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Executive summary

In partnership with the Royal Borough of Greenwich, we ran a public consultation on proposed changes to West Parkside and the Pilot Busway on Greenwich Peninsula. The consultation ran between 7 October and 4 December 2016. This document explains the processes, responses and outcomes of the consultation.

We received 491 responses, including ten responses from stakeholders. We also received a petition objecting to the proposals from some local residents.

Summary of responses raised by members of the public
A comprehensive summary of all responses from members of the public is provided in Appendix A of this report. The majority of consultees made supportive comments about the proposals. Among these comments were:

- The proposals were long overdue
- The proposals would make West Parkside and bus lanes safer
- Support for a more traditional road layout
- The proposed road layout would be less confusing to motorist and pedestrians

The main issues which we received from members of the public were as follows:

- Concerns that the proposed relocation of the existing bus stop would be a cause of disturbance to some local residents
- Concerns that moving the bus lane would bring buses closer to some local residents living nearby. Issues cited included pollution and noise disturbance
- Concerns that deliveries to local premises and the school run would be adversely impacted by the proposed new layout
- Concerns that a dual carriageway style layout and other developments in the area, would lead to increased volumes of traffic on the peninsula. This would lead to more pollution and congestion
- The Busway is vital and should be retained as a segregated road
- Details of any cycling provision is not included in the proposals

Stakeholder responses
A summary of stakeholder comments is provided in section 4.2 of this report. Stakeholders were broadly supportive of the proposals, though several concerns were also raised.

- Knight Dragon and AEG wanted to understand how any impact from the delivery of the proposed scheme could be mitigated. In particular, they wanted to know how delivery of the proposals would be integrated with the Silvertown Tunnel proposals and other developments/business operations in the area
• AEG and London suburban taxi driver’s coalition wanted taxis to be able to use bus lanes

• Greenwich Millennium Village (GMV) Management Ltd proposed an alternative scheme to meet the aims of the proposals, which was endorsed by the local Residents’ Committee. The proposal is included in Appendix B.

• Millennium Primary School and St Mary Magdalene School both support the proposed changes on safety grounds

Petition objecting to the scheme
A petition against the proposals was submitted by residents of Becquerel Court. The apartments are located next to the North Greenwich bound lane on West Parkside, between the junctions with John Harrison Way and Southern Way. The residents gave six reasons for opposing the proposals, namely that such a scheme:

• Would not improve road safety, but could cause a deterioration
• Would not improve capacity and reliability of bus services
• Would increase noise and vibrations
• Would increase air pollution
• Would increase noise and nuisance from the relocated stop
• Would create inconvenience for residents’ deliveries and vehicle access

A copy of the petition, which explains the reasons provided for these claims, is included in Appendix C.

We respond to the questions and issues raised by consultees during the consultation in a separate document, our Response to issues commonly raised.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction

The Pilot Busway runs in two directions in and out of North Greenwich station, providing a bus-only road connection towards Charlton Retail Park. General traffic runs in two directions along West Parkside, which is a parallel road separated from the busway by a central reservation.

Figure 1: West Parkside and Pilot Busway on Greenwich Peninsula

1.2 Purpose

We proposed to change how the highway could look and operate in the future. The aims of the proposals were:

- To address safety concerns about the existing road layout
- To ensure any changes would continue to deliver a dedicated bus service; and accommodate any new customers from the ongoing North Greenwich development, while maintaining current levels of reliability
- To help resolve land ownership issues around the highway, enabling further construction of the North Greenwich development
1.3 Detailed description

The proposals are shown in high level in Figure 2. Further consultation drawings are available on the consultation website\(^1\). These focus more closely on sections of the proposals at different locations along the road. An example is provided in Figure 3 on page 8.

Figure 2: Proposed new highway design

\(^1\) [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-parkside](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-parkside)
The proposals included:

- Reallocation of existing lanes to create a ‘dual carriageway’ style arrangement, with dedicated 24/7 bus lanes either side of the central reservation
- A change to the road surface at Edmund Halley Way junction, to calm approaching vehicles and reduce the risk of a wrong turn
- Left turn only/no right turn exit from the Pilot Inn access road, as the highway would become one-way
- A new bus stop north-west of the Pilot Inn
- A new pedestrian crossing next to the Pilot Inn access road
- A new junction alignment at John Harrison Way, to reduce crossing distances for pedestrians
- A new controlled pedestrian crossing on the north arm of the John Harrison Way junction
- A change to the road surface at the John Harrison Way junction, to calm traffic
- Relocation of the existing Millennium Village ML bus stop to the other side of the central reservation

We included two options for the way the highway could join Southern Way, as shown in Figure 3 on page 8. Option A included additional signals and two new pedestrian crossings, while Option B would retain the current crossings, but remove the existing signals. Bus services would be quicker with Option B, as it would be uncontrolled.
Figure 3: Option A and Option B for the West Parkside/Southern Way junction

Option A

- New signalised crossing
- Access and parking to be retained
- Bus lanes to join on Southern Way
- Signalised crossing retained

Option B

- New signalised crossing
- Access and parking to be retained
- Bus lanes to join on Southern Way
- Changed from signalised to unsignalised crossing
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2. About the consultation

2.1 Purpose

The objectives of the consultation were:

- To give stakeholders and the public easily-understandable information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- To understand any issues that might affect the proposal of which we were not previously aware
- To understand whether people had a preference for the design of the West Parkside/Southern Way junction
- To understand any concerns
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 Potential outcomes

The potential outcomes of the consultation were:

- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to further develop the scheme during the detailed design phase
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to develop alternatives
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to retain the existing highway arrangement and reject the proposed changes

Our conclusion and next steps are set out in Chapter 4.

2.3 Who we consulted

The consultation sought the views of a range of different groups potentially interested in the proposals, including:

- Local residents and businesses
- Elected representatives
- Diversity and inclusivity groups
- Motoring interest groups
- Transport interest groups
- Black Cab and Private Hire groups
- The emergency services
- Local and other stakeholders
2.4 What we asked

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed changes for West Parkside and Pilot Busway?

2. Do you have a preferred option for the junction with Southern Way?
   - I prefer Option A (Signalised)
   - I prefer Option B (Unsignalised)
   - No preference
   - Neither

3. What is your name?

4. What is your email address?

5. Please provide us with your postcode

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

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

8. Do you use any of the following bus services in North Greenwich? (Tick any/all that apply)
   - 108
   - 129
   - 132
   - 161
   - 188
   - 422
   - 472
   - 486

9. How did you find out about this consultation? (Tick any/all that apply)
   - Received an email from TfL
   - Received a letter from TfL
   - Read about in the press
   - Saw it on the TfL website
   - Social media
   - Other (please specify)
10a. What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)?
   - Very good
   - Good
   - Acceptable
   - Poor
   - Very poor
   - Not Answered

10b. Do you have any further comments about the quality of the consultation?

2.5 Methods of responding

We invited people to respond in one of three ways:
   - By visiting the consultation website and completing the online questionnaire.
   - By emailing comments to consultations@tfl.gov.uk.
   - By writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS

2.6 Consultation materials and publicity

A meeting was held with the GMVA Residents’ Committee in advance of the consultation period on 10 October 2016. The scope of the consultation was explained, together with details on how we planned to engage with the local community and how residents could respond.

On launching the consultation, we sent a letter and map describing the proposals to 1813 addresses on Greenwich Peninsula. A copy of this letter is shown in Appendix D and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix E.

The letters directed the recipients to the consultation website, where consultees could view high level drawings of the proposals and respond to the consultation questionnaire. The address was https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-parkside. To help people understand the drawings, a series of visualisations were produced and published on the consultation website. The consultation drawings and the additional visualisations can still be viewed on the website.

The content of the letter was also emailed to various local and pan-London stakeholders. A list of the stakeholders is provided in Appendix F.

We also emailed customers who use some of the bus services in North Greenwich and who had signed up to receive notifications. The bus services included in the consultation were chosen if they used the Pilot Busway or Edmund Halley Way to enter or exit the bus terminus. A copy of the email is included in Appendix G.

A meeting was held with Knight Dragon on 1 November 2016 to discuss the proposals. Knight Dragon made a number of points, on which they elaborated in their formal response. This is summarised in section 4.2
3. About the respondents

3.1 Number of respondents

The consultation received 488\(^2\) responses from members of the public and seven responses from stakeholders. Not everyone answered every question.

GMV Management Ltd submitted two responses. The second response included an alternative proposal and superseded the earlier contribution at their request. The GMV Association Residents’ Committee also responded twice and the responses have been combined.

The petition from Becquerel Court has been treated as a campaign and counted separately. Some residents who signed the petition also submitted comments individually. These have been counted in the 488 total.

3.2 Who responded

We asked people to describe their relation to the proposals. The results are shown in Figure 4. As consultees were allowed to choose from any relevant multiple choice answer, the percentages exceed 100 per cent.

![Figure 4: Who responded](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you?</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resident</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed locally</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor to the area</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter to the area</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local but interested in the scheme</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question seven asked whether consultees were responding in an official capacity as a stakeholder. Seven stakeholder responses were identified and their comments are summarised in section 4.3.

\(^2\) Four responses were omitted as they were duplications.
We also asked whether any of the consultees used the bus services out of North Greenwich bus station. The results are shown in Figure 5. As consultees were allowed to chose from any relevant multiple choice answer, the percentages exceed 100 per cent.

**Figure 5: Do you use any of the following bus services in North Greenwich?**

![Bus Services Usage Diagram]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 **How respondents heard about the consultation**

We asked how respondents heard about the consultation. The results are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: How did you find out about this consultation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9: How did you find out about this consultation?</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percent of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about in the press</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on the TfL website</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>475</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 **Methods of responding**

The majority of responses from the public were made on the website. We received 448 responses (94 per cent) on the online questionnaire, with 27 emailed responses, (six per cent)
4. Summary of consultation responses

4.1 Summary of responses to Question 1

We asked people whether they had any comments on the proposed changes for West Parkside and Pilot Busway. The main themes are shown in Table 3. A comprehensive summary of all the responses made by members of the public is included in Appendix A.

Table 3: responses to question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any comments on the proposed changes for West Parkside and Pilot Busway?</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good proposal/designs - long overdue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve safety</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a more traditional dual carriageway</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns/ Negative comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that the new layout may lead to more vehicles using West Parkside, with increasing noise/air pollution</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops would be too close to apartments, leading to increased noise/disruption</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses driving closer to apartments</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed layout is dangerous and could lead to accidents</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would lead to longer bus journey times</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes not needed/ waste of time and money</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No details of segregated cycle lanes included in the proposals</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated cycle lanes needed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase frequency at peak times/more buses during O2 events</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow bus lanes to be used by licensed cabs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses should be given priority over other vehicles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Summary of responses to question 2

We included two options for the way the highway would join Southern Way. Option A would be controlled, with two new pedestrian crossings, while Option B would retain the current crossing locations, but remove the existing signals. Bus services would be quicker with Option B, as it would be uncontrolled. We asked consultees whether they had a preference for the design of the junction. The consultation drawing for the consultation is shown in Figure 5 on page 14. The results are shown in Table 4 on page 15.
Table 4 Do you have a preferred option for the junction with Southern Way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer Option A (signalised)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer Option B (unsignalised)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the feedback we received from stakeholders. We used the full responses when analysing comments to inform our decision making.

Matthew Pennycook MP, (Greenwich and Woolwich)
Support was expressed for the proposals. A revision of the existing layout, which is confusing to both motorists and pedestrians, was considered long overdue.

The proposals could have gone further, but given the safety implications of further delay, timely implementation of the proposed reconfiguration was urged.

Greenwich Millennium Village (GMV) Management Ltd
GMV Management Ltd is a resident run management company responsible for the maintenance and management of Phases 1 & 2 Greenwich Millennium Village.

GMV believes the aims of the project can be achieved by other means, while avoiding some of the concerns expressed by local residents. GMV submitted an alternative design, included as Appendix B in this report. The design included:

- Keeping the Pilot Busway as a two-way road
- Installing an emergency access barrier at the junction between West Parkside and Southern Way
- West Parkside would become a no-through road, downgraded to a ‘home zone’ between Southern Way and John Harrison Way
- Access to West Parkside and the O2 would be via Edmund Halley Way
- Access from Pear Tree Way would be via Bugsby’s Way, Millennium Way and Edmund Halley Way

The home zone could be a less formal highway with a shared surface arrangement, utilising different surfacing materials, with no kerbs and incidental planting and other features breaking up the linear nature of the carriageway. This arrangement would be similar to internal access roads elsewhere on GMV. The combined Home Zone and bus route system would look nothing like a traditional dual carriageway and would thus avoid the present confusion – the issue that lies at the centre of the safety concerns.
**GMVA Residents’ Committee**
The Committee endorses the proposal made by GMV Management Ltd. It is also their preferred option.

In the event that option is not approved, they still consider the proposal made by TfL in the consultation, to be preferable to the existing highway layout. Regarding the consultation, the Committee would prefer Option A for the junction with Southern Way. The Committee notes:

- Some residents in Newton Lodge would experience more noise as a result of the relocating the bus lane and existing bus stop
- Concerns about noise are secondary to concerns about safety
- Adequate access to apartments and loading bays should be continued
- The Committee supports a properly phased signalised junction with Southern Way

**Knight Dragon**
**Property developers on Greenwich Peninsula**
Knight Dragon (KD) recognises that TfL are carrying out the consultation for the following reasons and makes comment under each heading as follows:

- **To address safety concerns about the existing road layout**
  KD considers that this is the primary objective of the consultation process. KD wholeheartedly supports the proposed change to a more traditional London road layout with associated changes to junctions, pedestrian crossings, signage and infrastructure.

- **To accommodate additional passengers from the North Greenwich development, while maintaining reliability of bus services**
  KD does not understand the reasoning behind this objective. KD requests further information on some of the assumptions informing the objective.

- **To help resolve land ownership issues around the highway, enabling further construction of the North Greenwich development**
  KD does not fully understand what TfL mean and request more information in relation to this claim.

Other issues:
KD notes that the proposed changes would involve the loss of some car parking spaces from Car Park 1, operated by AEG (The O2). KD would urge TfL to liaise with AEG on the matter of any replacement car parking to ensure the continued sustainable, efficient and effective traffic management of all forms of traffic on Greenwich Peninsula and the adjacent environment.

KD would urge that the proposed measures are implemented as soon as possible to prevent further incidents on the peninsula.
AEG
Owners and operators of the O2 Arena
In principle, AEG supports the proposed changes to West Parkside and Pilot Busway include in the consultation.

AEG has witnessed confusion and poor driver behaviour that the existing layout of West Parkside and Pilot Busway and in particular the junction with Edmund Halley Way can cause.

The junction is not designed to accommodate the volume of traffic and pedestrians the area now receives. AEG strongly welcome a scheme that improves the junction and introduces a dual carriageway on West Parkside. A dual carriageway will provide essential resilience to the Peninsula in managing future traffic demand.

AEG also made additional comments under seven headings:

1. **Realignment of West Parkside**
   The realignment would require the acquisition of a sizable section of Car Park 1 in its north eastern corner. A mitigation package is needed and should be managed in conjunction with ongoing commercial discussions with TfL on Silvertown Tunnel, which are at an advanced stage.

2. **Edmund Halley Way / West Parkside junction**
   It is critical that the pedestrian crossings at the junction are designed to factor the mass movement of pedestrians following an arena event. Pedestrian countdown timers to improve the efficiency and safety of pedestrian flows are strongly recommended.

3. **Car Park 1 and coach park vehicle exits**
   The entry and exit points at Car Park 1 are directly onto West Parkside. It is not clear from the consultation information how the new design of West Parkside will facilitate both northbound and southbound vehicle exits from Car Park 1 and the coach park. AEG would not support a scheme that required all vehicles exiting the car and coach park to travel northbound. This would worsen the congestion currently experienced after arena events.

4. **John Harrison Way / West Parkside**
   On the consultation drawing, vehicle movements from West Parkside are only permitted straight ahead or left through the junction, as indicated by the straight ahead and left arrows. Vehicles travelling southbound on West Parkside from Edmund Halley Way must be permitted to turn right into John Harrison Way. This is a key egress route from The O2 and must be maintained.

5. **Taxis**
   AEG strongly recommend and request that taxis and minicabs are permitted to use the bus lanes during event egress periods. This could significantly reduce vehicle congestion after arena events.
6. **Project timescales / construction period**
   The delivery programme given in the consultation is ambiguous. Given the number of construction projects planned for the Peninsula over the next few years every care must be taken to avoid gridlocked due to multiple roadworks occurring at the same time. It is therefore imperative that this project is carefully planned in close collaboration with AEG, Knight Dragon and the Silvertown Tunnel project team.

7. **General comment**
   AEG welcome face to face discussions with TfL regarding future designs of West Parkside and look forward to contributing during the detailed design stage of the project.

**Millennium Primary School**
The school support the proposals.

The current layout is extremely unsafe and is of great concern to the school, our children and parents. Pedestrians have been involved in serious accidents in the area. The new zebra crossing that was created in response, but is not enough. Having the bus lanes on one half of the central island running in both directions is dangerous and confusing. Children can miss the road signs and crossing the road and it is confusing and difficult to know which direction the traffic is flowing.

Keeping the current road layout is another accident waiting to happen and it must be changed as soon as possible as well as an increase in the signage, which is also essential. Not going ahead with the proposed changes to the peninsula road layout is another serious accident waiting to happen. The changes should and must go ahead.

**St Mary Magdalene CE School**
The school support the proposals.
The proposals would provide a much clearer and safer highway for pedestrians and drivers.

Pilot Inn Access drawing – The proposed new bus stop off the north-east bound carriageway should be moved from the proposed location to before the new signalised pedestrian crossing. This would mean pupils would not get off by the shop area, but the stop by the school. This will keep the traffic moving and be safer for pupils, who would no longer need to cross John Harrison Way.

**London suburban taxi drivers’ coalition**
Taxis can become trapped on West Parkside due to the high volume of private cars leaving events at the O2. Taxi access to Pilot Busway is therefore urgently required.
Metropolitan Police (Traffic Police)
Metropolitan Police supported the proposals saying they would be a major contribution in road safety. The layout would be of a traditional nature and easily understandable for all users.

Metropolitan Police expressed a preference for Option A; the controlled crossings for the junction with Southern Way. Additionally, ‘Give way’ signage should be installed at the junction for the bus lanes.

4.4 Campaigns and petitions

A petition against the proposals was submitted by residents of Becquerel Court. The apartments are located next to the North Greenwich bound lane on West Parkside, between the junctions with John Harrison Way and Southern Way. The residents gave six reasons for opposing the proposals, namely that such a scheme:

- Would not improve road safety, but could cause a deterioration
- Would not improve capacity and reliability of bus services
- Would increase noise and vibrations
- Would increase air pollution
- Would increase noise and nuisance from the relocated stop
- Would create inconvenience for residents’ deliveries and vehicle access

A copy of the petition, which explains the reasons provided for these claims, is included in Appendix C. We considered the reasons given in the petition along with the other issues raised in the consultation. Our responses to specific issues are included in our Response to issues commonly raised. It is our intention that the local community are involved in the development of the final design, to help protect and strengthen the ‘village character’ of the area.

4.5 Comments on the consultation

We routinely ask respondents for feedback on how we consult, so that we can continue to develop how we consult in the future. Question 10a asked a closed question about what respondents thought about the quality of the consultation and the results as shown in Figure 6.
We also asked for comments on the consultation to help us develop our consultation processes. The results are shown in Appendix H.
## Appendix A: Analysis of public comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally supportive</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good proposal/designs - long overdue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Parkside and Pilot Busway improvements will improve safety</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a more traditional dual carriageway</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads will be less confusing to pedestrians and motorists</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would mean bus service improvement</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced delays at the junction with Edmund Halley Way</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation of buses and pedestrian access</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to the bus station</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced congestion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced delays to buses at Pilot Inn traffic lights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to John Harrison Way Junction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of proposed new stops (general)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the banned right turn from the Pilot Inn access road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus stops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to a new stop north-west of the Pilot Inn</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to having stops close to the O2, as likely to be congested</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough bus stops along the route from Millennium Village to the O2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Layout/design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed layout is dangerous and could lead to accidents</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current layout has led to one death and one serious injury</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed layout is confusing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of small islands/pinch points for pedestrian safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to any road surface changes/raised walkways</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on residents/local area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes not needed/waste of time and money</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliveries/School drop-offs would be negatively impacted as there won't be anywhere to stop briefly on the dual carriageway</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New housing/business developments in the area will lead to increase road usage/pollution/congestion</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of the village feel to the area, due to dual carriageway being too close to apartments</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of privacy as bus lane/stops too close to apartments leading to poor quality of life</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety in the entire Peninsula has not been addressed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for residents/emergency/maintenance vehicles would be compromised</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic/congestion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses going up the carriageway intersecting with cars turning left into John Harrison Way will cause delays/congestion</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion going into/exiting Blackwall Tunnel will get worse</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy traffic/pollution around Millennium &amp; St Mary Magdalen schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing traffic congestion in the area is not addressed/rectified by the proposed changes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative – general comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer bus journey time would result from the proposals</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The busway/bus lanes vital &amp; should be maintained</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans not progressive enough. (Lack of segregated cycle lanes; only appears to be a temporary solution to the congestion; no provision for future traffic; more creative ideas should have been considered e.g. bridges, walk-ways)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorists being favoured over bus users/pedestrians</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to changes opening up West Parkside to general traffic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed junction between East Parkside &amp; John Harrison too narrow thus unsafe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer waiting times at bus stops, especially when leaving O2 events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed layout: No right turn from the north bound West Parkside into the Pilot Inn car park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula residents being favoured over North Greenwich Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns from people who were neutral about the proposals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocating bus stops too close to apartments would lead to increased noise/disruption for residents</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocating the bus lane would mean buses driving closer to apartments, bringing noise/pollution closer to residents</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over access to car parking especially the disabled car park if the North Greenwich station entrance is moved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual carriageway would bring extra traffic would negatively impact the Greenwich Peninsula Ecology Park and/or the village</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about delays/congestion during construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the scope of this consultation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comment/suggestion bus routes in the area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong justification given for these proposals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict enforcement of double yellow parking lines required if this is to work</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further request for Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions arising from the proposals</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further details requested about the proposals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated cycle lanes needed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase bus frequency at peak times/more buses during O2 events</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow bus lanes to be used by licensed cabs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses should be given priority over other vehicles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclude Black Cabs/ Install CCTV Cameras (bus lanes)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues can be resolved by better signalling instead of the proposed plans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Parkside should be buses only, apart from access to the Pilot Inn.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/introduce speed bumps/part-time signals/congestion charging to control traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus lane should be 24/7hr to avoid use by other vehicles, which would cause congestion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic lights at the Peninsula should give priority to buses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen pavements to improve safety &amp; comfort of pedestrians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any new layout needs to allow all traffic/buses/passengers/O2 visitors to flow more easily</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep road as it is but improve bus stops and pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide loading bays/safe drop-off points in front of the residential buildings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal parking/bushes at the end of John Harrison way need sorting out</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Edmund Halley Way/West Parkside junction a Yellow Box Junction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce traffic speed in this area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidy up the road layout on Commercial Way, Greenwich</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve the current trees along West Parkside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spaces need to be well maintained</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the GMV area pollution free (Noise and Diesel)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use brick on the new surface for the crossing on Edmund Halley Way</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Alternative scheme proposed by GMV Management Ltd

West Parkside: Local access only
An alternative to a four-lane highway on the Peninsula

West Parkside: Local access only' is a community-proposed alternative to the proposals currently being consulted upon by Transport for London. Our alternative solution addresses legitimate safety concerns, by downgrading West Parkside to a ‘Home Zone’ standard – reducing its usage to local access only, and making sure that it is not mistaken for a dual carriageway by drivers and pedestrians.

Our proposal also minimises negative impacts on privacy and noise levels for residents of the buildings immediately adjacent to West Parkside, and maintains access to the existing laybys. The local community feels that ‘West Parkside: Local access only’ will lead to a more pedestrian-friendly environment, contributing to the village feel originally intended for Greenwich Peninsula.

TfL-proposed realignment of dedicated two-way bus route / bus station loop
Existing dedicated two-way bus route retained
Community-proposed no-through road, downgraded to access only ‘Home Zone’ standard
Community-proposed emergency only access barrier at Southern Way / West Parkside
Opportunity for further downgrading to ‘Home Zone’ standard
Appendix C: Petition from Becquerel Court

On 24th October, we received Transport for London (TfL) proposal to make changes to the road layout of West Parkside, with part of the proposal considering the changes to the dual bus lane layout. The proposal claims to improve pedestrian safety and the bus service capacity without adversely impacting the journey times and reliability.

You stated that the project is currently in its initial stage and there is no business case yet that can outline full cost and benefit analysis and impact on residents as well as consideration of other alternative solutions. After consultation with stakeholders, we assume that large infrastructural projects like this one will consider and evaluate all the effects, both monetary and non-monetary affecting the well-being of residents, potential new risks and the environment. And will proceed only where the benefits will outweigh all the costs.

With this letter, we STRONGLY OPPOSE to the part of your proposal that suggests relocating the northbound bus lane close to residential buildings of Greenwich Millennium Village (“GMV”) along the West Parkside and below we list the risks and costs that in our opinion it will bring to affected residents.

In our view, relocating the northbound bus lane closer to the GMV residential blocks:

1. WILL NOT IMPROVE THE ROAD SAFETY BUT CAN DETERIORATE IT. - Road and pedestrian safety can be addressed in various ways, for example by introducing the lower speed limit, building more pelican/zebra crossings, installing traffic cameras or better enforcement. We are not clear how changing the bus lane layout can be considered as an effective safety solution. If buses will mix with general traffic, the road crossing will become more dangerous as pedestrians must watch for both buses and cars at the same time. In addition, the new road layout will introduce potential new risk areas (see the map attached3).

2. WILL NOT IMPROVE CAPACITY AND RELIABILITY OF BUS SERVICES. - We are not clear how relocating the bus lane and placing it alongside the general traffic can improve capacity and reliability of bus services. Surely the dedicated and uninterrupted dual bus lane can ensure free flow of buses as compared to a ‘traditional’ traffic sharing bus lane which will be interrupted in multiple spots (e.g. near the traffic light turning into John Harrison way or to allow deliveries for residents via maintaining the current access to the West Parkside). One car parked on a bus lane (for example to unload a delivery) will be enough to cause traffic chaos and delays during rush hour. The current layout of dedicated dual bus lanes provides significant advantage over traditional bus lanes as it allows unrestricted and timely flow of bus services irrespective of general traffic conditions. Alternative solutions like increased number of buses with higher frequency of service running on as much dedicated and uninterrupted bus lane as possible and/or renewing the bus fleet to reduce delays associated with technical faults and breakdowns can be more effective to improve the bus services.

3 Drawing included on page 26.
3. **WILL INCREASE THE NOISE AND VIBRATIONS.** - There are 6 bus routes passing through the West Parkside - that's a bus almost every minute on average especially during the rush hour. The reason the width restriction was placed at the end of West Parkside was to reduce the noise from large vehicles and therefore address the nuisance it used to cause. It looks like your proposal does not reconcile with the aim of noise reduction. This is not a working district – it is a residential village that is designed for a **safe and nuisance free** living. Research by the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) on attitudes to noise reveals that traffic is one of the most commonly reported sources of noise in the UK. Engine noise and tyre vibrations are the main causes of traffic noise. If it unreasonably interferes with the enjoyment of land, it can be treated as a private or public nuisance in common law.

4. **WILL INCREASE AIR POLLUTION.** – Higher vehicle emissions outside and inside the apartments with **increase the risks of health to the residents.** Diesel vehicles have higher emissions of NOx and particulate matter. **High levels of exposure to NOx have been linked with increased hospital admissions due to respiratory problems,** while long-term exposure may affect lung function and increase the response to allergens in sensitive people. NOx also contributes to smog formation, and acid rain, can damage vegetation, contributes to ground-level ozone formation and can react in the atmosphere to form fine particles ('secondary particles'). Particulate matter is associated with respiratory and cardiovascular problems.

5. **WILL INCREASE NOISE AND NUISANCE FROM THE RELOCATED BUS STOP.** - The relocated bus stop will turn a peaceful residential pavement next to our blocks into a noisy street with more litter.

6. **WILL CREATE INCONVENIENCE FOR RESIDENTS' DELIVERIES AND VEHICLE ACCESS.** – It is not clear how vehicle access will be provided for parking, loading and unloading if there is a continuous bus lane along the whole of the West Parkside.

In summary, we do not see the connection between the proposed changes to the dual bus lane and expected improvements in safety and bus services. **Unfortunately, we only see higher disturbance, risks and inconvenience to affected GMV residents if the bus lane is relocated.**

We are grateful for recent safety improvements like the reduction of speed limit to 20mph and the new pedestrian crossing with no accidents happening since.

We hope you will take our views on board and we urge you to reconsider the part of your proposal associated with changing the bus lane layout at GMV.

We will be happy to discuss this or any other alternative proposal.
Appendix D: Consultation letter

Transport for London

The Occupier

24 October 2016

Dear Sir or Madam

Have your say on proposed changes to West Parkside/Pilot Busway, in North Greenwich

In partnership with Greenwich Council, we are consulting on proposals to improve West Parkside and the Pilot Busway in North Greenwich. The consultation will run until 4 December 2016 and we would like to hear your views.

The proposals aim to address safety concerns about the current operation of the highway. We propose replacing the existing road layout with two one-way traffic lanes, separated by a central reservation. Bus services would continue along dedicated lanes, but would run either side of the central reservation. There would also be new signalised pedestrian crossings and new and relocated bus stops. The road changes would mean the motorists exiting the Pilot Inn access road would only be able to turn left onto West Parkside.

A summary drawing is provided overleaf, with more detailed drawings available online or on request.

To find out more and respond to the consultation, please see our website at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/west-parkside. You can also email your comments or ask us any questions at consultations@tfl.gov.uk.

If you do not have access to the internet, you can request paper copies of the consultation by writing to ‘FREEPOST Tfl Consultations’.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Yours faithfully

Edward Rees
Consultation team
Appendix E: Letter distribution area

The 7 October letter was delivered to 1387 addresses within the boarder below
Appendix F: List of stakeholders consulted

House of Commons
Clive Efford MP
Andrew Jones MP
Teresa Pearce MP
Matthew Pennycook MP

London Assembly members
Gareth Bacon AM
Kemi Badenoch AM
Shaun Bailey AM
Sian Berry AM
Andrew Boff AM
Len Duvall AM
Claire Hamilton AM
Nicky Gavron AM
David Kurten AM
Joanne McCartney AM
Caroline Pidgeon AM
Caroline Russell AM
Fiona Twycross AM
Peter Whittle AM

Diversity and inclusivity groups
Action on Hearing Loss (formerly RNID)
Age UK
Alzheimer's Society
Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance
British Dyslexia Association
Disability Alliance
Disability Rights UK
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Greater London Forum for the Elderly
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)
Joint Mobility Unit
London Older People's Strategy Group
MIND
National Children’s Bureau
Royal National institute for the Blind (RNIB)
Sense
Sixty Plus
Stroke Association
Motoring organisations
Automobile A
British Motorcyclists’ Federation
Motorcycle Action Group

Transport interest groups
Better Transport
Campaign for Better Transport
Confederation of Passenger Transport
London TravelWatch
London Omnibus Traction Society

Black Cab/Private Hire groups
Licenced Taxi Drivers Association
London Cab Drivers Club
London Suburban Taxi-drivers’ Coalition

Emergency Services
London Ambulance Service
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
Metropolitan Police Service

Local stakeholders
AEG (O2 Arena)
Greenwich Millennium Village Management Ltd
Greenwich Millennium Village Residents’ Committee
Greenwich Society
Knight Dragon
Millennium Primary School
St Mary Magdalene CE School

Other stakeholders
Central London NHS Trust
Department for Transport For London
Institute of Civil Engineers (London)
Living Streets
London Councils
National Grid
NHS Care Commissioning Group
RMT
Royal Mail
Royal Parks
Sustrans
Thames Water
Unions Together
Unite
Appendix G: Email to bus customers

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Plan journey</th>
<th>Status update</th>
<th>Driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Dear Internal TfL recipient,

We would like your views on proposals to improve West Parkside and the Pilot Busway in North Greenwich.

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

The proposals include creating a dual carriageway with bus lanes, as well as providing new pedestrian crossings. These would help to improve safety.

This consultation will run until Sunday 4 December.

Yours sincerely,

Sam Monck
Head of Borough Projects and Programmes

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

Copyright in the contents of this email and its attachments belongs to Transport for London. Any unauthorised usage will infringe that copyright. © Transport for London

Click here to report this email as SPAM.
# Appendix H: Analysis of comments on the quality of the consultation

## Positive comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate being consulted</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good maps/artist's impressions</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information given was clear &amp; concise</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice to have a separate comment box to specifically discuss the Southern Way options</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website explanation was clear and concise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Negative comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information provided not detailed enough</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps could have been clearer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the email sent to bus users about the consultation was misleading</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sceptical as to whether public views will be taken seriously</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of impact analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision already made</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough options given</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation not widely publicised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals too complex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questionnaire is not intuitive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link provided leads to a website that doesn't seem to have anything to do with bus timetable projections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale behind Signal options should have been provided on the questionnaire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison maps would be useful</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation should have included information on how changes will affect local buses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include audio commentary/video presentation on the website</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on whether taxis should use the bus lanes should have been included</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key schemes like this should include a CLOŚ and PERS assessment /a healthy streets score</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of the area should have been larger on the website or have a zoom function</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information on affected bus routes would be useful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A shorter email with relevant links would be preferable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL should have held face to face/ group consultations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 CLOŚ - Cycling Level of Service tools  
5 PERS - Pedestrian Environment Review System' is a walking audit tool