

From: [REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2022 12:56 PM
To: Alleguen Claire [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Birch John (IDP) [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Herne Hill Signal Intervention Report

Hi Claire/John

Is there any chance of a response to the below?

As you can probably imagine, we are taking a huge amount of negative criticism following the report going public, which is growing day by day (see the Southwark News article from yesterday I sent you). Social media is going ballistic.

Our Lead member ([REDACTED]) has asked for a meeting with the TfL officers that compiled the report. I am also aware she has written to Will Norman.

What do you think is the best way forward to ensure we come out of this with a united front to the public?

Cheers

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[Pronouns: He/Him](#)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - Highways Division
London Borough of Southwark
[REDACTED]
160 Tooley Street
SE1 2QH
London

E-mail [REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:28 PM
To: Alleguen Claire [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@lambeth.gov.uk>; Wiseall Andrew (ST)
[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Melbourne Jennifer (ST) [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>;
Clements Chris [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Khan Harun (ST) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>;
Birch John (IDP) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] =
[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>;
[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Herne Hill Signal Intervention Report

Hi Claire

I have removed Councillors from the recipients to this email.

I have to admit to some sympathy with our Councillor comments. My apologies for not commenting sooner but I was away from the office for some time when the report first came in.

The publication of this report to the public will be like a red rag to a bull. The statements claiming that Dulwich Phase 2 measures are solely responsible for the delays on Norwood Road and Croxted Road are not adequately evidenced.

There is no mention anywhere of the Lambeth measures, even to provide evidence as to why they have not contributed to the problem.

I am not disputing that the Southwark measures contribute to the bus delays but to state categorically this is the case seems a bit rash and I can understand why our councillors would be less than pleased.

There is also the evidence that traffic volumes on Croxted are less than pre-pandemic levels. At the very least this needs to be a consideration in any conclusions.

It was useful to see the graph of bus delays on Norwood Road at our meeting yesterday but I note that there is a different pattern for Croxted Road which does not support the introduction of the Dulwich Phase 2 measures significantly causing bus delays. Is there an explanation for this?

Do we have any bus journey time data more recent than January 2022? Our reduced bus gate times went live 21st February so ideally it would have been useful to see any effect on bus journey times after this date, albeit it would be slightly skewed by your 21st March signal changes.

I note the response to [REDACTED], and Jenny's response to [REDACTED] that TfL are happy with the conclusions of the report. The conclusions are fine as they solely relate to the bus timings. However, the report content and assertions only tell half the story and are not fully evidenced.

I am not sure if anyone from TfL is coming to the meeting with the Croxted Road residents on Monday. If not, it would be useful to have a response to the points raised above before the meeting.

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Pronouns: He/Him](#)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] - Highways Division

London Borough of Southwark

160 Tooley Street
SE1 2QH
London

E-mail [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk)

From: Alleguen Claire [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 3:38 PM
To: [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk); [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk); [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk)
Cc: [\[REDACTED\]@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@lambeth.gov.uk); Wiseall Andrew (ST) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); Melbourne Jennifer (ST) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk); Clements Chris [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); Khan Harun (ST) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); Birch John (IDP) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Herne Hill Signal Intervention Report

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email and I do apologise for not responding to your earlier emails regarding your request for further data.

We have been collating the additional data that you requested and are just in the process of checking it through. It does take some time to pull together as I am sure you can appreciate and we hope to send it to you within the next few days.

Best wishes

Claire

Claire Alleguen | Community Partnerships Specialist
Local Communities & Partnerships | Public Affairs & External Relations | Transport for London

Preferred Pronouns: She, her, hers

Mail: [REDACTED], Endeavour Square, Stratford, London, E20 1JN

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)

From: [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk)
Sent: 07 July 2022 14:28
To: [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk); Alleguen Claire [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk); [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk)
Cc: [\[REDACTED\]@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@lambeth.gov.uk); Wiseall Andrew (ST) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); Melbourne Jennifer (ST) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk); Clements Chris [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); Khan Harun (ST) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk); Birch John (IDP) [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)

Subject: RE: Herne Hill Signal Intervention Report

Further to [REDACTED] email below, I refer you to my request for information (of 13th June and 20th June) that I re-sent to you again yesterday as I have not yet received any reply.

As pointed out on numerous occasions, we know anecdotally that as traffic volumes rose coming out of lockdown and LTNs were introduced in Lambeth (including pavement widening under the Herne Hill Bridge), residents in the North Dulwich Triangle and on Turney Road and Burbage Road began to complain of increases in volumes of traffic. It seems highly likely that traffic was at that stage displaced from other areas into Dulwich Village. It follows that the measures later introduced in Dulwich Village simply halted that process.

In the light of the above and given the wide coverage of LTN interventions to the west of the borough boundary (which are far more extensive than those introduced in Dulwich Village), and the fact that traffic volumes are shown to have dropped on Croxted Road, like Richard I have yet to see any evidence to prove that the low traffic measures introduced in Dulwich Village are the sole cause of increased congestion.

Furthermore, it strikes me that a lazy assumption that the measures in Dulwich Village are the sole cause of increased congestion has hitherto stifled any inclination to properly investigate and understand the actual cause of the problem. Without such understanding I cannot see how the problem will be solved.

Once again, I call upon TfL to answer the questions that I have raised and to take account of the wider area when considering the causes of (and, therefore, the solutions to) the current congestion problems.

114

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] Dulwich Village Ward
 [REDACTED] Environment Scrutiny Commission
 Email: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk)
 Tel.: [REDACTED]
 Twitter: @ [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 1:24 PM
To: Alleguen Claire [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@lambeth.gov.uk>; Wiseall Andrew (ST) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Melbourne Jennifer (ST) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; Clements Chris <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Khan Harun (ST) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Birch John (IDP) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Herne Hill Signal Intervention Report
Importance: High

Dear Clare,

Thank you for this report, however I have some significant concerns with it and I'm not sure it's fit to release in its current form.

The report makes a number of assertions that are unproven and fails to mention many of the other changes to traffic infrastructure which have been implemented in the area.

My specific concerns are:

- Slide two describes the Dulwich scheme, but none of the scheme implemented in Lambeth are discussed. This omission on its own renders this report unpublishable
- The language on slide three is loose and could appear to describe the impact on bus journey times in Norwood Road and Croxted Road as a direct response to of the Dulwich scheme. There is no evidence to support this assertion and this must be removed
- The description of the root cause on Slide 6 makes claims that are partial and unevicenced – this cannot be published in its current form – it does not mention any of the schemes introduced elsewhere - nor does it mention the aspects of the work in Southwark that prevents traffic from the south-east joining Croxted Road
- No data is provided to support the assertion in the first bullet point on slide 7

Please could you address these points and reissue the report. Thank you

With best wishes, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED],
[REDACTED] Dulwich Village,
Tel: [REDACTED]
Twitter: @ [REDACTED]

From: Alleguen Claire [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 11:56 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@lambeth.gov.uk>; Wiseall Andrew (ST)

[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Melbourne Jennifer (ST) [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>;
[REDACTED]@southwark.gov.uk>; Clements Chris
<[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Khan Harun (ST) [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Birch John (IDP)
[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>

Subject: Herne Hill Signal Intervention Report

Dear Councillors

Following our recent discussions and site visits about the signal interventions at Herne Hill, I have attached a report which details these interventions and the resulting changes on both Norwood Road and Croxted Road.

We continue to discuss managing traffic flow in the area in partnership with both Lambeth and Southwark Council's.

Kind regards

Claire

Claire Alleguen | Community Partnerships Specialist
Local Communities & Partnerships | Public Affairs & External Relations | Transport for London

Preferred Pronouns: She, her, hers

Mail: [REDACTED], Endeavour Square, Stratford, London, E20 1JN

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk

This message has been scanned for malware by Forcepoint. www.forcepoint.com

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this in error please notify us immediately.

If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful.

Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this in error please notify us immediately.

If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful.

Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.