

**From:** [Adams Joel \(ST\) Bus Infrastructure](#)  
**To:** [Hextall Eva](#)  
**Cc:** [Johnson Michael](#)  
**Subject:** RE: FOI-2486-1314 Crawford - 8937 - 6/218  
**Date:** 25 March 2014 11:57:56  
**Attachments:** [N-Gwch Modified Sketch.pdf](#)  
[113313-44-044 A.PDF](#)  
[113313-44-045 A.PDF](#)

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Joel

---

**From:** David Ward [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 25 September 2013 12:58  
**To:** 'Kim Smith'  
**Cc:** 'Mark Page'; [REDACTED]; 'Richard Cornell'; 'Martin Reed'; Neil Smith;  
Julian Tollast; Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure  
**Subject:** FW: Peninsula Busway

Kim

In respect of the Busway extension between West Parkside and North Greenwich Interchange Joel on behalf of TfL has suggested that we take our proposed route to the next level of detail design and safety audit which is welcome news.

He also has tabled an alternative proposal, as attached. We have concerns about his proposal as follows

1. Our proposal takes buses out of a large area of public realm to the east and north of plot N0403 East - his proposal puts buses back. We desire that this area in the heartland of our development is solely available to pedestrians (and cyclists) presenting significant placemaking and urban realm benefits.
2. Our proposal splits the master plan Plot N0403 to create a highway / busway (which already

largely exists). This highway provides a route for buses to and from the Interchange and also provides an access route to Plots N0202 and N0403 East for service vehicles and a few cars. This is a lightly trafficked highway when compared to normal highway usage. The TfL proposal takes the buses away from this highway splitting plot N0403 and puts them onto a separate busway on the east and north side of plot N0403 thus creating two highways instead of one with the consequential degrading of the public realm but delivering relatively little benefit to buses.

Joel has asked for the input of RBG in respect of the GPRL proposal and also in respect of his alternative proposal. There are highway / public transport issues to be considered but also public realm issues. He has suggested a meeting - is this the best way forward? If so can you please advise as to the appropriate parties on the RBG side that should be invited.

Regards

David

David Ward  
Head of Retail and Estate, Greenwich

E: [REDACTED]  
DDI: [REDACTED]  
M: [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 28, 2013 5:33 PM  
**To:** David Ward  
**Cc:** 'Kim Smith'; 'Mark Page'; [REDACTED]; 'Richard Cornell'; 'Martin Reed'; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway

David,

Many thanks for these drawings. Sorry for the delay responding – people I needed to talk to kept being on holiday.

My impression is that subject to a satisfactory road safety audit confirming the safe operation of the junctions, particularly Busway/West Parkside/Edmund Halley Way, the latest iteration of the proposals (shown in the most recent Arup drawings) would deliver a significant improvement on the current method of operation for buses. This is on the basis that we retain the ability to turn buses/lost cars/deliveries at the northern end of the road, but you have produced drawings showing this is possible.

Given your/Arup's explanation you gave of how the original GWT proposals would necessitate traffic signals to enable servicing access along the link by the bus station this also looks at least as good (possibly better) than the original GWT proposal from the point of view of getting buses to and from the bus station (GWT obviously had other advantages in terms of running beyond the interchange down the west side of the peninsula).

Accordingly I have no objection to taking this proposal further forward into design, with the next step being a road safety audit with a designer's response. I suggest you add the turning head at the top of the access road to the drawings which the auditors will review.

The design to date has been largely focussed on buses and any further design work should, in particular, also consider pedestrian and cycle routes from the interchange at North Greenwich.

However, I do need to raise that I think there is a layout that (from the point of view of buses) would deliver even greater improvement. Broadly - keeping the existing proposed GWT alignment (possibly tightening the corner to slow vehicle speeds, and present a more standard street grid) but using the proposal to split N04-03 into east and west to enable a service road between the two. This would make it possible to give buses priority at the junction with the service road and run on bus-exclusive roads all the way to the bus station. A rough sketch of what I mean is shown in the attached.

I appreciate that the design work to date has been focussed on specifically keeping that side of your development clear of buses, and diverting us from the previous GWT alignment. In addition this is only from the point of view of London Buses. There are obviously important considerations around movement of other modes (particularly pedestrians and cycles), but also significant urban realm and commercial viability questions here. I do appreciate that buses are not the only consideration in terms of designing the peninsula and that compromises are necessary on all parts to progress here.

If you don't support the option I've sketched (and I'm presuming you don't), it would be good if you could set out why you think the alternative is superior. (I think I know why you don't want buses on that side of your building, but it would be good if I wasn't putting words in your mouth). I do think we will be talking in terms of the benefits to the overall development, rather than just for buses.

I think Greenwich's view here is very important – what is developed here needs to be the best solution in the round for all users/residents/occupiers and quite a lot of the view on wider urban-realm and vehicle/cycle/ped movements needs a view from Greenwich. Greenwich also need to be happy with the road layout from a road safety point of view. (Richard/Kim/Mark – your thoughts on all this would be welcomed). In particular if we were to agree to depart from the consented busway alignment we need to be clear that alternative road layout is one which Greenwich are whole-heartedly behind.

I do need to stress that your current proposal is a scheme that, provided the detailed safety issues can be resolved, would seem to deliver a significant improvement for buses, and resolve a thoroughly unsatisfactory situation that currently exists at the Busway/West Parkside/Edmund Halley Way junction. I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank GPRL/Quintain for continuing to push this forward and for appointing Arup to advance the design. It will, though, be necessary to confirm that there isn't a better option than the current Arup drawings before we could support the change to the consented GWT routing.

So in summary – the work to date has taken us to a proposal which is a significant improvement to the current situation and probably as good in terms of getting to the bus station as the GWT proposal (provided it works in detailed design). However from a purely public transport perspective there would be an option

which is better still and I think we need to consider the reasons not to support it.

Is it best to meet with you, but with Greenwich also present to take this forward?  
Also happy to pop down for an informal chat if that helps.

Regards

Joel

**Joel Adams** | Strategy and Planning Manager | Bus Infrastructure

T

10th Floor - Zone G3, Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NJ

**Transport for London** | London Buses | Operations Directorate

---

**From:** David Ward [[mailto:](#)]  
**Sent:** 06 August 2013 15:01  
**To:** Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure  
**Cc:** Kim Smith; Mark Page; Richard Cornell; Martin Reed; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast  
**Subject:** Peninsula Busway

Joel

Apologies for not replying sooner to your e mail re the Peninsula Busway but holidays have been a bit disruptive to the process. Our response to your e mail is as follows

1. Existing Consented route plan – sent to you under cover of my e mails 21 June and 26 June (copied to all)
2. Updated layout Drawing 45B - Shows existing car park access / egress routes for TfL Car Park and AEG Car Park 2. Existing Car Parks 4A and 4B are located further east along Edmund Halley Way which are not affected by these proposals. Likewise AEG Car Park 1 located to the south of Edmund Halley Way is not affected by these proposals

In respect of the future master plan car park layouts

- a) Car Parks 4A and 4B will be removed and there will be no car parks east of the Busway
  - b) TfL Car Park will be reduced in size to 70 spaces as per the development agreement
  - c) AEG Car Parks 1 & 2 will be relocated into multi deck car parks. The consented master plan shows these multi deck car parks on Plots N0402 and N0403 West, however, the masterplan is being reworked to show these car parks elsewhere nearer to Millennium Way / accessed off Millennium Way subject to the necessary approvals.
3. Yellow Box Junctions – Drg 45B shows yellow box extended the full length of the junction as requested.
  4. Swept Path
    - a. Drg 46 shows swept path analysis for a London Bus
    - b. Drg 47 shows a swept path analysis for a 10m rigid and a 16.5m articulated lorry
    - c. A turning head has been created at the north end of the access road for buses and lorries
  5. Anticipated trip numbers – both N0202 and N0403 East are serviced from the road into

the Bus Station

Trip generation for N0202 and N0403 East in the AM peak hour (assumed to be 8am – 9am):

*Assumptions*

N0202 – 19,088 sqm GFA, 19 employee spaces, 4 visitor spaces

N0403 – 31,441 sqm GFA 31 employee spaces, 7 visitor spaces. Note: Assume 50% for N0403 east

*Trips*

N0202 – peak hour cars – 12 in, 0 out

N0202 – peak hour servicing – 3 in, 3 out

N0403e – peak hour cars – 10 in, 0 out

N0403e – peak hour servicing – 3 in, 3 out

Total development vehicles on n-s route in AM peak hour – 28 in, 6 out

We have not carried out a road safety audit at this stage but as you suggest will carry one out when we have received your response. Trust we have responded to all your queries - look forward to receiving any comments that your team may have and then a meeting

Regards

David

David Ward | Head of Estate and Retail, Greenwich Peninsula | Quintain

Tel [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]

Greenwich Peninsula Business Centre, 1-2 Green Place, Greenwich, London SE10 0PE

[www.greenwichpeninsula.co.uk](http://www.greenwichpeninsula.co.uk) | [www.quintain.co.uk](http://www.quintain.co.uk)

---

**From:** Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

**Sent:** 21 June 2013 16:37

**To:** David Ward

**Cc:** 'Kim Smith'; 'Mark Page'; [REDACTED] 'Richard Cornell'; 'Martin Reed'; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast

**Subject:** FW: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013]  
[Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]

David,

Many thanks for this. Sorry for delay replying – have had a few things going on. Generally I view this positively. My main comment is our request for a plan to same scale showing existing consented routing to enable a proper comparison to be made when we next meet. Fundamentally this is a choice between whether we implement the existing consented route or this new proposal so comparing the two is key.

Detailed comments:

- Do anticipated trip numbers of the servicing requirements exist? Is it just “N04 03 East” that is serviced from the road into the bus station or is it “N02 02” as well? Depending on the vehicle trips we may need to ask for modelling, but lets get the numbers first.
- It's referred to in the emails below – but can we be clear on car park access/egress routes – both now and in the built out end-state. Can a drawing (can just be arrows on a plan) show this.

- Need ability to turn a rigid truck or a bus at the north end of the access road to the bus station. Can we show a roundabout/turning head here?
- Yellowbox junction at junction of bus only section and access road to bus station, our thinking is that yellow box needs to be extended north for full length of junction.
- Can we see swept path drawings showing bus manoeuvrability – need to remember that buses will need to turn right towards Millennium Way from south end of access road as well. Plus largest vehicle accessing “N04 03 East”, plus rigid truck turning at head of access road. Should have ability to turn a bus here if required.
- We will be requesting a road safety audit of these proposals, plus a designers response, but you might want to hold off on this until we meet with your team and Greenwich as this meeting might generate some more amendments.

I need to get some internal comments from my stakeholders on this option before we next meet. If you could come back on the points above, hopefully amending the drawing then I'll set up some internal discussions.

Once this is done I think we should meet with your team and with Greenwich.

Regards

**Joel Adams** | Strategy and Planning Manager | Bus Infrastructure  
 T [REDACTED] | Auto [REDACTED]  
 10th Floor - Zone G3, Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NJ  
**Transport for London** | London Buses | Operations Directorate

---

**From:** David Ward [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** 10 June 2013 16:20  
**To:** Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure; Kim Smith; Mark Page; [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Martin Reed; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast  
**Subject:** FW: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013]  
 [Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]

Dear all

Please find updated plans to reflect the Peninsula Busway dialogue in the meeting of the 14 May. Our preferred option is Drg 45A.

If required both options can be modified within the 'highway area' to accommodate the Bus lanes being changed to a dual carriageway layout with buses either side of the central reserve along West Parkside, as shown on previous layouts.

Look forward to receiving any comments

Regards

David

---

**From:** Martin Reed [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** 04 June 2013 16:46  
**To:** David Ward

**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; James Gooderham; Tristan McDonnell  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013]  
[Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]

David

Please see the updated plans as requested.

Kind regards,

Martin

---

**From:** Martin Reed  
**Sent:** 04 June 2013 11:48  
**To:** David Ward  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; James Gooderham; Tristan McDonnell  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013]  
[Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]

David,

Thanks, I agree that 45 is preferable from a spatial efficiency and operational perspective.


Drawing 45 did show an exit arrangement across EHW, although it may not have been clear due to the scale of the drawing. I agree that the arrangement in 45 should have one lane westbound to the east of CP2 and then split into two as it accommodates the exiting traffic from CP2.

We'll make the minor amendments and issue them by COP Thursday.

Kind regards,

Martin

---

**From:** David Ward [<mailto:>   
**Sent:** 31 May 2013 16:03  
**To:** Martin Reed  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; James Gooderham; Tristan McDonnell  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013]  
[Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013] [Filed 03 Jun 2013 09:29]


Martin

Can you please draw up an exit arrangement for car park 2 as per mark ups if they work (to cater for in the main the post event car park exit). We would be left with a 'turn around' facility at the car Park 2 exit onto Edmund Halley in normal mode. Presumably this would not be adequate for large lorries but would be functional enough for most vehicles. Drg 45 therefore removes the most highway infrastructure and is preferred?

Regards

David

---

**From:** Martin Reed [<mailto:>   
**Sent:** 31 May 2013 14:33  
**To:** David Ward  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; James Gooderham; Tristan McDonnell  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013] [Filed 21 May 2013 13:37]

David,

Please find attached the two plans as requested.

Although we consider it safe for buses to have priority across Edmund Halley Way, we recommend that northbound buses give way as they reach the 'station approach' road. If buses had right of way here, there is a greater risk of queueing for northbound cars/delivery vehicles and that this queueing would affect the operability of the junction with EHW.

We look forward to your comments.

Kind regards,

Martin

---

**From:** David Ward [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 May 2013 12:19  
**To:** Martin Reed  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; James Gooderham; Tristan McDonnell  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013] [Filed 21 May 2013 13:37]

Martin

Thanks – a good summary

Regards

David

---

**From:** Martin Reed [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 21 May 2013 12:08  
**To:** David Ward  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; James Gooderham; Tristan McDonnell  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013]

David,

Thanks for the call earlier. The discussions with TfL seem broadly positive. As discussed, we'll prepare two new options, which are based on their Option A (attached for ease of reference).

We were both happy for buses to share the north-south road, which TfL appear to be close to supporting.

We discussed the need to keep some kind of turn around facility during event times for cars exiting 'Car Park 2', which is accessed from the eastbound lane on Edmund Halley Way, just before the roundabout. You mentioned that cones are placed on the western portion of the roundabout during games time to direct cars to the west back along EHW.

The need for the turnaround facility remains, but could be managed at games times through a break in the central reservation opposite Car Park 2. Lorries are expected to be few in number and could exit along West Parkside if necessary.

The two options we'll review are:

- 1. Keep the roundabout and introduce the basic design of TfL Option A; and
- 2. Show a break in the central reservation opposite Car Park 2, remove the roundabout and introduce the basic design of TfL Option A.



Kind regards,

Martin

---

**From:** David Ward [<mailto:> ]  
**Sent:** 15 May 2013 15:20  
**To:** Martin Reed  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013] [Filed 16 May 2013 09:54]

Martin

We had a meeting with TfL yesterday. Sort of two steps forward and one back. Ref the e mail below and the attachments we need to talk though their comments on the drawings. Can you digest the comments and give me ring tomorrow say 10am?

Regards

David

---

**From:** Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure [<mailto:> ]  
**Sent:** 14 May 2013 12:42  
**To:** David Ward; 'Kim Smith'; 'Mark Page';  
**Cc:** Neil Smith; Julian Tollast; 'Martin Reed'  
**Subject:** RE: Peninsula Busway

David/Kim/Etc,

Just to confirm – meeting today will be at 14:30 in Palestra - 197 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NJ, opposite Southwark tube. Please ask for me at reception and I'll come and meet you. Probably worth both RBG and Quintain all getting to reception, then I'll come and get you as one group.

I attach some quick thoughts on the drawings presented by Arup. Don't worry if you haven't got time to review – I'll explain at the meeting, but it seemed worth giving everyone advance sight of them.

Key points:

- We (TfL) still don't think the junction between NO403 West and N04 03 East where buses and general traffic scissor over each other is working from an operational or safety point of view. We appreciate that it has been our requirement to date that it be a segregated bus only route so this isn't criticising Arup who are trying to meet the brief – but once its drawn it just doesn't seem to work.
- This is leading us to think that (if we agree depart from the masterplan bus routing, which we haven't at this time) then you probably need at least some of the road up to the bus station to be shared with buses and general traffic – this isn't necessarily a show-stopper – the road will be very little used – servicing for N04 West, and access to the disabled car park (twenty spaces).
- We've set out a few thoughts (only developed this morning, so really just where our thinking has got to) on how this might work. Just working

- drawings – none of them is (yet) a TfL preferred option.
- You'll see that common to all of these are questioning if we actually need a roundabout on Edmund Halley Way with a dual carriageway feeding into it from the west.
  - I think the options are more or less self-explanatory, but see what you think and I can explain in the meeting.

I do need to stress that TfL hasn't reached any formal position on replacing the dedicated bus-way with bus lanes on a dual carriageway arrangement along the existing busway/west parkside. As previously discussed we are happy to explore this further, but it won't necessarily be an option we can support once we've examined it.

Any problems this afternoon my mobile number is below.

**Joel Adams** | Strategy and Planning Manager | Bus Infrastructure

T [REDACTED] Auto [REDACTED] M [REDACTED]

10th Floor - Zone G3, Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NJ

**Transport for London** | Surface Transport

---

**From:** David Ward [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](#)]  
**Sent:** 09 May 2013 13:49  
**To:** Kim Smith; Mark Page; [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast  
**Subject:** Peninsula Busway

Kim / Mark / Paul

We have been having preliminary discussions with Joel Adams of TfL about a potential Busway alignment to connect the head of West Parkside to the North Greenwich Interchange. We would very much welcome RBG input. I have sent an invitation out for next week to discuss the attached drawings which I appreciate is late notice but if you could make it then that would be great. We would also like to have an outline discussion about Busway requirements on the west of the Peninsula.

In respect of the attached drawings

1. Drg 39A shows a solution which reflects the existing dedicated Busway arrangement along West Parkside
2. Drg 42 shows a solution should the Busway along West Parkside be reconfigured to a more standard dual carriageway arrangement incorporating dedicated bus lanes.
3. Drg 41 shows how the busway arrangement on West Parkside as shown on Drg 39A could be converted to a more standard dual carriageway arrangement incorporating dedicated bus lanes.

Our preference is a solution as shown on Drg 42 but appreciate that this requires a more extensive consideration of safety issues of the Busway along its full length.

Hope you can make the meeting, if not we will set up another meeting

Regards

David

David Ward | Head of Estate and Retail, Greenwich Peninsula | Quintain

Tel [REDACTED] | Mobile [REDACTED]