London Borough of Southwark

Burbage Road Pedestrian Island

Public Consultation Summary
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 This document report has been produced by the London Borough of Southwark Public Realm Projects Team, to provide a summary of the consultation exercise for a proposed pedestrian island in Burbage Road at its junction with Gallery Road. The measures are being drafted by the Public Realm Projects Team, with the project manager for this scheme being Chris Mascord (Senior Engineer).

1.1.2 The area under consideration is located within the SE21 district of Southwark (Dulwich), in the south of the borough. See figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Location of proposed scheme

1.2 Project and Objectives

1.2.1 Following a request from the Dulwich Society to introduce a pedestrian refuge island as the junction of Burbage Road with Gallery Road, the Dulwich Community Council awarded Cleaner Greener Safer funding to implement the island, subject to consultation with local residents and stakeholders.
1.2.2 The main elements of the scheme include:

- Introduction of a new pedestrian refuge island located on the existing raised carriageway table in Burbage Road (adjacent to roundabout);
- Whilst car traffic can still turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road, larger vehicles will have to traverse around the roundabout to access Burbage Road;
- Introduction of ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions both sides of Burbage Road to ensure adequate sightlines are maintained to the crossing location and the carriageway is free from obstruction;
- Bollards are to be installed on the island to provide additional protection to pedestrians waiting within the extents of the island;
- A bell bollard is to be installed on the southern corner of the junction to ensure vehicles do not overrun the footway.

See Appendix A for drawing of proposed scheme

1.3 Consultation Procedure

1.3.1 The views of the local community and those of statutory consultees have been sought, prior to the development of measures to a detailed design stage. Active community participation was encouraged through the use of a consultation document and questionnaire (see Appendix B – Consultation Documents).

1.3.2 The consultation document included a covering letter describing the proposals and a request for comments (including information to assist in translation and large print versions of the consultation document), preliminary design drawings (A4 size) and a questionnaire/comment form that could be sent to the Public Realm Projects Team with a pre-paid address reply.

1.3.3 The consultation document was delivered to a geographical area centred on the eastern end of Burbage Road using strategic roads and pedestrian desire lines as defined cut off points (See Appendix C – Location Plan and Extents of Consultation).

1.3.4 The distribution area was large enough to gain views from the wider community that may be considered to be affected by the proposed measures. A mailing list was established for the area by way of the Council’s GIS database. In addition, the consultation documents and plans were supplied to the Council’s established list of statutory consultees including London Buses, cycle groups and the Metropolitan Police.

1.3.5 The consultation documents were delivered by Royal Mail to 94 addresses detailed within the distribution list. The documents were delivered on the 28th November 2013, with a return deadline of the 20th December 2013, allowing 3 weeks for the consultation period.
2.0 Consultation Responses

2.1 Response Rate and Distribution

2.1.1 A total of 41 responses were received during the consultation period, equating to a 44% response rate.

2.1.3 One questionnaire was received from Statutory Consultees (Southwark Living Streets).

2.2 Questionnaire Analysis

2.2.1 The questionnaire element of the consultation document contained the following key questions and associated tick box options:

Q1. Are you a resident or business?

Q2. What do you think of the proposal?

2.2.2 The following is a summary of replies received:

**Question 1 - Are you a resident or business?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Returned questionnaire results for question 1

2.2.3 Table 1 indicates that the majority of responses received throughout the consultation period were from local residents, with only two businesses formally replying.

**Question 2 – Do you support the proposals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Returned questionnaire results for question 2
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Figure 2: Graphical representation of consultation data for question 2

2.2.4 Table 2 and figure 2 indicate a majority of support for question 2, with 76% supporting the introduction of a pedestrian refuge island in Burbage Road.

2.3 Additional Comments

2.3.1 The questionnaire element of the consultation document invited consultees to attach any additional comments they may have on the proposals when returning the reply-paid questionnaire.

2.3.2 The majority of respondents (76%) indicated full support for the proposed measures, indicating that the scheme was welcome to enhance road safety and pedestrian safety. Many highlighted that the existing layout of the junction was dangerous and difficult to cross during peak traffic flow periods.

2.3.3 Respondents indicated that they use this junction daily with their children and the proposed island will be a great help in assisting them crossing Burbage Road.

2.3.4 A number of respondents in support of the scheme indicated that they had concerns that vehicles will not be able to left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road. *

   * In response, the proposals have been modelled using tracking software to ensure cars and vans can still turn left without conflict.

2.3.5 A request was made for the existing speed tables on Dulwich Village to be modified, as they cause noise and vibrations. *

   * In response, the raised tables located on Dulwich Village adjacent to the roundabout have been designed to bus friendly specifications which ensure that the ramp gradients are suitable for large vehicles. Therefore there should be no vibration or excessive noise from vehicles traversing these measures.
2.3.6 A request was made for a stop sign to be erected at the Gallery Road approach to the roundabout. *

* In response, it is not possible to erect a stop sign at the junction of Gallery Road with the roundabout, as this would contradict the give way regulations associated with the operation of the roundabout and would result in confusion to drivers.

2.3.7 A number of respondents indicated that they would like all vehicles to still turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road and that the proposals will result in more congestion on the roundabout. *

* In response, it is physically not possible to install a pedestrian island and have large vehicles turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road due to the geometry of the junction and available carriageway width. If large vehicles were still allowed to turn left, then significant conflict would occur with highway infrastructure and seriously endanger pedestrians.

The vast majority of vehicles will still be able to turn left into Burbage Road. It will only be vehicles over 7.5t that will need to use the roundabout in order to access Burbage Road from Gallery Road. As a result it is anticipated that there will not be any adverse impact on traffic circulation on the roundabout.

2.3.8 A number of residents expressed concern at the bell bollard proposed on the corner of the junction, stating that it will make it more difficult to negotiate the left turn into Burbage Road. Drivers will look in their mirror to make sure they miss it instead of looking for pedestrians. *

* In response, the bell bollard has been included in the design following recommendations from the safety audit indicating that there was a chance that larger vehicles may still try and negotiate the left turn which would result in significant overrunning of the footway; thereby endangering pedestrians (as well as resulting in maintenance issues for the council). It can also be argued that the additional enforcement measure will also result in slower left turning vehicle movements into Burbage Road, which will further enhance pedestrian safety. As discussed above, the design has been modelled using different vehicle sizes and all except larger 7.5t vehicles can still turn left without conflicting with the existing geometry of the junction or proposed pedestrian island.

2.8.9 A number of respondents requested the removal of the footway ‘bulge’ on the south-western corner of the junction that was introduced as part of the previous junction ‘improvements’. Respondents asked why not just cut the corner back instead of banning large vehicles turning left? It will be impossible to police large lorries to use the roundabout. Many requested that the junction layout should be revised back to how it was before. *

* In response, the objective of the current scheme was primarily to investigate installing a pedestrian island. Reviewing the junction layout or proposing changes to the previous scheme is not part of the design brief, nor has funding been provided to progress further changes.
Even if the footway was cut back at this location, the presence of the island would still physically prevent larger vehicles turning left without encroaching onto the footway or conflicting with the island. The proposed measures (bell bollard and further bollards on the island) will physically prevent large vehicles turning left into Burbage Road. The conspicuousness of the island and signage will be clearly identifiable to lorry drivers who will have no choice but to access Burbage Road by traversing around the roundabout.

2.8.10 A request was received to remove the planted footway extensions further down Burbage Road to offset loss of kerbside parking associated with the island. *

* In response, there is no budget or justification to remove the recently installed road narrowing in Burbage Road. There is ample unrestricted kerbside parking availability in Burbage Road for residents and visitors. It must be also noted that the majority of residential dwellings have off street parking. The cost removing this feature and the adverse impact the removal may have on the visual amenity of the streetscape is not justified.

2.3.11 A respondent stated that the introduction of the double yellow lies will have a adverse knock on effect on parking availability in the area. *

* In response, the impact of the proposed double yellow lines will have minimal impact on overall parking availability in the area. Burbage Road is a residential street (with the majority of properties having off street parking) and no commercial frontages. Therefore the loss of short sections of kerbline available for parking will not have any adverse impact. The parking restrictions are essential to ensure that there are adequate sightlines on approach to the proposed island. Currently indiscriminate parking adjacent to the raised table / pedestrian crossing point compromises sightlines at the raised table.

2.3.12 A request was made for further measures in Gallery Road, such as yellow lines and bollards to prevent parking that restricts carriageway width and visibility between the zebra crossing and the raised table. *

* In response, such requests are outside the remit of the existing project. If members consider this to be an issue then CGS funding could be potentially allocated to officers to investigate this issue further.

2.3.13 Analysis of the additional comments from respondents that objected to the scheme highlighted the following concerns:

A respondent objected stating that there is no issue with crossing Burbage Road.*

* In response, the Dulwich Community Council provided funding to investigate the feasibility of a pedestrian island at this location. This was at the request of a number of local residents that highlighted a perceived safety concern when crossing Burbage Road across the existing table. It was also highlighted by residents that many school children cross this junction and further measures were warranted to assist pedestrians.
A respondent objected stating that this proposal will not solve the main safety issue at the junction (namely vehicles exiting Gallery Road and colliding with vehicles entering the roundabout from College Road and cyclists traversing around the roundabout).

* In response, the scheme has the specific objective of potentially providing a pedestrian island on Burbage Road and therefore can not be utilised to investigate other perceived issues on or around the existing junction and roundabout. If safety issues emerge, then future applications can be made to the DCC to potentially obtain funding to investigate the problems further.

A number of respondents objected stating that it will be impossible to turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road when the crossing is implemented.

* In response, the design has been modelled using the tracking movements of various vehicles. The results indicate that there will be no conflict between cars and vans turning left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road. Observations were also made on site with the island position marked out on the carriageway to ascertain if overrun is likely to occur. This observation was critical in determining the lane widths adjacent to the island and the size of the structure.

A respondent objected stating that very few people use the crossing point and money would be better spent on road repairs.

* In response, as outlined above, the funding has been allocated specifically for the investigation of installing a pedestrian island and cannot be used for other measures in the area.

A number of respondents argued that the ‘bulge’ on the corner of Burbage Road and Gallery Road should be removed to assist left turning vehicles (from Gallery Road) past the new island.

* In response, normal vehicles will still be able turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road without conflict. Enough carriageway width has been retained adjacent to the island to allow vehicles to traverse past without overrunning either the footway buildout or the island. It can be argued that the presence of the island will actually make drivers take more care when undertaking left turning manoeuvres, thereby improving pedestrian safety.

A number of objectors indicated that the proposals will slow traffic down and cause more congestion at the roundabout. Heavy goods vehicles will not want to queue around the roundabout.

* In response, there is no evidence that introducing a pedestrian island in Burbage Road will result in more congestion on the roundabout. Normal size vehicles will still be able to turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road and enter from the roundabout. The amount of HGV traffic currently entering Burbage Road is minimal and making them use the roundabout to access Burbage Road will have a negligible effect on traffic congestion in peak hours. HGV vehicles will be physically restricted from entering Burbage Road from Gallery Road and therefore will have no choice but to use the roundabout or seek alternative routes.
A respondent objected on the grounds that the plan did not show the vehicle entrance into his property. *

* In response, all proposed elements are clearly illustrated on the consultation drawing, which include the position of the island, bell bollard, yellow lines and advisory signage. There is no conflict with any private property or existing vehicle entrance. There is no change to any footway layout or locations of vehicle crossovers and therefore no requirement to illustrate them on the consultation plan.

A respondent objected indicating that the new island location is in the wrong place (too near the junction and should be positioned further down into Burbage Road). *

* In response, the island has been positioned on the table adjacent to the existing pedestrian crossing point and desire line. Offsetting the island further down Burbage Road, away from the desire line, would likely result in it not being used (as pedestrians would still continue to cross on the most direct line across the table).

In addition, the island is being placed on the table to ensure that it is prominent and easily identified by vehicles before they turn left into Burbage Road from Gallery Road. If the island was positioned further down Burbage Road then HGV drivers may not see the crossing point before committing to the left turn, thereby becoming blocked, and having to reverse out Burbage Road onto the roundabout which would cause safety concerns.

It must be noted that number of HGV vehicles were observed turning into Burbage Road and they would still collide with the island even if it was located 10m away from the junction, as they require the full width of Burbage Road to turn left and would be unable to correct to the near side to traverse past an island located away from the junction.

A respondent objected highlighting that there was no need for double yellow lines in Burbage Road. *

* In response, ‘at any time’ parking controls are essential if the pedestrian island is implemented to ensure that adequate forward sightlines are maintained to the crossing point at all times. If the restrictions were not in place, then indiscriminately parked vehicles would obscure pedestrians, particularly children, waiting to cross Burbage Road.

The parking restrictions would also be necessary to ensure that adequate carriageway width is maintained on approach to the island and adjacent to the crossing point. If no parking prohibitions were in place then vehicles may not be able to traverse past the island without conflict.

A respondent objected on the grounds the council has already spent too much money at this location for little benefit. *

* In response, the proposed scheme is the most cost effective solution to address the objectives of the project brief. The scheme, if implemented, only requires installation of a refuge island on the existing speed table and pedestrian desire line. Therefore no accommodation works on the adjacent
footway or tactile paving layouts are required. The proposal therefore compliments the existing layout and geometry of the junction. The island also does not need to be illuminated and therefore ongoing maintenance costs are minimal.

2.3.14 20% respondents did not submit a further comment.

2.4 Levels of Consensus

2.4.1 The following majority levels of agreement have been given in relation to the questions contained within the consultation document:

- 76% of consultees support the introduction of the pedestrian island;
- 24% of consultees are opposed to the scheme.

2.5 Statutory Consultee Replies

2.5.1 One statutory consultee provided a reply to the consultation (in support).

2.5.2 No objections were received from Ward Members throughout the consultation period.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 In accordance with the majority of respondents to the consultation exercise supporting the scheme, it is recommended that the scheme is considered for implementation.
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