

### Summary of Variations from Consented Scheme

1.1.1 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.

1.1.2 To 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

1.1.3 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.

1.1.4 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.

## Summary and Conclusions

### 1.2 Summary

1.2.1 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).

1.2.2 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.

### 1.3 Conclusions

- 1.3.1 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.
- 1.3.2 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.