

[REDACTED]

From: HOEY, Kate [HoeyK@parliament.uk]
Sent: 01 February 2013 18:41
To: [REDACTED]; Daniels Leon
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Proposed Plans - Clapham Old Town

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email of the 1st Feb to Leon Daniels which I think clearly sets out the total unsuitability of Lambeth's proposal to place a 24 hour bus boarding stop by Sainsburys Local.

The picture of a bus taken from your window demonstrates how your privacy will be effected visually and you will be disturbed from the bus and waiting passengers.

In addition there will be congestion on the pavement with the bus shelter, waiting bus passengers, pedestrians, Sainsburys customers and Sainsburys delivery trolleys.

The new proposed loading bay will also cause you and other residents further disturbance.

I think this is unacceptable and would confirm that TfL have said over the last couple of years that new bus stops should not be located near to residential property.

However, I think that it is very important to have good access in Old Town to the various bus routes - this being especially true for the elderly and disabled. To this end I would like to see live bus stands continue in Old Town and this would remove the need for any new 24 hour boarding stop outside Sainsburys.

I do not think that the Council have looked properly at keeping live stands in Old Town. The Council's plans for live stands in Old Town (option A) were poorly thought out and seemed to have deliberately located the live bus stands unnecessarily close to the Rose & Crown and oversized the platforms. This point has been illustrated by Allan Baxter who produced plans independently of the Council which showed a couple of options of how four live stands (with smaller platforms) could be retained in Old Town - further away from the Rose & Crown and still creating a good new public area.

You will see that I have cc this email to Caroline Pidgeon who is Chair of the Transport Committee at the GLA. Caroline has similar views to mine in this matter and will also make her views known.

I do not know why the Council seem insistent on dead stands which require additional 24 hour bus stops. Whilst Caroline and I may not be able to get the Council to see sense we will advise TfL (who are funding the project) that this is not acceptable.

Best wishes

Kate Hoey MP

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 February 2013 17:26
To: leondani@xuk
Cc: [REDACTED] HOEY, Kate; [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Plans - Clapham Old Town
Importance: High

Dear Mr Daniels,

I have been given your name by a neighbour of mine ([REDACTED], cc'd for information) who has been to several meetings you attended in connection with the proposed plans for Clapham Old Town. I understand you sit on the TfL Surface Board which determines the final scheme and funding.

I broadly support the plans for Option B, but have very strong feelings about the proposed location of the boarding point for the 88 and 417 buses on Old Town East.

I have been in correspondence with both George Wright at Lambeth Planning and [REDACTED] at TfL, but I get the distinct impression that no one seems to want to review this decision. Lambeth state that the bus stop location is a TfL requirement, TfL say that it is a Lambeth scheme and they have ultimate design responsibility.

I know you will have heard these complaints before, but I would like to explain my opposition to these plans.

My primary concern is that the proposed bus stop is located in the narrowest part of Old Town (the street), with residential properties in very close proximity on both sides of the road. As such, noise is always greatest here.



Focusing on the current situation, even with buses leaving the existing terminus, the noise they generate as they rev their engines is considerable, to the extent that it can cause vibrations / rattling to be felt at the rear of my property (I live at number 12 which is directly opposite the proposed stop). I would honestly say the noise from buses surpasses the noise generated from any other vehicles on the road.

If, however, the stop is to be located where it is currently proposed, that noise will be greatly increased as buses pull up and then rev their engines to leave the stop. Because it is so narrow at this point with buildings on both sides of the road, the noise will be amplified even further. Given many residents' bedrooms overlook Old Town East, this is a major concern, especially as the 88 is a 24 hour service.



Mr Wright dismissed this concern by stating:

“On balance it is considered acceptable to have a boarding stop at that location given the proposed improvements planned to enhance the pedestrian experience”.

Looking at the proposed plans for Old Town East, I would suggest that there is minimal enhanced pedestrian experience for this part of the proposal. Whilst the through road may be narrower under the proposals, what has been lost in road space has been taken up by parking spaces, 2 loading bays and the bus stop. Additional pavement space is marginal, so pedestrians are generally no better off from that perspective.

It is hard to gauge the exact width of the proposed road, but there must also be concerns over congestion, i.e. blockages, with buses, deliveries to Sainsbury's, Del Aziz, commercial units in The Polygon, etc. as well as fire engines wishing to use this route rather than take the longer Old Town West route. I know Sainsbury's have objected to the plans because of the reduction in loading space on their side of the road in the new plans caused by the inclusion of the boarding stop.

Another concern is about the passengers themselves.

I have lived in the Polygon since 1997 and the noise over the years has increased due primarily to late licensing and the opening of Sainsbury's and Del Aziz, the former being the biggest contributor. I can honestly envisage hordes of noisy, intoxicated people waiting for buses until the early hours, particularly at weekends, again causing a major nuisance to local residents. It is noisy enough now without these people shouting, singing, etc. outside your front door!

I understand that you have personally stated in meetings that alighting stops should not be by residential accommodation and Kate Hoey (cc'd for information) has also attended meetings where other TfL officials have made the same statement. In a letter to a neighbour of mine Kate stated:

“I have already had a number of meetings with the Council and Lambeth and said that it is wrong to locate bus stops near residential property. What I find particularly disappointing is that in two of these meetings last year TfL did say that they also did not support locating new bus stops close to residential accommodation”.

The picture below shows a bus at exactly the location where buses will stop to pick up passengers. If that is not by residential accommodation, I don't know what is.



Besides the noise caused by buses stopping at the stop and potentially by the passengers themselves, there is a real concern about privacy. As you can see passengers can look directly into residents' windows on both sides of the street. This is much less of an issue now as the buses generally drive by rather than being stationary.

Of course, the issue of where to place the bus stop rather than its proposed location is the million dollar question.

One of the original proposals was to locate the bus stop outside Trinity Close (tall building on left below):

<http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/C7D0F959-5F45-4A2C-AAA8-90FEECB51952/0/ClaphamGatewayDesignStudy2009.pdf>

That proposal stated:

"The current bus stand in old Town also operates as a boarding and alighting stop. Transport for London have proposals to install a new boarding stop outside Trinity Close and an alighting only stop outside George West House to remove the need for passenger interchange in the bus stand area".



This was apparently TfL's preferred location at the time and whilst designs changed, this would seem a more sensible approach. I mentioned this to Mr Wright, as locating the stop close to where Old Town meets The Pavement would be a far better option because:

- The pavements are much wider here.
- The nearest building (Trinity Court) is set back from the pavement in its own grounds.
- One side of the road is open to the Common.

This location would have a much lower impact on residents as any noise generated would be dissipated easily and of a much lower volume.

This was dismissed with the statement that TfL wanted a presence in Old Town, but given that moving this stop a little further up the street would probably add only an extra minute's walk for people coming from the Old Town proper area (a minimal 80m between the 2 points), I do not believe this is a valid argument.

The other option would be to retain a live stop at the terminus, albeit it with fewer stands, although the view seems to be that this is not acceptable for some reason. I think this could be achievable with fewer stops which would still allow the development of the town square to proceed as planned.

The main problem at the existing terminus is that often buses seem to be waiting there quite some time when they're not even due to depart. I've been there and four 88 buses have been at the terminus with passengers standing in the cold. If this were managed more effectively, e.g. with (early) buses waiting on somewhere like Rookery Road for example, you wouldn't need as many waiting stops in the Old Town.

I know there will always be objections to any plans put forward, but the proposal as it stands just seems to be the worst possible option given its definite impact on residents should it go ahead. I think there are workable solutions to this problem, but no one at the moment seems willing to address these. I hope my comments make you understand why me and my neighbours (also cc'd for information) are hoping that someone will look at this part of the scheme again and find that better solution.

Regards,



UK Parliament Disclaimer:

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.