



# Bakerloo line extension

Response to Issues Raised Report  
November 2020

# Contents

1. Executive summary .....	1
1.1 Overview .....	1
1.2 Summary of next steps .....	1
1.3 We asked, you said, we did .....	2
2. Summary of consultation responses .....	6
3. General issues .....	11
4. Elephant & Castle station .....	28
5. Proposed new route for the Bakerloo line extension between Lambeth North and Elephant & Castle.....	35
6. Proposed route for the Bakerloo line extension between Elephant & Castle and Lewisham .....	37
7. Possible primary tunnelling worksites for the proposed extension .....	53
8. Use of Old Kent Road 1 as a tunnelling site .....	61
9. Wearside Road Council depot site .....	65
10. Station Naming for Old Kent Road 1 and 2 stations .....	69
11. Possible further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction .....	70
12. Consultation and engagement .....	80
Appendix A: Consultation questions.....	83

# 1. Executive summary

## 1.1 Overview

This report details our response to the issues raised in the public consultation held between 14 October and 22 December 2019 on our proposals to extend the Bakerloo line beyond Elephant & Castle to Lewisham, serving Old Kent Road and New Cross Gate. The consultation also sought to understand the level of support for a potential further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction.

We received 8,749 responses to the autumn 2019 consultation, with 8,640 responses from members of the public and 109 from stakeholders. We also received a consultation response from the Back the Bakerloo coalition on behalf of the 20,600 individuals who had signed up to their own campaign on the proposals. The coalition was set up by Southwark and Lewisham councils to support the proposals for the Bakerloo line extension and includes local stakeholders including business organisations. We have published the results of the consultation at [tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension](https://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension)

Since the consultation closed, we have analysed the results and considered how they can inform the further development of the Bakerloo line extension proposals.

The issues and responses have been grouped according to themes and follow the order of questions in the consultation. A copy of the consultation questions is included in Appendix A of this report.

Many of the responses were very supportive of the proposals and are summarised in the consultation report at [tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension](https://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension). We are pleased to have received this positive feedback. We have not responded specifically to all of these comments in our response to issues although all comments made have been taken into account.

Some issues raised in the responses were applicable across all of the proposals on which we consulted (e.g. general concerns about construction). We have considered these as general issues and addressed them in section 3 of the report.

This report was drafted in 2020 during the Coronavirus pandemic. The longer term impacts of Coronavirus on available funds and travel patterns are uncertain at present and therefore some of the responses may be subject to change.

## 1.2 Summary of next steps

TfL and the Mayor remain committed to delivering the Bakerloo line extension. This however remains dependent on a viable funding package being put together. A

commitment from Government to support funding for the scheme is essential in developing a funding package. We will continue discussions with the Government, whilst being realistic about the funding London could contribute to delivering an extension over the coming years.

Mindful of the issues raised during the consultation, we will progress towards statutory safeguarding of the proposed extension between Lambeth North and Lewisham. Safeguarding is a formal process, undertaken by the Department for Transport, to protect land required for major new infrastructure projects from future development.

We are also investigating how we could deliver the possible further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction in more detail, considering in our work the feedback received from the public and stakeholders. This further extension would involve converting the current National Rail line to Hayes to accommodate Bakerloo line services. We are therefore not seeking safeguarding of the possible extension beyond Lewisham.

Subject to funding and design development we propose to apply for permission to build the extension through a Transport & Works Act Order.

There will be further opportunities to provide feedback on aspects of the Bakerloo line extension as our proposals develop, including subsequent rounds of consultation.

### 1.3 We asked, you said, we did

In the table below we outline the ten main issues where the consultation has influenced and shaped our development of the proposals.

<b>We asked</b>	<b>You said</b>	<b>We did/will do</b>
For comments on our overall proposals including whether they impact people in a positive or negative way.	The majority (89 per cent) of respondents made positive or supportive comments about our overall proposals.	This provides justification for us to further develop our proposals. We have given specific consideration in this report to suggestions we received and areas of concern or negative comments.
In our 2017 consultation, for views on the location of a new Bakerloo line entrance at Elephant & Castle station. The feedback was that most	The majority of respondents were positive about the proposal for an integrated station entrance.	Since the consultation closed we have agreed together with Southwark Council a funding package to expand the planned new Northern

<p>respondents would like to see this integrated with the Northern line entrance.</p> <p>Following this feedback we developed proposals for an integrated station entrance at Elephant &amp; Castle for both lines and asked for views on our proposals in the 2019 consultation.</p>		<p>line ticket hall to enable it to serve both the existing Northern line and an extended Bakerloo line.</p> <p>We will continue to develop our proposal for an integrated station entrance.</p>
<p>For views on the proposed new route of the tunnels between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle.</p>	<p>The majority of respondents were positive and supportive about the proposed new route between the two stations. There were concerns expressed from some respondents living above the tunnels.</p>	<p>We will now seek to safeguard the proposed route between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle, alongside the proposed route to Lewisham through statutory safeguarding directions. This is a formal process, undertaken by the Department for Transport, to protect land required for major new infrastructure projects from future development.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with stakeholders and residents on our plans. As part of any Transport &amp; Works Act Order application we would undertake a full Environmental Impact Assessment, which would detail any impacts in more detail as well as any proposed mitigation measures.</p>
<p>For views on the proposed route of the tunnels between Elephant &amp; Castle and Lewisham.</p>	<p>The majority of respondents were positive and supportive about the proposed route. There were concerns expressed from some respondents living and/or</p>	<p>We will now seek to safeguard the proposed route between Elephant &amp; Castle and Lewisham through statutory safeguarding directions.</p>

	working above the tunnels and on sites where stations would be located.	We will continue to engage with all affected landowners, including supermarkets, other businesses and residents on our plans. As part of any Transport & Works Act Order application we would undertake a full Environmental Impact Assessment, which would detail any impacts in more detail as well as any proposed mitigation measures.
For views on three possible primary tunnelling worksites; our proposed site at New Cross Gate, and two alternatives at Catford and Hither Green.	Respondents were most likely to be positive and supportive about New Cross Gate as the primary tunnelling site. Few respondents were positive about the proposed site being Catford or Hither Green.	We will focus on developing our proposals with New Cross Gate as the primary tunnelling worksite.
For comments on the possible use of the Old Kent Road 1 site to carry out tunnelling activities towards Lambeth North.	Of the respondents who expressed a view on this proposal most were positive about the use of the site for this activity.	We will further develop our proposals to carry out tunnelling activities from this site.
For views on our proposals at Wearside Road Council depot site where the tunnels would come to the surface and empty trains would be stabled.	Of the respondents who expressed a view on the site most were positive and supportive.	We will further develop our proposals to use the depot site for construction works and train stabling.
For views on the possible names of the two proposed stations on Old Kent Road.	The most popular choices were "Burgess Park" for Old Kent Road 1, and "Old Kent Road" for Old Kent Road 2 station.	We will proceed with these as the names for the two proposed stations.
For views on the level of support and opposition for a possible further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to	The majority of respondents were supportive of the proposal (82 per cent). It was opposed by nine per cent of respondents.	We are now investigating how we could deliver the possible further extension beyond Lewisham in more detail, considering in our work feedback

Hayes and Beckenham Junction.		received from the public and stakeholders.
For views about the quality of the consultation we carried out.	The majority of respondents considered the quality of consultation to be very good or good (ranging from 85 per cent for the website structure & ease of finding what you needed to 71 per cent for the promotional materials).	We received suggestions which will help us prepare a further consultation. For example, for future consultations we will develop an interactive tool for the route alignment of the proposed tunnels.

## 2. Summary of consultation responses

Below is a summary of the responses received to each question we asked in the consultation. For detailed analysis of the responses received please refer to the Consultation Report [tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension](https://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension)

### Overall proposals

We asked for comments about our proposals and how these may impact people whether in a positive or negative way (question 1).

The majority of respondents made positive or supportive comments about our proposals (89 per cent). Seven per cent made comments which were negative or opposing the proposals and four per cent made neutral comments.

### Elephant & Castle station

We asked for comments on our proposals for a new combined Bakerloo line and Northern line ticket hall at Elephant & Castle (question 2).

The majority of comments received in response to this question were generally positive and supportive of our proposals for the combined ticket hall (74 per cent). In addition to general support, comments included that the proposals would mean improved interchange and connections, that the current station layout is confusing, and a better station layout is needed. A further three per cent of comments were supportive with caveats such as ensuring accessibility for disabled people and minimising construction disruption.

Nine per cent of comments made in response to this question were neutral including that the respondent had nothing further to add.

Three per cent of comments were negative about the proposals.

Eight per cent of comments focussed on suggestions for the station. Two per cent of comments were unsure or needed more information and two per cent commented on the wider proposals.

### Proposed new route for the Bakerloo line extension between Lambeth North and Elephant & Castle

We asked for comments on our proposals for a new route for the line between these two stations (question 3).

The majority of comments received in response to this question were generally positive and supportive (59 per cent). Comments included that the route would be shorter and/or that journey times would be reduced. A further three per cent were supportive with caveats such as concern about cost and disruption.

27 per cent of comments were neutral, in the majority of which the respondent stated they had nothing further to add or couldn't comment.

Five per cent of comments received in response to this question were negative, including two per cent which stated that the proposal isn't really needed and/or existing transport is fine.

The remaining six per cent of comments focused mainly on suggestions for other destinations or comments on the wider proposals.

### **Proposed route for the Bakerloo line extension between Elephant & Castle and Lewisham**

We asked for comments on our proposed route between Elephant & Castle and Lewisham (question 4).

77 per cent of respondents were supportive of the route. Of these half (50 per cent) expressed general support for the proposed route. A further 27 per cent of comments focussed on reasons why respondents supported the route including improved transport access and connections (nine per cent), transport/traffic benefits (seven per cent), community and social benefits (five per cent) and benefits to the local economy (four per cent). In addition a further five per cent of comments were also supportive with caveats (such as good connections to National Rail/Overground) or with design suggestions.

A number of comments (seven per cent) proposed alternative locations and stations for the route including Camberwell, Peckham, Brockley and Bricklayers Arms.

A small proportion of comments (two per cent) to this question were either generally negative or raised specific negative impacts.

Five per cent of comments were neutral as respondents were unsure of the impact or it didn't affect them, and a further five per cent commented on other themes.

### **Possible primary tunnelling worksites for the proposed extension**

We asked for comments on the possible worksites at New Cross Gate, Hither Green and Catford. We stated that our proposal is for the primary tunnelling worksite to be at New Cross Gate (question 5a).

Approximately half (51 per cent) of the comments received in response to this question were generally positive and supportive of our proposal for the primary tunnelling worksite at New Cross Gate. 18 per cent of comments were opposed to the three sites mentioned or were concerned about the impacts of the worksites on the local area including through increased traffic disruption. 14 per cent of comments were neutral in nature with nothing to say on the proposals. A further 17 per cent of comments were either suggestions about the sites, comments about the wider proposals or unsure and needing more information to comment.

When the comments are analysed considering references to specific worksites, 30 per cent mentioned they were positive about the use of the New Cross Gate worksite location. Two per cent of comments were concerned about the use of New Cross Gate mentioning disruption and road closures. Two per cent of comments specifically mentioned they were positive about using the Hither Green site, with five percent being negative about using it. Two per cent of comments specifically mentioned they were positive about using the Catford worksite location, and six per cent being negative about using it. No other issues were raised were mentioned in two per cent of more of comments.

### **Use of Old Kent Road 1 as a tunnelling site**

In our consultation in 2017 we proposed that there would be a worksite at Old Kent Road 1 to build the station. We have updated our proposals and we are now also considering carrying out tunnelling activities from the site towards Lambeth North. We asked for comments on this proposal (question 5b).

Approximately half (49 per cent) of the comments received in response to this question were of a neutral nature including nothing to say or no view on the proposals.

29 per cent of comments were positive and supportive. A further seven per cent of responses were supportive with caveats – for example supportive of the proposals as long as this is the fastest option to construct the extension.

There were suggestions for the use of the site after construction (four per cent of comments), including affordable housing and commercial use.

Two per cent of comments were opposed to the proposals for example due to congestion issues. A further two per cent expressed concerns about the site impacts on the community and these included the loss of the supermarket, citing no alternatives locally and negative impacts on residents.

Eight per cent of comments were on other aspects of the proposed extension.

### **Wearside Road Council depot site**

We asked for comments on our proposals for this site where empty trains would be stabled (question 6).

Just under half (46 per cent) of the comments received in response to this question were of a neutral nature, with nothing to say or no view on the proposed use of the depot site.

Approximately one third (35 per cent) of comments were positive and supportive of the use of the site. A further seven per cent of comments were supportive of this use with caveats including the importance of minimising the impact on the surrounding environment and residential properties.

Five per cent of comments expressed concern or opposition about the use of the depot site, including two per cent concerned about noise, disruption or pollution.

Four per cent of comments were unsure or wanted to know what would happen to the existing depot and four per cent made comments about the wider proposal for the extension.

### **Station naming**

We asked for suggestions for the names of the two proposed stations which we currently describe as Old Kent Road 1 and Old Kent Road 2 (questions 7 and 8) and gave two suggestions for each station.

#### ***Old Kent Road 1***

Over half of responses (59 per cent) supported the station name Burgess Park and 15 per cent expressed a preference for Old Kent Road. A further two per cent commented on their support for the names including the name Old Kent Road is iconic and Burgess Park would make the park popular.

Seven per cent of comments made other suggestions for the name of the station. The most frequent was Mandela Way mentioned in one per cent of comments.

Seven per cent were neutral comments including nothing to say on this issue.

Seven per cent made comments about the wider proposal.

Two per cent opposed Old Kent Road as a name for the station as the road is too long and it would be difficult to work out where on the road the station should be.

#### ***Old Kent Road 2***

Opinion about the name for the Old Kent Road 2 station was more evenly distributed, with Old Kent Road receiving the greatest number of supportive responses. Old Kent Road was supported in 32 per cent of responses and Asylum was supported in 24 per cent of responses.

Sixteen per cent of comments made other suggestions for the name of the station. The most frequent was to have (rather than Asylum) Asylum Road, which was mentioned in three per cent of these comments.

Thirteen per cent of comments opposed Asylum as a name for the station for example because of negative connotations. Two per cent opposed Old Kent Road for example because the road is too long and it would be difficult to work out where on the road the station should be.

Ten per cent were neutral comments including nothing to say on this issue.

Four per cent of comments were about the wider proposal.

### **Possible further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction**

We asked whether people supported or opposed the possible further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction in a closed question (9a). We also asked for comments on this proposal in an open question (9b).

The further extension was supported by 82 per cent of respondents (73 per cent strongly and nine per cent partially). It was opposed by nine per cent of respondents (seven per cent strongly and two per cent partially). Nine per cent of respondents neither supported nor opposed the further extension.

The majority of comments received in response to the open question were positive or supportive about the proposed further extension (61 per cent). A further five per cent were supportive with caveats (for example concerns about a further phase delaying the initial phase, or the potential impact on National Rail services). 19 per cent of comments were negative or in opposition to the proposals with the most common reasons being a negative impact on rail services such as the loss of services to London Bridge and Cannon Street. Alternative destinations were suggested by five per cent. Eight per cent of comments were about the wider proposal. Two per cent were neutral including requiring more information to comment.

### 3. General issues

*These are issues raised by respondents about our overall proposals and/or issues which were repeated through many of the site or route specific questions.*

Ref	Issue	Our response
3.1	<b>Positive comments</b>	<p>There was a positive response to the consultation and the questions we asked. For example, in question 1 we asked for comments about our proposals and how these may impact people whether in a positive or negative way. The majority of respondents made positive or supportive comments about our proposals (89 per cent). Seven per cent made comments which were negative or opposing the proposals and four per cent made neutral comments.</p> <p>Our response to the issues raised is focussed on suggestions received, areas of concern and negative comments.</p> <p>We appreciate the time taken by everyone who responded to the consultation.</p>
3.2	<p><b>Timing</b></p> <p><i>Commence the scheme as soon as possible</i></p>	<p>The proposed extension would represent a significant infrastructure investment, which requires a large amount of planning and design work as well as further public consultation and the necessary consents before we can commence construction. Once open, the proposed extension would form a major part of London's transport system for many years to come, so we are committed to spending the time required to make sure that it is as good as it can be. Given these constraints we cannot commit to delivering the proposals any sooner.</p> <p>Longer-term certainty from Government on funding will allow investment in further schemes such as the Bakerloo line extension to create the vital shift away from private car use and to ensure London continues to thrive. We remain primed to pivot our investment towards a green recovery, supporting sustainable travel and London's international position. We will continue our discussions with</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<p>Government, whilst being realistic about what will be affordable over the next decade and where possible, safeguarding and feasibility work will continue, while further funding options are identified.</p>
3.3	<p><b>Phasing</b></p> <p><i>Build the Bakerloo line extension in one phase</i></p> <p><i>Build the Bakerloo line extension in several smaller phases</i></p>	<p>No decisions have been made on how to deliver the proposed extension as regards phasing.</p> <p>Feasibility work is being carried out and we continue to look at a wide range of possibilities and opportunities for the best way to deliver the proposed extension. We are keen to reduce disruption due to the works, as well as ensuring that it is affordable and represents value for money.</p> <p>Following the consultation, we are looking in more detail at the options for a further extension of the Bakerloo line beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. A key part of this work will be to review the whole construction processes from start to finish. This would include whether a further extension beyond Lewisham could be delivered at the same time as the extension to Lewisham, or at a later date.</p>
3.4	<p><b>Financing</b></p> <p><i>Concern it will be too expensive</i></p> <p><i>Need for value for money</i></p> <p><i>Concern that the project could never be delivered</i></p> <p><i>Need for innovative funding</i></p>	<p>We are progressing our proposals because our work suggests that, by unlocking new development and improving journeys between south east and central London, the proposed extension would provide good value for money. Furthermore, the extension is being planned alongside an upgrade of the existing Bakerloo line. Planning the upgrade and extension together provides the best prospect of developing a cost-effective proposal for the whole line that could deliver benefits to customer journeys and support growth. We are continually reviewing the project, a process known as value engineering, to ensure it is the most cost effective it can be.</p> <p>The cost of building the proposed extension is currently unfunded in our Business Plan. We are facing an unprecedented combination of financial</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<p>challenges at present and the impact of the ongoing Coronavirus outbreak means that the focus is on the provision of a safe and reliable public transport operation on the existing network.</p> <p>The proposed extension remains a priority for TfL and the Mayor, but we must continue to be realistic about what is affordable as we continue discussions with Government over funding for the scheme.</p> <p>Investment in long-term infrastructure projects, such as the Bakerloo line extension is therefore dependent on our ability to bring together funding from a range of sources, including the private sector and central Government. We consider that major beneficiaries of the extension, for example developers, should contribute financially towards it. We continue to develop the funding package for the proposed extension with the key stakeholders. At the same time, we are reviewing ways in which the proposed extension could be made more affordable.</p> <p>While development of a funding package is ongoing, we are clear that work to plan for the extension, and indeed for the upgrade and expansion of the entire transport network in London should continue. Not planning for the future would mean that London's public transport infrastructure could fail to adapt quickly to the changing needs of the city. It is vitally important that this work carries on to ensure that London remains on the best footing to compete internationally, contribute to the national economy, improve the quality of life for Londoners and support the population and employment growth that a prosperous capital would need.</p> <p>For more information on our wider financial circumstances, please see our current Business Plan available from <a href="http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-business-plan-2019-24.pdf">http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-business-plan-2019-24.pdf</a>, Emergency Budget <a href="http://content.tfl.gov.uk/board-20200729-">http://content.tfl.gov.uk/board-20200729-</a></p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<a href="#">item09-finance-report-revised-budget.pdf</a> and our Comprehensive Spending Review submission <a href="http://content.tfl.gov.uk/fc-20200930-suppl-agenda-public.pdf">http://content.tfl.gov.uk/fc-20200930-suppl-agenda-public.pdf</a>
3.5	<p><b>Business case</b></p> <p><i>Unsure if the scheme is value for money</i></p> <p><i>Need for details on the business case</i></p> <p><i>Have separate business cases for phases 1) Elephant &amp; Castle to Lewisham and 2) Lewisham to Hayes</i></p>	<p>The proposed extension has a strong case and provides good value for money. This is driven by the benefits generated, which for the proposed extension to Lewisham would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting thousands of new homes and jobs in south east London</li> <li>• Offering a new direct link into central London, with connections to every other Underground line</li> <li>• Providing capacity for at least 60,000 extra journeys in both the morning and evening peak periods</li> <li>• Relieving congestion on roads, reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and air pollution</li> <li>• Reducing journey times along the extension to central London by up to nine minutes</li> <li>• Providing an Underground train every two to three minutes from Lewisham across central London</li> </ul> <p>Considering the responses to the public consultation we are investigating the proposals to further extend the Bakerloo line beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. We believe this further extension would also offer significant benefits and provide value for money. This work includes further development and understanding of the business case for this further extension, that will help inform future decision making around the scope and phasing.</p>
3.6	<p><b>Alternative locations and stations for the extension to serve</b></p> <p><i>Have a station at Bricklayers Arms</i></p>	<p>We have previously considered and responded to proposals for a station at Bricklayers Arms. No new information or evidence has been provided in this 2019 consultation exercise that changes our view. Please see our Response to Issues Raised from the 2017 consultation publication and in section 2.6 available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf</a></p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
	<p><i>Serve Hither Green / Catford / Lower Sydenham in the first phase of the extension</i></p> <p><i>Further extension should serve Bromley and/or Orpington</i></p>	<p>We have previously considered and responded to proposals for extensions of the Bakerloo line to Croydon, Bromley and Orpington. No new information or evidence has been provided in this 2019 consultation exercise that changes our view. A summary report of the work done to date to look at the further extension beyond Lewisham is available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension/user_uploads/summary-report-further-extension-hayes-beckenham.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension/user_uploads/summary-report-further-extension-hayes-beckenham.pdf</a></p> <p>Finally, many of the alternative locations suggested by respondents are stations on the current National Rail branch line from Lewisham to Hayes. As part of a further extension beyond Lewisham, we would propose to serve all stations currently receiving train services on the Hayes line with new Bakerloo line services throughout the day.</p>
3.7	<p><b>Progress with Bakerloo line extension as well as, not instead of, other capital projects e.g. Crossrail 2, line upgrades</b></p> <p><i>Spend the money on other important projects</i></p>	<p>The Bakerloo line extension is a priority for both TfL and the Mayor as set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy. The need and the case for the proposed extension are clear and are not affected by other proposed capital projects in London. As such, subject to funding as well as further public consultation and working with the local authorities and stakeholders, we will continue to develop and progress our plans for the Bakerloo line extension.</p> <p>Please also see our response in section 3.4 on financing.</p>
3.8	<p><b>General opposition and requests to prioritise other infrastructure improvements</b></p> <p><i>Proposal is a bad idea</i></p> <p><i>The proposal isn't really needed, and existing transport is fine</i></p>	<p>We believe that there is a clear need to improve transport connectivity and capacity between south east and central London. Existing national rail services and the Jubilee line are overcrowded; journey opportunities are limited, and many Londoners rely on their cars. Improving transport connections by increasing the public transport provision in south east London would help to unlock significant growth and regeneration potential.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
	<p><i>Focus on improving existing transport infrastructure</i></p>	<p>The Bakerloo line is currently the only London Underground line with spare capacity in central London. Unlocking this capacity relies on radically changing the service from the Bakerloo line to deliver new and improved journey options within an area of London that is currently not served by the Underground network.</p> <p>Extending the Bakerloo line is a long-held aspiration that has been promoted by three successive London Mayor's since 2006. In March 2018 the Mayor's Transport Strategy formalised this aspiration.</p> <p>The 2018 Draft London Plan established the Old Kent Road as an Opportunity Area. The Plan also identified significant development opportunities in the New Cross, Lewisham and Catford Opportunity Area, subject to the provision of the transport infrastructure necessary to unlock the full growth potential.</p> <p>We have a responsibility to help maximise the development potential within Opportunity Areas and along the Elephant &amp; Castle, Old Kent Road, New Cross Gate and Lewisham route.</p> <p>In 2018 Southwark Council published a detailed draft development proposal for the Old Kent Road as part of their Area Action Plan (AAP). The AAP relies heavily on the delivery of the proposed extension because the areas surrounding the proposed stations have been identified as sites for significant development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20,000 new homes (up to 7,000 of which would be affordable)</li> <li>• Two new primary schools</li> <li>• A new secondary school</li> <li>• Nine primary school expansions</li> <li>• A new health centre</li> </ul>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<p>As part of the AAP development process, we carried out a study to identify how transport could support this growth, focussing on suitable, sustainable transport solutions. This study concluded that an extension of the Bakerloo line was the only intervention that could support the scale of growth aspirations in the area.</p> <p>Similarly, the emerging Lewisham Local Plan strongly supports the delivery of the Bakerloo line extension in order to maximise development potential. Support is further set out in the emerging New Cross Gate Supplementary Planning Document and approved New Cross Area Framework.</p>
3.9	<p><b>Local and national planning and policy requirements</b></p> <p><i>Compliance and integration with requirements</i></p>	<p>The extension proposals have and will continue to be developed in line with all relevant policy and guidance. This includes planning and transport policy set by Government, by the Mayor of London and by local authorities.</p> <p>There is strong support at national, regional and local level for major infrastructure projects to release development potential. The Bakerloo line extension would unlock a substantial amount of development along its proposed route. The National Planning Policy Framework, London Plan and Lewisham's/Southwark's Local Plans all strongly advocate the development of the Bakerloo line and as such the extension will continue to be developed in line with all relevant policy and guidance.</p>
3.10	<p><b>TfL technical studies – method and output</b></p> <p><i>Impacts on customer movements at London Waterloo station (for example) and mitigations needed</i></p>	<p>We continuously monitor how future conditions at stations may be affected by any new customer demand and changes in movements that the proposed extension could generate. This includes at locations across the London Underground and National Rail network, including at London Waterloo. To date, we have not discovered a need for infrastructure works at this station to accommodate the forecast impacts of the proposed extension. We therefore expect that the existing infrastructure capacity would be sufficient to enable the station to continue to function safely and efficiently.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<p>As we develop the proposed extension further we will continue to review the expected impacts on the wider network, including the impact on existing stations of both extension and higher frequency train services.</p>
3.11	<p><b>Technical studies undertaken by respondents</b></p>	<p>We are working closely with stakeholders, including Southwark and Lewisham Council and Network Rail, to ensure the proposed extension could be delivered and, as far as possible, is consistent with wider plans and aspirations along the proposed route of the extension.</p> <p>We have received responses from stakeholders that include their own assessments or proposals concerning the proposed extension and its impacts. Work received includes how the proposed extension could be built to reduce the impact on specific locations and the local community in certain areas.</p> <p>We have considered the information provided through the consultation and will continue to consider any new information and its impacts to determine whether we need to either modify our proposals or develop mitigations for their effects.</p>
3.12	<p><b>Lessons learnt on other projects / by other developers</b></p> <p><i>Make sure TfL heeds lessons learnt on other projects or by other developers</i></p> <p><i>How are TfL learning cost control lessons from Crossrail?</i></p>	<p>Learning lessons from previous projects is a key part of the development process for the proposed extension. We have engaged with teams working on a number of projects including: the Northern line extension; Crossrail; the Barking Riverside extension; the Silvertown tunnel; and the Bank Station Capacity Upgrade scheme. This is to understand how we can use their experiences to improve our proposed extension and the way we develop it. We aim to ensure that we continually improve our delivery standards and bring innovation and best practises forward across all areas of the project. This is at all stages, from early stage option development through public consultation and the Transport &amp; Works Act Order process through to construction and delivery.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<p>Crossrail has proved to be a good source of knowledge and experience in delivering a major infrastructure project and we have engaged closely with the project team to understand what lessons we can take to, amongst other things, reduce project risk and manage costs.</p>
3.13	<p><b>Minimising direct impacts on properties and compensating for loss of land or income</b></p> <p><i>Ensure compensation given to affected or disrupted residents along line of route)</i></p> <p><i>How will TfL help businesses relocate?</i></p>	<p>The scheme has been designed so that no residential properties would be lost as a result of the works.</p> <p>We would build the proposed extension in accordance with the relevant standards that are required by law to mitigate impacts of construction on neighbouring property. There would be a range of measures put in place to deal with physical impacts on property. We would publish information on how specific issues would be dealt with closer to when we apply for a Transport &amp; Works Act Order.</p> <p>We would develop a Code of Construction Practice and a Construction Logistics Plan which would set out how we would safely manage traffic movements, including mitigating disruption to the local road and bus networks.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with the landowners, occupiers and stakeholders more widely to understand their concerns and plans given our current proposals.</p> <p>Where any land or property interest is required for construction of the proposed extension and is acquired under the compulsory purchase powers included within the proposed Transport &amp; Works Act Order, the legislation and case law that relates to compulsory purchase compensation would apply. This is collectively called the Compensation Code. The code deals with how property owners are compensated for losses that are caused by the proposed extension including business relocation. Affected business would have direct access to a dedicated case manager with whom concerns about the impacts of the acquisition can be raised.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
3.14	<p><b>Local economy</b></p> <p><i>Concern about new residential developments in the area</i></p> <p><i>Will bring too much development</i></p> <p><i>Take steps to avoid pricing local people out of the area</i></p> <p><i>Could increase property prices and price local people out and cause gentrification</i></p>	<p>The proposed extension would improve customer journeys for the existing areas to, from and within south east London that are at present reliant on the bus and National Rail networks. These are constrained in capacity and suffer crowding in peak periods. It would also improve accessibility and enable significant numbers of new homes, including affordable housing, and jobs to be delivered. These new homes and jobs would help south east London to grow and provide more opportunities for customers to access opportunities and services across the whole of London and beyond.</p> <p>We would design the proposed extension with the aim that the scheme itself could provide new housing where it is appropriate to do so. Once works are complete at each site, we would determine what land is not required for safe and efficient operations of the new line and, where appropriate, offer the land back to the previous owner at the market price. The subsequent uses on the land either retained by us or returned to an alternative owner would be a matter for the landowner at that time and local planning authority taking into account the policies they have in place at that time.</p> <p>The proposed extension to Lewisham would improve transport connectivity in south east London. Improved connectivity may cause property values to change over time, however the property market is influenced by many different factors.</p> <p>Please also see our response in 3.9 about development and planning policy requirements.</p>
3.15	<p><b>Local community / society</b></p> <p><i>Concern about impact on residents and local people</i></p>	<p>We consider that providing new transport that is accessible and easy to use would improve the quality of life for local people that live and work along the route of the proposed extension, increasing their opportunities to benefit from the investment and growth that occurs in their local areas.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		Please also see our responses in section 3.13 and 3.14 about the impact on the local economy and community.
3.16	<p><b>Environmental impact</b></p> <p><i>Avoid impact on environment and green spaces</i></p> <p><i>Business case should show the carbon emissions savings</i></p> <p><i>Shoppers will end up driving to other stores which will negatively impact air quality</i></p> <p><i>Concern on the use of a Site of Nature Conservation (SINC) at New Cross Gate) for tunnelling</i></p> <p><i>Lewisham, Hither Green and Catford are all within Source Protection Zones and New Cross is adjacent to one, where groundwater is protected</i></p> <p><i>Consider opportunities for net environmental and biodiversity gains as well as mitigating impacts</i></p>	<p>We have considered the impacts on the environment throughout the selection of the options for stations, worksites and associated facilities. As part of this work we have looked at how the development is likely to impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community and people (including heritage, air quality, noise and vibration, visual amenity, severance)</li> <li>• Green environment (including ecology and biodiversity, surface water, flood risk and source protection zones)</li> <li>• Brown Environment (including contaminated land, ground conditions, materials and waste)</li> </ul> <p>As part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order application an Environmental Statement (ES) would be prepared which would contain an assessment of the effects of both construction and operation of the proposed extension on the environment. The ES would also identify mitigation measures proposed as part of the proposed extension. These would be developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders, for example the Environment Agency and Natural England.</p> <p>We are also developing a sustainability strategy and will be working towards a sustainability award known as CEEQUAL (Civil Engineering Environmental Quality Assessment). We will embed sustainability into the design of the proposed extension in line with our environmental policies on biodiversity net gain and minimising energy and carbon.</p> <p>In line with Government guidance, the business case appraisal for the proposed extension will include forecasts of the changes in carbon emissions that could result from the extension providing a new means of public transport.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
3.17	<p data-bbox="309 276 448 308"><b>Heritage</b></p> <p data-bbox="309 347 857 419"><i>Avoid impact on heritage buildings/old buildings</i></p> <p data-bbox="309 459 857 571"><i>Concern about what would happen to old (Elephant &amp; Castle) station building</i></p>	<p data-bbox="880 276 2033 459">We have considered the impact on local heritage throughout our work so far. This has ensured we are aware of any listed buildings, conservation areas and archaeological priority areas. None of the proposed stations or worksites would involve the demolition or alteration of a listed building, however some do fall within conservation areas or are in the proximity of listed buildings.</p> <p data-bbox="880 499 2033 683">There are currently no plans for the future use of current Bakerloo line ticket hall at Elephant &amp; Castle once the proposed extension opens (this ticket hall would no longer be used under our proposals since there would be an integrated Northern and Bakerloo line ticket hall). Any plans we develop would be shared as part of any future public consultations.</p> <p data-bbox="880 722 2033 906">As we develop the design of the proposed extension, potential impacts on the character of the local area, including heritage will be considered. We would undertake an environmental assessment to assess the proposed extension against many different environmental topics, including heritage, to identify and mitigate any significant impacts.</p>
3.18	<p data-bbox="309 954 589 986"><b>Health and Safety</b></p> <p data-bbox="309 1050 846 1121"><i>Concerns regarding crime, antisocial behaviour</i></p> <p data-bbox="309 1225 846 1297"><i>Concerns regarding crowding, safety of design</i></p>	<p data-bbox="880 954 1989 1010">We have experience planning, designing, building and operating new railways and services throughout London.</p> <p data-bbox="880 1050 2011 1201">Managing health and safety and the security of our network is a constant consideration in everything we do, and our day-to-day management of services involves constant and consistent work with security services as well as the Metropolitan Police and London Fire Brigade.</p> <p data-bbox="880 1241 2033 1385">We have planning standard guidelines to provide customers and staff with access to train services at both new and existing services in an attractive, safe, efficient environment and in a consistent and cost effective manner. This complements all other London Underground, British Standards and Her Majesty's</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
		<p>Railway Inspectorate (HMRI) Railway Safety Principles and Guidance to inform the required infrastructure and measures required to create a safe environment for our customers and staff.</p> <p>The proposed extension is designed to factor in both current and future demand, as guided by the Department for Transport, to ensure stations are adequately sized.</p>
3.19	<p><b>Impacts from construction activities</b></p> <p><i>Disruption – concern over levels, minimise and/or ensure you take the least disruptive option.</i></p> <p><i>Construction will be disruptive to local business/residents living above tunnels</i></p> <p><i>Concern about impact of tunnelling on building foundations</i></p> <p><i>Concern about traffic problems, congestion and/or disruption to bus services, impact on air quality</i></p> <p><i>Construction should not impact cyclists or pedestrians</i></p>	<p>Constructing the proposed extension is likely to involve some disruption to the local area. As part of the site selection process, environmental impacts have been considered for the shortlisted construction sites. Access by rail has been considered and this is one of the reasons that New Cross Gate is the proposed option for the primary tunnelling worksite as it would considerably reduce the number of lorry journeys required during construction.</p> <p>As part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order application an Environmental Statement (ES) would be produced which would assess the effects of both construction and operation of the proposed extension on the environment. Works to build the proposed extension would be regulated by a Code of Construction Practice and a Construction Logistics Plan. These would be agreed with the local authority and would put in place requirements for contractors to manage the impacts of the work, for example such as dust, noise and working hours.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 5 and 6 about the route of the proposed tunnels (including 6.12 on tunnelling under/close to existing buildings) and section 7 about the proposed primary tunnelling worksites.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
	<i>How will spoil be moved and waste management considered? Has rail been considered?</i>	
3.20	<b>Impacts on property values</b>	<p>Where any land or property interest is required for the construction of the proposed extension and is acquired under the compulsory purchase powers in the proposed Transport &amp; Works Act Order, the legislation and case law that relates to compulsory purchase compensation would apply. This collection of statute and case law is collectively called the Compensation Code. The Compensation Code deals with the circumstances in which compensation must or may be paid where land is taken and where land is not taken. The Compensation Code would be the basis upon which compensation may be claimed for impacts caused by the proposed extension.</p> <p>The proposed extension to Lewisham would improve transport connectivity in south east London. Improved connectivity is likely to increase property values, however the property market is influenced by many different factors. We would also expect a large proportion of new homes enabled by the scheme to be affordable in line with borough and Mayoral policies.</p>
3.21	<b>Impacts on specific groups of people, including those with protected characteristics under the 2010 Equalities Act</b>  <i>Ensure that stations and trains are accessible and step-free</i>	<p>We completed outline Equalities Impact Assessments for each of the proposed stations, shafts and possible tunnelling worksites which we published as part of the consultation. The assessments looked at how the proposed extension could impact both positively and negatively on protected characteristic groups and suggested elements to consider as we progress with the design of the stations and worksites. For example, new stations would be designed to be step-free to ensure user groups which might have limited mobility such as disabled people, visually impaired customers, those with young children and older people can access them.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
	<p><i>Ensure the proposal meets the needs of protected characteristics, including disabled customers, younger people and parents with pushchairs</i></p>	<p>The public spaces surrounding the proposed new stations would be designed according to Healthy Streets Guidelines including aspects such as lighting, seating, legibility and accessible ticket machines. The Healthy Streets guidelines are our system of policies and strategies to help Londoners use cars less and walk, cycle and use public transport more  <a href="http://content.tfl.gov.uk/healthy-streets-for-london.pdf">http://content.tfl.gov.uk/healthy-streets-for-london.pdf</a></p> <p>The proposed extension would improve public transport provision which Black, Asian, and minority ethnic (BAME) communities are more reliant on as a transport mode, as well as supporting the creation of new jobs and homes in the area.</p> <p>Equalities needs will be further considered as the detail of each station progresses and the Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIAs) updated to ensure any impacts are captured throughout the design phases. We have updated the EqIAs following the 2019 consultation and published at <a href="http://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension">tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension</a></p>
3.22	<p><b>Comments and questions about exact nature of service (including prices, train frequencies etc)</b></p> <p><i>Support, if there will be a more frequent service</i></p> <p><i>Introduce new trains and signalling</i></p> <p><i>Support, if there are less weekend closures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extension is being planned alongside an upgrade of the existing Bakerloo line. This would mean new trains for the extension and the existing Bakerloo line with more space, air-conditioning and walk-through carriages with improved accessibility.</p> <p>Our aim is to provide a frequency of train service on the proposed extension and existing Bakerloo line which is at least no lower than today's current peak frequency of 22 trains per hour (tph). As we develop our plans for the upgrade and extension, we would also develop customer demand forecasts and consider possible train frequencies. The final decision on what level of train service to operate when the proposed extension opens would be made around 12 to 18</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
	<p><i>Not enough information about proposed services</i></p> <p><i>What will the capacity of the line be?</i></p> <p><i>Will customers still be able to board at Elephant &amp; Castle, or will trains arrive already full? Provide additional 'fast tracks' to allow for express services / non-stop</i></p>	<p>months prior to customer services starting. This is because it would need to be based on testing of the new assets and their reliability and capability.</p> <p>Delivering an extension to the Bakerloo line would change the conditions on the line for existing users. The London Underground network is designed to operate high frequency services but also with high levels of demand. The Bakerloo line has spare capacity at the moment, but with an extension we could not guarantee that customers would experience the same levels of seating available and crowding as they do today. However, we would ensure we provide a service that keeps customers safe and we will aim to provide the highest benefits we can to customers as a whole.</p> <p>Providing a second set of tracks on the proposed extension (to allow for additional non-stop services) would increase the construction and costs needed to build the extension, whilst serving fewer people. The London Underground network does not operate on this basis and experience shows that offering a frequent, high capacity service that can operate quickly between each station leads to well used network. On that basis the design for the proposed extension is seeking to provide a route alignment that provide fast journeys between each station and operates serving all stations.</p> <p>Please also see our response in section 11.16 to the suggestion of running Bakerloo line and Network Rail services on the same line beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction.</p>
3.23	<p><b>Night Tube (both the proposed extension to Lewisham and further extension beyond Lewisham)</b></p>	<p>No decisions have been made on whether the Bakerloo line, including the proposed extension to Lewisham (and further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction), would form part of the Night Tube. This decision would not be made until after we have received planning powers to build and operate the proposed extension, and would be in line with Mayoral objectives.</p>

Ref	Issue	Our response
3.24	<p><b>Ticket pricing</b></p> <p><i>Ensure ticket pricing is affordable</i></p> <p><i>Ensure zoning remains the same</i></p>	<p>Our aim is to ensure ticket prices remain affordable for our customers. Ticket pricing and any consideration of zoning decisions would be made once the full route for the proposed extension is agreed, and closer to opening of the extension.</p>

## 4. Elephant & Castle station

Ref	Issue	Our response
4.1	<p><b>Concern and suggestions with regard to our proposal for Elephant &amp; Castle</b></p> <p><i>Proposed new integrated station isn't really needed, and /or no use to most commuters</i></p> <p><i>Prioritise further extension of Bakerloo line over construction of new ticket hall</i></p> <p><i>Elephant &amp; Castle station will not be able to cope with customer numbers</i></p> <p><i>Good signage/clear signage is needed</i></p> <p><i>Concern about how this aligns with other developments in the area</i></p>	<p>The Bakerloo line extension would change how customers use Elephant &amp; Castle station as it would result in increased demand at the station, and changes to the pattern of movements within it. The existing Bakerloo line entrance and ticket hall would not be large enough to cope with this increased demand, and the ticket hall would either need to be expanded or a larger facility provided elsewhere. We are therefore proposing to build a combined station entrance and ticket hall for the Bakerloo and Northern lines.</p> <p>The planned new Northern line station ticket hall is being designed to accommodate the proposal for the combined Bakerloo line ticket hall. This station would be fully accessible and, as part of the delivery of the Bakerloo line extension, would provide step-free access and improved interchange.</p> <p>The proposal to extend the Bakerloo line to Lewisham would provide new journey opportunities which are likely to increase the number of passengers getting on and off trains or interchanging with the Northern line at Elephant &amp; Castle.</p> <p>These changes to customer demand and flow through the station have been assessed against the current capacity of the existing station. Our analysis has found that the capacity of the interchange links between the Bakerloo and Northern lines, Bakerloo line platform width, staircases, and lifts to/from the Bakerloo line ticket hall would all need widening or replacing to accommodate future customer demand.</p>

		<p>The proposed new combined ticket hall and new Bakerloo line platforms and interchange to the Northern line would be an opportunity to provide an easier to use and better signed station, with a single point of entry and exit to the town centre and wider transport network.</p> <p>We are working closely with the owner of the shopping centre who has been granted planning approval for the redevelopment of the centre. The requirements for the combined station entrance and ticket hall have been included as part of the owner's redevelopment proposals.</p> <p>Our proposals for the combined station as part of the overall Bakerloo line extension are subject to funding discussions with the Government following the financial impact of the Coronavirus.</p>
4.2	<p><b>Construction of the proposed new station at Elephant &amp; Castle</b></p> <p><i>Concern about construction impacts, including impact on businesses</i></p> <p><i>Risk to cyclists' safety from construction traffic</i></p>	<p>Delivering a new combined station would require construction works. By working with the developer of the shopping centre, as well as the local authorities and other affected stakeholders, we would aim to minimise the disruption to local residents and businesses.</p> <p>Some parts of the new Bakerloo line station are likely to require further works from the surface in the town centre area. We acknowledge that the town centre is highly constrained with a very busy road network on the edge of the Congestion Charge and Ultra Low Emission Zone. As we progress our plans and designs for the construction of the new Bakerloo line platforms and connections to the Northern line platforms, we will consider how they can be constructed and aim to minimise disruption to the town centre where practicable. These proposals would be subject to further public consultation.</p> <p>Please also see our response in section 3.19 about managing the impact of construction works.</p>

<p>4.3</p>	<p><b>Accessibility and equalities at Elephant &amp; Castle combined ticket hall</b></p> <p><i>Step-free access</i></p> <p><i>Oppose use of lifts/ prefer to have lifts/install travellators</i></p> <p><i>Ensure the station meets the needs of protected characteristics such as older people, young people, disabled people</i></p> <p><i>Provide accessible toilet for disabled people</i></p>	<p>Our proposals include both escalators and lifts to access the new station. Alongside the new platforms and trains, this would ensure step-free access between the street and trains. This phase of design mainly focussed on the design of the new ticket hall and access to both the Bakerloo and Northern line platforms from the ticket hall itself. As we develop our next phase of design, we will seek to develop options to improve the interchange between the two underground lines. We are proposing to build new platforms for the Bakerloo line closer to the existing Northern line platforms and this would improve the interchange between the lines.</p> <p>We completed outline Equalities Impact Assessments for each of the proposed stations, shafts and possible tunnelling worksites which we published as part of the consultation. The assessments looked at how the proposed extension could impact both positively and negatively on protected characteristic groups and suggested elements to consider as we progress with the design of the stations and worksites. For example, new stations such as at Elephant &amp; Castle would be designed to be step-free to ensure user groups which might have limited mobility such as disabled people, visually impaired customers, those with young children and older people can access them.</p> <p>As we develop our plans for the new stations, we would include toilets for customers in line with the latest London Underground planning policy.</p> <p>The public spaces surrounding new stations would be designed according to Healthy Streets Guidelines including aspects such as lighting, seating, legibility and accessible ticket machines (see 3.21).</p> <p>Equalities needs will be considered as the detail of each station progresses and the Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIAs) updated to ensure any impacts are captured throughout the design phases. We have updated the EqIAs following the 2019 consultation and published at <a href="https://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension">tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension</a></p>
------------	--	--

<p>4.4</p>	<p><b>Design suggestions for combined ticket hall at Elephant &amp; Castle</b></p> <p><i>Retain existing entrances</i></p> <p><i>Oppose removal of the northern entrance to the Bakerloo line</i></p> <p><i>Better to have more entrances</i></p> <p><i>What will be the impact of removing the northern entrance to the Bakerloo line?</i></p> <p><i>Good idea as long as it is larger than current ticket hall</i></p> <p><i>What does a ticket hall need in order to be able to serve two lines?</i></p>	<p>We are proposing to replace the two separate entrances to Elephant &amp; Castle station with one larger, combined ticket hall within the new development on the site of the existing shopping centre. This would provide a modern, fully upgraded and accessible ticket hall for all customers.</p> <p>The existing Bakerloo line ticket hall was opened in 1906. As such, there are currently some non-compliances with current London Underground standards. As the Elephant and Castle area continues to be redeveloped, customer numbers will continue to grow, and this will cause further strains on the station's capacity.</p> <p>Once the proposed extension opens there would be a large increase in the number of customers interchanging between the Northern and Bakerloo lines, and the existing passageway would not be large enough. By combining the entrance, exit and ticket hall for the Northern and Bakerloo lines, we can create a single focal point for accessing the Underground that fits with the existing and planned changes to the wider town centre. Currently the two stations are confusing for the public and combining them would make it easier for people to find their way to the correct line.</p> <p>We have looked at the possibility of delivering an upgraded station by extending/rebuilding the existing Bakerloo line ticket hall, however our studies show it would be very difficult to provide sufficient lift/escalator capacity with the space available, alongside the required larger exit.</p> <p>The direction of the existing Bakerloo line platforms at Elephant &amp; Castle are positioned approximately in a north-south direction (as they follow the direction of London Road). As the proposed extension would run towards Old Kent Road, the best alignment is to run more closely to an east-west direction. Therefore, we are proposing to re-route the alignment from Lambeth North and build new east-west platforms at Elephant &amp; Castle. Whilst the position of the new platforms would ensure the station complies with modern fire requirements and would provide sufficient interchange capacity between the lines, it would mean that the existing</p>
------------	---	--

		ticket hall will be further away from the new platforms, which would increase travel times around the station.
4.5	<p><b>Comments and suggestions re how the new Elephant &amp; Castle station layout would impact/interact with the wider transport network in the local area</b></p> <p><i>Concerns about the impact on access to buses, and people having to cross the road to catch a bus</i></p> <p><i>Concern about impact on cycle lanes, consider cycle storage at station</i></p> <p><i>Integrate area into a transport hub, connect to other modes</i></p> <p><i>Suggestions for changes to the road system</i></p> <p><i>Concern it will lead to more traffic around Elephant and Castle</i></p>	<p>The new integrated Northern and Bakerloo line station would sit at the heart of Elephant and Castle town centre, accessible from all directions in the local area via the established road crossing points that exist. At this time we do not believe that the new station would require changes to the bus stops or cycle lanes in the town centre.</p> <p>Building the new Bakerloo line station tunnels, interchange links and the new integrated ticket hall with the Northern line may require some changes to the pedestrian, cycling and bus network during construction.</p> <p>Customers would need to cross the road to access the proposed new combined ticket hall via the traffic-lighted pedestrian crossing. Recognising the importance of improved safety for all road users, in 2015 we completed an overhaul of the northern roundabout to significantly upgrade facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles through creating a more open and accessible public space. The introduction of the new combined ticket hall would complement these works along with ensuring a joined approach with the owner of the shopping centre on their redevelopment proposals. This will further public realm improvements in the local area.</p>
4.6	<p><b>A combined ticket hall at Elephant &amp; Castle is not necessary/ the benefits can be achieved another way</b></p>	<p>As part of our development work we considered a number of options which involved upgrading the existing Bakerloo line station and delivering an entirely new station to replace it. We also considered whether a new combined facility could provide the necessary benefits to both future and existing Bakerloo and Northern line customers.</p>

	<p><i>Concerns about a waste of money, too expensive</i></p> <p><i>Make improvements to existing wayfinding, lifts, station environment instead</i></p>	<p>We consider that whilst the existing Bakerloo line station could be upgraded, there are greater benefits if a new Bakerloo line station is provided with a new integrated entrance and ticket hall for all London Underground services at this station.</p> <p>By combining the entrance, exit and ticket hall for the Northern and Bakerloo lines, we can create a single focal point for accessing the Underground that fits with the existing and planned changes to the wider town centre. The new entrance would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shorten the interchange from the Thameslink station to the Bakerloo line</li> <li>• Improve the accessibility of the Underground by providing passengers with one entrance to access the Bakerloo and Northern lines</li> <li>• Simplify and improve passenger flows in the station</li> <li>• Result in lower future operation costs through the use of a combined station entrance rather than two entrances</li> </ul> <p>Our proposal that we plan to progress has been chosen in part because it is less expensive than alternative options such as constructing an entirely new standalone station or potentially undertaking risky and disruptive works to upgrade the existing station. The proposed new Bakerloo line station would be integrated into the planned new Northern line station, providing improved wayfinding, lifts for step free access throughout the station and a larger, modern station environment.</p>
4.7	<p>Concern the proposals mean loss of businesses at the Elephant and Castle shopping centre</p>	<p>The redevelopment of the Elephant and Castle shopping centre is a separate proposal by the owner of the shopping centre that has been granted planning approval. As part of those plans the existing Northern line ticket hall at Elephant &amp; Castle station is to be expanded to provide additional station capacity. These plans would take place irrespective of the Bakerloo line extension.</p>

		<p>Our proposals for the combined station as part of the Bakerloo line extension are subject to funding discussions with the Government following the financial impact of the Coronavirus.</p>
--	--	--

## 5. Proposed new route for the Bakerloo line extension between Lambeth North and Elephant & Castle

Ref	Issue	Our response
5.1	<p data-bbox="293 555 792 587"><b>Why is the new route proposed?</b></p> <p data-bbox="293 667 842 730"><i>New tunnels aren't needed, and/or are waste of money</i></p>	<p data-bbox="871 555 1939 624">We are proposing to re-route the Bakerloo line between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle station.</p> <p data-bbox="871 667 2029 879">The existing alignment between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle is not ideal from a railway design perspective. Upon leaving Lambeth North, the existing Bakerloo line alignment turns east, then turns south below St George's Circus to run below London Road. These tight turns result in a slower train journey, adding time onto customers' journeys and increasing the wear and tear of the tracks, leading to an increase in maintenance works and closures.</p> <p data-bbox="871 927 2029 1361">Additionally, the position of the existing platforms at Elephant &amp; Castle does not easily align with an extension along Old Kent Road, and the platforms themselves do not have sufficient capacity to cope with the increased demand generated by the proposed extension. The existing Bakerloo line platforms at Elephant &amp; Castle are positioned approximately in a north-south direction (as they follow the direction of London Road). As the new extension would run towards Old Kent Road, the best alignment is to run more closely to an east-west direction. If the existing platforms and alignment between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle remained, a new connection would need to be made to the existing tunnels (which are below the shopping centre). The alignment would then need to make a sharp turn east before another turn south to head down the Old Kent Road. These additional turns would increase the travel time for customers, and increase</p>

		<p>running and maintenance costs for wear and tear on the tracks/wheels. The existing platforms would also have to undergo major upgrade works to improve capacity. It is likely there would also need to be an emergency access and ventilation shaft in Walworth which would increase the cost of the proposed extension and cause disruption to the community. By re-routing the alignment from Lambeth North as proposed, new east-west platforms could be built at Elephant &amp; Castle to both optimise the alignment of the proposed extension and provide new platforms with sufficient capacity.</p>
5.2	<p><b>What will be the disruption during construction?</b></p>	<p>Further to the outcome from this consultation, we are developing plans for how we would construct the connection between the new tunnels and the existing tunnels at Lambeth North. It is likely we would need to close a section of the Bakerloo line between Waterloo and Lambeth North for a period of time. This would allow for diversion of existing assets (such as power, telecoms, signals etc.), the tunnelling itself, and then the reinstatement of new assets. We would carry out a future consultation on this.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 6.12 regarding disruption during construction works (for example noise, vibration, settlement).</p>
5.3	<p><b>Use of current tunnels after new route opens</b></p> <p><i>What will happen to London Road Depot?</i></p> <p><i>What will happen to the old tunnels?</i></p>	<p>We are currently proposing to retain the existing London Road Depot and would continue to use it to stable trains for the Bakerloo line.</p> <p>We would also look to retain the existing tunnels between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle and possibly use these for stabling trains as well.</p>

## 6. Proposed route for the Bakerloo line extension between Elephant & Castle and Lewisham

Ref	Issue	Our response
6.1	<b>Build a station at the Bricklayers Arms</b>	<p>We have previously considered and responded to proposals for a station at Bricklayers Arms. We did not consider that responses to the 2019 consultation provided new information or evidence that changes our view. Our response continues to be set out in the Response to Issues Raised from the 2017 consultation publication in section 2.6 available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf</a></p>
6.2	<p><b>Interactions with rail transport/improve interchange between underground lines</b></p> <p><i>Clarify interchange with National Rail stations</i></p> <p><i>Lewisham station would need to be improved, have additional capacity and/or concerns it could not cope with customer numbers</i></p> <p><i>Concerned about impact on national rail services (including loss of back up routes, reduced capacity, impacts during construction)</i></p>	<p>At New Cross Gate and Lewisham stations, we are proposing to build and operate new London Underground stations linked to the existing rail stations. These new interchange stations would enable new customer journeys from across the wider south and south east London areas and beyond by providing access for quicker journeys into central and north west London. Furthermore, the proposed combined Northern and Bakerloo line ticket hall at Elephant &amp; Castle would enable a much quicker and more direct interchange between National Rail services and the Bakerloo line at this location.</p> <p>At Lewisham station, we are working closely with Network Rail as they develop proposals to upgrade the National Rail station. We will consider these emerging plans as we progress the design of our new Bakerloo line station, to ensure that we provide a high quality interchange and good passenger experience for the proposed integrated Lewisham station.</p>

		<p>As we develop our designs for both Lewisham and New Cross Gate stations we will update our forecasts of customer demand to make sure that our understanding of what is needed at each station and the impacts are as accurate as possible. These forecasts will enable us to identify whether the proposed extension would generate new customer journeys and new movements that require improvements to the existing stations in order that they can operate safely. Where we identify any need to do so we will work with Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies to ensure existing operations at the stations could be maintained as far as practicable during construction works for the extension.</p>
6.3	<p><b>Impacts on specific local supermarkets</b></p> <p><i>Oppose loss of supermarkets, no local alternatives</i></p> <p><i>Can some form of supermarket be retained during works?</i></p> <p><i>Can be supermarkets be relocated during construction?</i></p> <p><i>After works are complete can supermarkets return to the sites?</i></p> <p><i>Impact on groups with protected characteristics, including female employees in part-time jobs</i></p>	<p>We are committed to working with the landowners of all sites identified as required for the construction or operation of the proposed Bakerloo line extension. This includes the sites occupied by Tesco (proposed Old Kent Road 1 station and secondary tunnelling worksite) and Sainsbury's (proposed New Cross Gate station and primary tunnelling worksite) supermarkets. As we do so we will continue to review our requirements for these sites to understand if store operations could be maintained. Based on our current proposals we do not believe we can safely build the station and tunnels from these sites without requiring the closure of the existing supermarkets and other retailers. This is because the land required to operate the supermarkets is substantial and could not be accommodated on the site alongside the land needed to build the extension. If our land requirements change, we will ensure all affected stakeholders are informed.</p> <p>We recognise that supermarkets provide important services to local communities, including vulnerable groups. As such, we have considered the wider market providing grocery, pharmacy and petrol station services in the Old Kent Road, New Cross and wider area. We have concluded that there are a large range of other providers of comprehensive grocery services that are accessible by car, cycling, walking or bus services. Due to the number and spread of these alternative grocery retailers, we do not expect that many shoppers would experience longer travel times to access supermarket facilities. We will keep this</p>

		<p>under review and, at the time that we apply for powers to build the proposed extension through a Transport &amp; Works Act Order, we would set out the latest assessment we have of the impact on access by the local community to grocery services, including any mitigation measures as necessary as part of our Environment Statement.</p> <p>Our aim has been to consult on our proposals and their potential impacts at an early stage, to provide time for the current supermarket retailers to consider how they could provide alternative retail services in the area should they wish to do so. As with all land required for the proposed extension, landowners would be compensated for their losses in accordance with the Compensation Code.</p> <p>No decisions have been made on the future use of the sites after construction has been completed. As such, this could include a future use as a supermarket. As the project develops, we will work closely with the planning authorities, Southwark and Lewisham Councils, on how the station sites could be used following construction of the Bakerloo line extension.</p> <p>The proposed extension would improve public transport provision which would provide a benefit to many protected characteristic groups, such as Black, Asian, and minority ethnic (BAME) communities, who are more reliant on public transport mode, as well as supporting the creation of new jobs and homes in the area.</p> <p>We recognise that supermarkets often employ many female employees in part-time jobs. Whilst the proposed extension would benefit women through better transport, new jobs and homes, there may be a negative impact during construction. We would carry out further work to consider the impact of a loss of such jobs and any mitigations as part of the assessments required for the TWAO.</p> <p>Construction of the Bakerloo line extension would lead to the creation of new jobs and apprenticeships for local people.</p>
--	--	---

6.4	<p><b>Alternative station locations for Old Kent Road 1(Dunton Road)</b></p> <p><i>There are cheaper alternatives e.g. industrial land off Dunton Road</i></p>	<p>We have previously considered and responded to alternative proposals for the location of Old Kent Road 1 station. We did not consider that the 2019 consultation provided new information or evidence that changes our view. Our response is set out in the Response to Issues Raised from the 2017 consultation publication at section 2.6. This is available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf</a></p>
6.5	<p><b>Old Kent Road 1 station previous consultation</b></p> <p><i>Previous consultation was flawed as people didn't understand that Tesco would need to close.</i></p>	<p>We consulted on two options for the Old Kent Road 1 station in 2017.</p> <p>Option A was at the junction of Mandela Way and Dunton Road. Option B was the site at the junction of Old Kent Road with Dunton Road and Humphrey Street.</p> <p>We produced a factsheet as part of the consultation about two options for the site which is available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/st2-old-kent-road-1-station-factsheet.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/st2-old-kent-road-1-station-factsheet.pdf</a></p> <p>The factsheet included maps of the two sites including the location of Tesco in Option B. This also set out what we considered to be the advantages and disadvantages of both sites, including the likely loss of the supermarket during the construction period for option B.</p> <p>As a result of the feedback from the 2017 public consultation and our subsequent analysis, we have confirmed the proposed station at the Option B site.</p>
6.6	<p><b>Method and output of TfL technical studies</b></p> <p><i>Clarify vehicle movements at Old Kent Road 1</i></p>	<p>The proposed Old Kent Road 1 station and secondary tunnelling worksite is currently a petrol station and a supermarket with a large car park. The combination of these land uses generates many hundreds of vehicle movements every hour as vehicles enter and exit the supermarket car park and other vehicles access the petrol station. Based on the long operating hours of the store and its size it is likely to generate over a thousand vehicle movements a day. Given this,</p>

	<p><i>Need to consider wider value and contribution to local community of existing stores, including jobs</i></p>	<p>we are confident that based on our experience of tunnelling and station works on other projects, the extension proposals for the site would generate a lower number of vehicle movements.</p> <p>In assessing the proposed sites for stations and tunnels work, we have considered the impacts both during construction and operation of the proposed extension. In terms of the impact of using the current Tesco and Sainsbury's site (at New Cross Gate) our assessment has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding the loss of sales to the supermarkets in order to enable us to understand the compensation the landowners may be entitled to under the national compensation code</li> <li>• Understanding the impact on the supermarket customers and the changes they would need to make to access alternative grocery services, pharmacies and petrol stations</li> </ul> <p>We recognise that there may be impacts on the local community, however we believe the benefit of the proposed extension is greater than the temporary negative impact. We would also aim to mitigate many of these impacts through our own works. For example, we have established practices of creating apprenticeships, setting local employment targets and engaging and strengthening local community ties as part of construction schemes with its suppliers. We will continue to review all implications of the proposed extension as we continue to develop our plans.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in sections 3.13 to 3.19 about managing the impact of construction works.</p>
6.7	<p><b>BLE's interactions with road transport and walk/cycleways</b></p> <p><i>Ensure good pedestrian access to stations</i></p>	<p>We are confident that the proposed station locations along the route of the extension to Lewisham would provide comfortable and easy access from the local area around the station for both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed stations would form multi-modal transport hubs, and as such the points of entry and exit must enable comfortable and easy</p>

	<p><i>Ensure good connections to bus services</i></p> <p><i>Provide good cycle access/ safe cycle routes, use the opportunity of construction disruption to install cycleways and cycle infrastructure</i></p> <p><i>Ensure that pedestrian and cycle access is not impeded during construction</i></p> <p><i>Limit car parking in the areas close to new stations</i></p> <p><i>Co-ordinate new stations and bus routes to produce transport hubs</i></p>	<p>interchange with the local bus network. We will consider how the bus network is planned to ensure that it provides effective provision for travelling to and from the proposed Underground stations on the extension.</p> <p>We are working with Southwark Council to develop plans to transform the Old Kent Road through our Healthy Streets programme (see 3.21). This aims to provide more space for pedestrians and cyclists and improve bus priority.</p> <p>As we develop plans for the delivery of the extension, we will consider how construction works at each site would take place and how those works can happen in a safe manner both for construction workers and for the local area around the site. The aim would be to ensure that walking and cycling routes and vehicle routes remain available as far as practicable. Our aim is that prior to any changes being implemented during construction works, proposals are set out and communicated to the stakeholders that would be affected to help planning and managing the impacts.</p> <p>Our policy is to deliver a transport network that enables as many journeys as possible to be made by walking, cycling or public transport. We have a target of reaching 80 per cent of all trips in London being made this way by 2041. We would therefore work with the local highway authority to ensure that risks of parking on local streets to commute by Underground are managed through necessary controls. We would also not provide any vehicle parking for customers at any of our proposed stations.</p>
6.8	<p><b>New Cross area already has good transport links</b></p> <p><i>Concerns that station here is not needed</i></p>	<p>Whilst the New Cross area has good transport links in the form of London Overground, rail and bus services, the majority of these services are all at capacity, as are connecting interchanges.</p> <p>A new London Underground station and interchange at New Cross Gate would provide new capacity that would help relieve existing services, including the Jubilee line at Canada Water. It would also provide new journey opportunities for</p>

		both local residents and existing customers, including a direct new route to central London via the Old Kent Road.
6.9	<p><b>Lewisham station - future operation</b></p> <p><i>Can TfL take over management of whole of Lewisham station, including National Rail, DLR and Bakerloo line facilities?</i></p> <p><i>The Bakerloo line extension should include a total rebuild of Lewisham station to improve capacity to National Rail services and improve accessibility to DLR, National Rail and bus services.</i></p>	<p>With the exception of the Docklands Light Railway station and tracks, Lewisham station is owned by Network Rail. Rail services would continue to serve the station once the Bakerloo line extension is operation. Regardless of management of the station, all parties will need to work together for the station to function as effectively as possible for all station users. We do not believe therefore that there is a viable reason to transfer the management of the whole station to TfL at the current time. Any future decision on the management of the station, in whole, or in part will only be made once we have more certainty over the future design and operation of the station.</p> <p>Network Rail, in partnership with TfL, Lewisham Council and the Department for Transport are investigating options to enhance capacity at Lewisham station. This work will take account of the needs and impacts of the proposed Bakerloo line extension.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 6.2 on the interaction between rail and Underground lines in stations.</p>
6.10	<p><b>Relocation of buses at Thurston Road at proposed Lewisham station</b></p>	<p>Our proposals at Lewisham station are focussed on the construction and operation of a new Underground station as part of the extension to the Bakerloo line.</p> <p>The proposed construction site at Lewisham is on Thurston Road, which is currently used as bus stands. As we develop our designs, we will consider how they impact upon bus routes that operate from this site. This will help us consider what changes may occur to arrive at the required capacity of any new bus stand site and where it may be located. We will work to find a suitable location which avoids significant disruption to bus users.</p>

6.11	<p><b>Lewisham station size</b></p> <p><i>Why is Lewisham station a different (smaller) size and configuration to Old Kent Road 1?</i></p>	<p>The proposed site at Lewisham is constrained due to the existing developments around the station, the town centre and the National Rail station. The Retail Park and former Carpetright site also have planning permission for new residential development.</p> <p>A further area would be required underground, underneath the National Rail station and adjacent to the surface site, to provide enough space to safely build the station.</p> <p>The proposed station site at Old Kent Road 1 is a standalone site and does not have these constraints. We are also proposing to use Old Kent Road 1 to support the tunnelling works and therefore a larger area is required.</p>
6.12	<p><b>Tunnelling under/close to existing properties (noise, vibration, settlement)</b></p> <p><i>Concerns about noise, vibration and settlement</i></p> <p><i>Specific concerns that 15 metres depth of tunnels is not deep enough for tunnels under Brookmill Road Conservation area given the brick construction and lack of significant foundations</i></p>	<p>As part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order process for gaining approval to build and operate the Bakerloo line extension, an Environmental Statement would be prepared which would include an assessment of noise, vibration and settlement (ground movement) likely to be caused by the tunnelling activities.</p> <p>Other than at and on the approach to stations, the tunnels would be located at a minimum of 15 metres, and on average 20 metres below ground along much of the route, measured from the track level in the tunnel. Experience from the construction of similar tunnels, including the Northern line extension, the Jubilee line extension, High Speed 1 and Crossrail, is that the occupiers of properties above are unlikely to experience disturbance during construction or from the operation of the railway.</p> <p>During the proposed tunnelling, it is expected the tunnel boring machines (TBMs) will travel at an average speed of around 15 metres per day. This relatively slow speed allows the tunnelling to be completed safely in a controlled manner, and also reduces the amount of settlement. Occupants and users of buildings close to the tunnelling have typically encountered noise and vibration disturbance for a few</p>

		<p>days either side of day the TBM passes below the property. However, once the TBM has passed, no further disturbance of noise and vibration has been encountered.</p> <p>Tunnelling activities will naturally cause some ground movement which can affect properties close to the works. Based on our experience from Crossrail and the Northern line extension this could be up to 15mm. However, this ground movement does not necessarily translate into damage; it could cause some sticking of doors and windows and small cosmetic cracks in paint work. We would provide a freephone helpline for anyone to contact us on. This has been implemented on similar schemes such as the Elizabeth line and the Northern line extension.</p> <p>Our experience from Crossrail and the Northern line extension has demonstrated that neither absence of foundations nor a history of subsidence is a good indicator of the likely level of damage. The ground movement experienced on Northern line extension was similar to the annual cycle of building movement related to the natural variation in moisture levels in the soil. These are affected by rainfall, temperature and vegetation.</p> <p>When planning new tunnelling routes we seek to minimise noise, vibration and settlement.</p>
6.13	<p><b>Surveys of buildings above proposed new tunnels before construction</b></p> <p><i>Will these take place to monitor settlement?</i></p>	<p>Our experience from the construction of similar tunnels, including the Northern line extension, Jubilee line extension, High Speed 1 and Crossrail, is that the occupiers of properties above the route alignment are unlikely to experience disturbance during construction or from the operation of the railway. As we develop our alignment proposals and further investigate the geology and characteristics of buildings along the route, we will be better able to forecast any impacts and whether mitigations may be required to the affected properties. Assessments of any ground movement (settlement) and surveys of properties</p>

		above the tunnelled route would be undertaken before work begins to build the extension.
6.14	<b>Noise and vibration from trains in the new tunnels</b>	<p>As part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order process for gaining approval to build and operate the extension, we would produce an Environmental Statement including an assessment of the potential ground borne noise and vibration. Where necessary, we would include mitigation measures to ensure the level is acceptable.</p> <p>In recent similar projects, well-established London Underground guidance has been used to determine the acceptable maximum level for noise and vibration. For the Northern line extension, the predicted effects of noise and vibration was negligible for residents along the route.</p> <p>Much of the existing Underground service operates in tunnels which are very old. For the proposed extension we would be able to use latest technology and design of tunnels, track and trains to minimise noise and vibration.</p>
6.15	<b>Common themes relating to design for all stations</b>  <i>Ensure there are platform screen doors between the train and platform</i>  <i>Provide toilets at stations</i>  <i>Automatic Fire Suppression Systems should be included in designs</i>	<p>At this stage of design, no decisions have been made on whether platform edge/screen doors would be installed in the new stations along the Bakerloo line extension. As such, the design of the proposed extension to date does not include any aspect that would preclude the provision of platform edge/screen doors.</p> <p>As we develop our plans for the new stations, we would include toilets for customers in line with the latest London Underground planning policy.</p> <p>The design and construction of all our stations will always have safety and security as the base of its design, using good practice, strict design standards, and liaison throughout the design process with health and safety professionals and London Underground operations staff.</p>

6.16	<p><b>Design suggestions for Old Kent Road 1 station</b></p> <p><i>Location of entrances</i></p> <p><i>Can there be a subway across Old Kent Road to Burgess Park?</i></p>	<p>The proposed stations are in an early stage of design. We will continue to work with local stakeholders, including Southwark Council to develop designs for the stations, including considering where the entrances/exits will be located and the means of crossing the road. We will consult on these designs in future public consultations.</p>
6.17	<p><b>Design questions relating to Old Kent Road 2 station</b></p> <p><i>Ensure consideration for a future London Overground station</i></p> <p><i>The station box has been skewed on the site compared to the previous consultation. This will make the land harder to develop.</i></p> <p><i>Station should be further south to interchange with Queens Road Peckham Overground station</i></p>	<p>As a result of the feedback from the 2017 consultation, we are continuing to develop plans for a station on for the site of the former Toys R Us store. Our proposals do not include an interchange with London Overground, however provision for an ‘out of station’ interchange is not precluded.</p> <p>As part of the design development undertaken since the last consultation, we have refined the alignment of the route. This is to avoid deep foundations and to provide a smooth, quick journey for customers whilst reducing maintenance costs associated with wheel/track wear. This has resulted in a change of position for the footprint of the site compared to the position previously indicated.</p> <p>We have previously considered and responded to alternative proposals for the site of the Old Kent Road 2 station. We did not consider that responses to the 2019 consultation provided new information or evidence that changes our view. Our response continues to be set out in the Response to Issues Raised from the 2017 consultation publication in section 2.6 available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf</a></p>

<p>6.18</p>	<p><b>Extent of land take Old Kent Road 2 station</b></p> <p><i>812 Old Kent Road does not need to be acquired as well</i></p> <p><i>Other station sites (such as Crossrail Bond Street) have used much smaller sites.</i></p>	<p>The size of construction worksites, along with their shape and location, have a direct impact upon the overall project programme, that is the speed at which we can deliver the project and open the proposed extension.</p> <p>We have been working to determine the land take requirements across the project and believe the extent of land shown as required in the consultation is necessary to construct the station and fit out the tunnels at the proposed Old Kent Road 2 station site. This is based on a number of factors, including the area of land required for the station and the logistics of moving safely around the site, whilst construction is taking place. Our plans are based on lessons we are learning from projects such as Crossrail and the Northern line extension, where smaller worksites have been used and have caused delays and/or added complexity in building the stations. An example of the problems caused by a smaller worksite is the logistical problems in storing sufficient materials to maintain operations.</p> <p>We do not consider it feasible to construct the Old Kent Road 2 station without acquiring 812 Old Kent Road.</p>
<p>6.19</p>	<p><b>Burnhill Close gypsy and traveller site</b></p> <p><i>Concern over disruption during the construction period</i></p> <p><i>Concern for feeling unsafe through a perceived threat of racial abuse as a result of more people in the area during both construction and operation</i></p>	<p>Given the proximity of the proposed construction site at Old Kent Road 2 station, it is likely that there would be some disturbance to the nearby properties at Burnhill Close. We would consider surrounding residents and businesses in the detailed design of the construction site by locating the noisiest activities away from the site boundary and considering where HGV's would enter and exit the site.</p> <p>As part of the TWAO submission, an Environmental Statement would be produced which will describe the environmental effects of the project and set out ways we seek to mitigate them. It would also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Code of Construction Practice which would outline controls of the worksite such as working hours and ways of managing dust</li> </ul>

	<p><i>Concern a change in the area particularly tall buildings and increase in population would lead to loss of isolation and privacy</i></p> <p><i>Request to be relocated such the works go ahead</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Construction Logistics Plan which would detail how construction vehicles will use the site</li> <li>• A Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Policy which would offer mitigation such as double glazing or temporary rehousing should defined noise thresholds be triggered</li> </ul> <p>We completed outline Equalities Impact Assessments for each of the proposed stations (including Old Kent Road 2 <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension/user_uploads/old-kent-road-2-station-eqia.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension/user_uploads/old-kent-road-2-station-eqia.pdf</a>) and published these as part of the consultation. The assessment looked at how the proposed extension could impact both positively and negatively on protected characteristic groups and suggested elements to consider as we progress with the design of the stations and worksites.</p> <p>Equalities needs will be considered as the detail of each station progresses and the Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIAs) updated to ensure any impacts are captured throughout the design phases. We have updated the EqIAs following the 2019 consultation and published at <a href="https://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension">tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension</a></p> <p>With regards to concerns around loss of privacy and racial abuse due to the increased levels of development and population in the area, this part of the Old Kent Road is included within the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan with the proposed extension fundamental to allowing growth in the area. Developments around the proposed station would be managed by Southwark Council.</p> <p>Southwark Council provide and manage the Gypsy and Traveller sites within the borough and would need to facilitate any relocation of residents if they wished to move to another site.</p>
6.20	<b>Design suggestions / questions relating to New Cross Gate station</b>	As we develop our station designs we will ensure that they can support interchanging between the existing station and the new station. We will consult further on our station specific proposals as they are developed.

	<p><i>Ensure integration with existing London Overground / National Rail station.</i></p> <p><i>Make a connection with New Cross station.</i></p>	<p>A key requirement for the proposed extension is to provide a connection with New Cross Gate to allow an interchange between London Overground and Southern services with London Underground. For Southeastern services (which travel via New Cross), customers could interchange with the Bakerloo line at Lewisham, as all services stopping at New Cross also stop at Lewisham. Furthermore, New Cross and New Cross Gate stations are located five to ten minutes walk apart and it would be prohibitively expensive and technically challenging to connect. We would ensure good signage between the two stations.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 6.8 about integration of services at existing stations.</p>
6.21	<p><b>Design suggestions/questions relating to Lewisham station</b></p> <p><i>Ensure the new station is integrated with Network Rail</i></p> <p><i>Ensure the new station is integrated with existing plans for the redevelopment of Lewisham (eg the shopping centre, Lewisham Exchange etc.)</i></p>	<p>We are working closely with Lewisham Council, Network Rail, and other local stakeholders to ensure that the proposed new London Underground station is incorporated into plans to upgrade the existing National Rail station and the wider area. As our station designs develop, we would include these in future consultations.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in 6.9 about the future operation of Lewisham station.</p>
6.22	<p><b>Design suggestions/questions relating to Lewisham Way shaft</b></p> <p><i>Only part of the site is needed, suggestion for accessing the site</i></p>	<p>We are proposing a shaft and head house at a site off Lewisham Way at the Big Yellow Self Storage site, between New Cross Gate and Lewisham stations. We consulted on this site proposal in 2017 and the majority of respondents supported the location. We continue to require the site to house the shaft, plant, storage of materials and welfare facilities. It is unlikely that the current businesses could remain operational on this site during construction.</p>

	<p><i>whilst retaining access to the Big Yellow Self Storage property</i></p> <p><i>There is an underground stream at Luxmore Gardens</i></p> <p><i>What will the headhouse look like and who will decide on architectural design?</i></p>	<p>We will continue to engage with local residents and stakeholders as we develop our design further. The stakeholders will include local businesses and we will seek to understand the impacts on them and their clients.</p> <p>We would produce an Environmental Statement as part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order. This would include detailed studies of water courses and other natural assets, evaluate the proposed extension's effects on them and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Functionally, the headhouse would look similar to examples found on the Jubilee line extension, Crossrail or the Northern line extension, which have been designed to be consistent with the surrounding area. The planning process for the headhouses has yet to be determined, and consent would be sought as part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order process. We would liaise closely with Lewisham Council on the design.</p>
6.23	<p><b>More stations are required along this section of the route (i.e. between Elephant &amp; Castle and Lewisham)</b></p>	<p>We have considered the number and location of stations on the proposed extension route between Elephant &amp; Castle and Lewisham in detail, and this formed part of the 2017 public consultation. Based on the existing transport network, the areas that the extension would serve and the emerging plans for new development along the route (particularly along the Old Kent Road), we believe that the number and location of stations proposed is the optimal solution.</p> <p>This balances the benefits provided by new stations against the cost of construction and impact on journey times, which are increased with every additional station.</p> <p>We have been careful to plan the proposed extension based on the needs of south east London. The distances between the proposed stations, is consistent with that seen on other comparable underground lines across London.</p>

6.24	<b>Suggestion that Lewisham Way shaft could be a small station</b>	<p>The site at Lewisham Way would not be large enough for a new station.</p> <p>Please also see our response in section 6.23 regarding the location of stations along the route of the extension.</p>
------	--	---

## 7. Possible primary tunnelling worksites for the proposed extension

### General

Ref	General Issue	Our response
7.1	<p><b>Suggestions for tunnelling worksite selection criteria</b></p> <p><i>Support for the least disruptive site and to minimise disruption more generally</i></p> <p><i>Support for least expensive/cheaper option</i></p> <p><i>Support for the quickest/most efficient option</i></p> <p><i>Support option with least environmental impact</i></p> <p><i>Select the site that involves less tunnelling/work under ground</i></p>	<p>The consultation material set out our proposed option for the primary tunnelling worksite at New Cross Gate. We consider New Cross Gate presents the best option which balances cost, programme efficiency, environmental impacts (including disruption to local residents and businesses) and future benefits to customers. This option best reflects the suggestions received for tunnelling worksite selection criteria.</p> <p>The purpose of the consultation was to learn from a wide range of stakeholders what the key concerns and issues are, and who may be disrupted by the works. Feedback from the consultation supported our proposed option for a primary tunnelling worksite at New Cross Gate and further to this we will continue to develop and refine our proposals for this worksite.</p>
7.2	<p><b>Respondents who mistakenly thought that stations were considered/proposed at Hither Green or Catford</b></p>	<p>We considered a number of options for an extension beyond Lewisham. We determined that there is a case for developing plans for a further extension beyond Lewisham station to Hayes and Beckenham Junction.</p> <p>In the consultation materials we stated this could involve converting the current National Rail line to Hayes to accommodate Bakerloo line services. We outlined that Bakerloo line services could replace the current National Rail services on the</p>

		<p>line, and the following stations: Ladywell, Catford Bridge, Lower Sydenham, New Beckenham, Clock House, Elmers End, Eden Park, West Wickham and Hayes. In addition we would also modify platforms at Beckenham Junction to accommodate the new Bakerloo line trains (Bakerloo line services at this station would be additional to the existing National Rail services to London Victoria).</p> <p>Hither Green and Catford were outlined as possible primary tunnelling worksites rather than possible new stations, though are not the proposed option which is New Cross Gate. Feedback from the consultation supported our proposed option for a primary tunnelling worksite at New Cross Gate and further to this we will continue to develop and refine our proposals for this worksite.</p>
7.3	<p><b>Other options not included in the consultation for tunnel boring machine launch sites – Wearside Road and Goodwood Road</b></p>	<p>The consultation material outlined our requirements for a suitable primary tunnelling worksite. A worksite would need to be more than 30,000m<sup>2</sup> in size and have access to the rail network for deliveries of construction materials and removal of spoil, to reduce the impact on the local road network. Neither of the sites suggested at Wearside Road or Goodwood Road would meet these requirements as they would not be large enough for the complex tunnelling activities required.</p>

## New Cross Gate

Ref	New Cross Gate	Our response
7.4	<p><b>Concern and suggestions regarding our proposed tunnelling worksite</b></p> <p><i>Concern about disruption to roads (e.g. closures) and to public transport (e.g. bus routes, rail services, London Overground) at New Cross Gate)</i></p> <p><i>Concern about sites deliveries and construction vehicles (at New Cross Gate)</i></p> <p><i>Oppose works at New Cross Gate site due to impact on residents, businesses and community facilities)</i></p> <p><i>Oppose New Cross Gate site due to environmental impact</i></p>	<p>One of the key benefits of using the site at New Cross Gate for tunnelling activities is that it is alongside a railway. This means we could deliver construction materials and remove excavated materials (spoil) by rail as the tunnels are constructed. This would mean fewer Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) using the roads compared to at a site where there is no rail access. There would still need to be some trips made by road vehicles, for example when setting up the worksite and for smaller deliveries, but these would be reduced compared to the number of trips that would be generated if the site were not rail served.</p> <p>Opportunities to reduce these trips would be considered during the design (such as efficient design using fewer materials) and also managed during construction (such as encouraging workers to commute to the site by public transport). The vehicles would also be entering and leaving the site via New Cross Road, which is a main road and part of the strategic TfL Road Network.</p> <p>We have held discussions with Network Rail and freight operators to discuss our plans to use the rail lines for deliveries and removing excavated materials without disrupting existing rail services. We understand it would be possible to accommodate our proposals by using the lines in the late evening and early morning. This means that we would require space to store spoil on site during the day.</p> <p>As part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order process we would produce an Environmental Statement describing the effects of construction traffic and ways in which it would be mitigated. Safety will always be at the heart of what we do, especially during construction. We would ensure that suitable measures are in</p>

		<p>place to ensure vehicles travelling to and from the site are undertaken in a safe manner.</p> <p>We acknowledge the proximity of the site in relation to neighbouring residential properties and the possible impacts the project may have on the amenity of the surrounding area. The New Cross Gate site partly falls within the Hatcham conservation area. The railway lines running through the sites are designated as 'Green Corridor's' and part of the alterations to the adjacent railway fall within the New Cross Gate Railside's Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).</p> <p>We will develop plans for the site use during construction and will review how we could avoid or mitigate noise, air quality and visual disturbances to adjacent properties and the surrounding area. The design of the new station would consider the local context of the surrounding area, in particular the adjacent conservation area. Regarding any impacts to ecology, we are committed to delivering biodiversity net gain across the project. A full assessment of the likely effects would be presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Considering impacts on the local bus network, bus routes 321 and P13 use the New Cross Gate Retail Park as their starting/end point. As part of the proposed works, the buses would be unable to enter the site. We would work to find a suitable alternative standing space for these buses which minimises disruption to customers.</p> <p>Feedback from the consultation supported our proposed option for a primary tunnelling worksite at New Cross Gate and further to this we will continue to develop and refine our proposals for this worksite.</p>
7.5	<b>Concern about loss of supermarket on this site and suggestions for use of worksite after construction</b>	No decisions have made on the future use of the site after construction has been completed. As such, this could include a future use as a supermarket. As the project develops, we will work closely with the planning authority, Lewisham

		<p>Council, on how the New Cross Gate site could be used following construction of the Bakerloo line extension.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 6.3 and 6.6 about the impacts on local supermarkets.</p>
--	--	--

## Catford

Ref	Catford	Our response
7.6	<p data-bbox="320 316 853 384"><b>Concerns related to our non-proposed tunnelling site at Catford</b></p> <p data-bbox="320 464 837 533"><i>Loss of community, educational and recreational space</i></p> <p data-bbox="320 571 837 639"><i>Impact on the environment and road network</i></p> <p data-bbox="320 678 779 746"><i>Disruption to residents and local businesses</i></p>	<p data-bbox="904 316 2029 384">Catford is not our proposed primary tunnelling worksite option. Feedback to the consultation from both stakeholders and the public supported this approach.</p> <p data-bbox="904 422 2002 564">To provide enough space for all tunnelling activities, a portion of the Jubilee Grounds would need to be used during the construction of the works. This would mean that those who currently use the space would be unable to do so for the duration of the works.</p> <p data-bbox="904 603 2002 825">The site is close to a residential area with neighbours adjacent to the grounds in Canadian Avenue. All of our construction worksites would require a full assessment of the impacts of noise, dust, vibration and other disturbance. These assessments would be presented in the Environmental Statement with proposed mitigation measures as part of our Transport and Works Act Order application.</p> <p data-bbox="904 863 2002 1005">The Waterlink Way cycle route partly runs through the Catford Hill Retail Park to the east of the Ravensbourne River. This would need re-routing with the exact route to be decided in consultation with Lewisham Council and key stakeholders.</p> <p data-bbox="904 1043 1944 1185">The consultation feedback we have received has supported our proposed option of New Cross Gate over Catford or Hither Green as the primary tunnelling worksite, and this will guide us in refining our proposals as we continue to develop the proposed extension.</p>

## Hither Green

Ref	Hither Green	Our response
7.7	<p><b>Concerns related to our non-proposed primary tunnelling site at Hither Green</b></p> <p><i>Impact on the environment and a community space</i></p> <p><i>Disruption to local road networks</i></p> <p><i>Impact on communities</i></p>	<p>Hither Green is not our proposed primary tunnelling worksite option. Feedback to the consultation from both stakeholders and the public supported this approach.</p> <p>To provide enough space for all tunnelling activities, the current railway sidings and vegetated area (which is a designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation SINC) would need to be used. This would mean that those who currently use the space would be unable to do so for the duration of the works.</p> <p>This option would also require 1.6km of additional tunnelling beyond the current planned end point at Wearside Road and would therefore create additional waste and require more materials to construct when compared to other worksite options.</p> <p>The site is close to a residential area and road access would be required along Manor Lane, which is not favourable as it is a local road through a residential area and feedback to the consultation advised that it is a key route for local primary school children. The SINC, known locally as the Hither Green Nature Triangle is managed by a group of local volunteers, it is likely this area would be lost as part of the works.</p>

		<p>All of our construction worksites would require a full assessment of the likely effects of noise, dust, vibration and other environmental impacts. Mitigation measures will be taken as appropriate. These assessments would be presented in the Environmental Statement as part of our Transport and Works Act Order application.</p> <p>The consultation feedback we have received has supported our proposed option of New Cross Gate over Catford or Hither Green as the primary tunnelling worksite, and this will guide us in refining our proposals as we continue to develop the proposed extension.</p>
--	--	---

## 8. Use of Old Kent Road 1 as a tunnelling site

Ref	Issue	Our response
8.1	<p><b>General opposition to this as a tunnelling site</b></p>	<p>We proposed Old Kent Road 1 as a secondary tunnelling worksite to enable us to build the tunnels from Old Kent Road 1 to Lambeth North and allow for earlier completion of the tunnelling. This would mean that the proposed extension could open sooner.</p> <p>At this combined site we could assemble the tunnel boring machines and launch them from within the excavated station box. We would also use the site to supply the materials to build the tunnels. The site could also store the spoil taken out of the ground by the machines, before it is transported away. Using the site in this way could reduce the amount of time it would take to build and open the extension.</p> <p>By combining the works in this way rather than using two sites close to each other we would reduce disruption to the local area.</p> <p>Respondents were most likely to be neutral with no views on the proposal to use the site to carry out tunnelling activities towards Lambeth North. 36 percent were positive and supportive, and four per cent opposed. Following this feedback, we will continue to develop and refine our proposals for this site to build the Old Kent Road 1 station and also use it as a secondary tunnelling worksite.</p>
8.2	<p><b>General construction questions about Old Kent Road 1</b></p> <p><i>How will the spoil removed from the tunnelling be undertaken?</i></p>	<p>We are proposing that the section of tunnels between Old Kent Road 1 station and Lambeth North be constructed from the site of the Old Kent Road 1 station. This would require launching two tunnel boring machines and removing the spoil from the station site by road via the A2 (Old Kent Road) to New Cross Gate where it could then be transported by rail. The A2 forms</p>

	<p><i>Concern at congestion and disruption to bus services</i></p> <p><i>Other projects (such as Tideway Chambers Wharf site) have used smaller sites for their tunnelling worksites - do you need all the site?</i></p>	<p>part of the Transport for London Road Network, the London network of strategic roads suitable for transporting freight.</p> <p>We would develop a Code of Construction Practice and a Construction Logistics Plan which would set out how we would safely manage traffic movements, including mitigating disruption to the local road and bus networks.</p> <p>We would produce an Environmental Statement (which forms part of the Transport and Works Act Order application) which would include an assessment of traffic movements anticipated in association with building the proposed extension.</p> <p>To construct tunnels from Old Kent Road 1, we have considered how much land would be needed to build the station and tunnels, and fit them out. It is difficult to directly compare site requirements for a new railway tunnelling project with other different infrastructure projects. Firstly, the site is both a station worksite as well as a tunnelling worksite and would need to accommodate the station box itself (where the tunnel boring machines would be launched and recovered). Secondly, Tideway utilise the River Thames to deliver materials and remove spoil, but this option is not available at the Old Kent Road 1 site. Furthermore, the Old Kent Road 1 site would facilitate the driving of a pair of tunnel boring machines at the same time (as well as receiving a further pair of machines tunnelling from Lewisham). A larger area is needed for storing materials to ensure the timings of vehicles delivering and taking spoil away from site can be safely managed.</p>
8.3	<p><b>Use an adjacent worksite for the secondary tunnelling worksite</b></p>	<p>We have previously considered and responded to alternative proposals for the location of the Old Kent Road 1 station site. Our response is set out in the Response to Issues Raised from the 2017 consultation publication and in section 2.6 available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf</a></p>

		<p>A combined Old Kent Road 1 station and secondary tunnelling worksite would have the same land requirement as the 2017 consulted station worksite.</p> <p>By combining the station and secondary tunnelling worksite we could build and open the proposed extension earlier. It would also reduce the impact and disruption to the local community rather than using two sites close to each other.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 8.2 regarding general queries about this worksite.</p>
8.4	<p><b>Use the primary tunnelling worksite at New Cross Gate for all tunnelling activity and not have a secondary tunnelling worksite</b></p> <p><i>Suggest this would enable all machinery to arrive and spoil to leave by rail, therefore improve air quality</i></p>	<p>We proposed Old Kent Road 1 as a secondary tunnelling worksite to enable us to build the tunnels from Old Kent Road 1 to Lambeth North and allow for earlier completion of the tunnelling. This would mean that the proposed extension could open sooner.</p> <p>A significant part of the machinery would have to be transported by road as it is very large and could not be transported safely on the rail network.</p> <p>The use of the Old Kent Road 1 site as a secondary worksite would not preclude the option of taking some spoil to New Cross Gate by road and removing it from there. As we develop our proposals further we will consider the balance of road and rail use.</p>
8.5	<p><b>Concern at the loss of the supermarket and whether the whole of the site is needed</b></p>	<p>We have previously considered and responded to alternative proposals for the location of the Old Kent Road 1 station site. Our response is set out in the Response to Issues Raised from the 2017 consultation publication and in section 2.6 available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-extension-2017/user_uploads/ble-updated-response-to-issues-raised.pdf</a></p>

		<p>A combined Old Kent Road 1 station and secondary tunnelling worksite would have the same land requirement as the 2017 consulted station worksite.</p> <p>We are now proposing to use the site for both the construction, fit out and operation of a new station as well as a secondary tunnelling worksite. We have considered how much land would be needed for this work and believe the extent of land shown as required in the consultation is necessary to construct the station and tunnels from this site.</p> <p>Please also see our responses in section 6.3 and 6.6 about the impact on local supermarkets.</p>
8.6	<p><b>Proposed use of the site after construction</b></p> <p><i>Affordable housing</i></p> <p><i>Supermarket to return</i></p>	<p>No decisions have made on the future use of the site after construction has been completed. As such, this could include a future use as a supermarket. As the project develops, we will work closely with the planning authority, Southwark Council, on how the Old Kent Road 1 station site could be used following construction of the Bakerloo line extension.</p>

## 9. Wearside Road Council depot site

Ref	Issue	Our response
9.1	<p><b>Concerns regarding stabling trains at Wearside Road Council depot and suggestions for this site during and after construction</b></p>	<p>We have proposed a stabling facility at Wearside Road Council depot in a basement level structure below the existing ground level and below the level of the existing Network Rail lines. This would allow us to access the tunnels via a head house built on the surface, provide stabling, potentially reverse trains and remove the tunnel boring machines. This would also allow us to potentially further extend beyond Lewisham on the Hayes branch of the National Rail network.</p> <p>Although we are at early stages of design, we would expect there to be little impact on residents close to the site during operations. Typical train stabling comprises of tracks (known as roads) where trains are stored whilst empty. Whilst stored, the trains may be cleaned inside. As part of permission to build and operate the railway through a Transport &amp; Works Act Order, we would produce an Environmental Statement describing any likely effects (such as noise and vibration) on nearby residents and businesses and how we would take steps to reduce any disruption.</p> <p>Our designs are currently at an early stage and we will use comments from this consultation and further information from our discussions with stakeholders (including Lewisham Council) to develop our proposals. This includes discussions about future use at ground level (besides the head house) on the site.</p> <p>The consultation feedback we have received has supported our proposed use of the Wearside Road Council depot, and this will guide us as we continue to develop our proposals.</p>

<p>9.2</p>	<p><b>Current services which operate from Wearside Road Council depot</b></p> <p><i>Will these need to be relocated and will they return after construction?</i></p>	<p>We have been working closely with Lewisham Council as the plans for the proposed extension are developed. The Council is exploring plans for its fleet operations during the period that the site would be needed to build the extension. We are working with the Council to explore how the site could be used when construction is complete, in addition to the operational requirements of the extension.</p> <p>We have not yet developed our proposals for a further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction in sufficient detail to understand the extent to which the Wearside Road site would be required above ground. We will consider this as part of our wider work to further investigate the feasibility of a further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction.</p>
<p>9.3</p>	<p><b>The size of the Wearside Road Council depot</b></p> <p><i>Would more land be needed for stabling trains here or at other sites along the Bakerloo line?</i></p>	<p>As part of the proposed extension we are looking at stabling capacity across the whole of the Bakerloo line, which includes the existing depots at Stonebridge Park and Queens Park in north London and London Road near Lambeth North. We are also looking at how we could use the existing tunnels between Lambeth North and Elephant &amp; Castle to stable trains once a new alignment is provided as part of the extension. Our preliminary work shows that along with the four locations discussed above, Wearside Road Council depot as proposed would provide sufficient additional capacity for the Bakerloo line if extended to Lewisham only. Should our proposals change then these would be subject to further consultation.</p>
<p>9.4</p>	<p><b>Impacts of using Wearside Road Council depot on the local environment and residents</b></p> <p><i>Noise and pollution</i></p> <p><i>Other impacts on the environment</i></p>	<p>We would expect Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) to access the site during construction. HGVs would be required to travel approximately 150 metres on Wearside Road, which is a residential street with parking either side, before travelling just under 1.5km to the A205 South Circular Road. It should also be noted that vehicles using the existing council depot (cars, waste lorries, vans etc.) which currently use the site would no longer be making such journeys.</p>

	<p><i>Mitigating measures such as safety and screening</i></p>	<p>We acknowledge the proximity of the site in relation to neighbouring residential properties and the possible impacts the proposed extension may have on the amenity of the surrounding area. The Wearside Road Council depot also falls adjacent to railside Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) and the River Ravensbourne. The railway lines running through the sites are designated as 'Green Corridor's'.</p> <p>As part of the Transport &amp; Works Act Order application, an Environmental Statement would be produced that would describe the likely effects of construction traffic and ways we would seek to mitigate these effects.</p> <p>We will develop plans for the site use during construction and will review how we could avoid or mitigate noise, air quality and visual disturbances to adjacent properties and the surrounding area. Regarding any impacts to ecology, we are committed to delivering biodiversity net gain across the project. A full assessment of the likely effects would be presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Safety will always be at the heart of what we do, especially during construction. We would ensure that suitable measures are in place to ensure vehicles travelling to and from the site are undertaken in a safe manner.</p> <p>We completed outline Equalities Impact Assessments for each proposed worksite and stations and published these as part of the consultation. The assessments looked at how the proposed extension could impact both positively and negatively on protected characteristic groups and suggests elements to consider as we progress with the design of the stations and worksites. Equalities needs will be considered as the detail of each worksite and station progresses and the Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIAs) will be updated to ensure any impacts are captured throughout the design phases. We have updated the EqIAs following the 2019 consultation and published at <a href="https://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension">tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension</a></p> <p>Please also see our responses in 9.1 regarding concerns about the use of the Wearside Road Council depot for our works.</p>
--	--	--

9.5	<b>Use as an opportunity to enhance Waterlink Way</b>	Waterlink Way is an important cycle route within south London. The Mayor's Transport Strategy seeks to encourage more people to walk and cycle within the capital by having good quality footpaths and cycle paths. We would seek to mitigate any impacts on the Waterlink Way from the proposed works. Where there are opportunities to improve cycling facilities (such as Waterlink Way), we would consider the feasibility of these options in future stages of design.

## 10. Station Naming for Old Kent Road 1 and 2 stations

Ref	Issue	Our response
10.1	<p><b>Next stages on deciding on the names</b></p> <p><i>Will there be further consultation?</i></p>	<p>The consultation provided the opportunity for local people and stakeholders to have their say on the naming of the proposed two new stations on the Old Kent Road. For Old Kent Road 1 station 59 per cent of respondents preferred “Burgess Park” and 15 per cent “Old Kent Road”. For Old Kent Road 2 station 32 per cent of respondents preferred “Old Kent Road” and 24 per cent “Asylum”.</p> <p>As the most popular choices were “Burgess Park” for Old Kent Road 1, and “Old Kent Road” for Old Kent Road 2 station, we will proceed with these as the names for the two proposed stations.</p> <p>We are not proposing a further consultation on the station naming.</p>

## 11. Possible further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction

Ref	Issue	Our response
11.1	<b>Overall support and opposition for the possible further extension of the route</b>	<p>We asked whether people supported or opposed a possible further extension of the Bakerloo line beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. This was supported by 82 per cent of respondents (73 per cent strongly and nine per cent partially). It was opposed by nine per cent of respondents (seven per cent strongly and two per cent partially).</p> <p>Given this level of support we are investigating how we could deliver this possible further extension, taking into account feedback from the consultation from the public and stakeholders.</p>
11.2	<b>Timing and phasing</b>	<p>We are considering a range of possibilities and opportunities around how we could deliver a further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. This includes options that could deliver the further extension both alongside the extension to Lewisham and as a further phase following the extension to Lewisham becoming operational.</p> <p>We are keen to minimise disruption as far as possible. We are looking at the best way to deliver both phases and are also considering the cost implications of all scenarios.</p> <p>The responses to our consultation were positive about this further extension and as a result we are investigating these proposals in more detail.</p>

		<p>The cost of building the Bakerloo line extension is currently unfunded in our Business Plan. We are facing an unprecedented combination of financial challenges at present, and the impact of the ongoing Coronavirus outbreak means that the focus is on the provision of a safe and reliable public transport operation on the existing network.</p> <p>Investment in long-term infrastructure projects, such as the Bakerloo line extension is therefore dependent on our ability to bring together funding from a range of sources, including the private sector and central Government. We consider that major beneficiaries of the extension, for example developers, should contribute financially towards it. We continue to develop the funding package for the proposals with the key stakeholders. At the same time, we are reviewing ways in which the proposals could be made more affordable.</p>
11.3	<b>Concern that the further extension is not required/existing service is fine</b>	<p>We consider that a further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction could provide the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more frequent London Underground service compared to the existing National Rail service resulting in greater capacity</li> <li>• More direct journeys into the West End, however we appreciate that journeys into the City would require an interchange</li> <li>• Direct interchange with all other London Underground lines, the Elizabeth line, London Overground and the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) at Lewisham for Canary Wharf</li> <li>• New direct connections to National Rail services from Paddington and Marylebone</li> <li>• A new direct link from Beckenham Junction to Lewisham town centre and central London</li> <li>• Upgraded and fully accessible stations on the Hayes branch</li> </ul>
11.4	<b>Concern that the further extension to Hayes and Beckenham Junction</b>	

	<p><b>would cause crowding at other interchange stations</b></p>	<p>In addition to central London interchange stations, our proposals include new Bakerloo line stations at Elephant &amp; Castle, New Cross Gate and Lewisham stations where customers would be able to interchange to travel into the City.</p> <p>We continuously monitor how future conditions at all stations which may be affected by any new customer demand and changes in movements that the further extension beyond Lewisham could generate. This includes at locations across the London Underground and National Rail network. At this time, we expect that the existing infrastructure capacity would be sufficient to enable stations to continue to function safely and efficiently.</p> <p>We are continuing to review interchanges and how they are impacted, as well as taking into account future demand. This would be incorporated into all our designs. At Lewisham station, we are currently working with Network Rail and the Lewisham Council to develop a future design for the station that can accommodate future demand, including from the proposed Bakerloo line extension.</p>
11.5	<p><b>Concern around the capacity of the proposed service against existing service</b></p> <p><i>Overall capacity</i></p> <p><i>Ability to get a seat</i></p> <p><i>Comfort of trains</i></p>	<p>Whilst no final decision on the timetable for Bakerloo line services on the Hayes line would be made until approximately 12 months before opening, we expect that a more frequent service would operate on the Hayes line if it changed to Underground operations. This is because there would be no conflicting services north of Ladywell station, as there are currently with other rail services. Additionally, we are proposing to both serve the existing stations to Hayes and introduce a new service operating from Beckenham Junction. Once those two sets of services combine and serve stations from New Beckenham, the total service frequency would be higher than the current six trains per hour that operate in the peak on the existing network.</p> <p>Although a single Underground train is smaller and has fewer seats and space for standing compared to a full length National Rail train, a more</p>

		<p>frequent London Underground service would mean that overall capacity would be greater than is currently provided. As a minimum, Bakerloo line services from Hayes would have at least the same level of overall capacity as the existing National Rail services.</p> <p>Our proposals would see upgraded and more comfortable trains to travel in, and a more frequent service. Priority seating is available on our trains and on National Rail services.</p>
11.6	<p><b>Concerns about the negative impact on journeys to London Bridge, Cannon Street, other direct services to central London</b></p> <p><i>Would need to make an interchange, whereas I now have a direct service and can get a seat?</i></p> <p><i>Interchange station and trains are likely to be crowded</i></p>	<p>We outlined in the consultation material that journey times to London Bridge are expected to be slightly longer than they are with the present service. Whilst Bakerloo line services on the Hayes branch would continue to provide a direct link to London Waterloo and London Charing Cross, an interchange would be required to reach London Bridge and Cannon Street. Interchange to reach these stations could be made at Lewisham, New Cross Gate, Elephant &amp; Castle, Waterloo or Embankment stations. We appreciate that if a customer boarded a train during a busy period, for example at Hayes and had a seat for their journey, then an interchange could mean having to board a more crowded service.</p> <p>Overall, we consider there are many advantages and benefits to these proposals. The extension of Bakerloo line services to Hayes and Beckenham Junction would be expected to reduce existing journey times to the majority of destinations in central London and further afield. This is the case not only for journeys to the West End, where locations such as the South Bank, Whitehall, Oxford Street, Regent's Park and Paddington would only be accessible via a single Tube journey, but also for journeys to the City and locations such as Bank and Old Street via an interchange. These benefits would be enabled by a direct service to more locations, including key central London interchanges and the faster acceleration and braking capabilities of modern Bakerloo line trains that would operate on the Bakerloo line once it is</p>

		upgraded, as well as the frequency benefits delivered by a more frequent service.
11.7	<b>Concern about loss of direct services to Guys Hospital at London Bridge</b>	<p>We appreciate the concerns expressed by some respondents who make journeys which would mean that they would have to make an interchange rather than previously having a direct service to Guys Hospital.</p> <p>Our proposals would see upgraded and more comfortable trains to travel in, and a more frequent service. Priority seating is available on our trains and on National Rail services.</p> <p>Respondents travelling to other hospitals in central London such as St Thomas' at Waterloo and St Mary's at Paddington, would see a reduction in journey times.</p>
11.8	<b>Concern about other impacts on National Rail services</b>	<p>We do not decide what services operate across the rail network in south east London. Therefore we are not able to confirm which routes would benefit from improved services if the Bakerloo line was further extended beyond Lewisham to Hayes. Responsibility for planning the National Rail network lies primarily with the Department for Transport.</p> <p>However, we will continue to work closely with Network Rail and the Department for Transport to understand what the impacts of the London Underground extension proposal beyond Lewisham to Hayes could be and to explore which alternative routes would most benefit from additional national rail services.</p>
11.9	<b>Concern about impact on rail services during construction and the timeline for this</b>	We acknowledge that the proposal to for a further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction introduces the risk of disruption to customer services on that line as well as to communities and businesses that rely on the links it provides during the period of construction.

		<p>At the time of our consultation we were consulting on the principle of the further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. We had not yet done the work to give an accurate estimate of how long services on the Hayes line could be disrupted for. In light of the responses to the public consultation we are investigating the development of proposals for the Hayes line. The potential impacts during construction is a key part of this investigation. We will consult further on the potential impacts at a later date.</p> <p>We know that construction would entail a range of activities which would not be compatible with running either the existing National Rail services or running the planned new Bakerloo line services. Specifically, we would need to undertake works at stations and to the tracks to ensure that the London Underground trains can operate and provide step-free travel from platform to train. We would need to replace the signalling to match that which will be in operation on the remainder of the Bakerloo line and we would also need to test the Bakerloo line service once construction works are complete to ensure the trains run safely and reliably.</p>
11.10	<p><b>Concern about impact on local communities</b></p> <p><i>Noise (inc increased trains running by houses)</i></p> <p><i>Concern over the possible operation of Night Tube services</i></p> <p><i>Health and social impact</i></p>	<p>In light of the responses to the public consultation we are investigating proposals for the Hayes line. As part of this work, we are considering how the construction and operation of the further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction is likely to impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community and people (including heritage, air quality, noise and vibration, visual amenity, severance)</li> <li>• Green environment (including. ecology and biodiversity, surface water, flood risk and source protection zones)</li> <li>• Brown Environment (including contaminated land, ground conditions, materials and waste)</li> </ul> <p>In the event that we decide to proceed with an extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction, we would also undertake Equalities</p>

		Impact Assessments and as part of the Transport and Works Act Order application. An Environmental Statement (ES) would be produced assessing the effects of both construction and operation of the further extension.
11.11	<b>Concern about fares</b>	<p>Whether customers would be better or worse off in terms of fares paid would be dependent on how our fares change between now and when the further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction service could become operational. Our fares are set by the Mayor of London where travel can take place entirely on our operated services. National Rail fares are set by central Government.</p> <p>A comparison of current fares shows that journeys paid by Oyster or contactless, which makes up more than 90 per cent of journeys on the London Transport network, on possible future Bakerloo line services would in all cases be the same price or cheaper than National Rail only fares to the same destinations.</p> <p>Cash fares are also usually cheaper on the London Underground network than on the National Rail network, with the only exceptions being for fares to London Termini stations from zones 3 and 4 which are marginally more expensive. We will continue to monitor fares comparisons as the proposals for an extension to Hayes develop.</p>
11.12	<b>Zoning of Ladywell station (currently zone 3 and would like the station to be zone 2)</b>	There are no current plans to change the fare zone for Ladywell station. Our proposals for a further extension to Hayes and Beckenham Junction would involve converting the line to Underground operation. Zoning of stations would be only considered closer to the possible opening of the service.
11.13	<b>Concern over loss of car parking</b>	Our proposals for the extension to Hayes and Beckenham are at an early stage and we have not considered the provision of car parking at stations.
11.14	<b>Design suggestions for stations and infrastructure</b>	Our work to date has focused on the strategic case and some high-level engineering activities which would be needed for adopting the existing

	<p><i>Can Lower Sydenham Station be moved northwards towards Bell Green?</i></p> <p><i>Can a new station be built at Bell Green?</i></p> <p><i>Can a new bridge be built on Southend Lane to remove the height and width restriction?</i></p> <p><i>Can the interchange between Catford and Catford Bridge be improved?</i></p> <p><i>Will the rail services continue during construction?</i></p> <p><i>If London Underground take over the Hayes branch, a diversionary route between Beckenham Junction and St Johns will be removed</i></p>	<p>National Rail line between Lewisham and Hayes. We have not looked into moving stations, replacing bridges or improving the interchange with other stations in any detail.</p> <p>We do however appreciate the comments from residents and stakeholders and will consider such options during future stages of design. It is likely that such decisions will be dependent upon a strong business case and confirmation of funding.</p> <p>We are working closely with Network Rail to understand what the impact of taking control of the Hayes branch might be for both London Underground and Network Rail. This includes a range of matters including diversionary routes available.</p>
11.15	<p><b>Suggestion to extend even further beyond Hayes</b></p>	<p>We have considered a range of route options beyond Lewisham. These have also included for example Orpington and Bromley North, Hayes and Beckenham Junction with a spur to Bromley Town Centre, Hayes and East Croydon. This assessment is summarised in our 2019 consultation summary report on the Further Extension to Hayes and Beckenham Junction available here <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/tube/bakerloo-</a></p>

		<p><a href="#">extension/user_uploads/summary-report-further-extension-hayes-beckenham.pdf</a></p> <p>We considered that there is a strong case for extending the Bakerloo line beyond Lewisham and that the Hayes and Beckenham Junction route demonstrated the highest journey time benefits.</p>
11.16	<b>Suggestion to have National Rail and Bakerloo lines on same track</b>	<p>We have proposed a conversion of the existing Hayes branch to Underground services rather than inter running with Network Rail as this provides a number of advantages. It allows for works to facilitate step-free access and boarding of trains (which would not be possible if two different types of trains used the same platforms). It would allow for a more regular and regularly spaced train service, as all of the trains would be serving the same destination therefore removing crossing movements. As this would no longer be a branch line but part of a single line there would no longer be any requirement to consider other services further up the line which requires additional margin in the timetable to ensure no knock on effects. This would also mean that where delays from other branches further up the line currently delay or disrupt services to Hayes, this would cease to be the case.</p>
11.17	<b>Suggestion that Hayes line should be converted to London Overground</b>	<p>We have not considered routing London Overground services on the Hayes line, as they do not currently serve Lewisham, and an extension from New Cross (via Lewisham) would be operationally dis-advantageous as it would require London Overground services to cross the Southeast mainline to access the Hayes Branch. This would reduce the capacity on the wider rail network.</p>
11.18	<b>Suggestion to prioritise maintenance/improvement of existing line and infrastructure first</b>	<p>Network Rail are responsible for the maintenance and improvement of the existing line and infrastructure.</p>

11.19	<p><b>TfL technical studies</b></p> <p><i>Interest in the work on transport benefits and cost of further extension to Hayes and Beckenham Junction</i></p>	<p>Further to the responses received to the consultation, we are investigating the proposals for a further extension beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. This will give us an understanding of the costs, benefits and the impacts of constructing and operating the proposals.</p> <p>These studies will also take into account the potential impact of the released train paths from the Hayes line and we aim to work with the DfT and Network Rail to agree what these impacts could be.</p>
-------	--	---

## 12. Consultation and engagement

Ref	Consultation and engagement	Our response
12.1	<b>Suggestions and concerns regarding the consultation itself</b>	<p>The majority of respondents considered the quality of the consultation to be very good or good (ranging from 85 per cent for the website structure &amp; ease of finding what you needed to 71 per cent for the promotional materials).</p> <p>We welcome the comments and concerns that we received on the consultation itself and will take these into account before any further consultations. For example, we will develop an interactive tool for the route alignment of the proposed tunnels which would enable residents to search for their address by postcode.</p>
12.2	<b>Consultation results are not robust / reliable</b>	<p>We received a good response to the consultation (8,749 replies). WSP, who are an independent consultancy, carried out the analysis of the consultation responses.</p> <p>Some stakeholders questioned the validity of the consultation in relation to station and tunnelling worksite locations. In our 2017 consultation we asked for views about proposed locations for stations. We ensured that this included the potential loss of supermarkets at the Old Kent Road 1 and New Cross Gate worksites. We clearly identified in the 2019 consultation materials any changes to our proposals since the previous consultation.</p> <p>We also set out what was subject to the consultation and what was out of scope.</p>
12.3	<b>More information needed</b>	<p>We sought to provide a balance of information about our proposals on our website and in the supporting materials. People could access a simple landing page or, if they had more time available, click through to more detailed information. The consultation involved over 30 documents including a number of supplementary reports and 19 maps.</p>

Ref	Consultation and engagement	Our response
		<p>As we further develop the proposed extension we will continue to engage with local stakeholders and update them on our proposals. We would hold further consultations prior applying for a Transport &amp; Works Act Order.</p>
12.4	<b>Lack of promotion</b>	<p>We carried out an extensive promotional activity which is summarised in section 3.8 of the factual consultation report <a href="http://tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension">tfl.gov.uk/bakerloo-extension</a>. There were 8,749 responses to the 2019 consultation (the 2017 consultation had 4,899 responses). We are reviewing the effectiveness of the methods we used. We will work with our borough partners and stakeholders on the best methods for promotion.</p>
12.5	<b>Engagement and information since 2017 consultation have been inadequate</b>	<p>We have continued to regularly engage with stakeholders since the previous consultation. We carried out pre-consultation engagement with many stakeholders before the 2019 consultation. We will be contacting stakeholders about their preferred options and frequency for future engagement and to explore any concerns they may have about this previously.</p>
12.6	<b>Requests for additional engagement or rounds of consultation</b>	<p>We would carry out further consultations prior to seeking powers for the scheme under a Transport &amp; Works Act Order.</p> <p>We are not proposing to carry out further consultations on aspects of the scheme we have already consulted upon unless our proposals change. We will continue to engage with stakeholders on our proposals.</p>
12.7	<b>Consultation with vulnerable groups</b>	<p>We consulted with a wide range of stakeholders including those representing vulnerable groups. We aimed to produce information in plain language. We made available an "easy read" version of the consultation. We used a range of methods to promote the consultation including radio adverts. We held 15 public exhibitions including sessions at shopping centres which were particularly well attended. We met with the gypsy and traveller community living close to the proposed Old Kent</p>

Ref	Consultation and engagement	Our response
		<p>Road 2 station.</p> <p>We would welcome any opportunities to engage with vulnerable groups.</p> <p>We asked a question about the positive and negative impacts of our proposals. We collected demographic data to help us understand the profile of who had responded to the consultation and whether there were differences in views about our proposals.</p>

# Appendix A: Consultation questions

## ***Core consultation questions***

**Question 1:** Please let us have any comments about our proposals, including how these may impact you whether in a positive or negative way.

**Question 2:** Please let us have any comments on our proposals for a new combined Bakerloo line and Northern line ticket hall at Elephant & Castle.

**Question 3:** Please let us have any comments on our proposed new route for the Bakerloo line extension between Lambeth North and Elephant & Castle.

**Question 4:** Please let us have any comments on our proposed route for the Bakerloo line extension between Elephant & Castle and Lewisham.

**Question 5a):** We have considered three possible primary tunnelling worksites for the proposed extension at New Cross Gate, Hither Green and Catford. Our proposal is for the primary tunnelling worksite to be at New Cross Gate. Please let us have any comments on the possible primary tunnelling worksites.

**Question 5b):** In our previous consultation in 2017 we discussed that there would be a worksite at Old Kent Road 1 to build the station. We have updated our proposals and we are now also considering carrying out tunnelling activities from the site towards Lambeth North. Please let us have any comments on our updated proposal for how we could use the Old Kent Road 1 worksite.

**Question 6:** Please let us have any comments on our proposals for the Wearside Road Council depot site where empty trains would be stabled.

**Question 7:** Please let us have your views on the name of Old Kent Road 1 station. Suggestions for this station have included Old Kent Road or Burgess Park. There is a popular park nearby and there is a history of Tube stations being named after parks (eg Green Park, Regents Park). We welcome your views on the name of the station. *Please note we reserve the right not to proceed with any of the suggestions received. We will liaise with the council on any suggestions received.*

**Question 8:** Please let us have your views on the name of Old Kent Road 2 station. Suggestions for this station have included Old Kent Road or Asylum which reflects the nearby road of that name and the history of buildings in the area. We welcome your views on the name of the station. *Please note we reserve the right not to proceed with any of the suggestions received. We will liaise with the council on any suggestions received.*

**Question 9a):** We are considering a further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction. This would involve a conversion of the National Rail line via Catford to Hayes to an Underground operation.

Do you support or oppose our plans for a further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction?

*Closed question: strongly support/partially support/neither support nor oppose/partially oppose/strongly oppose*

**Question 9b):** Please let us have any comments about our proposals for a further extension of the route beyond Lewisham to Hayes and Beckenham Junction.