14 Summary & conclusions

14.1 Introduction
14.1.1 This final chapter draws out the key points from the analysis of the consultation responses and explains how the consultation findings will be used, including the next steps that will be undertaken by TfL.

14.2 Summary of key points
14.2.1 This section summarises:
- The overall response to the consultation
- The key points identified in the previous chapters in response to each of the closed and open consultation questions 5 to 19
- In addition to the findings of the free-format responses from members of the public and
- The findings of the free-format responses from stakeholders

14.2.2 Overall response
14.2.3 A total of 15,346 consultation responses were received, via questionnaire responses, emails and letters and 'campaign cards', during the consultation period of 30 September 2014 to 7 December 2014. Completed questionnaires account for the largest proportion of responses (93%), with campaign cards comprising the second highest return (5%). Free-format letters and emails from both stakeholders and members of the public account for 3% of all responses.

14.2.4 The majority of responses to the questionnaire (99%) were received from members of the public. The remaining 1% of responses were received from stakeholders.

14.2.5 A range of stakeholders contributed to the consultation, including businesses, political stakeholders, London boroughs, resident / community groups, transport stakeholders, campaign groups, the health sector and several heritage, environment, water and waste stakeholders.

14.2.6 A total of 10,068 valid postcodes were given (out of 15,346 total consultation responses). 96% of respondents are based within the Greater London area. The postcode data was further broken down to establish the proportion of questionnaire respondents by London borough. This shows that the boroughs with the greatest proportion of respondents are Southwark (28%), Lewisham (27%) and Bromley (20%), together accounting for three-quarters (75%) of all questionnaire responses. Lambeth (8%) and Greenwich (4%) are also represented.

14.2.7 Questionnaire responses
14.2.8 Questionnaire responses account for 93% (or 14,248) of all consultation responses. The following sections detail the key findings of the analysis.

14.2.9 A summary of responses to the closed questions (with the exception of Question 7 which has a different response scale) is provided in Figure 14-1. Figure 14-2 presents the findings of Question 7.
14.2.10 For each question, with the exception of Question 13 (Do you support the proposed extension terminating at Lewisham?), the majority of respondents are in support of the option posed. The topic of terminating at Lewisham had 40% opposing the proposals and 30% in support (28% neither support nor oppose).
14.2.11 The majority of respondents are in support of the proposals in principle (Question 5: 96% of all respondents either strongly support or support). The same is true of stakeholders (95% support/strongly support). This majority dips when considering the proposals in relation to enabling new development (Question 7: 82% of all respondents and 86% of stakeholders answered ‘yes’).

14.2.12 For each closed question, geographic distribution figures were generated to show the location of respondents (using valid postcodes provided) who support, oppose or neither support nor oppose the proposals within each question. A general theme noted from these figures is that larger clusters of support (a concentration of respondents within a certain area) are seen in close proximity to the section / element of the proposals being questioned. For example, for Option 1a the largest cluster of supportive respondents is seen in close proximity to the proposed route along the Old Kent Road, and for Option 1b the largest cluster is seen in proximity to the Camberwell route.

**Question 5: Do you support, in principle, the extension of the Bakerloo line into southeast London from its current end point at Elephant & Castle? (closed question)**

14.2.13 The majority of respondents (96%) stated that they either strongly support (91%) or support (5%) the extension in principal, with 1% neither supporting nor opposing the proposals. Of all respondents, 2% either oppose or strongly oppose the proposals.

14.2.14 The postcode distribution for strongly support or support responses, as shown in Figure 5-2, shows a wide geographical spread of support across the Greater London area for the principle of extending the Bakerloo line. Denser concentrations of support noted in the boroughs of Southwark, Lewisham and Bromley in proximity to the proposed extension.

**Question 6: Please use this space for any further views / comments on the above question (open question)**

14.2.15 With regard to Question 6, 7,901 respondents provided a valid response, which represents just over half of all respondents (55%). These open response comments have been coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 5.

14.2.16 The largest proportion of strongly support or support responses (5,332 responses) focused on issues related to connectivity, 16% commented on issues regarding crowding and congestion. Around 10% of comments gave positive feedback about route preference, with 9% of respondents stating that they prefer extension Option 1b (via Camberwell and Peckham Rye), compared to 2% of respondents who expressed their preference for Option 1a (via the Old Kent Road). One percent of respondents recommended that both extension routes should be implemented.

14.2.17 Other frequently mentioned themes included regeneration and development (8% of all comments), project cost, construction and timescale (5%) and the economic impact of the extension (5%). A number of comments (5%) came from respondents suggesting additional or alternative destinations which could be served by the extension.

**Question 7: One of the key purposes of the proposed extension is to enable new development in southeast London. It is unlikely the scheme can happen without this new development. Do you support the proposed extension on this basis? (closed question)**

14.2.18 The results show that 82% of respondents support the extension on this basis, with a further 10% stating ‘maybe’ and with 5% stating that they do not support the extension on this basis.
Question 8: Please use this space for any further views / comments on the above question (open question)

14.2.19 With regard to Question 8, 4,178 respondents provided a valid response (29% of all respondents). Comments were coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 7. Nearly two-thirds (66%) of responses were given by those who support the extension on the basis of new development, 10% relate to those who oppose, and 24% to those who neither support nor oppose the extension on this basis.

14.2.20 Overall, the largest proportion of comments from those in support of the extension on the basis of enabling development referred to the particular location and type of development (~40%). A fifth of all supportive comments) expressed general support for new development. The question also generated a number of comments (16%) on the economy and regeneration.

Question 9: One possible route option could be along the Old Kent Road to New Cross Gate and Lewisham (Option 1a). Do you support a route along the Old Kent Road? (closed question)

14.2.21 Almost half of respondents (49%) either support or strongly support extension Option 1a, while a fifth (21%) oppose or strongly oppose this option. A further 29% expressed that they neither support nor oppose.

Question 10: Do you have any further views / comments on the above option? (open question)

14.2.22 With regard to Question 10, 3,732 respondents provided a valid response (26% of all respondents). Comments were coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 9. The largest proportion of comments to Question 10 were from those respondents who indicated that they either Option 1a.

14.2.23 Overall, the largest proportion of supportive comments (22% of the total) focused on issues related to public transport provision while 19% commented on issues regarding the need for investment and development locally. Around 13% of comments provided general comments on route preferences. Other frequently mentioned themes included congestion (13%) and connectivity (8%). A number (4%) of comments came from respondents commenting on potential route or destination alternatives, and making suggestions as to the most appropriate interchange points. Many commented on the potential benefits of the line extension to those who live, work and socialise along the proposed Underground route (3%).

14.2.24 With regard to the opposing comments, 29% related to public transport, 18% to connectivity issues and 15% were more general sentiments on route preference. A further 13% of comments were comparisons with / reasons for preferring Option 1b.

Question 11: Another possible option would be a route via Camberwell and Peckham Rye to New Cross Gate and Lewisham (Option 1b). Do you support a route via Camberwell and Peckham Rye? (closed question)

14.2.25 Nearly two-thirds (64%) either support or strongly support extension Option 1b, while just 9% oppose or strongly oppose this option. A further 26% expressed that they neither support nor oppose.

14.2.26 There is a higher level of support for Option 1b than 1a (64% support compared to 49%).
Question 12: Do you have any further views / comments on the above option? (open question)

14.2.27 With regard to Question 12, 4,757 respondents provided a valid response (33% of all respondents). Comments were coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 11.

14.2.28 Of those who provided a response, the majority (71%) either strongly support or support Option 1b. The key recurring theme in these comments was connectivity (37% of the total). Concerns about congestion accounted for 16% of all comments, while a similar number took the opportunity to confirm the route option they prefer (16%). Other frequently mentioned themes included demand (10% of all comments), investment / development (8%) and other route suggestions (6%).

14.2.29 With regard to the comments given by those who do not support Option 1b, 49% of the total focused on issues related to connectivity. Other frequently mentioned themes included route suggestions (17% of all comments) and investment / development (12%).

Question 13: We are currently considering options for where the proposed extension may end. Do you support the proposed extension terminating at Lewisham? (closed question)

14.2.30 Overall, 30% of respondents either support or strongly support terminating at Lewisham, while 40% of respondents either oppose or strongly oppose this option. A further 28% expressed that they neither support nor oppose.

Question 14: Do you have any further views / comments on the above option? (open question)

14.2.31 With regard to Question 14, 4,690 respondents provided a valid response (33% of all respondents). Comments were coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 13.

14.2.32 The majority of those who provided comment at Question 14 are opposed to the Bakerloo line extension terminating at Lewisham. Overall, 22% of those who provided a comment support the termination of the extension at Lewisham, while 62% are opposed.

14.2.33 With regard to the comments given by those who expressed support for the Lewisham terminus, the largest proportion of comments (500 comments, or 27% of the total) were supportive, but with recommendations or concerns. Seventeen percent of respondents suggested that it could go on to serve other areas. Respondents concerns included the loss of the Hayes National Rail service (6%) and the loss of connections to London rail termini (3%). Fifteen percent of the comments expressed general support for the proposal, while 13% recommended an alternative destination to be served by the extension.

14.2.34 The comments given by those who oppose the extension terminating at Lewisham included suggestions of alternative destinations (21% of all comments), as well as general opposing comments (19%). Other themes included questioning the need to go to Lewisham (13%), and support for the core extension proposal (i.e. going beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction) - 8%.

Question 15: Do you support the proposed extension terminating at Beckenham Junction and Hayes? (closed question)

14.2.35 Over half of all respondents (56%) either support or strongly support the extension to Hayes and Beckenham Junction, while 11% of respondents either oppose or strongly oppose the extension. Nearly a third (31%) expressed that they neither support nor oppose.
14.2.36 When compared to the level of support for the extension terminating at Lewisham (30%), a greater proportion of respondents are supportive of the extension terminating at Beckenham Junction and Hayes (56%).

**Question 16: Do you have any further views / comments on the above option? (open question)**

14.2.37 With regard to Question 16, 3,453 respondents provided a valid response (24% of all respondents). Comments were coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 15.

14.2.38 Over 60% of the comments were given by those in support of the proposal to terminate the Bakerloo line extension at Hayes and Beckenham Junction, while 21% were opposed, and 16% neither support nor oppose.

14.2.39 Nearly 30% of all coded comments expressed support for the extension to Beckenham Junction and Hayes, while a similar proportion commented on connectivity benefits (28%). Other themes included responses regarding congestion and crowding (9%), the route itself (7%), economy and regeneration (7%) and project costs and timescales (6%).

14.2.40 Nearly half of all comments given by those who are opposed at Question 15, were reasons for opposing the extension terminating at Beckenham Junction and Hayes (44%). Other recurring themes included connectivity issues (9%), project costs and timescales (8%), and suggestions of other destinations that could be served by the extension (8%).

**Question 17: There is also the potential for the Bakerloo line to be extended beyond Beckenham Junction, in a new tunnel, to Bromley town centre. Do you support an extension to Bromley town centre? (closed question)**

14.2.41 The analysis shows that 61% of respondents either support or strongly support extending to Bromley town centre, with 8% of respondents either opposed or strongly opposed to this option. A further 31% expressed that they neither support nor oppose.

**Question 18: Do you have any further views / comments on the above option? (open question)**

14.2.42 With regard to Question 18, 3,359 respondents provided a valid response (24% of all respondents). Comments were coded into a series of themes and comment codes according to whether the respondent indicated a positive response, negative response or neither supported nor opposed at Question 17. The majority of comments (70%) were given by those who support the Bromley town centre option.

14.2.43 The most frequent theme in the supportive responses is the economic / benefits / regeneration (33%) which would occur if the Bakerloo line is extended to Bromley. Other themes included connectivity (27%) and stated preference (12%), where 15% of respondents in support of the proposals expressed the belief that the extension is a good idea / beneficial to the respondent.

14.2.44 Of those who were in opposition at Question 17, the largest proportion of responses (28%) focused on issues related to connectivity. Other common themes included the reason for not supporting the extension (14%), stating preference (negative – 13%) and scheme cost (13%).

**Question 19: Are there any other options or routes you think we should consider to support growth and increase public transport accessibility in southeast London? (open question)**

14.2.45 In total, some 4,464 respondents provided a valid response at Question 19. Comments ranged from specific route and location suggestions for the Bakerloo line to wider discussion of other routes and
public transport infrastructure across London. Twenty-seven themes were identified for comments to be coded to.

14.2.46 Over half of all comments (59%) refer to the Bakerloo line specifically, while 14% refer to rail (Overground, National Rail and Crossrail), 12% to other Underground provision, 11% to other transit systems (DLR, tram and buses) and 4% to other infrastructure, including roads and cycling provision.

14.2.47 Within the Bakerloo line theme, a significant number of respondents gave suggestions on where the Bakerloo line extension should go (82% of comments coded within this theme). Of these, 141 respondents suggested building both Options 1a and 1b, as well as providing links to Streatham (152), Orpington (129), Blackheath (115) and Hither Green (114).

Closed question responses from stakeholders

14.2.48 The vast majority (95%) of stakeholders expressed support or strong support for the principle of extending the Bakerloo line into southeast London from its current end point at Elephant & Castle (Question 5). The majority (86%) of stakeholders stated that they support the extension on the basis that it would enable new development in southeast London (i.e. answered ‘yes’ to Question 7).

14.2.49 Just over half of all stakeholders (53%) support / strongly support the principle of extending the Bakerloo line via Option 1a, the Old Kent Road (Question 9). Stakeholders expressed a slightly higher level of support (59%) for extending the Bakerloo line via Option 1b, Camberwell and Peckham Rye (Question 11).

14.2.50 Stakeholder opinions on terminating the extension at Lewisham are polarised with 38% opposed/strongly opposed (Question 13). Stakeholders are more supportive of the extension terminating at Beckenham Junction and Hayes: 58% support/strongly support this option (Question 15).

14.2.51 Stakeholders expressed a similar level of support for the extension going beyond Beckenham Junction to Bromley town centre in a new tunnel with 57% supporting this option (Question 17).

Free-format responses from members of the public

14.2.52 In total, 342 free-format responses from members of the public were received by a variety of mediums, including email, letter and telephone call. Responses ranged from short one-line or single paragraph responses to multi-page detailed assessments. Comments were coded into 11 main themes and 152 comment codes. Many comments covered multiple issues and as such were assigned multiple codes; in total 1,224 codes were assigned to the free-format responses.

14.2.53 Overall, the largest proportion of comments (348 comments, or 28% of the total) were comments related to the extension options. Three hundred and thirty-seven comments (28%) state their support or opposition of the extension. Issues of connectivity and congestion / crowding represented 12% and 10% of all comments, respectively. Other themes mentioned included journey impact / capacity / frequency (6%), regeneration / housing / economic impact (5%) and project cost, construction and timescales (2%).

Free-format responses from stakeholders

14.2.54 Detailed responses were submitted by 41 different stakeholders, including political stakeholders, London boroughs, campaign groups, residents’ groups, transport and heritage, environment, water and waste stakeholders, the health sector and business representatives.

14.2.55 Stakeholders support the opportunity to improve public transport infrastructure in southeast London. The majority of stakeholders support the proposed extension of the Bakerloo line from its current
terminus at Elephant & Castle, though their views on the route the extension should take vary. Several stakeholders support building both Options 1a (via the Old Kent Road) and 1b (via Camberwell / Peckham Rye), and extending beyond Lewisham to Beckenham Junction and Hayes (the core extension proposal) as well as Option 2 (an additional extension to Bromley town centre).

14.2.56 Where stakeholders are opposed to the extension of the Bakerloo line beyond Lewisham, the main reasons given relate to the loss of direct rail services on existing National Rail lines, increased journey times and capacity / crowding issues.

14.2.57 Disappointment is also expressed that Streatham does not feature in the proposed route options.

14.3 The next steps

14.3.1 TfL is currently conducting detailed assessment of the consultation results in order to understand all the issues that have been raised by respondents. This includes addressing the key issues raised regarding the proposed extension and its associated options.

14.3.2 A ‘Responses to issues raised’ document will be published later in 2015 which will address these issues.

14.3.3 Also as part of TfL’s next phase of work, TfL will be working with the London boroughs, through which a proposed extension may run, to identify possible funding options. As the consultation materials stated, any funding package is likely to include contributions from new residential and commercial developments along the proposed extension. It is unlikely the extension can happen without this new development.

14.3.4 The outcome of further investigations (including the consultation analysis) and development work will enable TfL to produce a revised list of route options. Further public consultation, including more detailed proposals, is expected to occur in 2016.

14.3.5 Regarding current timelines, completion of the proposed scheme is estimated to be early to mid 2030s. This is subject to a number of factors, however, including future public consultation on revised route options and acquiring planning consent and funding confirmation.