



City of Westminster

# Cabinet Member Report

<b>Decision Makers:</b>	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Built Environment  Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services  Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking
<b>Date:</b>	20 September 2016
<b>Classification:</b>	General Release
<b>Title:</b>	Baker Street Two Way Project – report on second round of consultation and next stage of detailed design
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	Marylebone High Street, Bryanston and Dorset Square, Regent's Park
<b>Key Decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Financial Summary:</b>	<p>The estimated cost to undertake the Traffic Order Consultation, detailed design and associated surveys for the Baker Street Two Way Scheme as outlined in this report is £890,000 and will be fully funded by Transport for London, The Baker Street Quarter Partnership (BID) and The Portman Estate.</p> <p>The estimated cost of the scheme is £16.9m and is expected to be fully funded by the partners.</p>
<b>Report of:</b>	Executive Director, Growth, Planning and Housing and Executive Director, City Management and Communities

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Baker Street Two Way project proposes to remove the one-way gyratory system and re-introduce two-way traffic flow on Baker Street and Gloucester Place while

improving public realm and conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, and bus users. First round of public consultation on these proposals was undertaken in summer 2015 for a period of ten weeks. A report analysing the consultation responses was published in November 2015. Based on the responses received and engagement with stakeholder groups, changes to the proposed scheme were developed. A second round of consultation was undertaken in February/ March 2016 for four weeks to seek views on these proposed changes. The consultation response report is attached as Appendix B. Officer's response to general and specific concerns raised during this consultation has also been included in this report.

- 1.2 This report presents responses to the second round of consultation including officer's response to concerns raised; details of proposed scheme including the subsequent proposed changes as a result of both consultations, and seeks necessary approvals to undertake Traffic Management Order consultation and proceed with detailed design.
- 1.3 A subsequent report will be presented detailing the results of the Traffic Management Order consultation and seeking approval for implementation of the proposed scheme.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the consultation response report of the second round of consultation be noted along with the officer's response to general and specific concerns raised.
- 2.2 That approval be given to proceed with Traffic Management Order (TMO) consultation.
- 2.3 That approval be given to proceed with detailed design including associated surveys.
- 2.4 That approval be given for capital expenditure of £890,000 necessary to undertake TMO consultation and detailed design, which is to be fully funded by external parties.
- 2.5 That approval be given to enter into a Section 278 agreement with The Portman Estate and Baker Street Quarter Partnership to secure the entire funding for this project.
- 2.6 That approval be given to enter into a Section 8 agreement with Transport for London (TfL) to undertake highway improvement works on TLRN (Transport for London Road Network) roads as part of this project (subject to TfL approval).
- 2.7 That authority be delegated to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Built Environment and

Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking, to consider the results of the TMO consultation and approve modifications to the scheme should they become necessary as a result of the TMO consultation.

- 2.8 That the Cabinet Member for Built Environment, the Cabinet Member for City Management & Customer Services and the Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking agree recommendations 2.1 to 2.7 to the extent that the matters fall within their respective Terms of Reference.

### **3. Reasons for Decision**

- 3.1 A Traffic Management Order (TMO) consultation can now be undertaken on the changes to parking and loading restrictions as part of the Baker Street Two Way project.
- 3.2 Detailed design can be undertaken based on the responses received so far in the two public consultations and on the responses that will be received as part of the TMO consultation.

### **4. Background**

- 4.1 Baker Street and Gloucester Place are part of the one-way gyratory system. The Baker Street Two Way project proposes:
- The removal of the one-way gyratory system and the re-introduction of two-way traffic flow.
  - In addition, it also proposes improvement of the public realm, improved conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and improved public transport accessibility. This project is being jointly funded by Transport for London (TfL), Portman Estate, Baker Street Quarter BID and other private funders. The current projected cost of the scheme is £16.9 million.
- 4.2 First public consultation on these proposals was undertaken for a period of ten weeks from 26 May 2015 to 31 July 2015. A report analysing the consultation responses was published in November 2015. Based on the consultation responses and engagement with community and amenity groups, alternative options were developed. A second round of consultation was undertaken for four weeks from 22<sup>nd</sup> February to 20<sup>th</sup> March 2016 to seek views on these proposed changes.

### **5. Consultation response**

- 5.1 The consultation area for the second phase was the same as the first consultation and the same stakeholders were contacted. 12,500 letters were posted by first class mail and emails were sent to 850 contacts who had registered during the

first consultation for future updates on the project. Around 230 people attended the exhibitions, a similar number to those who attended during the first phase.

- 5.2 Over 500 responses were received to the second consultation. The consultation response report is attached as Appendix B. Officer's response to general and specific concerns raised during this consultation has also been included in this report. Officers are confident that they have captured all major concerns which need to be considered in relation to this project.

Concerns relating to two-way operation, perceived traffic congestion, rat-run in residential streets, air quality, proposed cycling facilities, pedestrian safety and impact on parking and loading restrictions have been responded to in the report. Responses to specific concerns raised have also been provided in this report.

- 5.3 A set of over 100 responses appear to have been received from cyclists (identifying themselves as visitors) who offered duplicate responses to a number of questions. These respondents have opposed all suggested design changes and original design proposals due to lack of segregated cycling facilities and have significantly affected the total sample. If this 'visitor' group is excluded from the analysis, then there is overall support for all proposed changes.

- 5.4 London Cycling Campaign's website offered suggested answers to the consultation questionnaire, asking all those who responded to oppose all proposals on the grounds of cycling related issues. These suggested answers can be seen in individual responses from visitors throughout the questionnaire. Therefore we have analysed the responses to all proposals including and excluding this group to allow an understanding of how opinions differ among respondent types.

- 5.5 Letters of support were received from stakeholders and interest groups including St Marylebone Society, Marylebone Association, North Marylebone Traffic Group, Clarence Gate Gardens Residents Association and St Francis Holland School. Letters of opposition was received from Montagu Square Residents' Association, Westminster Cycling Campaign and London Cycling Campaign.

- 5.6 Based on the responses received during the second round of consultation, changes are now proposed to the original design which was consulted upon in July 2015.

## 6. Scheme Details

- 6.1 **Proposed changes** - Based on the consultation responses received, the following changes are proposed to the original design that was consulted upon in July 2015. Design drawings are provided in Appendix C.

- **Taunton Place/ A41 Gloucester Place junction** – traffic island to prevent southbound right turn into Taunton Place
- **Ivor Place/ A41 Gloucester Place junction** – traffic island to discourage southbound right turn into Ivor Place
- **Ivor Place/ A41 Park Road** – maintain vehicle access from Ivor place to Park Road and provide advisory cycle lanes on Park Road
- **Clarence Gate/ A41 Park Road** – junction improvement including diagonal pedestrian crossing, early release for cyclists. Based on responses received during second consultation, it is also proposed to provide access to Regent's Park for northbound cyclists. Proposed changes showing this access are shown indicatively on the attached plans.
- **Melcombe Place/ Dorset Square/ Melcombe Street** – additional measures to improve pedestrian facilities
- **Dorset Square south further footway widening** – footway on Dorset Square south to be widened and cycle hire stand to be relocated to a suitable location in the same area
- **A501 Marylebone Road/ A41 Gloucester Place junction** – retain left turn from Gloucester place northbound onto Marylebone Road, early release for northbound cyclists
- **A501 Marylebone Road/ Balcombe Street/ Upper Montagu Street junction** – straight-across crossing on Marylebone Road
- **York Street/ A41 Gloucester Place junction** – retain two-way working on York Street
- **Cycling facilities on Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road** – based on consultation responses received, an alternative route comprising a contra-flow cycle lane on Melcombe Street and two way cycling on Glentworth Street (with no impact on parking), and contra flow cycling on Balcombe Street is being developed and will be considered at detail design stage. This possible change will be discussed with stakeholders before finalising. The proposed changes have been shown indicatively on the attached plans.

6.2 Through the second round of consultation and in negotiation with key local amenity societies, the need to keep the proposed scheme under review after implementation has been identified. It is proposed to develop a monitoring strategy which will also take account of matters raised during TMO consultation. Subject to approval of this report, officers will prepare a more detailed monitoring programme, to be met from the project budget and keep close contact with the local groups consulted to date.

6.3 TfL have released the consultation report on the proposed CSH11 cycle route. They are currently reviewing the proposals in light of the consultation responses, in order to determine the best way forward. They will continue to discuss potential impacts of the proposals with key stakeholders and will set out later this year how to proceed. We await their future proposals and form of engagement and consultation.

Within the strategic modelling provided by TfL, it has taken account of the likely effects of Baker Street Two Way Project (BS2W) and the Tottenham Court Road Two Way scheme, known as the West End Project (TCR2W). The strategic traffic modelling results show that:

- The BS2W project is not detrimentally affected to any significant degree, although there are some locations where CS11 is predicted to result in increases in traffic demand on sensitive streets;
- The majority of traffic reassignment is expected to occur on the east side of The Regent's Park, in which case there would not be a significant impact on the BS2W scheme or upon Westminster City Council highways;
- Active Traffic Management (ATM) will be used by TfL to manage real time congestion through changes to the timing of traffic signals to hold back or redirect traffic at critical points

WCC officers and TfL are satisfied that we have taken account of potential impact and it is appropriate to proceed with the next stage of this project.

- 6.4 TfL has also released the consultation result for the proposed changes on Marylebone Road/ Harewood Avenue/ Enford Street junction. These proposed changes are part of the Quietway route from St John's Wood to Marylebone. They have decided to proceed with the proposals as outlined in the consultation documents and have advised that the works will start in early 2017. There is not expected to be any significant impact of these proposed changes to Harewood Avenue on the Baker Street Two Way scheme. This scheme is not expected to result in any noticeable change in traffic demand on Harewood Avenue at the Marylebone Road junction, and the introduction of one way southbound and a northbound contra-flow cycle lane on Harewood Avenue is not expected to affect materially the traffic patterns on Baker Street and Gloucester Place.

## **7. Impact on parking and loading restrictions**

- 7.1 **North of Marylebone Road** – No changes are proposed to the disabled parking provision. There may be a net loss of 4 pay for parking bays. There may be a net loss of 3 resident parking bays. It is proposed to provide 9 new shared use bays (loading and resident parking). Motorcycle parking is proposed to be retained. The potential loss of Transport for London loading bays may be 215m. The Cycle Hire station is proposed to be retained close to its current location. If footway on Dorset Square south is widened (as per second consultation), there may be a potential loss of 4 pay for parking bays and 2 resident parking bays. As part of the proposed design changes in Section 5.1, an alternative route for cyclists is being considered on Balcombe Street and Glentworth Street instead of Gloucester Place (between Dorset Square and Ivor Place). This option may lead to a loss of 5 parking bays on Melcombe Street but would mean that loading and

parking on Gloucester Place (between Dorset Square and Ivor Place) can be retained.

7.2 **Gloucester Place south of Marylebone Road** – No changes are proposed to disabled/ diplomatic parking provision. There may be a net loss of 6 pay for parking bays. There may be a net gain of 2 resident parking bays. There may be a net loss of 1 shared use parking bay. Motorcycle parking may be moved from Portman Square to Park Street. No changes are proposed to taxi rank provision. 'No waiting and no loading from 7am to 7pm' restrictions are proposed on Gloucester Place to provide proposed mandatory cycle lanes.

7.3 **Baker Street south of Marylebone Road** – No changes are proposed to disabled parking. There may be a net loss of 1 diplomatic parking bay. There may be a net loss of 11 pay for parking bays. There may be a net gain of 5 resident parking bays and a net loss of 2 shared use parking bays. No changes are proposed to the number of taxi ranks. 'No waiting and no loading at any time' restrictions are proposed on Baker Street.

## 8. Programme and next steps

8.1 Subject to Cabinet Members approval, it is proposed to complete initial design with the changes proposed in Section 6.1 and then undertake Traffic Management Order (TMO) consultation in September/ October 2016. Detailed design will be undertaken subsequently and changes made to the design based on this consultation.

8.2 A subsequent report will be presented with the results of TMO consultation and seeking approval for next steps.

8.3 Subject to all approvals, the works are expected to start on site in Spring 2017 for a period of 18 months.

## 9. Financial Implications

### Capital costs

9.1 The total expected project cost is £16.9m, this is supported by cost estimates from WSP Conway. Approval is requested for further spend of £890k to undertake Traffic Order consultation, detailed design and associated surveys.

9.2 This project forms part of the West End Partnership programme of work, this is a programme which will see significant investment in the West End. The scheme was included as a fully funded scheme.

### Capital funding

- 9.3 There is estimated funding of £15m for the project, this is from Transport for London, The Portman Estate, Baker Street Quarter Partnership and other private funders. The City Council will enter into Section 278 agreements to secure the external non-TfL funding.
- 9.4 There is currently a funding gap of £1.9m, the project team will continue to work with funders to ensure this is a fully funded scheme either through increased funding or value engineering of the scheme. Value engineering is being undertaken on the project and will continue to do so throughout the project life. Discussions on costs and comparisons with TfL and private sector bidders are continuing. Formal confirmation of costs and funding from each funder will be received in line with a subsequent report which will detail the results of the Traffic Management Order consultation and will seek approval for implementation of the proposed scheme.
- 9.5 This report seeks approval for capital expenditure of £890,000 for undertaking Traffic Management Order consultation and detailed design. The breakdown of funding sources for this stage is as follows:

*Portman Estate and Baker Street Quarter Partnership - £400,000*  
*Transport for London - £490,000*

- 9.6 The Portman Estate and Baker Street Quarter Partnership money has been received. The LIP allocation has been confirmed by TfL for this financial year.
- 9.7 This expenditure and corresponding funding is not included in the capital programme. This will be addressed as part of the capital programme update expected in Autumn. However, given that this stage is fully funded, the risk to the Council is low.

#### Revenue implications

- 9.8 There are no expected revenue implications as a result of this report.

### **10. Legal Implications**

- 10.1 The City Council will enter into Section 278 agreements with The Portman Estate and Baker Street Quarter BID to secure their funding for this project.
- 10.2 Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 enables a Local Authority, acting in its capacity as “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 developers own cost and expense.



- 10.3 The pre-conditions for an agreement under section 278 are firstly that the Local 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 secondly that the works must be such that the Local Authority are authorised to execute, i.e. they must fall within the highway authorities powers of road building, improvement or maintenance.
- 10.4 The highway elements of the proposed public realm scheme fall within the ambit of section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 10.5 Subject to TfL approval, the City Council will enter into an Agreement under Section 8 of the Highways Act with Transport for London (TfL) to undertake highway improvement works on TLRN (Transport for London Road Network) roads as part of this project.
- 10.6 The proposed Baker Street Two Way Scheme will require a Traffic Order to be made under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Any objections the City Council receives during the Traffic Order making process should be delegated to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities (or such other authorised officer) in line with the current Traffic Order making process.
- 10.7 The City Council has a General Power of Competence under Part 1 of the Localism Act 2011 to improve the well-being of its area the former power being under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000

## **11. Consultation**

- 11.1 Two rounds of public consultation have been undertaken. The results of the first consultation were published in November 2015. The results of the second consultation are included in Appendix B. Traffic Management Order (TMO) consultation will now be undertaken and any minor modification to the proposed scheme will be made as required based on this consultation.
- 11.2 The results of Traffic Management Order consultation will be reported in a subsequent report.

## **12. Conclusion**

- 12.1 Following the two rounds of consultation and design changes to meet comments raised, the revised scheme as set out in Section 6.1 above is recommended for detailed design, undertaking TMO consultation and further development of monitoring strategy as set out above.

**If you have any queries about this Report or wish to inspect any of the  
Background Papers please contact:**

**Anju Banga, Projects and Programme Manager  
at 02076412666 or [abanga@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:abanga@westminster.gov.uk)**

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

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  
Baker Street Two Way Project – report on second round of consultation and next stage of detailed design.

Signed .....

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, 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 City Management and Customer Services

**Declaration of Interest**

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: Councillor Melvyn Caplan

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  
Baker Street Two Way Project – report on second round of consultation and next stage of detailed design.

Signed .....

Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services

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, 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

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  
  
Baker Street Two Way Project – report on second round of consultation and next stage of detailed design.

Signed .....

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, 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.



## Appendix A

### Other Implications

1. **Resources Implications** – no implication
2. **Business Plan Implications** – no implication, the scheme is wholly externally funded
3. **Risk Management Implications** – no implication
4. **Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment including Health and Safety Implications** – see point 6 below
5. **Crime and Disorder Implications** – no implication
6. **Impact on the Environment** – The air quality impact assessment of the proposed scheme was undertaken and the report was published as part of the second consultation. Existing conditions within the study area show poor air quality and the site lies within an Air Quality Management Area. The proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but worsen it in others. The number of receptors where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. With specific regard to *residential properties*, a substantially greater number of properties (up to 190 times more) will experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme. Overall, the proposed scheme is not expected to have any detriment impact on environment.
7. **Equalities Implications** – no implication
8. **Staffing Implications** – no implication
9. **Human Rights Implications** – no implication
10. **Energy Measure Implications** – no implication
11. **Communications Implications** – no implication

Note to report authors: If there are particularly significant implications in any of the above categories these should be moved to the main body of the report.

## **Appendix B**

- **Consultation response report – second round of consultation**

## Appendix C

- **Location of proposed changes;**
- **Proposed Scheme – North;**
- **Proposed Scheme - Centre;**
- **Proposed Scheme - South**
- **Original vs Proposed design**