

Summary of consultation on design of St James Road / Blue Anchor Lane crossing works

Following the initial public consultation on [improvements to the Blue town centre](#), on 9 April 2020 the council carried out further direct consultation on a highway design for the improvements to Blue Anchor Lane, with a new crossing to connect the Low Line across St James Road. The draft design was sent to all stakeholders who took part in the initial consultation on 09 April 2020 including the Blue Community Steering Group, the Rouel Road estate TRA, and Trees for Bermondsey with a clear date requesting comments by 30 April 2020. All of the comments received below were received electronically by email.

Blue BID

This is the kind of individual seat that could be placed along Blue Anchor way to complement the seating area at the end of the street in the new pedestrianised cul-de-sac. They could be placed in between the new trees in pairs, maybe 4 of them. Because the area could be used as an extension of the market in the future, it's best to consider options for street pitches.



Trees for Bermondsey

Thanks for providing the Grosvenor plans. It's great to see that their plans will align with the raised pavement and roadway on Blue Anchor Lane when the project is finally delivered.

It's also great to hear that you're able to deliver the CGS funded hedge along Blue Anchor Lane. I completely agree it makes sense delivering the hedge at the same time as the tree pits on the pavement, as the pavement widening for the trees will provide the room required for the hedge. Rather than trying to find additional room for the hedge, the hedge could always be laid in sections in between the tree pits along the pavement?

I understand money is always tight with these sort of schemes so if there isn't money to deliver the whole hedge it may make sense to deliver the groundworks for the hedge as part of this and then we can apply for additional funding to plant the hedge itself. However, there must be many synergies with delivering the hedge and trees in the pavement at the same time.

Are you able to update the plan with the hedge so we can see what it might look like?

Team London Bridge

My understanding from the scheme is that the pavement on the west side is being made into a shared path for cyclists going along St James Rd (so cyclists don't get squeezed on the carriageway which is narrowed by the refuge). Amy thinks this is not the case, as that would be potentially dangerous for pedestrians (on a narrow pavement) and cyclists (when re-entering the road). So we can only assume that the shared space is in order to create a route through to Lucey Way – but this is not clear on the plan.

In terms of the pocket park, it is such a bold initiative – and such a great addition to the Low Line – are there plans to integrate the arches into the space? I think it could probably accommodate more biodiversity than 6 trees and two planters. I also think the long thin planters seem to divide this open space into two sides a little (there is possibly a reason for this?). Perhaps something round like the attached image (from the Low line Commons report). Also Amy suggested planting and surfacing like this one in [Waltham Forest \(mini holland\)](#).



Urban Movement

Great that the scheme is employing a raised table, and is now proposing a refuge island rather than build-outs. It would be useful to know the width of this refuge. There also look to be developments of the pocket park proposals, and footway widening along Blue Anchor Lane, which are all welcomed. Our main queries are:

- The Low Line walking and cycling route is proposed to travel along Blue Anchor Lane and continuing along Lucey Way- a council housing estate road not part of the public highway. We've already observed pedestrians and cyclists using Lucey Way, as it provides a very direct and low traffic route, despite the environment being poor. The Low Line walking and cycling route proposals would increase footfall alongside part of Spa Terminus, supporting businesses here and highlighting the Low Line. It would also help to support the new businesses planned in the arches at Blue Anchor Lane. It is therefore vital for the Low Line that 1) part of the fence on the west side of St James's Road is removed to enable access to Lucey Way and 2) cyclists and pedestrians are able to safely cross St James's Road. My queries are therefore:
 - Is the removal of a section of the Lucey Way/St James's Road fence being considered and pursued?
 - It would be useful to understand whether a formal cycle crossing has been considered and tested?
 - Is the intention with the current proposal that cyclists would cross informally in the shadow of the ped refuge island (where the right turn pocket is indicated)? If so, could the width of the island be confirmed, and could this be better indicated and implied (e.g. with 1057 cycle symbols facing perpendicular to the road, or a surface treatment?) It would also help to reposition the Belisha

beacon on the west side to keep the 'landing space' for cyclists clear. Other upgrades could include introducing a third traffic island to protect this crossing space.

- We had originally suggested an informal ped + cycle crossing with refuge island, and aligned at an angle to the street to provide a more direct crossing on the desire line between Blue Anchor Lane and Lucey Way. The informal crossing suggestion was due to the ability to better accommodate direct ped and cycle desire lines, the reduced space requirements for this shared arrangement, as well as any potential visibility issues arising from the proximity of the tunnel. A formal crossing would always be preferable, if workable, however not at the expense of a safe cycle crossing facility.
- The footway widening and tree planting along Blue Anchor Lane looks great- this street was highlighted by the Low Line study as particularly poor in terms of ped accessibility. It would be beneficial if the scheme could also rectify some of the missing dropped kerbs and footway defects throughout Blue Anchor Lane.
- The public space looks further developed from the previous design. It would be great to see more details on the surfacing materials and street furniture etc. Some seating would be beneficial, though I understand residents may be concerned by this. It looks like trees are being used to deter vehicles, which I think is a nice approach and reduces the number of bollards required. Claudia from Macfarlane and the wider team may have specific ideas here from their work- we had spoken previously about a micro forest. Jack, I'd recommend running this design proposal by them if you haven't already.

Consultation summary

The overall consultation feedback is supportive of the point closure and the creation of a pocket park. The key feedback and changes sought include

- The inclusion of a hedge funded by the CGS team along Blue Anchor Lane within the scope of works. This matter has been investigated and the highway maintenance team have agreed to maintain the new hedge feature.
- A request was made for street trading pitches to be incorporated into the landscape design, but it is considered that the footfall would not be sufficient for street trading at this stage, and pitches in this location could detract from the central viability of the Blue market.
- Consultees asked if more biodiversity could be included in the scheme. Engineers are removing paving to increase the size of the tree pits, and the planters both of which will increase biodiversity and act as sustainable urban drainage systems.
- Stakeholders queried whether improvements to Lucey Way, which is owned by housing but used by the general public could be included in this scope of works. The current budget and scope is limited, but funding applications are being made to secure a budget to extend improvements along Lucey Way in future.