superhighway Route 5 alignment, TfL will now review the necessity of reversing this one-way system. Further detail will be provided in the next stage of consultation in late 2015.
6) **Bus station issues**

The main concerns raised about change to bus station were as follows:

- 31 said there would be a reduction of space/make the place busier/too busy
- 9 mention disruption
- 52 said the plans would make things slower and more inconvenient
- 17 mention a negative impact upon safety
- 25 mention the need for good protection from weather when waiting for a bus – either a criticism of the current set-up, or a request for the new development
- 78 mentioned the cost of the plans and works, and that a significant amount of money was spent on the existing bus station which itself is not very old.

Under a two-way road layout of Vauxhall gyratory, it is not possible to retain the existing bus station access/egress and associated bus canopy in the current location. However, the proposals seek to reduce the interchange time/distance between buses and tube/rail while also improving upon weather protection and passenger facilities. More detailed work will now take place to examine the specific impact on bus routes and journey times, and to ensure the interchange at Vauxhall is improved.

7) **Regeneration and development issues**  
Response provided by London Borough of Lambeth

44 respondents expressed concerns that the proposals would have a negative impact on local residents and businesses, especially on the availability and affordability of housing and want to see the retail offer retaining a mix of existing and independent operators.

Major regeneration is underway within the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea (VNEB) Opportunity Area, which follows the aspirations set out in the Mayor’s Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The Mayor’s vision was evolved further in the Vauxhall Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which sets out the principles of establishing a district centre for Vauxhall. Removing the gyratory, along with calming traffic and improving pedestrian and cyclist safety, is a key part of creating an attractive district centre. How this is best achieved will be influenced by the consultation responses received to date and through on-going community and stakeholder engagement.

The project seeks to retain and enhance local character at Vauxhall, whilst catering for both existing and future growth. LB Lambeth will utilise their planning policy to encourage an appropriate mix of different sizes and types of business space, shops and services, including space for independent and small scale retailers and small businesses and start-ups.

Further design work will guide the development of the district centre looking at:

- Strategies to ensure that Vauxhall attracts the types of businesses, retailers and usages that people want to see – including in and around the public transport interchange, along Kennington Lane, Albert Embankment and South Lambeth Road, how connections through the viaduct can best be improved, along with connections to the river.
- High quality and well designed public realm which is an important part of attracting new businesses, shops and jobs to Vauxhall, and providing opportunities for existing businesses.

The next stage of design work will be more detailed and will benefit from the input of existing communities. Engagement opportunities are being planned for them to meaningfully contribute to this process.

In respect of affordable housing, Lambeth has ambitious targets of delivering at least 1,000 new homes across the borough at Council rent over the next 4 years and of achieving 40% affordable homes on new developments, wherever possible. Lambeth Council work with housing associations and developers to deliver affordable housing and continue to welcome investment and 'good' development that offers opportunities for local people. Lambeth officers explore all possibilities for maximising the benefits of development for Lambeth residents, and this sometimes entails the provision of housing off-site.

Lambeth are grateful for all of the comments and feedback on the proposed alteration to the District Centre boundary. Any changes to the District Centre boundary will be progressed through the Local Plan process, which is subject to its own statutory consultation processes.

8) Traffic modelling issues

347 respondents across eight questions felt that the consultation material lacked necessary detail to answer the questions asked fully and accurately.

Given the scale of the proposed changes to the gyratory and interchange, TfL and Lambeth consciously decided to hold two stages of public consultation to ensure the views of stakeholders and the public could be fully understood and addressed as the design progresses. This first stage of consultation was designed to test people’s views on the scheme’s three key principles: - conversion of the gyratory, changes to the bus station and creation of a thriving centre. TfL and Lambeth will now address the views received from this consultation and refine the design ahead of a second stage of public consultation in late 2015. At this second consultation, more detail will be provided on the full benefits and impacts for all road and public transport users, local residents and businesses. By having two stages of consultation, the views of all users will be considered at this early stage to inform the proposals that will come forward in the second consultation.

9) Consultation issues

Some respondents expressed concern regarding the consultation process itself. The main concern was that the questions were perceived as leading and the material as biased. Some also felt that TfL and Lambeth wouldn’t listen to any issues raised.
The consultation material and questions were put together by a specialist team within TfL and follow the same general style as our many other concurrent public consultations.

Consultation was carried out at an early stage of the scheme development to allow a better understanding of issues of particular interest to stakeholders, in order that they can be addressed more fully at the next stage of consultation.

Each question invited a balanced range of responses and provided a free text box for more detailed comment on each of the key elements of the proposals.

The images used in the consultation are artist’s impressions to give a feel of what the spaces could be like and do not reflect specific design proposals. For the next stage of consultation the supporting images will aim to convey the design proposals more realistically.

Appendix B – Copy of the consultation leaflet
Background

Vauxhall is at the centre of Nine Elms on the Southbank, one of Europa’s major areas of regeneration and a vital part of the Mayor of London’s plan to deliver jobs and homes for London’s growing population. The Nine Elms development will bring 20,000 new jobs and 18,000 new homes to the area.

Yet Vauxhall’s potential to flourish is constrained by the dominance of traffic in the area.

We want Vauxhall to continue to benefit from this regeneration. We are working with the London Borough of Lambeth on ambitious plans to create a thriving centre for Vauxhall, to make it a better, safer, more vibrant place for everyone, who lives, works and travels through it.

The proposals include removing the one-way traffic system at Vauxhall Cross and returning the streets to two-way working, and making improvements to the rail, bus and Tube interchange. This will create a safer environment for the growing number of pedestrians and cyclists in the area.

The plans are still in an early stage and we would like to hear your views to help improve the designs we are forward planning for next year. A second consultation in late 2018 will provide more detailed information on the benefits and impacts of any final proposed changes.

Vauxhall today

- Vauxhall is dominated by traffic and a one-way road system
- The Vauxhall gyratory has some of the highest numbers of collisions involving pedestrians and cyclists in London
- During peak hours public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians account for 40% of all journeys, with motorized vehicles accounting for only 10%. However the current layout makes this dominated by vehicles, making it intimidating for pedestrians and cyclists
- Connections to the river, open spaces and the surrounding areas are poor

Please see below for a map which shows the current layout at Vauxhall Cross.

Vauxhall in the future: what you’ve told us

In 2012, Lambeth consulted extensively on its Supplementary Planning Document for Vauxhall. Since then, TfL and Lambeth have been listening to your views.

You’ve told us:

- You value and want to retain and improve the features of the main public transport interchange
- You want a real centre for Vauxhall - a more attractive, safer place, better connected to the river and surrounding green spaces
- You want bus stops close together
- You want more shops, services and restaurants and cafes
- You want to celebrate and support Vauxhall’s existing character, culture, communities and businesses

Our proposals include:

- Two-way working on the streets immediately surrounding the transport interchange - Wandsworth Road, Perry Street, Kennington Lane, South Lambeth Road to make routes through the area simpler and safer.
- Reversal of the one-way system at Harleyford Road, Durham Street, Kennington Lane

Maintaining and improving the rail, Tube and bus interchange: Changes would be required to the current bus station, but buses would continue to run through the centre of the area to retain the benefits of short walking distances between rail, Tube and bus stops: bus stops would still be kept together, with positive access, good travel information and other facilities.

New and improved public spaces: Through the changes to the road layout we will be able to provide new public spaces including more places to eat, drink, shop and spend time within the centre of Vauxhall and along Albert Embankment, bringing new opportunities for existing local businesses and new ones. These public spaces will be linked by safer and better walkways throughout the centre and improved connections to the river.
Key benefits

- **Pedestrians** – New wide pedestrian crossings with signals for safe crossing between bus, tube, and rail stations, the river, and the local Vauxhall and Nine Elms area. This would mean the footbridge over Kennington Lane could be removed in due course.
- **Cyclists** – Dedicated cycle-only routes separated from the road throughout the majority of the new road layout. The new cycle facilities will be fully integrated with the proposed Cycle Superhighway 3 route and wider cycle improvements for the area.
- **Bus Passengers** – Keeping a centralised bus interchange to maintain effective connections to the tube and rail stations but improving where possible: existing facilities such as shelter, waiting areas and real-time information.
- **Drivers** – By converting the main Vauxhall gyratory to two-way streets. Routes through the area will be simpler and safer.

Vauxhall could be transformed by creating a thriving centre. This will include wider footways and pedestrianised areas, better public spaces, and room for large and small businesses. There will be more shops and places to eat and drink and better more logical connections across the area and to the river. Surrounding parks and open spaces will be improved too.

Investment in the area will bring opportunities for jobs and businesses and for local people, supporting Vauxhall’s growing economy.
Appendix C – Leaflet distribution area
Appendix D – List of stakeholders consulted

NHS:
CCG NHS Central London
CCG Wandsworth
King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

Disability Organisations:
Greater London Forum for the Elderly
The British Dyslexia Association
Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance
Sutton Centre for the Voluntary Sector
Joint Mobility Unit
MIND
Sixty Plus
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Living Streets
Disability Alliance
Stroke Association
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)
RNID
National Children's Bureau
London Older People's Strategy Group
RADAR London Access Forum
RNIB
Age Concern London
Campaign for Better Transport
Age UK
Sense
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association
Campaign for Better Transport
Action on Hearing Loss (Formerly RNID)

Emergency services:
Metropolitan Police (Borough traffic contacts)
Port of London Authority
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
London ambulance Service

Freight Organisations:
Road Haulage Association
Freight Transport Association
Assembly members and researchers:
Richard McGreevy
Caroline Pidgeon AM
Darren Johnson AM
Gareth Bacon AM
Jenny Jones AM
Katrina Ramsey
Mary-Clare Connellan
Murad Qureshi AM
Nicky Gavron AM
Andrew Boff AM
Victoria Borwick AM
Tom Copley AM
Stephen knight AM
Joanne McCartney AM
Fiona Twycross AM
Nick Waterman
Claire Hamilton
Tim Steer
Valerie Shawcross AM
Kit Malthouse AM
Valerie Shawcross AM
Richard Tracey AM

London Borough Officers:
LB of Sutton – Head of Transport
Lambeth – Chief Executive
Lambeth - Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Environment
Lambeth - Head of Transportation
Lambeth - Transport Policy Manager
Westminster – Policy Manager Transportation
Westminster - Scheme Development Manager
Westminster - Principal Transport Planner
Westminster - Chief Executive & Director of Finance
Westminster - City Commissioner of Transportation
Westminster - Head of Strategic Planning and Transportation
Southwark - Chief Executive
Southwark - Head of Transport Planning
Southwark - Transport Group
Wandsworth - Senior Transport Planner
Wandsworth - Head of Forward Planning and Transport
Wandsworth - Senior Transport Planner & Travel Awareness Officer
Wandsworth - Cycling Email Coordinator
London Councils:
Director, transport and mobility
Corporate director, services

London Cycling Campaign:
Lewisham
Lambeth
Westminster
Southwark
Wandsworth

Motoring Organisations:
Association of British Drivers
Green Flag Group
Motorcycle Industry Association
Motorcycle Action Group
AA Motoring Trust
Association of Car Fleet Operators
British Motorcyclists Federation

All Ward Councillors in Lambeth

Members of Parliament:
Stephen Hammond MP
Seema Malhotra MP
Patrick McLoughlin MP
Claire Perry MP
Chuka Umunna MP
Kate Hoey MP
Tessa Jowell MP
Karen Buck MP
Mark Field MP
Harriet Harman MP
Tessa Jowell MP
Simon Hughes MP
Justine Greening MP
Jane Ellison MP
Sadiq Khan MP

School Travel Advisors:
Wandsworth
Lambeth

London TravelWatch
Department for Transport

**Taxi and Private Hire:**
Licenced Taxi Drivers Association

**User Groups, Resident Associations, BIDs:**
Kennington, Oval, Vauxhall Forum
Vauxhall One
Sustrans
Northbank BID
Bankside Residents' Forum
London City Airport
CBI
The Royal Parks
London Underground
Eurostar Group
Heart of London Business Alliance
BBC
New West End Company
In Holborn
South Bermondsey Partnership
South Bank Employers' Group
Organisation of Blind Afro Caribbeans (OBAC)
Putney Town Centre Manager
Vauxhall Gardens Estate Tenants & Residents Association
Clapham Transport Users' Group
Herne Hill Forum
Lambeth Traffic and Transport Working Group
Virtual Norwood Forum
Clapham Society
Streatham Vale Property Occupiers Association
Thorney Island Society
Bayswater Residents Association
Neighbourcare St John's Wood and Maida Vale
St John's Wood Society
Paddington Residents Active Concern On Transport (PRACT)
In & Around Covent Garden
Harrowby and District Residents Association
Belgravia Residents Association
Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association
South East Bayswater Residents Association
Westminster Society
Pimlico FREDA
Wandsworth community transport
Marylebone Association
Bankside Residents' Forum
Evolution Quarter Residents' Association
Herne Hill Forum
Lambeth Traffic and Transport Working Group
Virtual Norwood Forum
Herne Hill Society
Better Bankside
Putney Society
Wandsworth Access Association
Raynes Park & West Barnes Residents' Association
Putney Traffic Transport and Parking Working Group
Battersea Society
Putney Society

Unions:
RMT
Unite
GMB

Utilities:
National Grid - electricity
EDF Energy
Thames Water
Royal Mail
BT
Appendix E – Transport survey results

Vauxhall Cross Survey Questions: Interim Report

Vauxhall Cross Survey Questions: Interim Report

Overview

Vauxhall Cross Survey

Question 1: How do you use Vauxhall? (Tick all that apply)

Table of “How do you use Vauxhall?”

Question 2: When traveling through/to Vauxhall what modes of transport do you use?
(Tick all that apply)

Table of “When traveling through/to Vauxhall what modes of transport do you use? (Select all that apply)”

Question 3: What are the main times you use the interchange at Vauxhall? (Tick all that apply)

Table of “What are the main times you use the interchange at Vauxhall? (Select all that apply)”

Question 4: Which of the below do you think best describe the public transport interchange at Vauxhall? (Tick your top five)

Table of “Which of the below do you think best describe the public transport interchange at Vauxhall? (Tick all that apply)”

Question 5: Please rate your current experience of the transport interchange in relation to

Table of “Distance to/from other transport modes (rail, underground, bus)”

Table of “Accessibility for vulnerable users”

Table of “Weather protection”

Table of “Access to good travel information”

Table of “Access to staff”

Table of “Availability of toilets”

Table of “Appearance”

Table of “Your sense of safety”

Table of “Air quality”

Table of “Signage”

Table of “Safety at crossings”
Table of "Choice of local shops and services" 14
Table of "Waiting areas" 15
Table of "Other (Please Specify)" 15
Question 6: How could your current experience travelling through Vauxhall be improved? (Tick your top 5) 16
Table of "How could your current experience travelling through Vauxhall be improved? (Select your top 5)" 16
Question 9: Please tick this box if you are happy for us to share your email address with our delivery partners, the London Borough of Lambeth. 18
Table of "I confirm you can share my email address with Lambeth" 18
Question 7: Please leave the first part of your post code (this helps us to better understand local issues). 18
Question 8: If you would like us to keep in touch with you about changes at Vauxhall, please let us know your email address. 18
Vauxhall Cross Survey

**Question 1: How do you use Vauxhall? (Tick all that apply)**

**Table of “How do you use Vauxhall?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commute for work in Vauxhall</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>26.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute for study in Vauxhall</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To change over on way to work elsewhere</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>41.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To change over on way to study elsewhere</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.989%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 111 responses to this part of the question.

**Question 2: When traveling through/to Vauxhall what modes of transport do you use? (Tick all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>46.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>76.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>London Underground</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>91.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>25.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Taxi private hire</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.189%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Motorised vehicle (e.g. car, motorbike)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7.015%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08302%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3: What are the main times you use the interchange at Vauxhall? (Tick all that apply)

Table of "What are the main times you use the interchange at Vauxhall? (Select all that apply)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Morning rush hour</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Throughout the day</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>26.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Afternoon rush hour</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>48.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>41.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4566%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: Which of the below do you think best describe the public transport interchange at Vauxhall? (Tick your top five)

Table of “Which of the below do you think best describe the public transport interchange at Vauxhall? (Tick all that apply)”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>37.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>18.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>44.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Outdated</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>40.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Free-flowing</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Congested</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>62.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Easy to navigate</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Confusing to navigate</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>28.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.985%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent of All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Unattractive</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>52.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>34.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3736%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5: Please rate your current experience of the transport interchange in relation to

Table of "Distance to/from other transport modes (rail, underground, bus)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.276%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>30.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>37.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4981%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of "Accessibility for vulnerable users"
### Table of "Weather protection"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>41.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table of "Access to good travel information"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>34.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7.680%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.162%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of "Access to staff"
Table of "Availability of toilets"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>60.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>25.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of "Appearance"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6.288%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.328%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>7.347%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table of "Your sense of safety"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>41.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>43.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.9683%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.449%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table of “Air quality”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>30.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table of “Signage”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.8717%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.445%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table of “Safety at crossings”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>16.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>51.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.283%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.068%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of "Choice of local shops and services"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>24.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>44.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>24.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.774%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table of "Waiting areas"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>23.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.483%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.400%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table of "Other (Please Specify)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>36.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>41.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>14.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.702%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5.230%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 170 responses to this part of the question.

**Question 6: How could your current experience travelling through Vauxhall be improved? (Tick your top 5)**

**Table of “How could your current experience travelling through Vauxhall be improved? (Select your top 5)”**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better weather protection (e.g. bus shelter, covered walkways)</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Greater choice of local shops and services</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>40.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Additional security measures (e.g. CCTV)</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improved provision of information and signage including real-time information</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Reduced congestion/crowding</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>63.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>More direct pedestrian street-level crossings</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>32.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>22.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian areas and walkways</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>48.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Improved public spaces</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>39.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Improved connections to the river and the local area</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>31.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.223%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 250 responses to this part of the question.

**Question 9:** Please tick this box if you are happy for us to share your email address with our delivery partners, the London Borough of Lambeth.

Table of "I confirm you can share my email address with Lambeth"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>83.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 2311 responses to this part of the question.

**Question 7:** Please leave the first part of your post code (this helps us to better understand local issues).

There are 590 responses to this part of the question.

**Question 8:** If you would like us to keep in touch with you about changes at Vauxhall, please let us know your email address.