



**A205 THURLOW PARK ROAD
SAFETY & PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS
POST CONSULTATION REPORT
August 2007**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	The Need for the Project	4
1.2	This Report	4
1.3	The Need for a Road Trial	4
1.4	The Need for Consultation	5
2	Activities Undertaken	6
2.1	The Options	6
2.2	Key Stakeholder Consultation	6
2.3	Road Trial Erection	6
2.4	Road Trial Monitoring	7
2.5	Road User and Local Consultation	7
3	Trial Monitoring Results	9
3.1	Parking Surveys	9
3.2	Pedestrian Movements	10
3.3	Vehicle Speeds	11
3.4	Turning Movement Counts (TMC)	13
3.5	Vehicle Classification Results	14
3.6	Conclusion on Monitoring	15
4	Consultation Responses	16
4.1	Analysis of Questionnaires	16
4.2	Feedback from Stakeholder Meetings	17
4.3	Discussion	18
5	Budget Costs	21
5.1	Assumptions	21
6	Recommendations	22
7	Quality Statement	24

Appendices25

Appendix A – Location Plan

Appendix B – Layout Options

Appendix C – Road Trial Layout

Appendix D – Leaflet/Questionnaire

Appendix E – Questionnaire Log

1 Activities Undertaken

1.1 The Need for the Project

The A205 Thurlow Park Road forms part of the TfL network and links Tulse Hill to the A205 Dulwich Common, as shown on the location plan Appendix A.

Between Rosendale Road and Tulse Hill the eastbound and westbound carriageways comprise of two traffic lanes in each direction. Pedestrian signal controlled junction and crossings exist at the junctions with Rosendale Road. At Lancaster Avenue there is a staggered Zebra crossing whilst at Elmcourt Road / Lovelace Road and Avenue Park Road / Birkbeck Hill there are straight Zebra crossings with refuges. The road speed is restricted to thirty miles per hour (30mph).

Following a casualty on the A205 close to the junction of Elmcourt Road and Lovelace Road the Mayor and TfL are reviewing the crossing together with the adjacent crossings at Lancaster Avenue and Elmcourt Road to see what improvements to safety can be made.

1.2 This Report

This report explains:

- the consultation and road trial activities;
- the options that were consulted on;
- the responses from the consultation;
- information and feedback from the road trial;
- the preferred solution;
- the work needed to implement the preferred solution.

1.3 The Need for a Road Trial

Initial work and consultation with local groups showed that there were various options to improve safety. In particular the traffic volumes between Birkbeck Hill and Lancaster Avenue were found to be low enough to consider options that would reduce the carriageway widths from two lanes in each direction to one lane along part of the road.

Transport for London Road Network Development (TfL RND) commissioned Project Centre to organise a road narrowing trial (see Commissioning Brief titled [Design of A205 Thurlow Park Road - Road Narrowing Scheme](#), dated April 2007).

The objectives of the trial were:

- to see if it was feasible to reduce traffic to one lane in each direction on this part of the A205;
- to improve road safety;

- to provide information from surveys on the use of the road by pedestrians, drivers and frontages, particularly on traffic speeds, traffic volumes, crossing movements and parking behaviour;
- to provide anecdotal feedback from local road users.

1.4 The Need for Consultation

TfL RND extended Project Centre's brief to include consultation on the options for improving road safety.

There was no statutory obligation for consultation to be carried out at option development stage, but previous consultations had indicated that the project was of considerable interest to local councillors and resident groups. To consult on well-defined options rather than a single preferred scheme was seen by TfL RND as a good way of managing the benefits and disbenefits of the project.

The main objectives of the consultation were:

- to find out from a representative sample of local people who cross Thurlow Park Road (i) the perceived problems and reasons for these; (ii) their main safety concerns; (iii) responses to three options put forward by Transport for London to improve safety; and (iv) any further added value suggestions that are not too expensive.
- to reassure local residents and their representatives that the design of the final scheme will take reasonable account of their concerns.
- to achieve support for a preferred option.

2 Activities Undertaken

2.1 The Options

Three options were identified by TfL RND for development by Project Centre and the exhibited layout options are shown in Appendix B. The options were based on the following:

- narrowing the road physically to reduce the crossing distance and slow traffic;
- converting road space to cycle lanes to reduce the effective crossing distance and slow traffic; or
- installing signal controls to stop traffic periodically and allow people to cross. (At Lancaster Avenue, option (iii) would mean full signalisation of the junction as well to improve traffic flow on Lancaster Avenue).

TfL RND recommended a combination of the second and third options in the consultation material.

2.2 Key Stakeholder Consultation

A meeting was held with Lambeth BC in September 2006 to review initial design ideas to improve the road crossings.

A meeting was held with TfL RND, Lambeth BC and Thurlow ward Councillors in November 2006 to draw attention to the intended road trial and consultation process.

In December 2006, discussions took place between TfL RND, TfL Network Assurance Team and the Metropolitan Police to discuss the intended operation of the road trial and safety issues arising.

A further stakeholder meeting was held in January 2007 with representatives of local resident groups and the ward Councillor. Further detail on the road trial and the consultation was discussed and feedback received on local concerns.

A final meeting took place at Rosemead School in March 2007 with representatives of local resident groups, the ward Councillor and the head of the school. At this meeting, early feedback from the first few weeks of operation of the trial was received with positive feedback.

2.3 Road Trial Erection

Appendix C shows the layout of the road trial. Originally it was to extend from Tulse Hill to Lancaster Avenue but this was reduced to meet available funding.

Two letter drops were undertaken in Autumn 2006 and February 2007 notifying key stakeholders and frontages of the proposed road trial commencing 19 February 2007 for a period of at least three months.

The trial was erected in late February 2007. It was planned to be removed in late May 2007 but following consultation with local stakeholders it was extended to late July 2007.

Following a review of performance and consultation responses in July 2007 and discussions with TfL Network Assurance, TfL RND decided to continue the trial until a permanent solution is implemented.

During the trial period 18 written responses were received as a result of the notification letters or through TfL Customer Services. Details of the responses are in the log in Appendix C and including parking concerns and access arrangement to frontages.

2.4 Road Trial Monitoring

Surveys were organised by Project Centre before and after the trial so that the effects of the trial could be assessed.

Automated Traffic Counters (ATCs) were laid in the carriageway to measure vehicle speed and traffic flow. Vehicle speeds and counts were measured for a 12 hour period in the daytime (7am – 7pm). Speed and flow surveys were carried out at two locations along Thurlow Park Road. At the request of LB Lambeth an additional ATC was added on Lancaster Avenue to monitor any traffic displacement that might occur as a result of the works.

Video cameras were erected to provide information on pedestrian crossings, vehicle and parking behaviour. Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays were selected for the analysis and the videos were run for 24 hours to pick up the overnight effects of parking.

Due to budgetary constraints, only two cameras were used. These were positioned between Avenue Park Road and Lovelace Road to pick up the maximum possible footage of the area of interest. This meant that no footage of the Lancaster Road area could be provided.

The monitoring was carried out on the following dates:

- Pre-trial: 21, 23, 25 November 2006; additional ATC at Lancaster Avenue 6, 8, 10 February.
- Post-trial, first survey: 6, 8, 10 March 2007
- Post-trial, second survey: 19, 21, 23 June 2007

Survey results for Tuesday 7th June 2007 were unfortunately unavailable as the cameras used for recording were vandalised.

2.5 Road User and Local Consultation

TfL RND and Project Centre produced a consultation leaflet / questionnaire illustrating the options, advertising the consultation process and inviting comments as shown in Appendix D. The leaflets were distributed and promoted as follows:

- Leaflets, as shown in Appendix D, were handed out at a school open evening on 3 May 2007.
- Leaflets were issued to key Stakeholders and Councillors in advance of general distribution.

- Leaflet was added to a dedicated TfL web page (3 May 2007)
<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/projectsandschemes/roadsandpublicspaces/4984.aspx>
- Leaflets were handed out at the three existing pedestrian crossings (8 May 2007).
- 4000 leaflets were delivered to the local area (6,7 & 8 May 2007).
- A stand was held at the Rosemead School Summer Fair on the 16 June 2007.
- An exhibition was held at West Norwood Library (18-23 June 2007).

The closing date for returns was 30 June 2007, although questionnaires received after this date have been included in the analysis.

3 Trial Monitoring Results

3.1 Parking Surveys

Two camera surveys simultaneously recorded any parking behaviour north and the south of the stretch of road between the rail bridge at Thurlow Park Road & Lovelace Road. They were used to record the behaviour of all drivers for their duration of stay when parking their vehicles.

The summary information provided in Tables 1.0 – 1.2 indicates that even with the new layout parking behaviour of motorists has not changed in any day recorded with any significance.

From these results it would show that the trial has not had any significant impact on the behaviour of motorists parking along this part of Thurlow Park Road.

Survey Date	Day	Location	Length of Stay		
			<1 min	1 to 5 Min	> 5 Min
		Lovelace Road to Railbridge			
Nov-06	Tues	Northside	10	17	13
	Tues	Southside	5	8	3
	Thurs	Northside	21	18	17
	Thurs	Southside	3	12	2
	Sat	Northside	17	14	26
	Sat	Southside	8	14	6

Table 1.0 November 2006 Parking summary

Survey Date	Day	Location	Length of Stay		
			<1 min	1 to 5 Min	> 5 Min
		Lovelace Road to Railbridge			
Mar-07	Tues	Northside	12	17	13
	Tues	Southside	4	6	3
	Thurs	Northside	14	14	10
	Thurs	Southside	5	3	3
	Sat	Northside	17	18	24
	Sat	Southside	6	10	4

Table 1.1 March 2007 Parking summary

Survey Date	Day	Location	Length of Stay		
			<1 min	1 to 5 Min	> 5 Min
		Lovelace Road to Railbridge			
Jun-07	Tues	Northside			
	Tues	Southside			
	Thurs	Northside	5	8	16
	Thurs	Southside	6	14	8
	Sat	Northside	16	15	18
	Sat	Southside	4	11	7

Table 1.2 June 2007 Parking summary

3.2 Pedestrian Movements

From the results summarised in Tables 2.0, 2.1 and 2.2 below there is no considerable difference between the total number of pedestrians crossing Thurlow Park Road in each survey period between November 2006 and March and June 2007.

Survey Date	Day	Location	Number of Peds	
			Total	Peak hour
		Lovelace Road to Railbridge		
Nov-06	Tues	Not using Zebra crossing	38	10-11 am/ 1-2 pm (4 peds)
	Tues	Using Zebra crossing	1529	8-9am (239 peds)
	Thurs	Not using Zebra crossing	25	3-4 pm (6 Peds)
	Thurs	Using Zebra crossing	1644	8-9 am (265 peds)
	Sat	Not using Zebra crossing	43	8-9pm (10 Peds)
	Sat	Using Zebra crossing	993	12-1pm (102 Peds)

Table 2.0: Pedestrian movement's summary, November 2006

Survey Date	Day	Location	Number of Peds	
			Total	Peak hour
		Lovelace Road to Railbridge		
Mar-07	Tues	Not using Zebra crossing	22	2-3 pm (5 peds)
	Tues	Using Zebra crossing	1766	8-9 am (261peds)
	Thurs	Not using Zebra crossing	30	12-1 pm / 11pm-12am (4 peds)
	Thurs	Using Zebra crossing	1688	8-9am (241 peds)
	Sat	Not using Zebra crossing	36	7-8pm (36 peds)
	Sat	Using Zebra crossing	1148	1-2 pm (108 peds)

Table 2.1: Pedestrian movement's summary, March 2007

Survey Date	Day	Location	Number of Peds	
			Total	Peak hour
		Lovelace Road to Railbridge		
Jun-07	Tues	Not using Zebra crossing	0	-
	Tues	Using Zebra crossing	0	-
	Thurs	Not using Zebra crossing	23	11pm - 12am (5 Peds)
	Thurs	Using Zebra crossing	1676	8 - 9 am (265 Peds)
	Sat	Not using Zebra crossing	79	2 - 3 pm (33 Peds)
	Sat	Using Zebra crossing	1085	11 - 12 pm (98 Peds)

Table 2.2: Pedestrian movement's summary, June 2007

Table 2.3 below illustrates that an increased proportion of pedestrians were using the zebra crossings during the March and June surveys (98% and 99% respectively) in comparison to the surveys carried out in November (97%). This would indicate that a larger percentage of pedestrians were using the zebra crossing as a result of the introduction of the trial layout.

	Average Crossing	Percentage using	Percentage not using
	Per day	Zebra Crossing	Zebra Crossing
	(peds)	(peds)	(peds)
Nov-06	1404	97%	3%
Mar-07	1563.3	98%	2%
Jun-07	1386.5	99%	1%

Table 2.3 Crossing behaviour of pedestrians on average per day

3.3 Vehicle Speeds

Vehicle speeds were recorded in November 2006 and in March and June 2007. Tables 3.1 to 3.3 provide the 85%ile results of these surveys.

From the results, the average 85%ile speeds show the speeds remain consistent during each of the 7-day recordings.

The results provided for March 2007 at Site 1 shows a dramatic reduction in the average 85%ile speed by approximately 10 mph compared to the results in June 2007 and almost 15 mph in Nov 2006 at site1, this may be due to road works local to the site.

The results at site 1 between November 2006 and June 2007 show a variance in results of approximately 4mph in the 85%ile results with traffic speeds reduced to around 30 mph in the June 2007 results.

The speed limit along Thurlow Park Road for both sites is 30 mph; the 85%ile traffic speeds were recorded in November 2006 to be on average 4.5 mph above this speed limit. Results recorded in March and June 2007 show that 85%ile speeds were reduced to around the 30 mph limit, after the trial period had commenced.

Nov 2006 Data		
85%ile Speeds (12 hr 07:00 to 19:00) (mph)		
Location		
	Between	Between
Date	Lovelace Road &Thurlow Hill	Birkbeck Hill and Lovelace Road
Sat 18/11/06	35.1	29.4
Sun 19/11/06	34.7	N/A
Mon 20/11/06	34.4	34.4
Tue 21/11/06	34.5	34.2
Wed 22/11/06	34.2	33.9
Thu 23/11/06	34.5	34.2
Fri 24/11/06	34.5	34.4
Average	34.5	33.4

Table 3.1: November 2006 ATC 85%ile Results

March 2007 Data		
Date	85%ile Speeds (12 hr 07:00 to 19:00) (mph)	
	Location	
	Between Lovelace Road &Thurlow Hill	Between Birkbeck Hill and Lovelace Road
Sat 03/03/07	22.8	30.6
Sun 04/03/07	21.3	30.5
Mon 05/03/07	20.9	30.5
Tues 06/03/07	21.2	30.2
Wed 07/03/07	20.2	30.2
Thurs 08/03/07	21.0	30.0
Fri 09/03/07	n/a	30.4
Average	21.2	30.3

Table 3.2: March 2007 ATC 85%ile Results

June 2007 Data		
Date	85%ile Speeds (12 hr 07:00 to 19:00) (mph)	
	Location	
	Between Lovelace Road &Thurlow Hill	Between Birkbeck Hill and Lovelace Road
Fri 15/06/07	31.5	31.3
Sat 16/06/07	31.9	31.3
Sun 17/06/07	30.9	30.6
Mon 18/06/07	31.0	30.3
Tues 19/06/07	31.1	30.6
Wed 20/06/07	30.9	30.6
Thur 21/06/07	30.9	30.7
Average	31.2	30.7

Table 3.3: June 2007 ATC 85%ile Results

3.4 Turning Movement Counts (TMC)

The summary information provided in Table 4.1 below indicates that the heaviest traffic movements for both the AM and PM peak are along both directions on Thurlow Park.

Table 4.1 below indicates traffic movements recorded during the trial layout as requested for March 2007. It would be a valuable exercise to carry out another TMC survey after the trial layout has been removed to identify any significant changes in traffic movements at the same junctions.

From	To	Time	Mar-07 Total PCU
Thurlow Park (W)			
	Lovelace Rd	07.00 - 10.00	229.5
		1500 - 1800	138
	Thurlow Park (E)	07.00 - 10.00	2358.2
		1500 - 1800	4136.5
	Elm Court Rd	07.00 - 10.00	69
		1500 - 1800	174.8
Lovelace Rd			
	Thurlow Park (E)	07.00 - 10.00	20.2
		1500 - 1800	21
	Elm Court Rd	07.00 - 10.00	65
		1500 - 1800	65
	Thurlow Park (W)	07.00 - 10.00	59.4
		1500 - 1800	69
Thurlow Park (E)			
	Elm Court Rd	07.00 - 10.00	132.6
		1500 - 1800	86
	Thurlow Park (W)	07.00 - 10.00	2700.8
		1500 - 1800	1925.6
	Lovelace Rd	07.00 - 10.00	29.6
		1500 - 1800	22
Elm Court Rd			
	Thurlow Park (W)	07.00 - 10.00	11.2
		1500 - 1800	9.9
	Lovelace Rd	07.00 - 10.00	42.8
		1500 - 1800	28.8
	Thurlow Park (E)	07.00 - 10.00	47.7
		1500 - 1800	55.1

Table 4.1: March 2007 TMC Summary

3.5 Vehicle Classification Results

The summary information provided in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show results from recorded two-way traffic data in November 2006 and in March and June 2007.

The most significant change identified from the results was the March results at Site 1 where a vast reduction in all classes was observed compared to results in November and June.

Results in March and June at site 2 show an increase in the volume of vehicles such as cars, vans, motorcycles etc. compared to results in November 2006.

The only consistent noticeable change at both sites is from July data. The total volumes in July are only slightly greater than compared to November figures however; there is a major decrease in the volume of large vehicles in July in compared to November before the trial. This difference is also identified in March results with the number of large vehicles recorded also being less than those in November.

Thurlow Hill to Birkbeck Hill		Total	Bin 1	Bin 2	Bin 3	Bin 4
		Vol.	1 to 3	4 to 7	8 to 10	11 to 13
Nov 2006	Totals	119982	110640	5800	2814	728
	Daily Ave	17140.3	15805.7	828.6	402.0	104.0
Mar 2007	Totals	4582	4549	30	3	0
	Daily Ave	654.6	649.9	4.3	0.4	0.0
Jun 2007	Totals	128653	119322	6564	2743	24
	Daily Ave	18379.0	17046.0	937.7	391.9	3.4

Table 4.1: Vehicle Classification Results Thurlow Hill to Birkbeck Hill (site 1)

Lovelace Road to Birkbeck Hill		Total	Bin 1	Bin 2	Bin 3	Bin 4
		Vol.	1 to 3	4 to 7	8 to 10	11 to 13
Nov 2006	Totals	71852	66954	889	4009	
	Daily Ave	10264.6	9564.9	127.0	572.7	
Mar 2007	Totals	118905	113162	3345	2068	330
	Daily Ave	16986.4	16166.0	477.9	295.4	47.1
Jun 2007	Totals	131337	119279	8964	3063	31
	Daily Ave	10541.6	9560.1	679.1	299.6	2.7

Table 4.2: Vehicle Classification Results Lovelace Road to Birkbeck Hill (site 2)

3.6 Conclusion on Monitoring

- From the Camera surveys carried out it was identified that the overall parking behaviour of motorists was not affected by the introduction of the trial layout with little difference in vehicle numbers parking on either the north or south side of Thurlow Park Road.
- The results of the pedestrian study showed that there was a significant increase in the proportion of pedestrians using the zebra crossing after the trial layout had been installed.
- The recorded speed of vehicles was reduced compared to the November 2006 results along the study area with recorded 85thile speeds of just over the 30 mph speed limit. This reduction in average speed may have been influenced by the introduction of the trial layout.
- Vehicle classification results at both sites shows a trend between the reduction of large/ multi axel vehicles from November results and after the trial layout was installed.
- Analysis from results shows that the trial layout had impacted significantly the driver speed and the behaviour of crossing pedestrians along the area studied at Thurlow Park Road. It also showed that with this trial the type of vehicle changed with the narrowing of the carriageway lane reducing the volume of larger vehicles.

4 Consultation Responses

4.1 Analysis of Questionnaires

To date some 350 completed questionnaires have been returned.

The results recorded for each question are shown as a percentage of the returns.
(Note - where more than one answer was given this has been double counted, thus reflecting an overall percentage in excess of 100%).

Question 1 – The crossing point that most concerns me is?

Avenue Park Road	31 % Agree	7% Disagree
Lovlace Rd	56 % Agree	3% Disagree
Lancaster Avenue	60 % Agree	4% Disagree

Question 2 – The main safety issues that concern me crossing Thurlow Park

Road are:

Traffic too fast	92 % Agree	7% Disagree
Road too wide	39 % Agree	14% Disagree
No protection signals	73 % Agree	6% Disagree
Traffic not easy to see	50 % Agree	11% Disagree
Feel insecure	17 % Agree	32% Disagree

Question 3 – The main problems I find crossing Thurlow Park Road are:

Crossing not in right place	16 % Agree	27% Disagree
Refuge not big enough	32 % Agree	21% Disagree
Road too wide	39 % Agree	14% Disagree
Difficult to get on crossing	53 % Agree	10% Disagree

Question 4 – In general, I think that the best solution to improving crossing Thurlow Park Road would be:

Option 1	28 % Agree	24% Disagree
Option 2	27 % Agree	26% Disagree
Option 3	60 % Agree	9% Disagree
Combination of options		
1&2	3 % Agree	7% Disagree
1&3	13 % Agree	7% Disagree
2&3	21 % Agree	5% Disagree
1, 2, 3	7 % Agree	7% Disagree

Question 5 – It would be useful to me if the solution included:

Cycle Lanes	30 % Agree	19% Disagree
Bleepers	36 % Agree	10% Disagree
Tactile	27 % Agree	7% Disagree
Signals Lancaster	44 % Agree	11% Disagree

Question 6 – I would be happy to accept any of the following disbenefits:

Loss Parking	34 % Agree	15% Disagree
Slower Cars	57 % Agree	15% Disagree
Signals Time	52 % Agree	18% Disagree
Turning restrictions	35 % Agree	24% Disagree

An assessment of the postcodes identified on the returned questionnaires showed the following representation:

SE19	1.5%
SE20	0%
SE21	60%
SE22	0.5%
SE23	0.5%
SE24	1.5%
SE26	1%
SE27	26%
SW2	7%
SW9	1%
SW12	0%
SW16	1%

A number of additional comments were made, the full details of which are in the questionnaire log in Appendix E.

4.2 Feedback from Stakeholder Meetings

In early discussions, LB Lambeth emphasised the importance of maintaining the capacity of the A205 and collecting information on parking behaviour before and after the trial to determine the impact.

In early meetings with local Councillors, the inadequacy of the school transport assessment was emphasised, and the need to co-ordinate any network changes with other initiatives such as the CPZ consultation, school access and Norwood Road was seen to be very important.

In meetings with local residents, a number of issues were raised, particularly perceived congestion and parking problems around the school, displacement of traffic onto residential streets and pedestrian crossing safety.

4.3 Discussion

4.3.1 General Comments

The general consensus is that the road narrowing trial has improved the safety for both pedestrians and motorists.

Speed and driver awareness seems to be the main concern with vehicles not stopping at zebras; overtaking on crossings when traffic in the other lane stops to allow pedestrians to cross.

Also highlighted as a problem is the fact that vehicles are not stopping for pedestrians unless the person steps onto the crossing.

With reference to the road narrowing trial, approximately 60% of returns highlighted that it made it easier to cross the road (not as wide & slower traffic). 40% of the returns suggested that the trial slowed down traffic too much (already a very busy road) and that the barriers and cones made it difficult to see pedestrians on crossings.

The introduction has left opinion divided. Some feel they are necessary but others think they would be ignored and dangerous to cyclists as the road is not wide enough. There were also suggestions that the footway could be widened to incorporate a cycle lane as currently a lot of cyclists use the footway due to the fact they do not consider it safe to cycle on the carriageway.

4.3.2 Lancaster Avenue

Respondents identified this junction as the number one priority.

Traffic signals were a popular solution to this junction, both in the written responses and verbal feedback at the summer fayre. It is interesting that so many people perceive a traffic benefit as well as a pedestrian safety benefit, despite possible increases in delay. This points towards a fully signalised junction rather than an off-set signalised crossing.

There was some concern that signalisation might slow the flow of traffic too much. The traffic impacts of any signalisation will be modelled and audited by TfL before implementation.

Another concern expressed was that signals can cause acceleration in-between junctions and crossings. However, this should be balanced against the existing situation, where the zebra crossings and give-way lines already cause vehicles to slow down and usually to stop.

There are some significant design constraints on the layout of this junction:

- the need to maintain parking provision outside Rosemead School on Lancaster Avenue, which, in its current position, constrains the number of approach lanes to one, and therefore limits the junction capacity;
- the need to maintain access for the abnormal high load route along Lancaster Avenue; and
- the need to accommodate existing private accesses, some of which would have to be inside the controlled area of any signalised junction, and these dictate the location of pedestrian crossings.

4.3.3 Elmcourt Road / Lovelace Road

Respondents identified this junction as a high priority.

Traffic signals were a popular solution to this junction. However the junction is relatively close to the proposed signalised junction at Lancaster Avenue and in conjunction with a poor road alignment between the sites and the side road junction of Thurlow Hill it is considered that another signalised junction may introduce further safety concerns. In addition the volume of traffic from Elmcourt Road and Lovelace Road does not justify fully signalised control and increased delays to traffic on the A205 Thurlow Park Road.

An alternative approach would be to provide a single pedestrian signalised crossing at this location which would facilitate the existing and proposed school crossing demands, as well as the normal pedestrian crossing movements.

The design issue is that a signalised crossing should be at least 20m away from a road junction so that traffic turning out of the junction can see any red signal; but this can move the crossing well away from the desire line and tempt pedestrians to cross off-line. TfL RND do not endorse moving the crossing away from the junction and the consultation responses showed a high level of satisfaction with the current crossing position.

The 20m guideline could be argued to apply from the vehicle position rather than the edge of the junction. As cars drive on the left hand side of the road there would be an advantage of locating the crossing on the right hand side so that the offset is minimised.

A signal crossing can be located close to a significant vehicle access if the access has a banned turn towards the crossing or is one way inbound. No traffic can exit onto the crossing in either case. The options are:

- In-bound only movements to Elmcourt Road, with a signal crossing on the west side of the junction – this would need to be discussed and co-ordinated with the developer's proposals for traffic management of the school, but would reduce movements and conflicts at the junction which would improve safety.
- A banned left turn from Elmcourt Road, with a signal crossing on the west side of the junction – this would need to be discussed and co-ordinated with the developer's proposals for traffic management of the school, but in TfL RND's opinion would affect a significant number of drivers.
- In-bound only movements to Lovelace Road, with a signal crossing on the east side of the junction - but this would probably displace significant traffic onto Thurlow Hill which in TfL RND's opinion is not desirable from a safety perspective because visibility is poorer there.
- Banned left turn from Lovelace Road, with a signal crossing on the east side of the junction – this would only affect a very small number of drivers , although there may be a slight impact on safety of these drivers using Thurlow Hill to egress eastbound.

At the exhibition a school representative noted that they had no preference for the location of the signalised crossing either in its existing location on the west side of the junction or on the east side.

Moving the crossing further east would avoid the need for school children to cross Elmcourt Road but then would be required to cross Lovelace Road in order to reach the school playing fields.

Overall there appears to be no strong driver to have the crossing on the west or the east side of the crossing.

There was some concern that any signal crossing facility might slow the flow of traffic too much. The traffic impacts of any signal facility will be modelled and audited by TfL before implementation.

Another concern expressed was that signals can cause acceleration in-between junctions and crossings. However this should be balanced against the existing situation where the zebra crossings and give-way lines already cause vehicles to slow down and usually to stop.

4.3.4 Avenue Park Road/ Birkbeck Hill

This crossing was identified as the lowest priority. This points away from a signalised solution in lieu of costs and timescales and the priorities elsewhere on the road.

The road width is of concern to pedestrians and this could be modified by introducing cycle lanes or kerb build-outs. Cycle lanes would be more consistent with emerging solutions elsewhere on the road.

The existing refuge is substandard in width and could be widened to help narrow the effective carriageway width.

4.3.5 Thurlow Hill

It has been identified that during the road narrowing trial westbound traffic on the A205 turning right into Thurlow Hill causes significant delay to the traffic flow on the A205. One solution would be to introduce a dedicated right turn lane of approximately 2.75m width. In addition it is considered that this would improve safety at the summit of the hill on the bend.

5 Budget Costs

5.1 Assumptions

Budget cost for the various proposals are summarised below in Table 1 and are based on recent tenders, except for the traffic signals which are provisional sums at this time. A contingency of £15,000 has been allowed for each site for additional/unforeseen works and stats diversion.

No provision has been made for carriageway resurfacing at this stage, however TfL RNM have identified this carriageway for future maintenance.

Table 1	Estimate	Totals
Lancaster Avenue		
Civils Works	95,000	
Traffic Signals (inclusive)	55,000	
Contingency	15,000	165,000
Elmcourt Road / Lovelace Road		
Civils Works	30,000	
Traffic Signals (inclusive)	30,000	
Contingency	15,000	75,000
Avenue Park Road / Birkbeck Hill		
Civils Works	50,000	
Upgrade of Zebra Crossing	25,000	
Contingency	15,000	90,000
Provision of cycle facilities throughout the site		
Civils Works	80,000	80,000
Estimated Total Construction Cost		410,000
Design Fee @ 8.5% + £3,000 Traffic Orders	37,850	
Supervision Cost @ 5%	20,500	
Estimated Total Scheme Cost		468,350

6 Recommendations

6.1 Lancaster Avenue

A fully signalised junction with pedestrian crossing facilities is recommended.

The design constraints dictate that the controlled north-south crossing should be on the east side of the junction.

Cycle lanes can be provided through the junction but will need to terminate east of Rosendale Road due to limited existing road width, unless the road layout is reduced to one traffic lane in each direction towards the junction with Croxted Road. To continue the cycle route east along Thurlow Park Road appropriate cycle route signing could be put in place.

The scheme is subject to detailed design and modelling and TfL Network Assurance approval.

6.2 Elmcourt Road / Lovelace Road

A stand-alone signalised pedestrian crossing is recommended.

It is recommended that the crossing is located close to the junction on the desire line for pedestrians.

Cycle lanes should also be provided through the junction with measures put in place to deter vehicular overrun on any mandatory cycle lanes.

Consultation with LB Lambeth should determine the best form of traffic management and crossing position. The most promising options are:

- Crossing on the east side of the road, with left turns banned from Lovelace Road.
- Crossing on the west side of the road, with one-way inbound operation of Elmcourt Road.

Turning movements should be reviewed to optimise the layout of build-out to further deter any banned movements.

6.3 Avenue Park Road / Birkbeck Hill

The existing zebra crossing should be maintained but the crossing length reduced by the introduction of cycle lanes.

The central refuge should be widened to meet current standards and will further reduce carriageway width.

It is recommended that modifications to the entry/exits from the side roads are undertaken to assist pedestrian and traffic movements.

6.4 Thurlow Hill

A right-turn entry lane should be considered at this location to minimise traffic queues.

6.5 Scheme Overview

It is important to consider the sites as a whole to ensure that drivers are not subject to a continually changing road layout and continuity of cycle facilities.

The various issues raised shall be considered in further developing the details of the preferred layout at each site.

Subject to further consultation the existing traffic orders will be required to be reviewed and modified to suit the propose road layout.

In the event that insufficient funding is made available to undertake the whole of the works it is recommended that priority is given to installing cycle facilities along the length of the scheme in order to reduce road space and improve the safety of the existing crossings. This should be done in advance of removing the existing road trial which has improved safety and user comfort at the site. It is recommended that the second priority should be an upgrade of the pedestrian crossing at Elmcourt Road followed by the signalisation of the junction at Lancaster Avenue and this would also tie-in with programming requirements.

7 Quality Statement

PCL has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions from TfL. PCL shall not be liable for the use of any information contained herein for any purpose other than the sole and specific use for which it was prepared.

PCL REF	ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	ORIGINATOR	CHECKED	AUTHORISED
515/105	A	Original Issue Date Date Date

It is the policy of PCL to supply Services that meet or exceed our clients' expectations of Quality and Service. To this end, the Company's Quality Management System (QMS) has been structured to encompass all aspects of the Company's activities including such areas as Sales, Design and Client Service.

By adopting our QMS on all aspects of the Company, PCL aims to achieve the following objectives:

- Ensure a clear understanding of customer requirements;
- Ensure projects are completed to programme and within budget;
- Improve productivity by having consistent procedures;
- Increase flexibility of staff and systems through the adoption of a common approach to staff appraisal and training;
- Continually improve the standard of service we provide internally and externally;
- Achieve continuous and appropriate improvement in all aspects of the company;

Our Quality Management Manual is supported by detailed operational documentation. These relate to codes of practice, technical specifications, work instructions, KPIs, and other relevant documentation to form a working set of documents governing the required work practices throughout the Company.

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.

Appendices

Appendix A – Location Plan

Appendix B – Layout Options

Appendix C – Road Trial Layout

Appendix D – Leaflet/Questionnaire

Appendix E – Questionnaire Log
