

From: [Adams Joel \(ST\) Bus Infrastructure](#)
To: [Arnold Sally \(ST\)](#)
Subject: FW: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013] [Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]
Date: 08 August 2013 11:53:21
Attachments: [20130130 Busway Presentation \(Precis\).pptx](#)

From: David Ward [mailto:]
Sent: 26 June 2013 17:28
To: Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure
Cc: Kim Smith; Mark Page; ; Richard Cornell; Martin Reed; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast
Subject: RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013] [Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]

Joel

Thought I would also forward to you a truncated version of the presentation that we showed you when we first met to consider an amended Busway route. It graphically shows some of the issues to be considered with the current approved scheme

- Slide 5: The need to build an access road from the west across the current car parks in order to access Plot N0202 and the TfL Service Yard
- Slide 6: The traffic lights and pedestrian crossings required for the consented scheme with consequential impact on the Busway

We think that the current proposal gives a better solution

Currently looking at your comments and we will set up a meeting tomorrow

Regards

David

David Ward | Head of Estate and Retail, Greenwich Peninsula | Quintain
Tel: | Mobile:
Greenwich Peninsula Business Centre, 1-2 Green Place, Greenwich, London SE10 0PE
www.greenwichpeninsula.co.uk | www.quintain.co.uk

From: David Ward
Sent: 21 June 2013 16:50
To: Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure
Cc: 'Kim Smith'; 'Mark Page'; ; 'Richard Cornell'; 'Martin Reed'; Neil Smith; Julian Tollast
Subject: RE: Peninsula Busway[Reviewed by MR 16-05-2013][Reviewed by MR 21-05-2013] [Reviewed by MR 03-06-2013]

Joel

Apologies I forgot to forward the comparison drawing – here it is

I will study your comments and get back to you

Regards

David

From: Adams Joel (ST) Bus Infrastructure [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] | M [REDACTED]
10th Floor - Zone G3, Palestra, 197 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NJ
Transport for London | London Buses | Operations Directorate

From: David Ward [[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:\[REDACTED\]](#)]
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: [REDACTED]]
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: [REDACTED]]
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:>]
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] | M [REDACTED]

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

Transport for London | Surface Transport

From: David Ward [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](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]
Greenwich Peninsula Business Centre, 1-2 Green Place, Greenwich, London SE10 0PE
www.greenwichpeninsula.co.uk | www.quintain.co.uk

Quintain Estates and Development PLC
Registered Office and Trading Address: 16 Grosvenor Street, London, W1K 4QF
Registered Number 2694983 England
VAT Number 653 1281 54

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at xxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.x and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.