

15 June 2026

info@transfromtuleshill.co.uk

Tulse Hill Gyratory

Follow-up to meeting of 22 May 2026

To

Thomas Holmes

Lead Sponsor, Safe and Healthy Streets,
Transport for London

Claire Alleguen

Local Engagement Manager, Local Communities
and Partnerships, Transport for London

CC

Seb Dance

Deputy Mayor for Transport

Helen Hayes

Member of Parliament

Marina Ahmad

London Assembly Member for Lambeth and
Southwark

Bell Ribeiro-Addy

Member of Parliament

Caroline Russell AM

Chair of the Transport Committee

Steve Reed

Member of Parliament
Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and
Local Government

Dear Thomas and Claire,

Thank you for meeting us on 22 May 2026 at the Tulse Hill Hotel and for taking the time to walk around the gyratory with us to see the situation first hand. We appreciated the open and constructive way in which you engaged with our concerns, and left the meeting feeling that a positive and productive working relationship will continue.

We want to acknowledge the specific commitments made in the meeting - on VivaCity sensor installation, pedestrian crossing timing reviews, coordination with Lambeth on bus priority measures, and openness to further collaborative engagement to achieve better road safety and making Tulse Hill a safer place to live, work in, visit, and travel through.

We also wish to place on record that both TfL Commissioner Andy Lord (letter of 26 March 2026) and Deputy Mayor Seb Dance (letter of 25 March 2026) committed to genuine, proactive and timely engagement with this community. We look forward to discussing with you how that commitment can be given practical form.

A detailed appendix sets out our questions arising from the meeting. We request written responses within 10 working days, in line with TfL's stated commitment to respond to local councillor and MP enquiries. This letter sets out who we are, our position, and our key asks.

Who we are

Transform Tulse Hill is a non party-political community campaign seeking the safe transformation of the Tulse Hill gyratory in Lambeth.

We are supported by Norwood Forum, the Station to Station Business Improvement District, all four ward councillors for St Martin's and West Dulwich, three Members of Parliament, two London Assembly Members, and over 1,110 petition signatories from people in Lambeth and beyond.

Every locally elected party represented in the area is publicly committed to action on the gyratory and willing to work together to achieve it.

Our campaign is founded on powerful community experiences of the day-to-day dangers of this gyratory, and is also data-led.

Our analysis of publicly available TfL collision data, conducted with the support of an independent academic researcher in road safety, shows that the gyratory - 420 metres of TfL's own Red Route network - represents 0.12% of Lambeth's roads but accounts for 1.19% of the borough's casualties over the past decade: ten times more dangerous per metre than the borough average, with 18 serious injuries over ten years and one fatality. DfT provisional figures published this week show Lambeth among London's most affected boroughs for killed or seriously injured casualties, and excess speed as a contributory factor in 57% of London's fatal collisions in 2025.

TfL's own *Walking and Wheeling Action Plan* (May 2026) identifies road danger, hostile pedestrian environments and insufficient crossings as the primary barriers to walking - all of which describe this junction precisely. TfL owns and manages this road. Its transformation is

TfL's responsibility, and we understand Lambeth Council and its newly elected councillors stand ready to support.

Our position

- **Urgency.** This junction was first promised £5 million of funding by the Mayor of London in 2013. On the trajectory described in the meeting - VivaCity sensors installed in summer 2026, six months collecting data, then a 9–12 month feasibility study - physical transformation cannot begin until the early 2030s at the earliest. That would be two decades. Our community cannot accept this. With two Superloop bus routes due to begin serving stops on the gyratory, footfall and bus-stop usage will increase significantly. This heightens the urgency of interim safety measures and must be factored into the prioritisation and feasibility work.
- **Transformation, not tinkering.** We welcome interim safety measures but the long-term outcome must be transformational and ultimately mean the removal of the one-way gyratory system.
- **An equitable and consistent funding allocation.** We understand Highbury Corner was funded from TfL's Business Plan with no developer contribution. Within this borough, Vauxhall Cross, Waterloo City Hub and Lambeth Bridge South are all funded primarily from TfL's Business Plan. TfL acknowledged in the meeting that areas of high social need and deprivation, where there is limited local development potential, cannot rely on developer contributions to fund such projects. Applying a different standard to a deprived inner-London junction with no significant development pipeline is neither consistent nor equitable and appears inconsistent with TfL's own published equity and prioritisation criteria.
- **Transparent prioritisation.** TfL stated that other junctions score more highly but did not identify them or share the scoring.
- **Sustained engagement.** The commitments made by Andy Lord and Seb Dance were explicit on proactive, genuine and timely engagement. TfL needs to deliver on this as this community has already experienced a full cycle of engagement and design work that was extremely well received but abandoned. Many years later, TfL's revised design options were released to TTH only after a Freedom of Information request, 18 months after they were produced. The new process must be transparent from the outset, with early sharing of data, design principles and feasibility findings.

Our asks to TfL

1. A formal quarterly liaison mechanism with us and officers from Lambeth Council, and a single point of contact at TfL for Transform Tulse Hill.
2. A written project timeline with milestones from sensor installation through to feasibility completion, local consultation and engagement and option selection.

3. Tulse Hill's prioritisation scores across all criteria and the junctions that ranked above it, and an explanation of on what basis third-party funding is expected here when it was not needed at comparable TfL-funded schemes elsewhere.
4. Clarification on VivaCity sensor installation timeline and confirmation that TTH and local councillors will be consulted before the decision is implemented.
5. Confirmation that TfL will support the nomination of the gyratory for the next phase of TfL's RedSpeed Sentio Shield 4D radar camera deployment.
6. Written responses to our questions in the appendix within 10 working days; if this is not possible, a clear explanation of why, and when you will send us your responses.

We are committed to working constructively with TfL. The political support for change is broad and cross-party, the evidence base is strong, and TfL's own published strategies - *Vision Zero*, the *Walking and Wheeling Action Plan*, the *Healthy Streets* programme - all point to exactly the kind of intervention that is needed here.

We will share a summarised overview of TfL's response with our petition signatories, elected members and the wider community in advance of its submission to the Mayor via the London Assembly. As a group and as a community, we look forward to the ongoing partnership that the Commissioner and Deputy Mayor committed to.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr Martin Abrams

Councillor for Streatham Hill East and Leader of Lambeth Council

Marina Ahmad AM

London Assembly Member for Lambeth and Southwark

Cllr Ciara Alleyne

Councillor for Herne Hill & Loughborough Junction, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment, and Climate Crisis, London Borough of Lambeth

Charlotte Ashworth

Director, Station to Station Business Improvement District

Councillor Georgina Berriman

St Martin's Ward, London Borough of Lambeth

Councillor Judith Cavanagh

West Dulwich Ward, London Borough of Lambeth

Kim Hart

Secretary, Norwood Forum and Chair, Thriving Norwood

Helen Hayes MP

Member of Parliament for Dulwich and West Norwood

Jamie Hodge

Transform Tulse Hill Steering Group

Councillor Jeremy Isaacs

St Martin's Ward, Cabinet Member for Health & Adult Social Care, London Borough of Lambeth

Councillor Tom Palmer

West Dulwich Ward, London Borough of Lambeth

Steve Reed MP

Member of Parliament for Streatham and Croydon North; Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Bell Ribeiro-Addy MP

Member of Parliament for Clapham and Brixton Hill

APPENDIX

Questions for written responses from TfL

We ask TfL to give written responses to all questions below within 10 working days, addressed to our ward councillors and to Transform Tulse Hill.

A. Engagement, transparency and liaison

1. Will TfL agree to a formal quarterly liaison mechanism - TTH, Norwood Forum, Station to Station BID, ward councillors, Lambeth Council officers and a named TfL lead?
2. Will you schedule the first meeting within six weeks of receiving this letter?
3. Please confirm a single point of contact at TfL for TTH.
4. TfL has conducted no community engagement on long-term design options since 2019. The 2016 Streetworks process was described by TfL as an exemplary model of co-design. Will TfL commit to that model - sharing options before decisions are made, consulting openly, co-producing outcomes - for the feasibility stage and beyond, including a commitment not to advance design decisions without prior meaningful engagement with TTH?
5. Will TfL publish a public-facing project webpage with a regularly updated timeline, so the community does not need to rely on FOI requests to track progress?

B. Project status, timeline and the Amber rating

6. The 2025/26 TfL committee milestone was to start option selection but this has not happened. What prevented it, and when will option selection begin?
7. Has the Gate 1 review referenced in that milestone been completed, and if not when will it take place?
8. Please provide a written project timeline with specific milestone dates from VivaCity installation through data collection, brief, feasibility study, option selection, preferred design, statutory consultation and implementation.
9. What specific factors led to the Amber rating in the December 2025 TfL committee report, and what needs to happen - in concrete, measurable terms - for the project to move to Green?

C. Long-term design options

10. **10.** No progress has been made on the six second-stage design options since the FOI document of February 2025. What is the current status of each option?

11. **11.** TfL indicated that eastern arm closure with two-way working is currently considered 'undeliverable'. What cost estimate and network modelling underlie this assessment, and what would need to change for this option to become viable?
12. **12.** TfL referred to a 'stepping stone' approach. Please explain in writing what physical changes this implies, on what timescale, and whether it is a route towards full gyratory transformation or a long-term alternative to it.
13. Please confirm that the project outcomes agreed in March 2023 - two-way working, enhanced pedestrian provision, enhanced cycle connectivity - remain committed outcomes.
14. Has the March 2023 project outcomes document been formally reviewed or revised since it was agreed? If so, by whom, when, and what changed?

D. Funding, prioritisation and comparable schemes

15. What is the specific budget line or allocation for Tulse Hill within the Safe and Healthy Streets programme for 2026/27 and 2027/28?
16. Funding was removed in 2019 and again in 2020. Who took those decisions, and what would be needed to establish a committed budget line now?
17. TfL stated that other junctions score more highly on its prioritisation criteria and that Tulse Hill is not in the Safer Junctions Programme. Please provide Tulse Hill's specific scores across all criteria - road safety, bus performance, active travel potential, social equity, and community and political support - and identify the junctions ranked above it on this combined assessment.
18. TfL stated that large schemes entirely funded from its Business Plan are no longer available and that third-party funding would be required. What is TfL's current policy on Business Plan funding for Red Route junction schemes, and when did that policy change?
19. On what basis is a third-party funding expectation being applied to Tulse Hill that was not applied to Highbury Corner, Vauxhall Cross, Waterloo City Hub or Lambeth Bridge South?
20. TfL acknowledged that areas of high social need cannot rely on developer contributions - what alternative funding mechanism does TfL propose for this junction?
21. Would third party contribution materially improve Tulse Hill's prioritisation? If so, what form should that take?
22. We are particularly eager to know if fully referenced traffic modelling given to TFL could potentially reduce the '9 months to a year' of time suggested as necessary by Thomas Holmes to allow financing to be brought forwards into the 2027-28 budget'?

23. TfL said that once a scheme is shown to be deliverable it becomes more likely to be funded. What specific evidence or process would establish deliverability for Tulse Hill, and what can TTH and Lambeth Council do to build that case?

E. Vision Zero, the case for prioritisation and social equity

24. TfL's analysis rates Tulse Hill as highest priority for bus underperformance and mode shift, Priority 3 for road safety, with high pedestrian densities and high cycling potential. The gyratory accounts for 1.19% of Lambeth's casualties on 0.12% of its roads - ten times the borough average danger rate per metre. DfT provisional figures published 29 May 2026 show Lambeth among London's most affected boroughs for killed or seriously injured casualties, with excess speed a contributory factor in 57% of London's fatal collisions. Please explain in concrete terms why this junction is not a priority for funded design work.
25. TfL's *Inequalities in Road Danger dashboard* shows that those in the most deprived 30% of London have a KSI rate of 0.40 per 1,000 population versus 0.26 for the least deprived 30%. Over 40% of households in the Tulse Hill and St Martin's estate area have at least one dimension of deprivation. TfL's *Liveable Neighbourhoods guidance* lists community and political support as an explicit prioritisation criterion. How are social equity and community, and political support weighted in TfL's assessment of the gyratory scheme, and what would TTH need to show to move either criterion to its highest weighting?

F. New radar speed cameras and enforcement

26. The *Vision Zero Action Plan 2* (March 2026) commits to at least 20 new RedSpeed Sentio Shield 4D radar camera locations based on 'speeding risk' and/ or 'persistent community concerns'. Lambeth is not in the current trial however TfL committed in the meeting to looking into whether the gyratory could be considered as a location for the installation of such technology in future.
- Will TfL formally support a written request from our ward councillors for the gyratory to be nominated for the next phase?
27. Please confirm the eligibility and assessment process to select the next locations for rollout, and whether any locations in Lambeth are already being considered.
28. TfL confirmed that the threshold for speed camera consideration is that 15% of vehicles must be exceeding the posted limit, alongside persistent community concern. 20mph post-implementation speed surveys at the gyratory were due from January 2025. Have these been completed, and if so does the data show the gyratory meeting the 15% threshold?
29. If surveys have not been conducted, when will they take place, given that evidence of non-compliance would directly support the case for camera deployment? The gyratory demonstrably meets the persistent community concern criterion - over 1,110 petition

signatories, multiple serious injuries, and residents reporting observed speeds far in excess of the 20mph limit.

G. VivaCity sensors and data

30. TfL indicated 4 to 6 VivaCity sensors are to be installed 'in the summer'. When exactly will they be installed, at which specific locations, and covering which arms of the gyratory?
31. Will TTH and local councillors be consulted on the proposed placement locations before the plans are finalised?
32. Will TfL consider Lambeth Council's offer (made in the meeting) to explore using its existing VivaCity contract to reduce costs?
33. What data will the sensors collect, and can TTH see it before it informs decisions?
34. TfL confirmed the data will be published publicly once cleaned to remove anomalies. What is the expected timeline from installation to publication?
35. What internal traffic monitoring has TfL conducted at the gyratory to date? We understand that 20mph post-implementation speed surveys were due from January 2025 - have these been completed, and if so will results be shared with TTH?
36. Can speed data from the existing Lambeth-TfL data-sharing agreement covering Christchurch Road be made available now, ahead of VivaCity installation?

H. Interim works and ongoing safety

37. The Commissioner's letter references 'early indications of reduced collisions' on the western arm. Please share the actual before-and-after data: collision counts, period covered, monitoring methodology and comparison with the three untouched arms.
38. We understand a female cyclist was seriously injured on 6 June 2025 very close to the location of a previous fatality on Norwood Road, where no interim safety works have been carried out. What monitoring has taken place and what, if any, intervention is planned here?
39. No further interim measures appear planned by TfL for the eastern, northern or southern arms. What is TfL's assessment of the ongoing safety risk on those three arms during the data collection and feasibility period, which is unlikely to conclude before 2028? Some cyclists also report that lane narrowing on Hardel Rise has made cycling more dangerous.

Will VivaCity sensors be positioned to assess the impact of the temporary measures, and when will a decision be taken on whether the narrowing should be made permanent?

V. Pedestrian crossings

40. TfL's *Walking and Wheeling Action Plan* (May 2026) identifies road danger from fast-moving vehicles, hostile pedestrian environments and insufficient crossings as the primary barriers to walking. The plan commits to 1,000 new pedestrian crossings by 2031, 50 area-wide neighbourhood transformation schemes by 2031, and re-timing signals to reduce pedestrian wait times. Which of these will you apply to the Tulse Hill gyratory, how will this junction be progressed within the plan's framework, and on what timeline?
41. Thomas Holmes indicated in our meeting that you could investigate introducing pedestrian countdown timers at the gyratory's crossings. These timers are part of TfL's own 'gold standard' for upgraded pedestrian crossings. Will you review the crossing points, if so, what is the timeline for completing that review, and whether countdown timer installation will be treated as an immediate deliverable independent of the longer feasibility process?

J. Buses

42. When will the SL6 Superloop bus begin stopping at the identified bus stops (E and G), and what passenger infrastructure improvements are planned in advance?
43. The SL15 is confirmed to launch in 2027 - what is the specific start date, and what improvements to the gyratory's substandard pavements and bus stops (A and E) are planned before it launches? TfL's *Walking and Wheeling Action Plan* (May 2026) states the quality of the walking experience to a bus stop defines the perception of the entire journey.
44. We are concerned about the large increase in people who will use the new services at bus stops that are inadequate and in locations where speeding vehicles have regularly mounted the pavements and caused collisions with street furniture and homes. Have safety audits taken place around the proposed bus stop locations for the new Superloop services?
45. There have been reports of bus drivers using adjunct private gardens and alleyways to urinate rather than the designated driver-only facility on Christchurch Road. Will TfL issue a formal instruction to all operators serving the gyratory to use only the designated facility?

K. Dangerous situation at development site

46. The pavement on Norwood Road opposite the Tulse Hill Hotel has been blocked by construction hoardings associated with the Southern Housing development at 338 Norwood Road. The permit GL003RGC-NORWOOD-01-02 confirms works running from 20 April 2026 to 24 November 2027 (19 months) - with TfL listed as the highway authority and a permit condition requiring an 'alternative pedestrian route' to be provided. Community members report no safe and clearly marked alternative exists: pedestrians are being forced into the carriageway and cyclists into the traffic. This is on one of the five main roads feeding into the gyratory, and the danger will become even

more acute when SL6 and SL15 Superloop services increase pedestrian flows from 2026 and 2027.

As the named highway authority, is TfL satisfied the alternative route condition is being met? If not, what enforcement action will TfL take and when, and will TfL raise this with Lambeth Council and Southern Housing as part of its commitment to joined-up safety working across the gyratory and its approach roads?

