



Job Name: Brockwell Park, Herne Hill

Job N^o: IMA-08-088

Date: February 2009

From: Paul Greatwood/Scott
Cruickshanks

Summary of Position at February 2009

Introduction

1. This note discusses the outstanding objections from Lambeth officers to the junction proposals put forward by IMA Transport Planning, as summarised in an email from Ann Kingsbury on 5th February 2009, following a meeting with the council. Six issues have been expressed by Lambeth:

Issue 1 - IMA Island Size

Lambeth Council Position:

The Island as proposed by IMA is not of a size commensurate with the scheme and may appear cluttered.

2. Our scheme reduces land take from the park by using a smaller island, but is considered large enough to accommodate demand. Key facts to support this:
 - (i) At 280m², the island in our latest layout is about 4 times larger than the existing island (73m² including the HGV over-run area).
 - (ii) Central islands on Dulwich Road and Norwood Road are fed from the island that Lambeth are questioning. Taking into account guard-railing, the central islands proposed are about 30m² each, about 11% of the IMA island area feeding them.
3. In view of the above facts, there is no credible issue of capacity arising from the smaller island, the central islands that are common to both schemes being the limiting factor. The 'clutter' argument is entirely subjective and is in the hands of the designers to address through their choice of street furniture.

Issue 2 - Slip Road Ingress

Lambeth Council Position:

The IMA scheme has a wider corner radius than the Lambeth scheme at the Norwood Road end of the slip road.

4. Although the Lambeth scheme has a tighter initial radius, the difference between the actual vehicle speeds along the slip roads for both schemes will be negligible. This is because although the Lambeth scheme has more initial deflection, the proposed IMA slip road is curved which will act to reduce vehicle speed to a greater extent than the straight slip road.

5. 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 or having to shorten the bus lane, which are likely outcomes with the Lambeth scheme.

Issue 3- Absence of Lane Discipline

Lambeth Council Position:

Absence of lane discipline may cause some drivers to hang around in the straight ahead lane and reduce the traffic flow into the slip road. This is prevented in their scheme by the extent of the island.

6. This point could more fairly be levelled at the Lambeth scheme, which only allows drivers about 15m 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.
7. 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 in the bus lane.
8. The Lambeth scheme is almost certain to lead to the bus lane being shortened in future to address a likely safety issue.
9. By contrast the IMA 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 and maximising the priority that can be given to buses.

Issue 4 - Heavy Vehicle Access

Lambeth Council Position:

It will not be possible to separate the pedestrian access to the Park from heavy vehicle access to the park with IMA's smaller island.

10. There is no reason why a heavy vehicle access cannot be incorporated into the IMA design, following exactly the alignment of that proposed by Lambeth (see plan IMA-08-088-010).
11. The zebra crossing will need to be slightly narrower than the maximum permissible size shown in Lambeth Plans, but as I have observed before, the zebra feeds into small central refuges and therefore the zebra crossing was substantially oversized.

Issue 5 -Slip Road Egress

Lambeth Council Position:

The egress from the slip road into the Dulwich Road is too close to the pedestrians on the island.

12. I am uncertain which layout they are criticising here, as we have already addressed this issue with a variation to our scheme (plan IMA-08-088-009 October 2008), repositioning the pedestrian waiting area out of the line of sight for drivers leaving the slip road. It is possible that layout was not submitted to Lambeth. Plan IMA-08-088-010 shows the same layout.

Issue 6 - Conflict between Pedestrians and Cyclists

Lambeth Council Position:

With a small island, pedestrians and cyclists will come into conflict.

13. I refer back to my first observations, in that our island is 4 times larger than the existing one, and feed into central islands proposed by Lambeth that are almost 10 times smaller, so I can see no factual basis to this point.