



City of Westminster

Cabinet Member Report

Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for Built Environment Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking
Date:	25 April 2016
Classification:	For general release
Title:	Abell House and Cleland House Highway and Public Realm Improvements
Wards Affected:	Vincent Square
City for All Summary:	This decision contributes to the City for All initiative through the installation of new high quality paving materials, additional public seating, additional cycle facilities and improved lighting and drainage.
Key Decision:	No
Financial Summary:	The estimated cost for the implementation of the highway and public realm improvement proposals identified in this report is £2,396,900 and will be fully funded by the developer from two financial contributions contained within the section 106/section 278 agreement.
Report of:	Executive Director for City Management and Communities
Report Author:	Peter Bennett, Project and Programme Manager

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report presents proposals to improve the highway and public realm on John Islip Street, Page Street and Thorney Street, London SW1 and seeks approval to:
- the design and implementation of the highway and public realm improvements identified in this report;
 - modify and make traffic regulation orders necessary to accommodate the proposals;
 - capital expenditure necessary to implement the proposals;
 - delegate authority to the Executive Director for City Management and Communities to approve minor modifications to the scheme in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Built Environment and the Cabinet Member Sustainability and Parking.
- 1.2 Attention is drawn to the objections received in response to the consultation exercise and the Executive Director's responses to them, contained in Appendix E.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That approval be given for the design and implementation of the proposed highway and public realm improvements shown on the General Arrangement drawings, Plan A and Plan B, included in Appendix C.
- 2.2 That approval be given to modify and make traffic regulation orders under sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 necessary to accommodate the proposals together with the Statement of Reasons as set in Appendix D.
- 2.3 That delegated authority be given to the Executive Director for City Management and Communities to approve minor modifications to the approved scheme, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Built Environment and the Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking.

3. Reasons for Decision

- 3.1 The proposed highway and public realm improvements identified in this report will:
- Improve the public realm on John Islip Street, Page Street and Thorney Street using materials selected with close reference to the Westminster Way guidelines and principles;
 - Create increased footway space to improve pedestrian facilities on John Islip Street and Page Street;

- Improve the pedestrian area of Page Street between John Islip Street and Thorney Street by introducing a granite clad planter with seating, and improved lighting and drainage.
 - Improve security measures on Page Street to protect the servicing bay of Thames House from vehicular attack.
 - Plant additional trees along John Islip Street;
 - Provide additional parking, and
 - Provide improved lighting, drainage and cycle parking facilities.
- 3.2 The estimated cost to implement the highway and public realm improvements is £2,396,900 which includes Westminster City Council's costs, and will be fully funded by the developer from two contributions secured through a section 106/section 278 agreement.
- 3.3 The Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking are therefore recommended to approve the proposals outlined in this report together with capital expenditure necessary to implement the works.

4. Background, including Policy Context

- 4.1 Planning permission was granted by Westminster City Council on 21 March 2012 to Berkeley Homes to demolish Abell House and Cleland House which were on the west and east sides of John Islip Street respectively. The permission allowed for the construction of two buildings, each with three basement levels, a ground floor and 12 upper floors and was granted subject to the completion of a section 106/section 278 agreement.
- 4.2 The section 106/section 278 agreement secures two contributions towards the highway and public realm improvements identified within this report. Berkeley Homes, is to fully fund highway works required to accommodate the new developments and a contribution of £1m towards public realm improvements to mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding streetscape.
- 4.3 Under the terms of the section 106/section 278 agreement, the City Council's service provider FM Conway Limited has been commissioned to carry out the design of the highway and public realm improvements and subject to approval of this report will be commissioned to implement the proposals.
- 4.4 The proposals identified in this report are consistent with the Westminster Way and have been endorsed by the City Council's officer led Public Realm Advisory Group and Public Realm Operations Group.
- 4.5 To accommodate the development proposals it was necessary to modify security measures in Page Street. These measures have been designed in close liaison with Thames House.

4.6 The highway and public realm improvements referred to in this report are shown on the General Arrangement drawings Plan A and Plan B included in Appendix C.

5. Scheme Design Proposals

5.1 The aim of the proposals is to accommodate the new development whilst improving the highway and public realm for all highway users.

5.2 The proposals have been designed to reflect the agreed areas contained within the section 106 agreement and are shown on the General Arrangement drawings Plan A and Plan B in Appendix C and include:

Highway Improvements

- New Yorkstone footway paving and granite kerbs in John Islip Street, Page Street and Thorney Street adjacent to the developments;
- Realignment of the kerbs on John Islip Street and Thorney Street;
- New loading lay-bys on John Islip Street;
- New trees on John Islip Street and Page Street;
- A granite clad planter in Page Street to provide additional trees and public seating. The planter will include measures to deter skateboarding and make lying and sleeping uncomfortable;
- New hot rolled asphalt carriageway surfaces;
- A revised parking layout on John Islip Street providing additional parking;
- Improved public lighting and drainage, and
- The existing benches outside the medical centre on Page Street are existing and have arms to discourage lying and sleeping.

Public Realm Improvements

- New Yorkstone footway paving and granite kerbs in John Islip Street and Page Street at the junction of Page Street, John Islip Street and Dean Ryle Street;
- A raised 'Silver Grey' granite sett table at the junction of John Islip Street and Page Street to create a flush footway and carriageway surface;
- New trees on John Islip Street and Page Street;
- A stone clad planter in Page Street to provide additional trees and public seating;
- Improved drainage, and
- Additional cycle stands.

Security Measures

- For details of proposals relating to security measures please refer to Appendix B.

6. Parking, Waiting and Loading

- 6.1 To accommodate the public realm improvements it is necessary to locally redistribute existing parking facilities along John Islip Street. There will be no net loss of parking resulting from these proposals but there will be a gain in “Shared Use” bays and cycle stands. It is also proposed to introduce additional “At Any Time” waiting restrictions to prevent obstructive parking.
- 6.2 The proposed parking arrangements are shown on Plan C, Plan D, Plan E and Plan F included in Appendix C.

7. Programme

- 7.1 The proposed highway and public realm improvement works are currently programmed to commence in February 2017 with an anticipated duration of nine months.

8. Outstanding Issues

Subject to approval of this report the Executive Director for City Management and Communities will;

- 8.1 Initiate a consultation exercise for the proposed changes to traffic orders identified in this report. The City Transport Advisor will use his delegated powers to consider any objections received in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking.
- 8.2 Ask Tri-Borough Shared Legal Services to draft and enter into a maintenance agreement between Westminster City Council and Berkeley Homes to secure costs to maintain the proposed planter.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 All costs of implementing the highway and public realm improvements are being funded by the developer from two contributions contained within the section 106/section 278 agreement.
- 9.2 The estimated cost of the highway improvements necessary to accommodate the new developments is £1,094,300 including an allowance of £275,000 for risk and contingencies and will be fully funded by the developer.
- 9.3 The estimated cost of the improvements to mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding public realm is £1,302,600 including an allowance for risk and contingencies and will be funded from the public realm contribution.

9.4 A maintenance agreement will be entered into between Westminster City Council and Berkeley Homes to secure costs of maintaining the proposed planter in Page Street. Costs to maintain the planter will be secured prior to completion of the works.

10. Legal Implications

10.1 Section 106 of the Town Planning Act 1990 enables a Local Authority to enter into an agreement with a person with an interest in land to regulate the use of the land, including amelioration of development impacts. Financial contributions can be received under the provisions of a section 106 agreement.

10.2 Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 enables a local authority, acting in its capacity as local highway authority, to enter into agreements with developers (in order to facilitate development) for the developer to either pay for, or make alterations or improvements to, the highway at the developer's expense.

10.3 The pre-conditions for an agreement under s278 are first, that the local highway authority should be satisfied that it will be of benefit to the public to enter into the agreement for the execution of the works by the authority and, second that the works must be such that the local highway authority are authorised to execute, i.e. they must fall within the highway authority's powers of road building, improvement or maintenance.

10.4 The proposed highway works and the highway elements of the proposed public realm scheme fall within the ambit of section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.

11. Consultation

11.1 A consultation exercise involving Ward Councillors, the local amenity society and section 6 consultees including frontages was carried out during March 2015. This consultation exercise attracted four responses.

11.2 A summary of the responses is attached as Appendix E.

If you have any queries about this Report or wish to inspect any of the Background Papers please contact: Peter Bennett on 020 7641 2920, fax 020 7641 2920, email pbennet@westminster.gov.uk.

Background Papers:

1. Section 106/section 278 agreement dated 21 March 2012
2. Planning Permission dated 21 March 2012

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for Built Environment**

Declaration of Interest

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed: _____ Date: _____

NAME: **Councillor Robert Davis MBE DL, Cabinet Member for Built Environment**

State nature of interest if any

(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation(s) in the report entitled

Abell House and Cleland House Public Realm Improvements and reject any alternative options which are referred to but not recommended.

Signed

Councillor Robert Davis MBE DL, Cabinet Member for Built Environment

Date

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment:

If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Director of Law, Strategic Director Finance and Performance and, if there are resources implications, the Strategic Director of Resources (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy and Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking**

Declaration of Interest

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed: _____ Date: _____

NAME: **Councillor Heather Acton, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking**

State nature of interest if any

.....
(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation(s) in the report entitled

Abell House and Cleland House Public Realm Improvements and reject any alternative options which are referred to but not recommended.

Signed

Councillor Heather Acton, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking

Date

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment:

If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Strategic Director Finance and Performance and, if there are resources implications, the Strategic Director of Resources (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy and Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.

Other Implications

1. Resources Implications

All costs associated with the scheme (including the costs of making any necessary traffic orders) will be recovered from the developer.

2. Business Plan Implications

No implications.

3. Risk Management Implications

No implications.

4. Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment including Health and Safety Implications

The scheme will have a beneficial impact on health and well being over the current layout. Disruption during works will be carefully managed to minimise negative impacts such as dust and noise.

5. Crime and Disorder Implications

The measures in this report are not expected to have any implications under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

6. Impact on the Environment

Wherever possible existing materials that are taken up will be recycled.

7. Equalities Implications

The scheme will improve the accessibility of the streets for persons with mobility difficulties through the installation of flush kerbs at pedestrian crossings.

8. Staffing Implications

No implications.

9. Human Rights Implications

No implications.

10. Energy Measure Implications

No implications.

11. Communications Implication

Residents and business will be notified of the works through a letter drop in advance of the works. Contact details will be displayed on site notice boards and scheme details and progress available on the City Council's website.

Appendix B – This Appendix has been classified and restricted so is not for General Release

Security Measures

As part of the scheme proposals it is proposed to enhance security at Thames House to provide additional protection against vehicle borne improvised explosive devices (VBIED). This will be achieved through the use of 13 static security rated magnesium steel Westminster 'City' bollards in strengthened foundations. The Granite Clad planter will also provide protection should the first line of defence be breached.

The bollards will be installed in two alignments in Page Street; one to the west of the proposed planter and the other to the east of the planter.

The costs for the security measures will also be funded by the developer.

The bollard alignments are shown on the General Arrangement drawings, Plan A and Plan B included in Appendix C. Details of the bollard foundations have been classified as Officially Sensitive and are not for general release.

Appendix C

Plan A – General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 2 Drawing No. 70003940-CD-11-A

Plan B – General Arrangement Sheet 2 of 2 Drawing No. 70003940-CD-12-A

Plan C – TMO Consultation Existing Parking/ Loading Restrictions Sheet 1 of 2 Drawing No. 70003940-CD-07-C

Plan D – TMO Consultation Existing Parking/ Loading Restrictions Sheet 2 of 2 Drawing No. 70003940-CD-08-C

Plan E – TMO Consultation Proposed Parking/ Loading Restrictions Sheet 1 of 2 Drawing No. 70003940-CD-09-C

Plan F – TMO Consultation Proposed Parking/ Loading Restrictions Sheet 2 of 2 Drawing No. 70003940-CD-010-C

Appendix D

Traffic Management Orders

Proposed Traffic Orders

John Islip Street

- Shared Use parking increased by 13.5 metres.
- Installation of 8 cycle stands.
- Residents' parking redistributed.
- "At Any Time" waiting restrictions between parking provisions.

Dean Ryle Street

- 2 Disabled Bays relocated to the eastern side of the street and increased to 6.6 metres each.
- Residents' parking redistributed.
- "At Any Time" waiting restrictions between parking provisions.

Page Street

- 3 cycle stands removed.

In summary the waiting and loading proposals are as follows:

SCHEDULE OF PARKING CHANGES			
TYPE OF TRAFFIC ORDERS	EXISTING	PROPOSED	DIFFERENCE
Residents parking (Mon - Fri 8:30am - 6:30pm)	125.4 metres	125.0 metres	-0.4 metres
Pay-by-phone parking (Mon - Fri 8:30am - 6:30pm)	10 bays	10 bays	0 bays
Disabled parking	2 bays	2 bays	0 bays
Motorcycle parking	5.4 metres	5.4 metres	0.0 metres
Shared use parking (Mon - Fri 8:30am - 6:30pm)	39.5 metres	53 metres	+13.5 metres
Cycle stands	12 stands	17 stands	+5 stands
Double yellow lines ("At any time")	125.7 metres	266.1 metres	+140.4 metres
Single yellow lines (Mon – Fri, 8.30am – 6.30pm)	186.7metres	29.3 metres	- 157.4 metres

Statement of Reasons

The proposed modifications to parking facilities in John Islip Street will improve conditions by providing additional shared use parking provisions.

The distance between the existing cycle stands on Page Street, near its junction with John Islip Street, do not meet the current cycling parking guidelines. It is therefore proposed to install a reduced number of new stands in this location to ensure the distance between the proposed cycle stands meets the current guidelines. Additional cycle stands are proposed on John Islip Street to increase the total number of stands in the area.

The introduction of "At Any Time" waiting restrictions will prevent obstructive parking and will ensure the existing and proposed vehicular entrances to properties are kept clear.

Section 6 Consultation Response Summary

West End Ward Members Responses

Councillor	Comments	Executive Director's Response
Danny Chalkley	No response	N/a
David Harvey	No response	N/a
Steve Summers	No response	N/a

Section 6 Stakeholders Responses

Organisation	Comments	Executive Director's Response
Taxi & Private Hire	<p>Thank you for sending through the consultation for John Islip Street/Page Street Public Realm Improvements.</p> <p>We at London Taxi and Private Hire (TfL) have the following comments/questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While you carry out these works, what impact will this have on through traffic? Will there be road closures in place? On the plan provided there is a loading/drop off bay. Please could you answer the following questions:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What time stipulation will be on this loading/drop off bay? Who can use this loading/drop off bay? How will this bay be enforced? <p>Many thanks, Kind regards.</p> <p>Donna</p>	<p>Whilst the works have yet to be programmed and traffic management plans prepared, it is expected that work at the junction of Page Street and John Islip Street can be phased to allow one lane of traffic to proceed under traffic control. Traffic may therefore experience minor delays at this time. This will also be the case during the resurfacing of John Islip Street south of its junction with Page Street. Should a road closure be necessary relevant stakeholders will be consulted prior to the closure.</p> <p>It is also proposed to resurface a small section of Thorney Street which will also require a road closure.</p> <p>There will be no time restrictions on the proposed loading/drop off bays and there will be no user restrictions so the bays will be available for the use of any servicing vehicle. The no waiting restriction will be enforced by Westminster City Council parking enforcement officers.</p>
Waterloo Ambulance Station	<p>The only concern from LAS is the raised table at the John Islip / Page Street junction</p> <p>These are proven to extend the response times of crews</p>	<p>The design of the raised table at the junction of John Islip Street and Page Street is similar to all others in Westminster City Council with very smooth ramps and should have minimal impact on traffic and response times.</p>

	<p>As John Islip Street is a main route our of our Westminster station this could have an impact.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Paul Smith Ambulance Operations Manager London Ambulance Service NHS Trust</p>	
<p>19 Page Street</p>	<p>I have received a circular on City of Westminster headed paper from a Mr. Hamish McLachlan of the WSP Group consulting about proposed changes to the paving slabs and road surface, as well as narrowing of the roadway at the junction of Page St and John Islip St. The reference given is 0001-70003940-S6-E.</p> <p>The key question is "why."</p> <p>There is no explanation given for these proposed changes nor any attempt to justify the dog's breakfast of colours which would then proliferate on the highway and pavements of Dean Ryle St, Page St and John Islip St. Nor can I see any explanation as to how this would make these streets safer.</p> <p>There is no consistency to the design and it does not sit harmoniously with what would remain; Dean Ryle St would retain its existing concrete paving slabs and asphalt road surface from Horseferry Road but then suddenly, part way along the front of the Burberry building of Horseferry House the roadway would be replaced with granite cobbles and York paving slabs. The cobbles and York paving, on the south side, would run for about 50 yards and stop before the Mint Hotel. However the York paving would continue for another 100 yards on the north side. It looks a mess on the plan and would look a greater mess in reality.</p> <p>The Granite cobbles and York Stone paving would go up Page St for about 20 yards and then the asphalt road surface and concrete paving would take over again. There is no logical or aesthetic reason for it to go there or stop there.</p> <p>I hold no brief for Burberry but they have made a good job of rebuilding Horseferry House and No.1 Page Street from the green glass monstrosity it was formerly. However Burberry would find</p>	<p>The proposed natural stone paving in the footway and raised carriageway surface has been chosen based on Westminster City Council's standard palette of materials and complies with the Westminster Way Guidelines to produce a high quality finish to the streetscape. The use of granite setts for this purpose is also a common feature within the Westminster borough.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to the extents of the proposed natural stone materials to ensure that the changes in material types stop at logical break points on the highway. In addition, it is now proposed to pave the footway on Thorney Street with artificial stone paving instead of the previously proposed York stone paving flags.</p> <p>Currently the carriageway on Thorney Street is reduced in width near the Double Tree Hotel vehicle entrance. The proposed vehicle entrance into Cleland House from Thorney Street will not reduce the carriageway width but slightly increase it leaving a minimum width of 4.51m which is sufficient for safe low volume and low speed two way traffic. The length over which the carriageway width reduction occurs however will increase but this will have no adverse impact on the current traffic conditions on Thorney Street. Similarly, the proposed loading/drop-off bay in front of Abell House will not result in changes to current traffic conditions as the proposed bay will extend no further into the carriageway than the existing parking bay to the south.</p> <p>Your concerns regarding the consultation process have been noted.</p>

that at their No.1 Page Street building they would have York Stone and granite cobbles on their John Islip St frontage and asphalt and grey concrete slabs on their Page St frontage without a sensible dividing line between them. It would look even worse on their Dean Ryle St frontage where, for no good reason, part way along the paving would switch to York Stone and the road to granite cobbles.

Since Berkeley Homes obtained planning permission for Cleland and Abell House, Westminster house prices have risen dramatically. Berkeley will make £100 million profit from these developments, for which I applaud them, and it is understandable that they want to tart/posh up the bits right outside their developments. However this scheme leaves the rest of the streets looking like a dog's breakfast and they should be told to leave it all alone or continue the scheme to encompass more of Dean Ryle, Page and John Islip Streets so that we at least have some consistency. As a wheelchair user I also detest cobbles even if they are called "fine picked granite setts."

With regard to other points in the proposed scheme, I am in favour of the new planter between Cleland and Horseferry House which is essential for protection of the S.S. underground garage.

I am opposed to the plans to drastically narrow Thorney Street by making a big protrusion into the street to facilitate vehicular access. The Mint Hotel (now Hilton) has managed to have access for lorries and buses and have not needed to take up half of Thorny Street. Clearly the architects knew at the time of the original planning application that vehicular access would be necessary. However they have adopted the usual ploy of asking for further planning permissions when construction is half complete because they knew that being honest at the start could damage their original application.

Similarly there is no need for a new "loading/drop off point" on John Islip Street with the concomitant protrusion at either end thus narrowing the road. This is a very important road and we are

	<p>suffering a loss of amenity at the moment because it has been reduced to one way to assist Berkeley Homes construction. We do not need that made permanent.</p> <p>Let me say that I applaud Westminster Council for its management of the highways and pavements. As a wheelchair user I find nearly all pavements accessible with dropped kerbs, except Covent Garden of course, a wonderful lack of potholes and careful thought given to the design of highways, pavements and street furniture. I appreciate that this matter is for your department to determine but since I can see no "Safe Streets" justification I hope that you will take into account the overall appearance of the proposals which way heavily against it.</p> <p>Finally I know that Mr. McLachlan will be a man of integrity and will no doubt pass on all comments he has received. However I believe that the consultation in this matter should have been led by the Council with responses sent directly to your Department or Planning or whoever and not to a private contractor who will benefit financially by the scheme.</p> <p>The Rt Hon the Lord Blencathra</p>	
<p>19 Page Street</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of 19th March. We are grateful for the chance to comment on the proposed improvements in the area of Page Street. Naturally as local residents we welcome them.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that they ignore the damage that has been done by not only the Berkeley Homes scheme, but also the work carried out by Derwent over the past four years involving our neighbouring building Number 1 Page Street, the conversion by Barratt Homes of Great Minster House for residential use and the demolition and conversion of the old Westminster Arms pub into a restaurant and flats.</p> <p>The stretch of Page Street between John Islip Street and Marsham Street has been in the eye of a massive building programme that will continue for another two years at least. As well</p>	<p>The Page Street highway, west of its junction with John Islip Street, is beyond the extent of highway which the developer is required to improve to fulfil its obligations under the Section 106 agreement for this scheme. Therefore we are unable to include this section of Page Street within the scheme proposals.</p> <p>Your comments regarding damage to the highway have however been forwarded to Westminster City Council's Highway Maintenance team for consideration and possible inclusion within the future maintenance programme.</p>

	<p>as the work and vibration caused by the John Islip Street work that is not yet complete, which saw our building vibrating from the use of pile drivers on the adjacent site, Page Street itself has been used as a transit route for lorries serving all three sites. On some days there have been more or less continuous heavy lorry movements as the street is used as part of a circuit of demolition and construction traffic by all sites, in particular the Great Minster House scheme.</p> <p>As a result, the surface of the street has significantly deteriorated over the past couple of years. And it can hardly be coincidental that the retaining wall for St John's Gardens has seriously, and potentially dangerously, been weakened to the point of imminent failure in several places.</p> <p>We would therefore urge that the Council use some of the funds available from agreements under Section 106 or any other means from Derwent, Berkeley and Barratt in relation to the various developments not only to improve the local area but to make good the extensive damage that their work has caused to Page Street and St John's Gardens.</p> <p>We look forward to your response.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Merrick and Beatrice Willis</p>	
--	--	--

Section 6 Stakeholders Who Failed To Respond

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
British Medical Association (Marylebone)	British Medical Association (Tavistock Square)	British Telecom National Noticing Centre
C/O Atkins Telecom	Confederation of Passenger Transport UK	E.ON UK Plc
EDF Energy plc	Energis	Freight Transport Assoc. Ltd.
Hammersmith Fire Station	Westminster Living Streets Group (Mr Peter Hartley)	Westminster Living Streets Group (Mr Hugh Small)
London Chamber of Commerce	London Cycling Campaign	London TravelWatch
Metropolitan Police Service	National Grid	NOKIA
Network Rail (South East Territory)	Thames Water Utilities	The British Motorcyclists' Federation

The Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association	The London Fire Brigade (Soho)	The London Fire Brigade (Paddington)
The London Fire Brigade (Lambeth)	The Road Haulage Assoc. Ltd.	Transport for London Better Routes and Places
Transport for London Surface Transport Communications	Transport for All	RMT London Taxi Branch
London Cab Drivers Club	Cab Shelter Fund	Westminster Property Owners Association
Unite the Union (Cab Section)	Licensed Private Hire Car Association	Royal Mail
Crown Estate Paving Commission	The Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James's	Mr Jacobs
Soho Society	Thorney Island Society	1-41 Morland House
20 John Islip Street	22 John Islip Street	24 John Islip Street
30 John Islip Street	1a Page Street	8 Dean Ryle Street
20 Dean Ryle Street	22 Page Street	29 Page Street