

HERNE HILL JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS,  
LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH

Design & Access Statement  
For Friends of Brockwell Park Scheme

April 2009

IMA-08-088

## CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Scope of Report .....	1
2	SITE DESCRIPTION AND CONSENTED IMPROVEMENTS.....	2
2.1	Introduction.....	2
2.2	Existing Herne Hill Junction .....	2
2.3	Local Planning Policy Context .....	3
2.4	Consented Lambeth Scheme.....	3
3	DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION .....	6
3.1	Introduction.....	6
3.2	Evolution of the FoBP Scheme.....	6
3.3	Issues Raised in TNS Site Safety Assessment .....	7
3.4	Issues Raised at Meeting of 24 <sup>th</sup> January 2009 .....	8
3.5	Examination of Technical Issues .....	8
3.6	Current FoBP Scheme.....	10
4	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	13
4.1	Summary.....	13
4.2	Conclusions.....	14

## PLANS

Plan D&A-1	-	Red Line Plan
Plan D&A-2	-	The Proposed FoBP Scheme
Plan D&A-3	-	Visibility onto Slip-Road

## APPENDICES

Appendix D&A-1	-	Decision Notice & LBL Plan PA3 (Consented Scheme)
Appendix D&A-2	-	Highway Works Appraisal by IMA Transport Planning (September 2008)
Appendix D&A-3	-	Consideration of the Design & Access Statement and Associated Documents by IMA Transport Planning (October 2008)
Appendix D&A-4	-	Site Safety Assessment by TMS (December 2008)
Appendix D&A-5	-	Plan 1000-1 from LHA

- 1 Introduction
- 1.1 Background
  - 1.1.1 IMA Transport Planning Ltd has been commissioned by the Friends of Brockwell Park to provide supporting information for a planning application to improve the junction of Dulwich Road with Norwood Road in the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - 1.1.2 The junction improvement scheme proposed involves a minor variation from planning applications 07/03341/RG3 & 07/03741/CON which were submitted by the London Borough of Lambeth in September 2007 and approved in June 2008.
  - 1.1.3 The consented scheme is intended to improve facilities at the junction for all road users and involves constructing a slip-road between Norwood Road and Dulwich Road, requiring land to be taken from the north eastern corner of Brockwell Park.
  - 1.1.4 The Friends of Brockwell Park (FoBP) support the principle of the junction improvement, but believe that there is an alternative scheme that meets all of the objectives of the consented Lambeth scheme while reducing the amount of land take from Brockwell Park.
  - 1.1.5 The land required to implement the proposal, excluding highway land, is shown in Plan D&A-1 and has an area of 630m<sup>2</sup> (0.0063 hectares).
- 1.2 Scope of Report
  - 1.2.1 This report has been produced on behalf of a community group, and therefore to minimise costs, and to reflect the fact that this proposal represents a minor departure from the consented scheme, the supporting information focuses on identifying the differences between the two schemes, and addresses specific issues raised by Local Highway Authority (LHA) officers during consultation over the alternative proposals.
  - 1.2.2 Section 2 describes existing conditions, sets the local planning policy context and then explains the consented scheme, drawing on work from the original Design & Access Statement.
  - 1.2.3 Section 3 describes how the FoBP scheme has evolved through consultation with the LHA to provide an overall improvement relative to the consented scheme that also meets local planning policy more fully.
  - 1.2.4 Section 4 summarises the report and draws conclusions.

## 2 Site Description and Consented Improvements

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The consented Lambeth scheme was supported by a Design Statement that incorporated technical work carried out MVA Consultancy on behalf of the council, in a document appended to the Design Statement titled Designing the Future: Herne Hill Junction Improvements.

2.1.2 This section draws on the MVA work to describe existing conditions and the key aspects of the consented Lambeth scheme.

### 2.2 Existing Herne Hill Junction

2.2.1 The Herne Hill junction is a complex arrangement where the A215 Norwood Road/Herne Hill and the A2214 Dulwich Road/Half Moon Lane cross one another under a railway bridge, with the B222 Milkwood Lane and the B223 Railton Road also joining the junction either side of the railway bridge.

2.2.2 All 6 approaches to this junction are controlled by traffic signals. It is reported that the junction is prone to congestion, which impacts on the reliability of the 7 bus services routed through the junction.

2.2.3 Some, but not all, of the junction arms have controlled crossings for pedestrians. MVA describe the junction as intimidating for pedestrians and cyclists.

2.2.4 MVA produced computer models (using TRANSYT software from the Transport Research Laboratory) for the existing junction, with headline results as follows on each approach:

Norwood Road: Exceeds capacity in the AM peak

Dulwich Road: Remains within capacity

Railton Road: Reaches capacity in the PM peak

Milkwood Road: Approaching capacity in the PM peak

Herne Hill: Approaching capacity in the PM peak

Half Moon Lane: Approaching capacity in the AM peak

2.2.5 MVA validated their models against observations on site, and apart from exaggerated queue lengths where links exceed capacity (a feature of the software), the model appears to be a good reflection of actual conditions.

2.2.6 While several of the approaches are nearing capacity in the PM peak period, the resultant queuing does not appear excessive. The queues on Norwood Road in the AM peak are large, but not sufficient to block the upstream junction with the A2199 Croxted Road.

## 2.3 Local Planning Policy Context

2.3.1 The Lambeth Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP, adopted August 2007) sets out a variety of specific improvements proposed around the borough. Section 5.6 deals with Herne Hill, and Policy 67 reads as follows (the policy number was 59 in an earlier draft):

### Policy 67 Herne Hill District Centre

‘Improvement of traffic and environmental conditions in central Herne Hill, in addition to junction and other improvements in partnership with the London Borough of Southwark. The use of a very small part of Brockwell Park for this will exceptionally be permitted where this is essential to these improvements and the character of the Conservation Area/Historic Park is not harmed.’

2.3.2 The UDP expands on the junction improvement in paragraph 5.6.1, explaining that the scheme ‘... could entail use of a very small part of Brockwell Park for junction improvement, both to improve bus flow and the safety of park users.’

2.3.3 Considering the underlined sections (added by IMA), Policy 67 can be condensed to say that use of a very small part of the park will be permitted, where essential, to improve bus flow and the safety of park users.

## 2.4 Consented Lambeth Scheme

2.4.1 The MVA report defines the main objectives of the Herne Hill junction improvement scheme as follows:

- To improve traffic flows, reducing traffic dominance and congestion.
- To improve pedestrian access to Brockwell Park and to help revitalise the centre of Herne Hill community.
- To increase bus reliability by providing bus priority measures, with associated benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and mobility - impaired persons.

2.4.2 To achieve the above objectives, MVA produced an improvement scheme for the junction with key features as follows:

- Removal of the Railton Road signal entry to the junction (through traffic diverts to Dulwich Road via Rymer Street).
- Improved pedestrian facilities on all arms.
- Advance stop lines for cyclists.
- A left-turn slip-road from Norwood Road to Dulwich Road.

2.4.3 It is the last item, the slip-road, that concerns the Friends of Brockwell Park. The proposed left-turn lane has been drawn cutting through part of Brockwell Park, moving the highway boundary into this public space by over 20 metres.

2.4.4 MVA considered three variations of their proposed scheme, one of which recognised the concerns regarding unnecessary intrusion into the park by exploring a left-turn lane of reduced scale.

- 2.4.5 The differences between the three MVA layouts, termed Options 1, 2 & 3 for the purpose of this report, were as follows:
- Option 1: The pedestrian crossing over Dulwich Road would run uninterrupted across the whole road to maximise convenience for pedestrians.
  - Option 2: The pedestrian crossing over Dulwich Road would be staggered, with pedestrians crossing in two stages using a central island.
  - Option 3: A smaller left-turn lane from Norwood Road to Dulwich Road to reduced land-take from Brockwell Park.
- 2.4.6 MVA conclude that Option 2 was the most acceptable, as while the Dulwich Road approach nears capacity in that scenario, the queues predicted by their model would not interfere with other junctions.
- 2.4.7 Improvements to bus reliability would result from the overall improvement in traffic flow rather than any specific bus priority measures (none are proposed). However, while there would be benefits from reduced queuing on the Norwood Road approach, queues on Dulwich Road would increase, probably due to the diversion of traffic from Railton Road onto the Dulwich Road approach.
- 2.4.8 The models show delays reduced by around half a minute per vehicle on the Norwood Road, Half Moon Lane and Milkwood Road approaches in the AM peak, but delays to all vehicles on the Dulwich Road approach, including buses, would increase by 20 seconds.
- 2.4.9 The reduction in delays in the PM peak is generally less significant, 8 seconds on Norwood Road and Half Moon Lane, 12 seconds on Herne Hill, although Milkwood Road, a minor entry to the junction, would receive a substantial reduction in delays of 77 seconds. Delays on Dulwich Road would again increase however, by 23 seconds in the PM peak.
- 2.4.10 The work by MVA shows that overall, Option 2 would allow the junction to operate with more capacity, less queuing and fewer delays. Pedestrian facilities would also be improved in the process.
- 2.4.11 Consideration of the MVA scheme options has shown that Option 2 was recommended over the less land-hungry Option 3 for three main reasons:
- (i) The desire to maintain a left turn lane from Norwood Road to Dulwich Road that is not obstructed by queues at the Norwood Road stop line.
  - (ii) The need to stagger the Dulwich Road crossing to minimise impact on capacity.
  - (iii) The need to have adequate space to 'land' pedestrians from the Dulwich Road crossing at the entrance to Brockwell Park.
- 2.4.12 The combination of the above factors led MVA to a solution that involves moving the highway boundary about 20m into the park, with a large triangular traffic island that results in the loss of 1,070m<sup>2</sup> of the park to highway land. The consented scheme is shown in plan PA3 produced for the London Borough of Lambeth, which is the plan specifically approved in the decision notice of 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008 and both are included as Appendix D&A-1.

2.4.13 On reviewing the proposal, IMA Transport Planning were of the opinion that elements of Options 2 and 3 could be combined to produce a scheme that meets all of the stated objectives, while minimising unnecessary loss of public space from Brockwell Park. The following section explores how the FoBP scheme developed from that point following input from the LHA.

### 3 Development Description

#### 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section sets out the alternative improvement scheme proposed by the Friends of Brockwell Park, referred to as the FoBP scheme hereafter.

3.1.2 A technical appraisal then follows, setting out all of the points that the LHA have raised through a series of consultations, and explaining how the scheme has been altered to take account of those points where appropriate.

3.1.3 The current scheme is then described and key transport points summarised.

#### 3.2 Evolution of the FoBP Scheme

3.2.1 The FoBP scheme initially involved combining Options 2 & 3 from MVA's work for Lambeth to provide a scheme that meets all of the stated objectives, but with much less land taken from Brockwell Park.

3.2.2 The alternative scheme was presented to the LHA in a short report from IMA Transport Planning Ltd entitled Highway Works Appraisal, dated September 2008 (copy included as Appendix D&A-2).

3.2.3 At a meeting between the FoBP and the council held on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2008, the LHA explained that the alternative proposals need to be compared against the principles and objectives set out in the Design and Access Statement that supported the planning application for the consented scheme.

3.2.4 In October 2008 a second report was therefore produced by IMA Transport Planning, titled Consideration of the Design & Access Statement and Associated Documents, considering the scheme in the context requested by the LHA.

3.2.5 The second report, included as Appendix D&A-3, included a revised scheme to take account of comments from the LHA with regard to the design of the slip-road, particularly with respect to visibility. Key conclusions were as follows:

Having compared the IMA alternative scheme against the details criteria set out in the 'Transport Design Statement' of the Design and Access Statement, it has been demonstrated that there are several material differences relative to Lambeth's Option A, but the balance of those differences is in favour of the IMA alternative scheme.

Firstly, the IMA alternative provides better visibility for drivers emerging from the slip road onto Dulwich Road, as they will not have to look over their shoulders to the same extent to see vehicles approaching from the signal junction.

Secondly, vehicle speeds on the slip road will be reduced by the curvature in the alternative scheme, whereas the Lambeth scheme is virtually straight.

Thirdly, and the only negative point against the alternative scheme, the inter visibility between drivers and pedestrians could be obstructed by other pedestrians on the footway in the alternative IMA scheme. However, two solutions have been proposed, one involving a slight realignment of the alternative scheme, the other the use of signal control on the crossing to the park.

Finally, the alternative scheme complies more completely with Policy 59<sub>#1</sub> of the Lambeth UDP, which sets out that in order to improve bus flow and the safety of park users, use of a very small part of Brockwell Park will be permitted where absolutely essential. This report has demonstrated that it is possible to meet those objectives while saving at least 470m<sup>2</sup><sub>#2</sub> of valuable public open space.

Note<sub>#1</sub> Policy 59 of the draft UDP for Lambeth was re-numbered 67 in the adopted version of August 2007

Note<sub>#2</sub> Changes to the scheme to accommodate issues raised by the LHA have reduced the saving slightly to 440m<sup>2</sup>

3.2.6 The LHA subsequently commissioned TMS Consultancy to carry out what was termed a Site Safety Assessment, dated December 2008. This report compared the consented scheme with an alternative that involved less land-take from the park.

3.2.7 The points raised in the TMS report are set out below, followed by points raised at another meeting between FoBP and the council on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2009. All of the technical issues are then considered, and it is explained how alterations have been made to the FoBP scheme to reflect the points raised. The current FoBP scheme is then described in detail and key points summarised.

### 3.3 Issues Raised in TNS Site Safety Assessment

3.3.1 The Site Safety Assessment carried out by TMS (included as Appendix D&A-4) compared the consented scheme against an alternative with less land take from the park. However, the report did not include plans of either scheme being assessed, so it is not possible to tell whether evolutions in the FoBP scheme that had already been incorporated to take account of LHA comments were considered in the TMS report.

3.3.2 Many of the points in the TMS report applied equally to both the consented scheme and the FoBP scheme, which are identical in most respects, but the criticisms specific to the FoBP alternative were:

#### Island Size

There will be less pedestrian/cyclist space in the large triangular island between the slip road and the signal junction, increasing the risk of pedestrian/cyclist conflict in this landscaped area.

#### Large Vehicle Access to Park

The large vehicle route into the park will coincide with the main pedestrian route, which may lead to conflict between pedestrians/cyclists and large vehicles or maintenance vehicles.

#### Entry to Slip Road

The entrance into the slip road is much longer, and vehicles can therefore approach at a higher speed. This could lead to an increased risk of collisions between vehicles turning left into the slip road and a westbound cyclist continuing straight ahead to the traffic signals.

### Obstruction of Slip Road

The entry into the slip road is closer to the traffic signals stop-line, which increases the possibility of the slip road becoming blocked by straight ahead traffic queuing at the signals. This could lead to frustration and drivers encroaching onto the footway to pass queuing vehicles on the nearside.

3.3.3 In addition to the criticism of the FoBP scheme, TMS noted that in both schemes, the bus lane would terminate very close to the left slip-road, so that drivers intending to turn left might not be aware of the slip-road, potentially leading to 'side-swipe' accidents or causing drivers to turn left at the signals rather than using the slip-road.

### 3.4 Issues Raised at Meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> January 2009

3.4.1 The FoBP met with ward councillor Kirsty McHugh and officers from the LPA/LHA to discuss the proposed alternative scheme. The LHA raised 6 issues as follows:

- (i) The alternative island is not of a size commensurate with the scheme and may appear cluttered.
- (ii) The alternative scheme has wider corner radii at the Norwood Road end of the slip-road.
- (iii) Absence of lane discipline may cause some drivers to stay in the straight-ahead lane, reducing use of the slip-road.
- (iv) Large vehicle access cannot be separated from pedestrian access with the smaller island.
- (v) The slip-road egress onto Dulwich Road is too close to pedestrians on the island.
- (vi) Pedestrians and cyclists will come into conflict on the small island.

3.4.2 The following section considers the comments from TMS and those direct from the LHA in detail before describing the current scheme.

### 3.5 Examination of Technical Issues

3.5.1 Each of the issues raised by the LHA is considered below, grouped together where appropriate.

#### Island Size & Pedestrian/Cyclist Conflict

3.5.2 The FoBP scheme reduces land take from the park by using a smaller island that remains large enough to accommodate demand. At 316m<sup>2</sup>, the island in plan D&A-2 is about 4 times larger than the existing island (73m<sup>2</sup> including the HGV over-run area), so offers a substantial improvement over the existing situation.

- 3.5.3 It is however critical to realise that the triangular island is not the limiting factor in terms of pedestrian/cycle capacity. The central islands on Dulwich Road and Norwood Road are fed from the island that the LHA have questioned. Taking into account guard-railing, the central islands proposed are about 30m<sup>2</sup> each, about 10% of the island area feeding them in the FoBP scheme.
- 3.5.4 Quite plainly there is no credible issue of capacity/conflict arising from the smaller triangular island, which will provide 10 times the space on the central islands that they will feed to and have been approved in the Lambeth scheme.
- 3.5.5 The question of 'clutter' on the triangular island is entirely subjective and is in the hands of the designers to address through appropriate choice and positioning of street furniture. The reduction in island size will have no effect in this respect.

#### Large Vehicle Access

- 3.5.6 There is no reason why a heavy vehicle access cannot be incorporated into the FoBP design, following exactly the alignment of that proposed by Lambeth, as incorporated in the latest layout shown in Plan D&A-2.
- 3.5.7 The decision notice issued on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008 refers specifically to Plan PA3, both reproduced in this report in Appendix D&A-1. That plan does not show any formal pedestrian crossing over the slip-road, but later proposals from the LHA have shown a 10m wide zebra crossing on the slip-road, as shown in plan 1000-1 from the LHA, included as Appendix D&A-5, which is undated but did not form part of the planning application.
- 3.5.8 In order to accommodate a separate HGV access to the park and to ensure that large vehicles are able to stop at the slip-road egress without overhanging the crossing, the width has been reduced from the 10m shown on the later LHA plan to 5m (Plan D&A-2).
- 3.5.9 The 10m zebra crossing shown in the Lambeth scheme is the maximum size permissible, and hence appropriate only in the busiest of pedestrian locations where very large numbers of pedestrians need to cross at once. As such, the crossing was completely over-specified, especially in view of the fact that it would immediately feed into small central islands as described above, which would have a fraction of the capacity of such a large zebra crossing.
- 3.5.10 The proposed 5m zebra crossing would have more than enough capacity to accommodate demand, and would be less likely to cause drivers to encroach onto the crossing if a pedestrian is using the far end. In contrast, the LPA granted consent for a scheme that showed no formal crossing over the slip-road.

#### Entry to Slip-Road

- 3.5.11 Several points have been made about the entry to the slip-road, including entry speeds, risk to cyclists from left-turning traffic, lane discipline issues and possible blocking by ahead traffic, all of which are linked.
- 3.5.12 The difference between vehicle speeds along the slip roads for either schemes will be negligible, as while the consented scheme has marginally more initial deflection, the proposed FoBP slip road is curved rather than straight as in the consented scheme and hence will reduce vehicle speeds.

- 3.5.13 In either scheme the fact that vehicles will have to change lanes after the bus lane to reach the slip road will introduce far more deflection than the slip road alignments. The alternative scheme actually provides drivers with more time to make the lane change, improving visibility onto the slip road when the bus lane is occupied and reducing the likelihood of drivers entering the bus lane early, as highlighted in Plan D&A-3.
- 3.5.14 The Lambeth scheme only allows drivers between 15 and 30m to change lanes after the end of the bus lane before entering the slip road. If a driver is positioned alongside or slightly behind a bus in the bus lane, the slip road will not be visible at all under the Lambeth scheme.
- 3.5.15 A driver positioned some way back from a bus in the bus lane will be left with very little time to react to signal, change lanes and enter the slip road, which is likely to lead to unexpected braking as drivers try to enter the slip road too late, potentially cutting across other vehicles - including cyclists - in the bus lane.
- 3.5.16 The Lambeth scheme is almost certain to lead to the bus lane being shortened in future to address a likely safety issue that is actually highlighted by TMS in their Site Safety Assessment carried out for Lambeth (see paragraph 3.3.3), but no alteration has been incorporated into the consented scheme to address this concern.
- 3.5.17 By contrast the FoBP scheme allows drivers to see the slip road from further away even when the bus lane is occupied, and provides drivers with more time to react to signal and change lanes safely, ultimately improving lane discipline, maximising the priority that can be given to buses and minimising the danger to cyclists travelling ahead in the nearside lane.
- 3.5.18 With regard to blocking of the slip-road by traffic queuing at the signals, the entry in the FoBP scheme has been positioned to allow 8 Passenger Car Units (1 PCU = 5.75m) to queue in the inside ahead lane before the slip-road becomes blocked, exactly the same as the consented scheme and less than the modelling by MVA in the Lambeth Design & Access Statement shows will occur.

#### Egress from Slip-Road

- 3.5.19 Concern was expressed that the slip-road egress in the original FoBP scheme was too close to the pedestrian crossing immediately to the east, so that pedestrians waiting at the crossing could obscure driver's visibility when looking right towards the signal junction.
- 3.5.20 IMA Transport Planning accepted this point as valid criticism, and the layout was amended to address the issue by moving the pedestrian crossing point slightly further south so that pedestrians would be out of the line of sight.
- 3.5.21 This re-design has the additional benefit of increasing turning space for HGVs, which otherwise would pass very close to pedestrians waiting at the crossing and might potentially over-run kerbs where the traffic islands are spaced close together in the consented scheme.

### 3.6 Current FoBP Scheme

- 3.6.1 It has been explained how the FoBP scheme has evolved to take on board comments made by the LHA, but remains a minor variation to the consented improvement scheme.

- 3.6.2 Plan D&A-2 illustrates the latest version of the FoBP scheme, which uses a much smaller traffic island to reduce land-take from the park by just over 40% from 1070m<sup>2</sup> to 630m<sup>2</sup>. The alternative arrangement meets all of the aims of the consented scheme and in most respects the two layouts are identical.

#### Materials

- 3.6.3 It is proposed that the materials for the FoBP scheme would be identical to those agreed for the consented scheme. Paving would be in Yorkstone and generally with standard pedestrian construction, except for an area to allow large vehicles to access the park, which would be reinforced appropriately (Plan D&A-2).
- 3.6.4 All new kerbs would be 300mm granite, and the slip-road between Norwood Road and Dulwich Road would be constructed in granite setts.

#### Tree Loss & Planting

- 3.6.5 The consented plan PA3 (Appendix D&A-1) shows four trees being removed to construct the new slip-road and island. With the revised FoBP scheme, it may be possible to retain two of those trees, one of which would remain inside the park boundary and another just outside it.
- 3.6.6 The locations of the existing trees are taken from the approved plan PA3, and it is not known whether they were fixed by topographical survey.
- 3.6.7 Additional planting would be identical to the proposed scheme, although the tree proposed on the triangular island would need to be located slightly further east.

#### Summary of Variations from Consented Scheme

- 3.6.8 The only variations proposed from the consented scheme relate to the slip road between Norwood Road and Dulwich Road and are summarised as follows:
- (i) The park boundary would be moved back 14m rather than 21m, so that 630m<sup>2</sup> of park would be lost rather than 1070m<sup>2</sup> as consented.
  - (ii) The triangular traffic island between the slip-road and the park entrance would be smaller relative to the consented scheme, but would be 10 times larger than the central islands in the consented scheme, and 4 times bigger than existing.
  - (iii) The slip-road would be curved, reducing vehicle speeds over the entrance to the park relative to the straight slip-road in the consented scheme.
  - (iv) Drivers on Norwood Road would have better visibility onto the slip-road when the bus lane is in use, increasing time for proper signalling and reducing the likelihood of late manoeuvres that might cause danger to other road users, particularly cyclists in the nearside lane.
  - (v) Drivers joining Dulwich Road from the slip road would do so at a much less acute angle, improving visibility by not forcing drivers to look over their shoulder to see approaching traffic.

- (vi) The pedestrian waiting area on the southern side of Dulwich Road has been set back slightly to improve visibility for drivers exiting the slip-road and increasing separation from turning HGVs.
- (vii) The width of the zebra crossing on the shortened slip-road has been reduced from 10m to 5m to ensure it is not blocked by large vehicles, but would remain adequate to accommodate demand.
- (viii) It may be possible to retain more of the existing trees by taking less of the park land.

3.6.9 To put further place the FoBP scheme in context relative to the consented scheme and the existing arrangement, the following table has been produced:

	Consented Scheme	Proposed FoBP Scheme	Existing Arrangement
Highway Extended into Park	21m	14m	-
Park Land Taken	1070m <sup>2</sup>	630m <sup>2</sup>	-
Visibility onto Slip-Road Ingress	Problems evident	Improved	-
Visibility from Slip-Road Egress	Problems evident	Improved	-
Slip Road Speeds	Problems evident	Improved	-
Heavy Vehicle Access	Improved	Improved	Shared with Pedestrians
Pedestrians Facilities	Improved	Improved	-
Cyclist Facilities	Visibility concerns	Improved	-
Bus Facilities	Bus lane may need shortening	Improved	-
Highway Capacity	Improved	Improved	At Capacity

Table 1: Comparison on Key Transport Issues

3.6.10 Two important conclusions can therefore be drawn from the revisions to the consented scheme proposed by the FoBP. Firstly, the alternative scheme reduces land-take from the park, more fully meeting the requirements of UDP Policy 67 where park land will only be taken for the junction improvement where essential.

3.6.11 Secondly, it is evident that the changes suggested to the consented scheme have resulted in a number of small but important improvements, such that the FoBP scheme would be better in terms of highway safety for all road users, including cyclists and pedestrians.

## 4 Summary and Conclusions

### 4.1 Summary

4.1.1 This report has considered proposals by the Friends of Brockwell Park (FoBP) to make minor revisions to an approved junction improvement scheme at Herne Hill in the London Borough of Lambeth (LBL).

4.1.2 The report sets out how the alternative scheme has evolved from input from the Local Highway Authority (LHA), and the key points are summarised as follows:

- (i) The Herne Hill junction is a complex arrangement with traffic capacity issues evident that are also causing delays to buses. Pedestrians and cyclists are poorly served at present.
- (ii) The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policy 67 permits, exceptionally, a very small part of Brockwell Park to be used for improvement of the junction where essential.
- (iii) Consultants acting for LBL set out objectives for the junction improvement that include improved traffic flow, reduced traffic dominance, improved access to Brockwell Park, better bus reliability and benefits for pedestrians and cyclists.
- (iv) A comprehensive improvement scheme for the junction was granted planning consent in June 2008. The scheme included a slip road that required 1070m<sup>2</sup> of land to be taken from the park, moving the highway boundary into the park by over 20m.
- (v) FoBP have produced an alternative scheme that reduces land-take from the park, closely based on the consented scheme but incorporating comments from the LHA.
- (vi) The FoBP scheme reduces land-take with a smaller island at the park entrance, which will be adequate to accommodate demand, being 4 times larger than the existing island and 10 times larger than the central islands from the consented scheme into which pedestrians and cyclists would feed.
- (vii) Access to the park for heavy vehicles would be segregated from pedestrian access in exactly the same way as in the consented scheme.
- (viii) Entry to the slip-road would be significantly improved relative to the consented scheme, as drivers would have improved visibility onto the slip-road when the bus lane is occupied, allowing adequate time for signalling and lane changes without placing other road users at risk, particularly cyclists travelling north on Norwood Road in the nearside lane.
- (ix) The slip-road itself is curved in the FoBP scheme, reducing vehicle speeds over the pedestrian access to Brockwell Park relative to the straight road in the consented scheme.
- (x) The egress from the slip-road will provide better visibility for drivers, who would join Dulwich Road at a very acute angle under the consented scheme, having to look over their shoulders to see traffic coming through the junction.

- (xi) The FoBP scheme would also increase separation between HGVS turning into Dulwich Road and pedestrians waiting to cross.

## 4.2 Conclusions

- 4.2.1 The FoBP scheme represents a small variation from the consented scheme, but by a process of evolution that has involved taking account of detailed comments from the LHA, FoBP have produced a scheme that reduces land-take from the park by 40% while more fully meeting the requirements of UDP Policy 67 where park land will only be taken for the junction improvement where essential.
- 4.2.2 Perhaps more importantly however, the changes suggested to the consented scheme have resulted in a number of small but important improvements to the overall arrangement, such that the FoBP scheme would be better in terms of highway safety for all road users, including cyclists and pedestrians.