

Response ID ANON-YH1G-FKY2-N

Submitted on 2015-01-02 22:00:30.871146

About you

1 What is your name?

Name:

David Lewis, on behalf of London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

2 What is your email address?

Email:

drlewis27@yahoo.com

3 What is your postcode

Postcode:

not applicable

4 In what capacity are you responding to the consultation?

As a representative of a community or organisation

5 If responding on behalf of a business, is your business a member of Vauxhall One, the local Business Improvement District (BID)?

Not Answered

6 Are you?

Not Answered

7 What is your age group?

Not Answered

8 Do you have a mental or physical disability that limits your daily activities or the work you can do, including any issues due to your age?

Not Answered

Our proposals

9 Do you support or oppose the overall aim of creating a thriving centre in Vauxhall around the central transport interchange?

Support

Do you have any further comments?:

It would be desirable to increase the numbers of shops, cafés/restaurants and other services at Vauxhall. However, the space available in the immediate vicinity of the transport interchange is limited. It may be possible to ensure that proposals for sites which have yet to be developed include some small-scale commercial development to meet local needs, but that is uncertain. Lambeth Council's proposal to extend the boundary of the district centre is a recognition that its viability needs to be considered in a much wider context than the central transport interchange. To a large extent, therefore, its future prosperity will depend on improving access between the central transport interchange and surrounding areas. We suggest in response to question 13 some additional steps that might be taken for that purpose.

10 Do you support or oppose our proposal to convert the one-way gyratory to a two-way road system around the Vauxhall Cross interchange (Parry Street, Wandsworth Road, Kennington Lane & South Lambeth Road)?

Support

Do you have any further comments?:

Planning for this area needs to reflect that, important as motorised vehicles are, they account for fewer than 10% of journeys through the Vauxhall Cross interchange at peak periods. London Forum supports the objective of making provision for motorised traffic less dominant, subject to evidence about the practicability of proposals in terms of traffic volumes and flows and design of junctions.

11 Do you support or oppose our proposal to reverse the direction of the Kennington Lane/Durham Street/Harleyford Road one-way system?

No opinion

Do you have any further comments?:

TfL should also examine the possible merits of the alternative proposal suggested by the Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Forum in response to the present consultation.

12 Do you support or oppose our proposal to change the layout of the bus station whilst maintaining or improving public transport interchange and facilities?

Neither

Do you have any further comments?:

It is impossible to answer this question until there is further information about what is being proposed.

We welcome the commitments to keep 'a centralised bus station to maintain effective interchange with other bus routes, the tube and rail stations' and to improve 'where possible existing facilities such as shelter, waiting areas and travel information'. We also welcome the reassurance that bus stops will remain centralised and grouped by common destinations.

However, the present proposals do not plot the paths to be taken by particular bus routes. The illustrations in the consultation pamphlet and discussions with TfL staff at the events have left considerable confusion over what layout is being proposed. Is it envisaged it will take the form of (A) a single-direction carriageway with all the bus stops arranged along it (as was suggested by TfL staff at one of the consultation events) or (B) a two-way carriageway with bus stops on both sides of it (as the illustration on the front cover of the consultation pamphlet suggests) or (C) an island with bus stops on each side (as the lower illustration on page 6 of the consultation pamphlet rather suggests)? Layout (A) seems to require that, whichever direction buses are travelling in, they would have to be redirected awkwardly into passing through the bus station in one direction. Layout (B), on the other hand, would necessitate large-scale movement of pedestrians across the carriageway (as hinted at in the cover illustration of the consultation pamphlet).

Layout (C) would essentially reproduce the present layout. No justification has been advanced for departing from that.

Whatever layout is proposed for the bus station it must provide full weather protection and not give rise to conflicts between movements of buses and movements of pedestrians.

It was suggested at one consultation event that some bus stops (in particular a stop for buses proceeding from Kennington Lane onto Vauxhall Bridge and a stop for westbound buses in Wandsworth Road) might be located outside the bus station. We would regard that as a very unfortunate erosion of the basic principle of centralisation and the advantages it brings.

13 Do you support or oppose our indicative proposal to improve provision and safety for pedestrians?

Support

Do you have any further comments?:

We support the proposals for new and improved pedestrian crossings. We are concerned, however, that enough attention has not been paid to the potential scale of pedestrian movement to and from surrounding areas, including the northern part of the district centre now being proposed by Lambeth Council, the green link through Spring Gardens to Lambeth Bridge and the sites being redeveloped along Nine Elms Lane. We are also concerned at the absence of a firm commitment to remove the pedestrian footbridge over Kennington Lane. We propose that, in addition to the planned pedestrian crossing on Kennington Lane, an additional entrance should be constructed from the east side of Albert Embankment to the sub-surface concourse of the underground station. That would considerably strengthen the links with the northern part of the district centre and also make the footbridge unnecessary. This subsurface access would pass under Kennington Lane and Cycle Superhighway 5, thus considerably reducing the scope for conflict between pedestrians, motorised traffic and cyclists. We also urge that more attention should be given to providing for safe and convenient pedestrian movement to and from Nine Elms Lane and the Nine Elms Linear Park.

We are also concerned that, as well as the extensive area so designated on the east side of Albert Embankment, there are other significant areas proposed as 'shared use footway [sic] for cyclists and pedestrians'. Such use would presumably be unregulated, but further thought needs to be given to how it could be satisfactorily and safely managed.

14 Would you support or oppose our indicative proposal for improving provision and safety for cyclists?

Support

Do you have any further comments?:

As is acknowledged, further development of the proposals is required at certain points, especially at the Harleyford/Kennington Lane and Wandsworth Road/Parry Street junctions.

Over and above the proposals for Cycle Superhighway 5 a clear indication also needs to be given about how the two-way cycle lanes within this area will link with cycle lanes in adjoining areas. That applies particularly to Nine Elms Lane (which is not shown in this proposal as having any cycle lane) and the connection between Albert Embankment and the cycle lane shown in this area on the west side of Wandsworth Road. It is plausible from observation (we have not seen statistics) that the route Albert Embankment- Vauxhall Cross-Wandsworth Road/Nine Elms Lane is the most heavily used route for cycle commuting in this whole area.

See also our comments at the end of our response to question 13 on the proposal for shared use footway for cyclists and pedestrians.

15 When considering future plans for Vauxhall, please rank from 1-5 how important the following features are to you? (where 1 is not important at all and 5 is extremely important)?

Interventions to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour:

2

Improving safety at crossings:

5

Improving safety on roads:

5

Making the area more accessible for vulnerable users such as people with disabilities, children and older people:

5

Convenience of changing between bus, rail and underground:

5

More shops and services (eg banks, dry cleaners):

3

More cafes/restaurants:

3

More, and better quality, open spaces:

3

Environmental improvements, including reducing air pollution:

5

Better connections to the river and the rest of Vauxhall including parks and open spaces:

5

Any other (please identify below):

Not Answered

Other:

16 The wider regeneration of Vauxhall and Nine Elms will result in a number of benefits for residents, businesses and workers. From the list below, please rank each benefit in order of how important they are to you (1 is the most important, 3 is the least)

More job opportunities for local people:

2

More training opportunities for local people:

1

More opportunities for local and new businesses:

1

More opportunities for young people, such as jobs and training and leisure pursuits:

1

More investment in parks and open spaces:

1

More investment in health facilities:

3

More investment in education facilities:

3

More investment in cultural activities:

2

Other (please specify below):

1

None of the above:

Not Answered

Other:

more genuinely affordable housing

17 Finally, we want your views on where the boundary for Vauxhall's retail and commercial area should be drawn. This will ensure that Lambeth council and residents can have more influence over how spaces for new shops and businesses are built. Do you agree with the boundary?

Support

Do you have any further comments?:

18 Lastly, do you have any further comments on any or all of these proposals?

Comments: