



Cabinet Member Report

Decision Makers: Cllr Davis, MBE, DL, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Business, Culture and Heritage.
Cllr Chalkley, Cabinet Member for City Highways.

Date: 30 March 2017.

Classification: General Release.

Title: Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project: Result of Traffic Management Order Advertisement and Works Approval.

Wards Affected: West End.

City for All Summary: The Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project will improve permeability in the Mayfair area by allowing new movements for all road users including cyclists. It will improve provisions and accessibility for pedestrians by widening crossings, improve street lighting and provide greater resilience for the road network. This project will also facilitate the construction of the adjacent proposed Bond Street Public Realm Improvement project.

Key Decision: No.

Financial Summary: The estimated total cost for the project is £1.22m which will be fully funded by contributions from TfL.

Report of: Executive Director, City Management and Communities.

Author: Mark Allan

1. Executive Summary

This report:

- 1.1 Provides feedback on the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project stakeholder engagement carried out in October/November 2016 and the Traffic Management Order consultation carried out in December 2016. The report proposes amendment to some of the advertised kerbside controls as a result of comments and objections that have been received.
- 1.2 Seeks Cabinet Member approval for the detailed design and implementation of the proposals as shown in the general arrangement drawings contained in **Appendix B** and the revised traffic management drawings contained in **Appendix G**.
- 1.3 Seeks a spending approval for the full £1.22m of project costs which is fully funded by Transport for London.
- 1.4 Confirms the implementation programme for the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That approval is given for the final designs for the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project as shown on the General Arrangement drawings numbered 70018389-03-GA-01 to 05 (Rev A4/5) shown in **Appendix B**
- 2.2 That Traffic Management Orders are made to introduce the revised parking and loading controls as shown on the Traffic Management Order drawings numbered 70018389-03-TMO-01 to 05 (Rev D/E) shown in **Appendix G**.
- 2.3 That approval is given to implement the proposals in line with the Proposed Project Delivery Programme for the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project as set out in Section 8 of this report.
- 2.4 That spending approval is given of £1.22m, all of which is funded by Transport for London.
- 2.5 That the Executive Director of City Management and Communities is given delegated authority to make any additional minor changes to the Traffic Management Orders needed for the project and to make any necessary changes to the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project designs as presented in this report, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Culture and Heritage and the Cabinet Member for City Highways on condition that these changes do not exceed the overall approved capital expenditure of £1.22m.
- 2.6 That the Cabinet Member for Business Culture and Heritage, and the Cabinet Member for City Highways agree recommendations 2.1 to 2.5 to the extent that the matters fall within their respective Terms of Reference.

3. Reasons for Decision

- 3.1 The proposed highway modifications that will be delivered by the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project will improve permeability and accessibility in the Mayfair area by shortening journeys, improving traffic flows and by improving route choices for all road users, including cyclists. Current loading and parking opportunities are being maintained and many delivery vehicles will have to undertake less circuitous routes in order to reach the businesses because of the new two way traffic availabilities.
- 3.2 This project will support the delivery of the adjacent Bond Street Public Realm Improvement Project which proposes a new right turn into Brook Street so that traffic on Bond Street, taking advantage of the proposed two way traffic operation on Brook Street, has an alternative route into the Mayfair area. The Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project will also support other projects and schemes nearby such as Hanover Square and the developing Berkeley Square project.
- 3.3 The results of the stakeholder engagement and Traffic Management Consultation indicate that overall the project is considered beneficial, but minor amendments are proposed to the kerbside controls that were advertised to address the comments and objection that have been received.

4. Background, including Policy Context

- 4.1 A Cabinet Member Report was approved on the 16th November 2016 which gave approval for:
- The initial design of the £1.22m Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project as shown on the General Arrangement drawings contained in the report.
 - Spending approval for the completion of all stages of design at a cost of **£133,000**
 - The consultation and advertisement of the Traffic Management Orders necessary to introduce the project.
- 4.2 Initial stakeholder engagement took place towards end of October 2016. This included the distribution of leaflets describing the project to almost 2,400 residential and commercial properties in the area around Brook Street and Davies Street, setting up a consultation page on the Council's website to allow engagement and inquiry, and an exhibition on 1st November 2016 held at, and with support by, Claridges. The exhibition was attended by business representatives, stakeholder organisations and residents.
- 4.3 **Section 6** of this report describes:
- the results of the initial stakeholder engagements and the good support received and discusses issues that were raised and the responses to them.

- the responses received following the statutory consultation on the proposed changes to parking, loading and kerbside controls. The 21-day formal statutory consultation required for the Traffic Management Orders commenced on 2nd December 2016 and closed on 23rd December 2016.
 - the changes that are proposed to the advertised parking, loading and kerbside controls resulting from comments and objections received during consultation.
- 4.4 If the recommended amendments are approved by the Cabinet Member, the design for the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way project will remain compliant with WCC highway standards and Westminster Way, and will still support the Council's City for All vision.
- 4.5 Other implications for the project which are relevant to the Council are set out in **Appendix A**.

5. Scheme Design Proposals

- 5.1 The aim of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project is to introduce two-way traffic operation in Brook Street (between Bond Street and Grosvenor Square) and on Davies Street (between Brook Street and Berkeley Square), through revised traffic signals and road markings, minor changes to kerb lines and rearrangements of the kerbside waiting, parking and loading controls.
- 5.2 The approach to design and the use of materials are in line with Council policy and guidance.
- 5.3 The construction phasing has been co-ordinated with the neighbouring Bond Street project. A small area of the Bond Street project on Brook Street, between South Molton Lane and New Bond Street, is shown on the Brook Street and Davies Street project drawings as the works in this area will occur at the same time.
- 5.4 The project has now progressed from a Stage 2 Initial Design to a Stage 3 Detailed Design.
- 5.5 There have been some design changes as the project has progressed to a detailed design. These include
- an extension to the carriageway resurfacing to provide new surfaces for the high friction surfacing,
 - adjustments at pedestrian crossings to achieve better alignment with the pedestrian desire lines, and
 - kerb line adjustments to reduce clashes with utility covers and to improve vehicle turning movements.

- 5.6 The Detailed Design proposal is shown on the General Arrangement drawings numbered 70018389-03-GA-01 to 05 (Rev A4/5) included in **Appendix B**, and includes
- Proposed new road markings introducing centre lines and revised junction markings to introduce two way traffic movement;
 - Advanced Stop Lines and other facilities for cyclists;
 - Widened pedestrian crossings with two row tactile paving and dropped kerbs for disabled users;
 - ‘Green man’ and ‘countdown’ at signals at all controlled pedestrian crossings;
 - Repaving the footways adjacent to proposed kerbs with concrete or York stone paving (to match existing provision);
 - Resurfacing the carriageway in black asphalt along for the entire project to provide a clean surface in preparation for the proposed new road markings and new kerbside controls;
 - Laying of anti-skid surfacing on the approach to all junctions;
 - Relocation of gullies to maintain current surface water drainage provision;
 - Upgrading of the street lighting using modern equipment;
 - New traffic signal arrangements with modern equipment (at the Brook Street and Davies Street and Davies Street/ Grosvenor Street junctions) to accommodate the revised traffic movements and better pedestrian crossing facilities;
 - Combined lighting and signal columns to minimise street furniture and reduce street clutter;
 - Introduction of a new traffic island and build-out of existing kerb lines at the Grosvenor Square junction to direct and separate new opposing traffic flows;
- 5.7 The traffic management arrangements and the kerbside parking, loading and waiting restrictions which have been subject to consultation and on site advertisement are shown in Traffic Management Order Drawings No’s. 70018389-02-TMO sheets 1 to 4 Rev C and are attached at **Appendix C**
- 5.8 Consultation on the proposals has now taken place at an exhibition on site and through the statutory advertisement of the Traffic Management Orders. The results of the stakeholder consultation and the Traffic Management Order advertisement, and the response to comments and objections made, are set out in **Section 6** of this report and in **Appendix F**.
- 5.9 Proposals for amendments to the advertised kerbside parking, loading and waiting restrictions resulting from consultation are also set out in summary in **Section 6** and are shown on revised new Traffic Management Order drawings numbered 70018389-03-TMO-01 to 05 (Rev D/E) and shown in **Appendix G**.

6. Results of the Stakeholder Consultation and Traffic Management Order Advertisement and Proposed Amendments

Stakeholder Consultation

- 6.1 A leaflet detailing the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project was posted to 2,400 residential and commercial properties in the area around Brook Street and Davies Street on October 25th 2016.
- 6.2 The leaflet contained an introduction to the proposed changes to traffic movements and the new parking and loading arrangements. It explained the reasons why the proposal was being developed. Existing and proposed traffic layouts were shown, indicating how Brook Street and Davies Street will change from one-way to two-way operation. The leaflet provided details of the public exhibition being held as part of the proposal. The leaflet was also available online.
- 6.3 Table 1 below summarises the communications channels that were used in this initial stakeholder consultation:

Table 1 – summary of the communications channels used for initial stakeholder consultation

Channel	Audience
Information leaflet	Approximately 2,400 nearby properties (distributed by post)
Brook Street consultation page on Westminster City Council website	Wider public, and stakeholders
Exhibition session	Interested groups, local residents & businesses
Project email address	Interested groups, local residents & businesses

- 6.4 An exhibition was held at Claridges between 4pm and 8pm on Tuesday 1st November 2016. In total 25 people attended the exhibition at Claridges, including residents and businesses representatives. The exhibition materials and engagement questionnaire were also made available online and a project email address was set up for people to use to provide additional feedback on the proposals.
- 6.5 Every effort was made to contact local residents and businesses and the venue was located within the project area at a high-profile venue. The number of people engaging with the project team was relatively low. This suggests that there is good support for the proposals among the majority of people affected.
- 6.6 Of the 25 people who attended the exhibition at Claridges, many were content with the proposals and made no further comment.

6.7 Of the eight people who responded to the online questionnaire after the event, four respondents strongly opposed the proposals. The questionnaire comments and responses on them are summarised in the table contained in **Appendix D**. More information about the initial stakeholder consultation and the responses are included in the full Stakeholder Engagement Report in **Appendix E**.

Traffic Management Order Consultation

6.8 On 2nd December 2016, press and street notices were published and posted online and in the Brook Street and Davies Street area. Twelve responses were received within the consultation period which lasted from 2nd December until 23rd December 2016. Another response was received outside the consultation period, on 8th January 2017, which has also been responded to.

6.9 Of these thirteen responses:

- One response expressed support for the proposals
- Six were comments that generally expressed support for the project, but suggested improvements or required clarification
- Six were objections

6.10 The comments and objections made during the advertisement of the Traffic Management Orders and responses on these are shown in detail in the table in Appendix F. As a result of the responses received, amendment of the consulted and advertised parking, waiting and loading controls are proposed as set out in section 6.11 to 6.16 below.

Amendments Proposed as a Result of Stakeholder Consultation and Traffic Management Order Advertisement

6.12 As a result of the comments received during stakeholder consultations and the comments and objections received during the advertisement of the Traffic Management Orders, it is proposed that amendments are made to the advertised parking and loading arrangements for the Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project.

6.13 These are that:

- the existing taxi stand for three spaces on Davies Street outside Claridges' western façade is removed and replaced with three pay-by-phone parking bays,
- the proposed two space taxi rank on the south side of Brook street, to the west of the Claridges' ballroom entrance, is moved to the east of the ballroom entrance with two additional taxi spaces added, making four spaces in total. This proposal will mean the loss of four pay be phone parking bays, which investigation has shown cannot be accommodated within the extent of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project. It is proposed that relocation / replacement of these bays is identified in the immediate vicinity and that the Project bears the cost of their introduction (see Section 8.1 of this report).

- a section of double yellow line and one resident parking bay on Davies Street west side outside restaurant 'C London' will be changed to create a new taxi rank for two spaces,
- one pay-by-phone parking bay on Davies Street east side opposite restaurant 'C London' to be moved into the new bay pay-by-phone area at the Claridges western façade (see bullet one above) with the bay then being converted to residents parking, and
- two pay-by-phone parking bays on Brook Street at Avery Row will be relocated to the position of the removed taxi stand on Davies street at the Claridges western facade (see bullet one above) to make space for a new footway build-out to improve pedestrian crossing movements over Brook Street at the Avery Row, South Molton Lane / Street and Lancaster Court junctions.

6.14 The advertised waiting, parking and loading controls as set out in the earlier Cabinet Member report provided a net neutral situation. The above move some of the parking bays and types to different locations without any effect on the overall numbers amendments would reduce by four the number of pay by phone parking numbers originally advertised and as set out in the earlier Cabinet Member report - until such time as they can be replaced by relocation in the adjacent area, particularly as Crossrail works complete and free up highway and kerbsides.

6.15 During discussions with Claridges, it has been suggested that the single yellow lines on Brook Street in front of their façade could be changed to double yellow lines. Whilst the existing single yellow line does not attract any significant numbers of evening parkers, because of the amount of activity associated with Claridges' customers, Claridges have stated that the consequences are very disruptive when they do occur. The parking and loading surveys undertaken last year indicate that there is indeed very little night time parking on these single yellow lines and a good deal of night time under occupancy on yellow lines nearby.

6.16 It is therefore further proposed that the single yellow line on the southern side of Brook Street from the proposed 4 space taxi rank to east of the ballroom entrance to the Brook Street / Davies Street junction be changed to a double yellow line restriction

6.17 In addition to the above changes, a Council proposal also exists to introduce a Restricted Parking Zone in Haunch of Venison Yard which has already been agreed with developers. This relocates part of an existing motorcycle parking bay from Haunch of Venison Yard on to Brook Street just to the west of the Davies Street junction. Whilst agreed, this change has yet to be implemented and as a result of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project will no longer be possible because of the two way traffic measures and the associated new traffic signal rearrangements.

6.18 An alternative location is therefore proposed within the Brook and Davies Street Two Way Project to temporarily accommodate the motorcycle bay nearer to Haunch of Venison Yard by replacing one existing pay-by-phone parking bay on the north side of Brook Street directly to the west of South Molton Lane. There would be a consequent loss of one pay by phone parking bay, but this is considered to be a temporary loss which can be replaced once the nearby Crossrail works are complete.

- 6.19 The changes set out above have been incorporated into the revised new Traffic Management Order drawings numbered 70018389-03-TMO-01 to 05 (Rev D/E) shown in **Appendix G** and it is proposed that these drawings form the basis for the making of the Traffic Management Orders to be used to implement the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project.
- 6.20 St James's Ward councillors were consulted on the proposed amendments following the consultation and raised no objections.

7. Programme

- 7.1 Construction of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two-Way Project is programmed to start in April 2017 and finish before August 2017.

8. Outstanding Issues

- 8.1 The amendment that the proposed two space taxi rank on the south side of Brook Street, to the west of the Claridges' ballroom entrance, is moved to the east of the ballroom entrance with two additional taxi spaces added, making four spaces in total, will mean the loss of four pay by phone parking bays. Investigation indicates that the four removed pay by phone parking bays cannot be accommodated within the extent of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project. It is therefore proposed that a relocation / replacement of these bays is identified in the immediate vicinity of Brook Street and/or Davies Street and that the Project bears the cost of their introduction.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 Spending approvals of £133,000 were obtained by Cabinet Member decision on the 16 November 2016 to complete design stages 1 to 3 and undertake the Traffic Management Order consultation. This work has now been completed and this report, subject to the Cabinet Member's approval of the recommendations relating to the Traffic Management Order consultations, seeks spending approval for the remainder of the £1,220,000 project spend (of £1,087,000) for the construction stage of project delivery. This project is fully funded by TfL.
- 9.2 The work for all stages of delivery including works will be undertaken by the Council's Service Provider F M Conway Ltd under the contract signed by the Council on 1st April 2014.
- 9.3 The cost plan in **Appendix H** shows the current estimated cost for the design and implementation of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project.

10. Legal Implications

- 10.1 Traffic Management Orders will need to be made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to introduce the new parking, waiting and loading arrangements, as shown on

drawings 70018389-03-TMO-01 to 05 (Rev D/E) in **Appendix G**, to support the delivery of the Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project.

10.2 The Director of Law has considered the contents of this report and does not have any other comments to add.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

11.1 None.

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

Mark Allan Tel: 020 7641 1154
mallan@westminster.gov.uk

For completion by the **Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Business, Culture and Heritage**

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, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Business, Culture and Heritage**

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 **Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project**

Signed

Councillor Robert Davies MBE, DL, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Business, Culture and Heritage

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, Director Finance and, if there are laughing implications, the Director of People Services (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 **Cabinet Member for City Highways**

Declaration of Interest

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

Signed: _____ Date: _____

NAME: **Councillor Danny Chalkley, Cabinet Member for City Highways**

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 **Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way Project**

Signed

Councillor Danny Chalkley, Cabinet Member for City Highways

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, Director Finance and, if there are laughing implications, the Director of People Services (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

1.1. A WCC Project Director is in place to support delivery of the project and is included within the project cost.

2. Business Plan Implications

2.1. None

3. Risk Management Implications

3.1. The Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project operates within a formalised governance structure. The Partner Project Board and the WCC Steering Group will monitor and consider risk management issues at regular meetings and remedial action will be directed as appropriate.

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

4.1. There are no issues relating to co-operation with health authorities arising from this report.

4.2. All works undertaken will be closely monitored and carried out to the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007

5. Crime and Disorder Implications

5.1. There are no crime and disorder issues arising from this report.

6. Impact on the Environment

6.1. There are no environmental issues arising from this report.

7. Equalities Implications

7.1. There are no equalities impacts arising from this report

8. Staffing Implications

8.1. There are no other staffing implications arising from this report

9. Human Rights Implications

9.1. The measures in this report are not expected to have any implications under the Human Rights Act 1998.

10. Energy Measure Implications

10.1. There are no Energy Measure implications as a result of this report

11. Communications Implications

11.1. Communication implications are dealt with in the body of this report

Appendix B

**Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project –
General Arrangement Drawings 70018389-03-GA sheets 01 to 05 (Rev A4/5)**

Appendix C

**Brook Street Davies Street Two-Way Project:
Traffic Management Order Drawings No's. 70018389-02-TMO sheets 01 to
04 (Rev C)**

Appendix D

Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project – Stakeholder Engagement Questionnaire Responses

Comment	Response
Streets are inappropriate for two-way traffic (i.e. too narrow) and this might pose a safety risk to pedestrian and cyclist	The design included a full review of road widths to ensure safety of pedestrians and cyclists in two-way operation. Two-way operation is not anticipated to increase traffic volumes within the area. Therefore the proposals are not expected to increase the number of collisions resulting in road casualties. The narrowness of the road is not anticipated to be a problem and the proposed lane widths are common within the area.
Loss of parking for residents	The objectives of the project are more wide reaching than simply the immediate project area. The proposals are not expected to make the existing traffic problems (or lack of them) worse. The overall volume of traffic is expected to remain the same and so there is unlikely to be an increase in pollution. Parking has been retained within the proposals as much possible. However there is an overall reduction in parking and loading provision. The surveys and assessment carried out suggest that this should not be an issue and the design team have sought to identify and mitigate any very localised issues.
The presence of minicabs parking to pick up and drop off restaurant patrons on Brook Street is considered to result in pollution, noise grounds and congestion.	The number of taxi rank spaces remains broadly similar and so there is no change from the current situation.
There will be increased pollution, noise and traffic for residents living near the affected area.	The proposals are not expected to make the existing traffic problems (or lack of them) worse. The overall volume of traffic is expected to remain the same and so there is unlikely to be an increase in pollution. Noise of traffic post implementation is not expected to increase noticeable from current levels, as the volume of traffic remains broadly similar.

Appendix E

Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project – Stakeholder Engagement Report

Appendix F

Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project – Comments and Responses following Traffic Management Order Consultation

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<p>Julian Malone-Lee Savile Club 69 Brook Street Mayfair London W1K 4ER jml@savileclub.co.uk</p> <p>Email dated: 2nd December 2016</p>	<p>1.</p>	<p>Mr Malone-Lee states that the Savile Club has many guests that arrive by taxis and also receives a large number of deliveries.</p> <p>He also states that unlike Claridge's, there are no dedicated taxi bays or back entrances for deliveries and wants to be assured that he will be able to operate as normal.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged and Response to comments made:</p> <p>It was confirmed :</p> <p>That no proposed changes to the pay-by-phone bays or length of single yellow line immediately outside his premises.</p> <p>That some changes to parking places and waiting restrictions are proposed towards the junction with Davies Street. These changes would entail a loss of 4 pay-by-phone bays.</p> <p>The changes to waiting restrictions would provide an additional 7.5 metres of kerb-side space which could be used for loading and unloading deliveries or guest collection / drop off. However at the junction with Grosvenor Square there would be a loss of 14.5 metres of kerb-side space which would have been available for loading and unloading deliveries or guest collection / drop off.</p> <p>Officer has replied as per above and attached the consultation plans.</p> <p>An acknowledgement was received stating that this was most helpful.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<p>Mrs Vassilina Bindley and Mr Mikhail Noskov on behalf of Hatfield Estates Estates Ltd 72 Brook Street W1K 5EB vasilina@ntlworld.com</p> <p>Email dated: 3rd December 2016</p>	2.	<p>Mrs Bindley objects to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the introduction of the two way working in Brook Street; b) any proposal introducing double yellow lines on Brook Street; c) the removal of the pay-by-phone bays outside Nos. 70 and 72; and d) the relocation of the diplomatic parking bays outside Nos. 70 and 72. <p>She states that the proposed measures will lead to more traffic congestion, pollution and noise in the residential area and will impede access and parking for the vehicles of the residents and their guests. She also says that it will be impossible for such essential services as security companies, doctors, plumbers, electricians, decorators, telephone and utility companies visiting residents to park.</p> <p>Mrs Bindley also says that she regularly receives guests arriving by taxi / private hire vehicles and also uses them.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>The project is not expected to make the existing traffic problems worse. The overall volume of traffic is expected to remain the same and so there is unlikely to be an increase in pollution and easier journeys may improve this. Noise of traffic post implementation is not expected to increase noticeably from current levels as the volume of traffic is expected to remain broadly similar.</p>
<p>Mr Colin Wing Westminster Cycling Campaign cyclist@westminstercyclists.org.uk</p> <p>Email dated: 9th December 2016</p>	3.	<p>Mr Wing responds on behalf of Westminster Cycling Campaign and says that Westminster's extensive one-way systems are a significant obstacle to cycling. As well as lengthening journeys and requiring the negotiation of more junctions, they tend to increase traffic speeds. He therefore welcomes the principle of allowing two-way cycling in streets that are currently one-way.</p> <p>Mr Wing repeats comments that were made in response to the Jubilee Quietway proposals in that he believes that the proposed scheme could be quite difficult to cycle. Due to the parking bays along each side of the road, the free carriageway width is likely to be only about three metres in each direction. It will therefore be difficult for motor vehicles to overtake cyclists safely and when there is a queue of traffic, it will also be difficult for cyclists to pass it. Mr Wing suggests that a far</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made (these match the response that were drafted for Mr Wing on the similar comments that were made during consultation on the Jubilee Quietway) :</p> <p>We are pleased to hear that in principle, you are in favour of proposals to allow two-way cycling in streets that are currently one-way.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>better result would have been achieved for cyclists if the proposed traffic management Order had included extensive restrictions on parking and loading.</p> <p>Mr Wing raises concerns that the proposals fail to do anything about the most difficult location in the whole scheme, at the exit from Berkeley Square into Davies Street. At this point, fast moving vehicles heading towards Mount Street cut across the path of northbound cyclist heading towards Davies Street. The proposals also fail to protect cyclists from turning traffic at the other junctions in the scheme.</p> <p>He also notes that this scheme is being funded by £1.22m of Transport for London Cycle Grid money, and does not consider this to represent good value for money for cyclists.</p>	<p>We understand your concern about the width of the carriageway. We investigated the possibility of introducing more restrictions on parking and loading in earlier design stages before going to consultation. Unfortunately, while liaising with local businesses, residents and taxi groups, we found that this would generate significant opposition. We have proposed Advanced Stop Lines for cyclists wherever possible and there are new protective measures for cyclists to free up the kerbside at key points such as the approaches and exits at the main junctions. The Advanced Stop Lines are a positive start to encourage cycling in the area.</p>
<p>Mr Richard Massett Licensed Taxi Drivers Association Taxi House 11 Woodfield Road W9 2BA richard@ltda.co.uk</p> <p>Email dated: 19th December 2016</p>	<p>4.</p>	<p>Mr Massett, Chairman of the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association states that they support the proposed scheme to re-introduce two-way working in Brook Street and Davies Street.</p> <p>Mr Massett raises concerns over the arrangement of taxi stand and has been discussing this with Transport for London and Westminster City Council.</p> <p>Mr Massett would like to see the existing taxi stand in Davies Street relocated with one space added to the new rank in Brook Street proposed by Claridges with the remaining two spaces re-sited outside the C London restaurant at 23 – 25 Davies Street.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>The taxi stand outside Claridges' side entrance can be removed and Claridges have said previously that they do not make a great deal of use of this stand.</p> <p>A new taxi rank can be provided outside restaurant 'C London' to provide for the night</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			<p>time economy in this area. This will require one resident bay to be moved immediately across the road (but there is a degree of under occupancy of res bays in this area).</p> <p>The addition of an extra space to the new taxi rank on Brook Street is possible and Claridges have indicated that they feel this would be beneficial to their operations.</p>
<p>Mr Paul Jackson Claridge's – General Manager Brook Street Mayfair W1K 4HR</p> <p>pmore@claridges.co.uk</p> <p>Email date: 16th December 2016</p>	<p>5.</p>	<p>Whilst Mr Jackson recognises that the three consultation meetings have resulted in a number of accommodations and revisions to the proposed plan on a micro level; he believes that the objections he raised regarding the overall impact and broader implications of the proposal have not been adequately addressed. They relate to the significant inconvenience to guests arriving to Claridge's from Heathrow Airport who will incur substantially increased journey times, particularly during peak periods.</p> <p>Mr Jackson states that first impressions are extremely important to guests staying at any five-star hotel, and especially Claridge's, who expect their mode of transport to be able to pull up outside the main entrance of the hotel or at least on the same side of the road.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will result in two primary routes of arrival to the hotel via chauffeur-driven car or taxi.</p> <p>1) The first via Davies Street or Grosvenor Square, as the majority of guests currently arrive, as usually simply driving into Brook Street to arrive at the main entrance of Claridge's. Under the proposed scheme vehicles, will be required to take a circuitous route via Davies Mews, and South Molton Lane, before turning right into Brook Street to arrive at the hotel. Both Davies Mews and South Molton Lane are not designed to handle this volume of traffic, which will no doubt cause</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council. Suggested response:</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>Significant consultation with Claridge's has been undertaken with several meetings taking place. This has been successful in working with Claridges to ensure that that the kerbside restrictions on Brook St support their business requirements and that amendments are identified to the advertised kerbside controls to achieve this.</p> <p>Everything has been done to minimise the impact of two-way operation and maximise the benefits outside the hotel. However, a new two-way traffic operation does require a change in the way some guests arrive:</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	<p>congestion, resulting in delays and frustrated guests.</p> <p>Mr Jackson believes that the majority of the drivers will opt to avoid the “loop” and will simply turn right into Brook Street from Davies Street where the only option they will have is to park on the other side of the road leaving our guests to navigate two-way traffic, double parked cars and possible vehicles doing U-turns before they reach Claridge’s front entrance. Whilst Claridge’s prime concern is to protect the safety of their guests and to prevent any inconvenience or disappointment they also have an important duty to care to their staff who will have to negotiate the same two-way traffic whilst carrying an arriving guest’s luggage in to the hotel.</p> <p>2) The second route involves a far longer journey via Park Lane to Marble Arch then along Wigmore Street, turning into Wellbeck Street and entering Bond Street via Vere Street, before turning right into Brook Street.</p> <p>Mr Jackson says that whilst Normal Rourke Pryme have conducted research into the proposed impact of these changes, their results are based on modelling which does not take into account the significantly increased volumes of traffic that will potentially use Davies Mews and South Molton Lane, or the reality of a car journey through Mayfair at rush hour and the increased journey times that will result from the more circuitous route via Marble Arch.</p> <p>Mr Jackson states that the report serves to highlight the benefits of the proposed changes, which he acknowledges, but does not, in his view adequately answer or provide for the concerns he has repeatedly raised.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Journey time increases are anticipated to be less than four minutes in the worst cases. 2. Many more journey times will decrease and there are significant benefits to the area as a whole. 3. Improved pedestrian crossing facilities are proposed at the nearby crossing to allow safe crossing <p>A meeting was held with Senior Managers at Claridges on 3rd March to discuss proposals to increase the amount of free frontage kerbside space at the front entrance by moving the proposed taxi rank facility to the east of the ballroom and increasing taxi provision to 4 spaces. This would be in the place of four paid for parking bays.</p> <p>This would allow eastbound taxis to pull into the southern kerbside much as they do now crossing a limited amount of oncoming traffic – the traffic signals at the Brook Street / Bond Street junction allow 6/7 vehicles to turn right into Brook Street westbound (a 19 second green time for right turners in a 120 second cycle time).</p> <p>Claridges indicated that they were content with this proposed amendment and that it would overcome their concerns over two-way traffic on Brook Street.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			<p>It was also agreed that the Council and Claridges would work together to monitor the situation once the project was operational.</p>
<p>Mr Darren Crowson Strategy and Infrastructure Manager Transport for London - Taxi and Private Hire 3rd Floor (3Y2), 230 Blackfriars Road London SE1 8NW</p> <p>Darren.Crowson@TfL.gov.uk</p> <p>Email date: 19th December 2016</p>	<p>6.</p>	<p>Mr Crowson would like to request that the following amendments are made to the scheme:</p> <p>The existing taxi rank in Davies Street, which is outside the side door of Claridge's should be split with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One space added to the relocated taxi rank in Brook Street, near the main exit from Claridge's • Two spaces relocated to outside 23-25 Davies Street so that there is a new taxi rank outside the C Restaurant <p>Mr Crowson States that these changes have been previously discussed on site between Transport for London, Westminster City Council and the main taxi trade associations.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>Following consultation with Claridge's, the taxi rank has been extended to include one extra bay.</p> <p>A new taxi rank will be provided outside restaurant 'C London' to provide for the night time economy in this area. The taxi stand outside Claridge's' side entrance will be removed.</p>
<p>Mr Martin Hall Development Manager Lodha Developers UK Ltd 3rd floor, 3 St James's Street London, SW1Y 4JU</p> <p>martin.hall@lodhagroup.com</p>	<p>7.</p>	<p>Mr Hall represents Lodha Developers UK and welcomes and supports the proposed amendments in principle, including the introduction of two-way traffic to Brook Street and Davies Street and, particularly the conversion of diplomatic parking bays outside 1-3 Grosvenor Square to resident parking bays.</p> <p>He notes that the intention is to retain one diplomatic bay outside 1-3 Grosvenor Square. The plans included within the consultation show the retained diplomatic bay at the southern extent of the row of resident parking bays.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>The possibility of combining the diplomatic bays has been considered since this</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<p>Email date: 22nd December 2016</p>		<p>Mr Hall states that in regard to the layout it would be more appropriate to locate that diplomatic bay adjacent to the three diplomatic parking bays outside the Italian Embassy at 4 Grosvenor Square. It is his view that this would provide a more logical layout by separating the diplomatic parking bays and the resident parking bays, such that it will be easier to comprehend by the relevant users.</p> <p>He has also provided a plan to show how this might be arranged.</p>	<p>representation. However, the single bay is for the Canadian High Commissioner who is content with the current location and has expressed the wish to be separated from the diplomatic bays belonging to the Italian embassy.</p>
<p>Paul Roland General Manager – Hedonism Drinks Ltd 3 to 7 Davies Street London W1K 3LD Paul@hedonism.co.uk</p> <p>Email date: 22nd December 2016</p>	<p>8.</p>	<p>Mr Roland states that he is in favour of the two-way traffic and feels it will have a positive impact on trade for local businesses – he does have some concerns regarding any proposal to introduce double yellow lines to the front of his shop.</p> <p>He states that he receives regular kerb side deliveries from suppliers, courier companies and during permitted hours his customers appreciate the ability to collect sometimes heavy goods whilst parking in a bay close by or on the single yellow line.</p> <p>The two bays which were available for use by the public to the front of his shop have already been replaced by more resident's only parking bays therefore if his understanding is correct he would certainly oppose a further barrier in the form of the introduction of double yellow lines to the front of his shop.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>Double yellow lines are not proposed outside 3 to 7 Davies Street and so suppliers, courier companies and customers will be able to go on parking and loading as they currently do.</p>
<p>Ms JF Noble 70 Brook Street London, W1K 5EA</p> <p>letter received on: 22nd December 2016</p>	<p>9.</p>	<p>Ms Noble a resident at No. 70 Brook Street wrote in to say that to have Brook Street and Davies Street as a two-way working street will create mayhem. The congestion is bad enough as it is and she very much hopes that the Council will not proceed with this idea.</p> <p>She states that 70 Brook Street is a large seven bedroom house and desperately requires the parking space outside the front door. There is only one</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>This parking must be removed to free up</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>embassy on the street and to relocate the diplomatic parking bay in from of 70 Brook Street is going to cause permanent problems.</p> <p>Ms Noble points out that Numbers 70, 72 and 74 are three residential houses that have 21 bedrooms between them and that an enormous amount of people are unable to park outside their residence.</p> <p>She also adds that the embassy has existed for years quite comfortably so why change things now and that the ambassadors have drivers and can park anywhere.</p>	<p>space at the approaches and exits to the Brook Street/ Davies Street junction. This is to allow two-way traffic on each arm of the junction.</p> <p>Analysis of the Mayfair area suggests that residents will be able to park in nearby resident bays. It is accepted that this particular location is where residents are most affected by the proposals. The design has attempted to reduce the impact as much as possible.</p>
<p>Judy Kuttner</p> <p>Kuttnerj2@gmail.com</p> <p>Email received 23rd December 2016</p>	<p>10.</p>	<p>In response to the consultation Ms Kuttner states that she is concerned about the proposal to make Brook Street and Davies Street two-way working between Davies Street and Bond Street with regard to safety and to added traffic congestion. She understands the wish to make this happen in order to achieve an overall two-way solution for Mayfair and to allow two-way bicycle traffic, however, the section of Brook Street is heavily used both by vehicles and by pedestrians and she does not believe that it is wide enough to allow two-way traffic without a heavy cost to all section of the community.</p> <p>She states that the section of Brook Street has a very busy hotel and ballroom with a large volume of vehicle traffic, but no forecourt and that it will be difficult and time consuming for taxis/minicabs/chauffeurs to have to approach the front entrances from the north via Vere Street / Bond Street. She believes that many drivers coming in from the west will either pull across two lanes of traffic, or go north up Davies Street to Davies Mews and then back down South Molton Lane in order to turn west to pick up / drop off in front of the hotel entrances and believes that this work around would block anyone trying to turn up South Molton Lane thereby slowing up traffic.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-way operation is possible. • See Technical Note on Claridge's. • Deliveries for Avery Row will be able to continue, as there will be enough space for one delivery vehicle outside Lancashire Court. This is shown on the Bond Street proposals. Also on the Bond Street proposals is a proposed build-out that would aid pedestrians crossing from Avery Row to South Molton Street. • Uncontrolled pedestrian crossing was provided following previous engagement

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	<p>Ms Kuttner says that there is the requirement to accommodate a myriad of deliveries, not only to addresses in Brook Street itself, but also to addresses in the side passages. The shops / restaurants / bars around here are nearly all small or medium size and do not have loading bays or, in most cases back entrances. There are unending shop refurbishments and building works locally which require deliveries and pick-ups, not to mention the fact that this section of the street has constant utility works going on. She knows that there are plans to rationalise deliveries and rubbish collections, but it is not yet known how effective these measure will prove in reducing the requirement for parking / waiting space. There is certainly not enough provisions in the new scheme for loading/unloading on the south side of Brook Street at the east end of this section of the plan, which means drivers parking on the north side will have to cut across two lanes of cars and bicycles with their loads. She does not understand why the Council would want to block the passage into Avery Road with parking bays as there are a number of deliveries down that passage and it is also an established pedestrian crossing point.</p> <p>Ms Kuttner points out that the crossing points at the bottom of South Molton Street and South Molton Lane are a very serious concern. People have always crossed the street here to get to/from work or to the shops, including any number of tourists. When Crossrail opens there will be an even greater volume of people crossing at these points, yet no crossing mechanism has been provided. At present people walk through traffic, but, if traffic becomes two-way, it will be riskier for pedestrians as well as for bicycles and drivers.</p> <p>Ms Kuttner also highlights that there is also the difficult issue of South Molton Street which has 60 plus shops and cafes, nearly 30 flats and a large number of offices. The entry route for deliveries/pick-ups to South Molton Street was always via Davies Street. With Davies Street shut, South Molton Street, a designated pedestrian precinct, has become a complete mess because the diversion via Oxford Circus is so time-consuming. At present most of the delivery</p>	<p>sessions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need, a more controlled crossing can be kept under review. <p>The issues raised about South Molton Lane are outside the scope of this project but the developing measures that have commenced with Grosvenor about enhancing the pedestrian crossing arranges across Brook Street at the convergence of South Molton Street, South Molton Lane, Avery Row and Lancashire Court may resolve some of Judy Kuttner's concerns.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>or work vehicles either park in Brook Street or drive/back up South Molton Street through the Do Not Enter sign at all hours. Even if Davies Street reopens for a limited time in the morning, there will still be added pressure on parking space in Brook Street all day.</p> <p>Ms Kuttner finds it interesting that part of the Brook Street scheme is supposed to be implemented during 2017 and says there are still a number of sizeable construction projects coming up locally over the next couple of years that will require the services of large lorries which will need to come in via Brook Street as well as to park somewhere adding to the strain on the street. She finds it difficult to comment fully on a number of aspects of the traffic order (and the part of the Bond Street order which shows Brook Street as two-way) because details have not been published I believe as to the plans for Davies Street North, South Molton Lane or Gilbert Street.</p>	
<p>Scott Marshall Senior Development Manager Grosvenor Estate</p> <p>scott.marshall@grosvenor.com</p> <p>Email received: 23rd December 2016</p>	<p>11.</p>	<p>Mr Scott Marshall writes in on behalf of Grosvenor and states that they have worked closely with Westminster City Council and Transport for London to bring forward 2-way working in Brook Street and Davies Street which support and enable the Bond Street public realm plans recently approved. Grosvenor supports this proposal in principle and is keen to see two-way working introduced in 2017/18. They also note that these proposals dovetail with their proposals at Berkeley Square, that have been appropriately coordinated by close working with Westminster City Council officers over the past couple of years.</p> <p>Following their review of the proposed changes to traffic management orders in Brook Street, as shown on "Inset B" of drawing no. 70018389-03-TMO-03 Rev B dated 09-11-2016, they are writing to object to the proposed location of parking bays on the south side of Brook Street – 2 additional PBP parking bays outside</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>It is proposed that the two pay-by-phone bays mentioned by Grosvenor are removed and are relocated on the eastern side of Davies Street where the taxi rank has been removed.</p> <p>Discussions have also commenced with Grosvenor about enhancing the pedestrian crossing arrangements across Brook Street at</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	<p>No. 39 that would replace the existing "no waiting at any time" restriction. These bays will, if introduced, significantly obstruct pedestrian crossing associated with the convergence of South Molton Street, South Molton Lane, Avery Row and Lancashire Court, particularly South Molton Street, Lane and Avery Row.</p> <p>At present there is no pedestrian crossing at this popular location and pedestrian movements across Brook Street are informal. It is their view that there should be a formal crossing at this location. They have regularly highlighted this location as an important pedestrian crossing in Grosvenor's dialogue with officers on 2-way and Bond Street.</p> <p>Currently the double yellow lines allow temporary "short stay" loading, but pay by phone parking bays would inevitably be a permanent obstruction, which in their view is regressive. 696 people per hour in a weekday PM peak (1800-1900) informally cross in this location (which on average is over 11 every minute). This would be a significant number of pedestrians that would be impacted in just that hour alone, not to mention daily flows, as this is a popular route throughout the day.</p> <p>The level of informal crossing at this point is a significant consideration and greater attention should be given to pedestrian safety and comfort, particularly with future two-way traffic movements. Parked vehicles may obstruct sight lines between pedestrians and other drivers (and vice versa) and thereby reduce the respective modes ability to traverse or cross the street easily. The north east – south east routes of Avery Row, South Molton Street and South Molton Lane, are established secondary pedestrian routes. These streets link Oxford Street to the south and south east areas of Mayfair. In particular this route, crossing Brook Street, connects Bond Street London Underground stations, and the forthcoming Crossrail Station, to New Bond Street to the south east, an area with a high number of visitors and workers requiring good pedestrian walking routes.</p>	<p>the convergence of South Molton Street, South Molton Lane, Avery Row and Lancashire Court by providing wider and longer kerb build-outs. The developing scheme is shown on the latest</p> <p>Brook Street and Davies Street general Arrangement drawings and is attracting Grosvenor support.</p> <p>However, the scheme is located at the join between the Bond Street and the Brook Street and Davies Street Projects but will be delivered from within the Bond Street project with a continuing discussion with Grosvenor Estate.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>Grosvenor also adds that it is likely that pedestrian flows will increase with the opening of Crossrail in 2018, just after this scheme is implemented.</p> <p>In summary, the combined effect of the proposals would obscure an important desire line within the wider area linking Oxford Street to south and south east areas of Mayfair. This could negatively alter pedestrian movement and discourage the use of this important secondary route away from congested areas, such as Oxford Street and New Bond Street. As a consequence pedestrians may look for unobscured routes and places to cross the street with ease, that may bring pedestrians closer to alternative and more congested routes along, Oxford Street or New Bond Street. This could amount to a lowering of footfall on Avery Row and the converging streets, as well as their connecting streets. This would be a negative impact on spatial accessibility between north and south Mayfair which should be avoided. It is appreciated that there is a loss of parking bays on proposed changes overall, though the proposed parking bays added in this location should either be removed or relocated where they will not have significant consequences for pedestrian movement and safety.</p> <p>Grosvenor also adds that they would be keen to assist in finding a suitable solution.</p>	
<p>Louise Rossitter PA to Sir David Ford KBE LVO, Chairman PCCW SERVICES (UK Branch) Ltd. 78 Brook Street, Mayfair, London W1K 5EF Tel: +44 207 297 6123 Mobile: +44 7590 683 333</p> <p>Louise.Rossitter@relish.net</p>	12.	<p>Louise Rossitter responds on behalf of Sir David Ford with his full support for the scheme.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged with gratitude for his positive comment included.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS		OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
Email received: 9 th December 2016			
<p>Dr Peter Kertesz peter@kertesz.demon.co.uk k</p> <p>Email received: 8th January 2017 (after closure of the consultation)</p>	13.	<p>Dr Kertesz wishes to object to the scheme and states that he has worked in the area for over 47 years and knows the problems better than the people proposing the unnecessary and disruptive changes.</p> <p>Dr Kertesz says that he has studied the proposals very carefully and suggests that they would create greater traffic congestion and major difficulties in deliveries.</p> <p>He also adds that Brook Street is a particularly narrow street with numerous commercial establishments on both sides of the street and that there are also numerous shops in the adjacent street that are pedestrianised. The establishments rely heavily on deliveries throughout the working days from vehicles stopping in Brook Street. It is totally impractical to expect the deliveries to be made outside working hours.</p> <p>Dr Kertesz states that the delivery vans would create major obstruction in the two-way system and cause much greater congestions that exists at present.</p> <p>Westminster City Council Cabinet members must understand and take notice of the concerns of the businesses in the area that need to operate efficiently and not to create further obstacles for the sake of changes for the sake of changes.</p> <p>Dr Kertesz again re-iterates that he does not need the disastrous and unnecessary changes invented by people who do not understand the needs of the area.</p>	<p>Email acknowledged including statement that outcome to be shared following further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Proposed response to comments made:</p> <p>Two-way operation on Brook Street and Davies Street project will improve accessibility and permeability in the Mayfair area, reducing journey times, mileage travelled and improving air quality. The design has reviewed road widths, delivery requirements, traffic flows and the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed design is a balance between the needs of various users. Congestion is not expected to be worse. The demand for deliveries will be met by the proposals, without major disruption to traffic.</p>

Appendix G

**Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project –
Amended Traffic Management Drawings 70018389-03-TMO sheets 01 to 05
(Rev D/E)**

Appendix H

Brook Street and Davies Street Two Way project – Project Cost Plan

PROJECT COST PLAN



City of Westminster



To: Mark Allan

From: Jon Noble

Copies to: Dawn Donaldson, Saleha Khanon and Graham Higgins

Ref: 70003916

Date: 17 January 2016

Revision: I

Project: Brook Street / Davies Street 2way

Please find below the project cost estimate for the implementation of proposed works on Brook Street Davis to create a 2 way Street.

Item	Contract A	Contract B	Contract E	Notes
(Design and Works Cost)				
Stage 1: WSP feasibility design cost	£0			
Stage 1: Publica feasibility design cost	£0			£150k of work has been carried out and/or funded separately as part of the Cycle Grid (Jubilee Quietway)
Stage 1: Jacobs feasibility design cost	£0			
Stage 1: Surveys	£0			
Stage 2: FMCWSP Initial Design Cost - Contract A	£31,106			Increased due to PV change
Stage 2: FMCWSP Initial Design Cost - Contract B (lighting)		£19,479		Decreased due to PV change
Stage 2: NRP Initial Design Cost	£20,013			Original estimate of £20,000 has increased to an actual cost of £20,013
Stage 2: Surveys	£20,000			
Stage 3: FMCWSP Detail Design Cost - Contract A	£34,755			
Stage 3: FMCWSP Detail Design Cost - Contract B (lighting)		£7,050		
Stage 3: FMCWSP Additional costs (work above contract expectations)	£55,000			This number has increased since Rev H due to TMO consultation and other additional design requests.
Stage 3: Surveys (C3/C4 estimate)	£15,000			This is an estimate. The next cost plan revision will have actual costs
Stage 4	£1,886			
Stage 5: Works cost	£423,841	£99,302		A 10% contingency was added to the figures in the Bill of Quantities in Rev H. Traffic Signals installation is shown in Third Party Costs.
Stage 6.1				
Stage 9 TMO preparation costs	£1,976		£15,000	
Design and Works Cost Sub-Total	£603,577	£125,831	£15,000	
Grand Total		£744,409		

Third Party Costs	
Utility Diversions (provider TBC - covered within risk value)	£50,000.00
TFL / TSS Traffic Signals	£198,000.00
Publication costs (TMO)	£2,000.00
Road Closures Traffic Orders	£5,000.00
Confirm TMA Permit Notifications	£15,000.00
UKPH connection and disconnection	£5,000.00
Third Party Costs Total	£275,000.00

Design and Works Cost Total £1,019,409

In addition the following allowance for Risk and Contingency may be considered in budgeting for the scheme. Note - this is applied to design and works costs only.

Item	Allowance	Allowance
Contingencies	4.8%	£59,831
Risk Allowance	RR	£89,332
Risk and Contingency Total	12%	£148,563.39

Client Costs	£43,642.81
Service Management fees	£8,202.93
Westminster City Council Costs	£51,845.74

Project Total (inc Risk and Contingency) £1,219,818.00

Reserved costs	£0.00
NWEC Client Costs	£0.00

Project Total (inc Reserved and NWEC) £1,219,818

Project Board Approval Date

Feb 2016