## APPENDIX C – BAKER STREET TWO-WAY – TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION RESPONSES

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
1.	Expresses total agreement with the restoration of two-way traffic on Baker Street and with all the orders underpinning this long overdue move.	Support for the scheme is noted.
2.	Appalled by the range and scope of this project that appears to have taken very little account of the needs of local residents. The sub-title to the whole project is "Improved Streets for their Local Community": this is arrant nonsense as far as we are concerned. The constant references to traffic, traffic flows and the two-way system are sufficient evidence for us to see that the local community has not been, nor is even now, the focus of attention.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
	Your frequent use of the term "improved" is unwarranted; it is by no means clear that there will be any improvements for residents. You have started with a parti pris attitude that change will lead to improvements. In this regard you have not been neutral.  The two-way system makes it much more difficult for us to approach Baker Street Station (BSS). We shall have to negotiate two lanes of traffic in each direction instead of traffic in one direction only. This is certainly no improvement for us. Your information is unhelpfully lacking in key information about the location of pedestrian crossings.	<ul> <li>The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:</li> <li>To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;</li> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> </ul>
	Cycle paths are fine. But what are you proposing to do about the blatant disregard for the law of the road by cyclists? Far too frequently they do not obey traffic lights or pedestrian crossings. Without cyclists being subject to the law, journeys for us to BSS and elsewhere will become more dangerous and difficult.	In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road.
	The proposed changes to bus routes are extremely unhelpful to us.  Why, for example is there is no southward bus stop outside the London Business School on Park Road near the junction with Rossmore Road? To use the proposed bus stop by BSS means the crossing of more lanes of traffic in both directions.	The project will improve junction layout including raised tables to aid pedestrian crossing. In addition, broader zebra crossing on Melcombe Street and footway widening on Melcombe. The Project Team suggest using Melcombe Street as main route to Baker Street Station western entrance. Baker Street will operate as most two-way roads in London with appropriate crossing points and opportunities along the corridor. There are also dedicated pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction of Baker Street and Melcombe Street junction.
	Why are there going to be no buses on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road? This is an enormous loss to us.	Cyclists, like all road users, should behave responsibly and legally and those cyclists who behave in a careless, inconsiderate and dangerous manner are liable to prosecution.
	Why are you removing the bus stop on the south side Rossmore Road near Park Road and opposite the eastward stop on the other side of the road for the 139 and 189 buses? This is a very convenient stop and it will be sorely missed.	The amendments to bus routes have been designed in close consultation with the TfL bus team. The overall service and passenger requirements have been considered and TfL's proposals will deliver improvements to bus services in the area. The proposed changes to bus routes follow a consultation carried out by TfL in summer 2015.
	Parking and waiting places have been little mentioned in any of the documentation so far. This makes us fear the worst. Clearly there will be a reduction in parking places to permit the proposed changes. It is very regrettable that these reductions have not been spelt out to residents.  Although we do not have a car, family and friends at the moment can help us with shopping by being able to wait	There is a proposed southbound bus stop on Park Road just north of the business school, as shown on drawing 70004404-C-TMO-PR-01 Rev A on the project website <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs</a> . (proposed drawing for zone 1)
	for 20 minutes outside Ivor Court. This allows us to unload and decant passengers as necessary. We have written on a number of occasions about the possible (if not the certain) loss of parking and waiting places near our home. We have heard nothing! We see that more information about them will come in 2016. Well, we are now past the middle of the eleventh month of 2016 and still there is no relevant information.	TfL have undertaken a consultation regarding bus provision on Gloucester Place. All southbound buses are on Baker Street, as referred to in the TfL Bus Consultation response report, 2016 at <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/baker-street/">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/baker-street/</a>
	Overall, we are very disappointed at this set of proposals and the way that you appear to have disregarded the views of residents. To us, the focus of attention has been on motorists, cyclists and traffic flows and this has	The two-way project is not looking to remove these stops; they are shown on both the existing and proposed drawings.
	contributed to the clear denial of rights of the people who live in the area. They have not been heard, nor have their views been taken properly into account.	One of the objectives of the formal Traffic Order consultation exercise was to inform residents of the proposed changes to parking and waiting and loading restrictions. Details of the proposals, including plans showing the

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
7		existing and proposed layouts, were made available on the project website ( <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs</a> ), together with a table summarising the parking changes including number of bays gained or lost. This information was published on the website ("summary table of restriction changes").
		The existing single yellow line waiting restriction outside Ivor Court will remain to allow vehicles to stop for a period of 20 minutes between 11.00 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. and for an unlimited period outside of those hours, provided that continuous loading / unloading is taking place. Vehicles are also permitted to stop for as long as necessary to drop off / pick up passengers. The loading facility outside the mini market and deli is being removed because of the new junction layout. However, the loading facility on the red route outside 203 and 205 will remain to serve the loading requirements of local businesses.
		Two public consultations have previously been undertaken on this project. Comments received during the consultations were taken into account and changes made where considered appropriate. The City Council considered all responses received and form the basis of two subsequent Cabinet Member reports which are available to view on the website (address above). In addition, a series of meetings were held with various residents' groups and amenity societies to address their concerns.
3.	Requested paper copies.	Paper copies were sent in post with covering letter on 23/11/16.
4.	PS my dear when you come back we will go for a walk on Gloucester Place and I'm sure you will find this charming! And relaxing. Westminster Council is amazing. We should import them here would be the icing on the cake of Chaos A la Francaise. Anyway from the beginning they planned to win this battle and people who were against almost everyone is delighted now! This is the politics one uses honest people to make enterinate anything and how is one arrives at% for; While neighbouring was basically - and is - against. To make you laugh you know that Jean had asked for sleeping policemen and was told no but "we will check one of these days traffic" time later he received an invitation to attend this with the police and they (Not jean) found that a Saturday between noon and 2.00 p.m. was the best time to do the test! We frankly laughed that it was the day of departure HK in this quarter the weekend people go to the countryside and those who make noise revving their motors etc. are from the neighbourhood, maybe not from the square but from the neighbourhood. Since his complaint we no longer heard anything else interesting. ( <i>Translated using Google Translate - original email in French</i> )	The wording of this response is such that the Project Team's comments are not considered necessary.
5.	I wish to confirm my support for the scheme: the speed and aggression of drivers on Gloucester Place will be considerably reduced by this proposal, and render the area safer for pedestrians and drivers alike.	Support for the scheme is noted.
6.	Requested paper copies	Paper copies were sent in post with covering letter on 24/11/16.
7.	One item that is not clear from the drawings we have received is the coach stops on Baker Street. Baker Street will have much more bus traffic (northbound and southbound) and bus stops on boats sides. In particular, Baker Street north of Marylebone road will be very congested if the coaches will be allowed to stop where they currently stop. Please clarify what we should expect.	Currently all buses and coaches run northbound on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street. In order to retain adequate space for parking and essential servicing it is not possible to provide two full lanes in both directions on both streets. Therefore, where feasible, Gloucester Place has been designed to accommodate two northbound lanes and Baker Street with two southbound lanes. In certain sections it is possible to provide two lanes in each direction, but not in the area north of Marylebone Road where the coach stops are currently located. It is not considered feasible for coaches to travel northbound on Baker Street; coaches often require a longer wait than buses, and northbound coaches would obstruct traffic flow, as it would not be possible for other vehicles to overtake them. This would have a detrimental impact on traffic in the area. Therefore, it is necessary to retain existing coach movements (northbound on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street). In other words, all northbound bus services will be removed from Gloucester Place (north of Marylebone Road) and only northbound coach services will remain. This represents a very significant reduction in the volume of large

NO. (Names	DECDONICE	DDO IFOT TEAMA DECORONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,		vehicles moving along the east side of Dorset Square as a result of the scheme.
		For southbound coach movement on Baker Street, coaches will share stops with TfL buses. The X90 stop on Baker Street is now proposed to be on Marylebone Road.
8.	As part of this project (that I fully support) can you also look into making Porter Street one-way in order to reduce pollution and traffic, and increase road safety? It is a rather narrow street, full of parked cars and bikes, and I feel having this street as a one-way street would benefit both residents as well as road users.	The possibility of introducing one-way working in Porter Street was considered as part of the initial study. However, the Baker Street model observed minor movements westbound, which could be attributed as ratrunning but this number is very low.
		The Project Team has considered records, which show that no accidents have occurred in Porter Street with the exception of two incidents involving car doors being opened onto oncoming cyclists and motorists at the Baker Street junction. Furthermore, one-way streets do not accord with the objective of maximising accessibility for residents. The Project Team considers there is insufficient evidence, either in terms of traffic flows, or road safety, to justify a change. This location has been included in the post monitoring strategy and if any issues occur then appropriate mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9.	XXXXX is writing on behalf of his client XXXXX who are on the verge of agreeing an Agreement for Lease in support of a revived Dorset House Petrol Filling Station.	A response was sent to XXXXX via email 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2016.
		The Project Team spoke to XXXXXX to clarify all point relating to the operation of the petrol station.
	We have examined the current proposals and its likely impact on the operational aspects of the petrol filling station and would require, as a matter of urgency, clarification of a number of points relating to the future entry / exit arrangement to / from the petrol filling station.	It is not proposed to install a kerb-line across the entrance into the petrol station and access from Gloucester Place will be maintained.
	Based on our initial inspection of the relevant plan (Baker Street & Gloucester Place Two-Way Project, Proposed Scheme Drawing, Rossmore Road to Marylebone Road), we are unclear how the traffic movements into and out of the petrol filling station would work in terms of safe manoeuvres and avoidance of rat-running through the site.	The Baker Street Two-Way Scheme will allow access into the petrol filling station forecourt from Gloucester Place only. Vehicles arriving from the west or north will be able to turn directly into the site. Vehicles arriving from the south will be able to do so by waiting for a suitable gap in southbound traffic; the timing of the signals has been designed to clear the queue as much as possible to enable the right turn to occur with minimal delay.
	Furthermore, we fail to understand the purpose of the proposed kerb-line across the petrol filling station access in Gloucester Place.	Vehicles arriving from the east will be able to make the G-Turn using York Street that is signed from Marylebone Road to the A41 and will therefore arrive at the site from the south.
	You may also be aware that our Clients' prospective landlords have submitted a planning application in support of the site's return to use.	Vehicles will be required to exit the site onto Marylebone Road eastbound where they will be able to head in all directions via either Glentworth Street (northbound), Baker Street (southbound) or use York Street to head westbound.
		The Project Team consider that rat running through the site will be will be minimal as signing for southbound left turning traffic at Park Road will steer vehicles into Allsop Place instead.
		The proposed layout will not affect the use of the site as a petrol station.
10.	We suggest that Porter Street is converted into a one-way street in order to reduce pollution and traffic, and increase road safety. It is a rather narrow street and we feel having it as a one-way street would benefit both residents as well as road users. One-way from Baker Street to Chiltern Street.	The possibility of introducing one-way working in Porter Street was considered as part of the initial study. However, the Baker Street model observed minor movements westbound, which could be attributed as ratrunning but this number is very low.
		The Project Team has considered records, which show that no accidents have occurred in Porter Street with the exception of two incidents involving car doors being opened onto oncoming cyclists and motorists at the Baker Street junction. Furthermore, one-way streets do not accord with the objective of maximising accessibility for residents. The Project Team considers there is insufficient evidence, either in terms of traffic flows, or road safety, to justify a change. Traffic monitoring will be targeted at this location post-implementation and traffic

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		movements will be reviewed if necessary.
11.	I have reviewed the proposed changes and I have a question regarding southbound coach stops, I am afraid I cannot see them on Baker Street (while I see two sets of northbound coach stops on Gloucester Place). Would you be able to clarify where those stops would be located? We have represented some time ago that we would strongly recommend that coach traffic be routed via Gloucester place (both northbound AND southbound), however the current set of drawings does not clarify the matter, in my personal opinion.	Coaches are proposed to continue to operate with all northbound services retained on Gloucester Place and southbound services operating on Baker Street. This is because if the northbound coach services are transferred to Baker Street this would result in traffic congestion at the stops. Southbound coaches will operate in the same manner that they currently do on Baker Street. The southbound bus stops have been redesigned to ensure adequate capacity and there is some minor adjustment and re-routing of some of the southbound bus services to provide improved operation. Overall bus numbers on the Baker Street / Gloucester Place corridor would be reduced following TfL consultation earlier in the year, and further reductions might be expected following the current TfL 40% bus reduction consultation for Oxford Street. The TfL consultation demonstrated that there is a strong desire from passengers to improve the interchange with Baker Street station, and the majority of destinations for passengers are closer to Baker Street than Gloucester Place.
		Southbound coaches will share stops with TfL buses. Southbound X90 coaches will stop on Marylebone Road.
12.	1. The coaches should be routed on Baker Street (which is mainly commercial and by the tube station) and NOT Gloucester Place (which is mainly residential and it is confusing for passengers to have the coaches on this road). It is a key issue to the BSTW that the coaches be routed on Baker Street to create a fairer scheme that does not disadvantage local residents over the commercial interests of Baker Street and to ensure that local residents' health and well-being are not harmed by increased and illegal levels of pollution. In addition,	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.
	Gloucester Place forms the Eastern side of Dorset Square which is the centre of a designated conservation area and this conservation status needs to be respected. It is wholly inappropriate to have heavily polluting airport buses which wait for prolonged periods to pick up passengers and all their luggage right next to residential buildings and next to a listed Georgian garden square.	Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced
	2. I strongly object to the proposal to locate a new coach stop at Dorset Square. This is totally inappropriate in a residential area and at the side of a listed Georgian garden Square providing one of the few green spaces in the area. The coach stop will increase noise, pollution and disturbance for the residents in this area and for all users of the garden square. The coach stops (if the coaches are not moved to Baker Street as they should	between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.
	be - see point 1 above) should be south of Dorset Square towards Marylebone Road outside the Allsop Arms public house where they are currently located. Not only is the proposal to site the two coach stops on Gloucester Place in different locations bad for residents but also bad for coach passengers as it will lead to confusion as to which coach stop is required and will inevitably be dangerous as passengers will be running between the two coach stops when they realise that they are waiting at the wrong stop.	On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.
	3. I note that 4 residents' parking spaces will be lost from the south side of Dorset Square to allow for pavement widening and that these will only be replaced with 2 residents' parking spaces. The south side of Dorset Square needs at least 4 residents' parking bays to replace those which are being lost as these are the only residents' parking spaces on the south side of Dorset Square.	Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on
	4. I note that on the north side of Dorset Square there are 4 parking spaces which back onto Gloucester Place and the diagram is marked to say they will remain as residents' parking bays but in fact they are currently pay and display only. Please clarify what is meant by this and what is proposed for these 4 spaces.	Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
	5. Please ensure that signage is kept to a minimum at and around Dorset Square and that street furniture and paving is appropriate to a Georgian garden square which is the heart of a designated conservation area and that the designated conservation status is respected and not violated.	It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
	6. I note that on the diagram showing the northern section of Baker Street close to Baker Street tube there is	The proposed coach stop on Dorset Square is to be located in the position currently used by a large number of

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	no coach stop showing for southbound traffic. Only a bus stop is showing. Why is this? It is essential that where coaches will be stopping is clearly identified in your diagrams as otherwise the diagrams are worthless and do not allow people to properly feedback their comments if key information is missing.	TfL day and night-time bus services. These are to be removed from the stop. The proposed stop will also be reduced in length with the stop to be moved further to the south away from residences. The number of coaches using this stop will be limited as the northbound services will be split between this stop and one further to the south. It is not possible for all coach services to be accommodated further to the south outside the Allsop Arms as the space available will be insufficient. This is a result of providing a new controlled pedestrian crossing over Gloucester Place on the north side of the junction with Marylebone Road which is currently lacking. The number of vehicles using the stop will be significantly less than the current volume. Coach services will be assigned in a manner that is not confusing for passengers.
		The loss of two residents' parking spaces at Dorset Square is acknowledged. Melcombe Street is a very well used pedestrian route connecting Marylebone train station with Baker Street underground station. Footway widths at this stretch are sub-standard and difficult to use by wheelchair and buggy users. As shown in the parking and loading schedule, the total number of B Zone residents' spaces will be increased by 5. This means that the two spaces are not lost but relocated elsewhere within B Zone, with an increase on the total number of available spaces. Most of the new spaces will be installed in Gloucester Place, between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street, with a short walk from the lost two spaces. The relocation of those bays would also allow a better appreciation of the Dorset Square Conservation Area.
		Unfortunately, there was an error on the drawing; the existing bays are pay-by-phone bays and remain so in the new scheme. No change is proposed here. The existing bays are not part of the consultation.
		The project has been designed with a view to de-clutter the footway so signage will be kept to a minimum and be merged with other street furniture where possible.
		Southbound coaches on Baker Street will share the bus stops with TfL buses.
13.	Don't understand how there is space on both Gloucester Place and Baker Street for - cycle lanes in two directions, bus lanes in two directions, cars going north and south taking two more lanes - plus widening the pavements. Maybe trees too!	There is a general rearrangement of the road layout on both roads with footway widening only proposed on eastern footway of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road; no bus lanes are proposed; cycle lanes are proposed on Gloucester Place south of Marylebone Road only. Overall, when taken together, there are still three lanes northbound and southbound.
14.	I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed coach stop in Dorset Square. I endorse all the reasons that you will have received from the Dorset Square Trust. I see no reason why it can't remain at the existing stop in front of the Alsop Arms.	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.
		Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.
		On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.
		Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
15.	Strong opposition to the coach stop in Dorset Square. Coaches should be routed on Baker Street. Dorset Square is a residential Square and also the heart of the Dorset Square Conservation area.  Baker Street should have capacity since ALL cars and trucks will be routed onto Gloucester Place / Dorset Square	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.
	during the day time hours from York Street onward Northbound.	Hadaadha aan an dadhaan baar ah aan dadhaadhaadhaadhaadhaadhaa f Olasaadaa Dlasa aan dadhaadhaa Daad
	Baker Street is a commercial street unlike Gloucester Place.	Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will
	There is currently no coach stop in Dorset Square.	have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced
	We residents frequently have to redirect users to the current coach stops in Gloucester Place. The current layout only reflects the coach stop in Gloucester Place north of Dorset Close and not the one south of Dorset Close. Commercial tickets are sold as Baker Street. Having coaches in Baker Street will immediately link coaches with the Underground.	between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.
	Coaches will increase environmental and noise pollution in our area.	On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'.  This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester
	The proposed coach stop will affect the enjoyment of the Square and will affect residents of Dorset Square in particular those living on the north side of Dorset Square. It would also increase traffic in Dorset Square by people driving to the coach stop.	Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.
	The coach stop is very likely to block the entry to the square by coaches waiting.	Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
		Northbound buses / taxis are moved to Baker Street, which reduces northbound flow on Gloucester Place to a

NO. (Names	DECDONCE	DDO JECT TEAMA DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		significant degree. This is expected to result in a reasonable balance of traffic demand and capacity on both Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Northbound flow on Gloucester Place needs to be managed so that the southbound right turn from Baker Street can be maintained.
		The proposed changes to bus routes are as a result of the TfL bus consultation undertaken by TfL in summer 2015. Whilst it is accepted that Gloucester Place is more residential they are both currently designated A41 and the Project Team have to balance the flow of traffic evenly to ensure smooth running of the network.
		There is currently a coach stop just south of the Square and a bus stop at the Square in the existing layout.
		Coach users also need to access Marylebone Station hence why the coach stops have been located in a central area for both destinations.
		A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
		The use of the park by local residents will not be affected by the proposed coach stop location.
		The coach stop will be on the carriageway and will not obstruct the pedestrian entrance into the park. Furthermore, the proposed stop is set away from the eastern access / regress point into the Park.
16.	The Chiltern Railway Company Limited ("Chiltern Railways") operates franchised passenger train services from London Marylebone to Aylesbury Vale Parkway, Birmingham Moor Street and Oxford Parkway. The Chiltern Railways franchise is due to expire at the end of 2021.	The Project Team will contact The Chiltern Railway Company once the project has been approved. A plan will be developed to ensure coordination of works and to resolve any signing issues.
	Chiltern Railways welcomes the proposal to improve the urban realm for pedestrians and cyclists in the area of Marylebone station. We are especially pleased to see that the proposals include widening of pavements and improvements of crossings for pedestrians.	
	Marylebone LUL Station, its interface with Marylebone National Rail Station and the Bakerloo line more widely is likely to face capacity issues as Chiltern Railways' business continues to grow, including the opening of our service to Oxford in December 2016.	
	In 2016 Chiltern started to address the issue of connecting passengers to Baker Street Station from Marylebone Station by undertaking a comprehensive refresh of signage in the station and the installation of a 'legible London' monolith to direct passengers to onward travel connections. This was designed to highlight to passengers that the journey between the two locations is only 400m or 4 minutes walking.	
	We would observe that the more popular walking route is on the southern side of Melcombe Place, Dorset Square and Melcombe Street. It would therefore be worth considering the improvement of pedestrian crossings on this side of the road.	
	It is worth noting that current plans see Marylebone Underground Station being closed for refurbishment for 9 months from February 2018. During this time passengers will need to have a viable alternative route to access onward London Underground connections. We would therefore encourage the phasing of the programme to realise the benefits ahead of this major work being undertaken.	
	Chiltern Railways would encourage the provision of additional signage on the walking route between	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	Marylebone Station and Baker Street Station. This work stream has already been explored by TfL for the period that Marylebone LUL station is closed and we would be happy to share the proposed signage programme with you. We would observe that this signage programme would be of more value if it was installed permanently.	
	We note the work that is intended to take place directly outside Marylebone station. Chiltern Railways has several staff parking spaces at the front of the station and it is vital for operational reasons that access to these is not compromised.	
	It is important to note that any works on Network Rail and will need to go through the proper procedures including Landlords Consent and Station Change. Works cannot commence without the prior consent of both Chiltern Railways and Network Rail via these processes.	
	Chiltern Railways is committed to working with Westminster City Council in order to fully realise the benefits of the project.	
17.	Disappointed to note that there is no improved pedestrian crossing provision at the intersection of York and Crawford Streets with Baker and Gloucester Streets.	In the new proposal, three of the four junctions mentioned are signalised junctions with facilities for pedestrian crossing on all arms. Improvements have been made to the Marylebone crossings to make it easier for pedestrian to cross the road in one cycle.
	Also, it appears the provision of pedestrian crossing on Marylebone Road has been reduced. Given this is such a busy thoroughfare, I'm at a loss to understand why this is planned.	It should be noted that in order to provide green man crossing facilities on all four arms of York Street / Gloucester Place junction, it was earlier proposed to make York Street one-way. However, due to objections from residents in previous consultations, this was changed. The proposed pedestrian crossing facilities are still an improvement on existing conditions.
18.	My only residual concern, which may be unfounded, is that it is not clear to me what improvements will be made to the pedestrian crossings, especially where York Street and Crawford Street cross Gloucester Place and Baker Street. These crossings have always been hazardous and will be even more difficult when those streets become two-way.	These junctions will be signal controlled with crossing facility to enable pedestrians cross these roads safely.  It is proposed that a straight-across crossing be provided at the Marylebone Road / Balcombe Street junction to improve the pedestrian crossing facilities over Marylebone Road. The timing allowed for these movements is with all safety tolerance specification.
	The various crossings on the Marylebone Road are also VERY difficult to cross without running. The staggered crossings invariably result in reaching the centre island and then having to wait a prolonged time (in the fumes) until it is possible to cross the 2 <sup>nd</sup> carriageway. Can the crossing time please be increased a little, and the islands shortened (especially just West of Gloucester Place) so that it does not take so long to negotiate the centre reservation? Removing the central and kerbside railings all together, as at the Baker Street station crossing has been very effective. Could the same be done at Gloucester Place? This is important because the more open crossing east of Gloucester Place seems to be going.	A straight across crossing was previously proposed on Marylebone Road at its junction with Gloucester Place. In order to achieve this, the left turn from Gloucester Place onto Marylebone Road had to be banned. However, due to objections received during previous consultations, this was changed and replaced with a staggered crossing.
19.	Please take these comments as my formal response to the TfL Traffic Order Consultation. I do not comment on the specific proposals of the document, since I continue to oppose the two-way project as a whole.	The comments have been shared with TfL colleagues who are part of the Project Team.
	On 16.9.15 Councillor Robert Davis stated "no such scheme will be taken forward until it conclusively meets the needs of the area". I suggest it is by no means proved that the scheme does this. That it is still being actively pursued is surprising, in the context of the recent court ruling in favour of Client Earth's legal challenge against the Government's Air Quality Plan.	The air quality impact assessment 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.
	The two-way scheme is an unjustified waste of public money and still does not give any priority to the urgent problem of air pollution in and around Marylebone Road. The declared aim to "provide a safe environment for all users" and "creating a welcoming area" is unlikely to be achievable while users continue to breathe in air which is way above the EU permitted levels of toxicity. The intention to slow down traffic on Baker Street and	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation.  The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	It has been repeatedly been pointed out that any necessary public realm improvements can be implemented without recourse to a two-way system.	Westminster City Council has been successful in securing funding to improve air quality in Marylebone LEN area. Proposals are currently being finalised in consultation with residents and other stakeholders to tackle this air quality issue.  The existing one-way system could be maintained to improve public realm but the conversion to two-way movement adds more to the area and improves accessibility in the area and cuts down rat running.  A detailed response on this was given as part of the previous consultations and these responses can be found on the Baker Street Project website - <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> .
20.	Ido not intend to get bogged down in details. I know this is a standard tactic to confuse the public: get thousands of detailed comment and then say there are so many conflicting comments they can be ignored, and the Council continues on its merry way.  The present system works well; it does not need to be messed with. The principal supporters of the two-way scheme are the businesses that hope to profit from the congestion that the two-way scheme will create. Never mind the pollution emitted by the slow moving traffic.  As to the "public realm", these alleged improvements can be carried out without changing the traffic flow, and at much less cost.  We have been here before, and it was because of the chaos of the two-way traffic that the present one-way system was introduced.  I thought the Mayor intended to "get London moving", not choke it up even more.  Leave well alone. To see what chaos ensures when you fiddle with a perfectly good arrangement go to St. Georges Circus in Southwark at about 5.00 p.m. and see what "traffic engineers" can do, without even trying.	All process and procedures has been followed in developing this project. Two public consultations have been undertaken previously: all concerns / issues raised have either been responded to or changes made to the design to meet these concerns. Meetings have been held with residents' groups and amenity societies to discuss these concerns and possible design changes. This last Traffic Order consultation has been undertaken to inform and receive comments specifically on changes to parking, loading and waiting restrictions.  Removing the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes will serve to make better balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of both Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Extensive traffic surveys were carried out to feed the traffic model with latest traffic volumes and speeds. The traffic model for the two-way system results in better and more efficient traffic management and improved accessibility to local streets without increasing congestion. Vehicle journey distances are also reduced, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed. A better positioning of bus and couch routes will also make possible a more efficient traffic management, which aims for slower but more fluid traffic flows in the area.  An air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and published as part of the second consultation. The report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than disbenefits as a result of the scheme.  One of the key aims of the project is to improve accessibility and this is better achieved in a two-way road.  The local factors and land use have changed since the current one-way was introduced in the 60s and the current traffic conditions and aspiration is better serv
21.	I refer to the proposal to make Baker Street and Gloucester Place open to two-way traffic. I would like to strongly object to this proposal. I have been living in the NW8 area for the last over 15 years and have been seeing the increase in congestion over the years causing unnecessary delays and frustrations. Both these roads are very important connections that link the North to the City. I travel on both these roads nearly every day and see traffic build up especially at the Baker Street station going South and when going North the crossing of	Extensive traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure the traffic flows smoothly under the proposed scheme.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Withington	Marylebone Road from Gloucester Place and getting on to Park Road.  Converting these two roads into a two system will create traffic jams, causing more pollution and endangering the environment. Please give the proposal your most serious consideration.	<ul> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> <li>The air quality impact assessment 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.</li> </ul>
		A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts.  There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
22.	I very strongly SUPPORT the proposal that Baker Street and Gloucester Place should become two-way. I hope it might end the practice by which drivers speed up north on Gloucester Place as if it were a race track: this causes a lot of noise and is dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians.	Support for the scheme is noted.
23.	Stop f**king up London. All these crackpot schemes are destroying the road network in London. You only have to look at EVERY place TFL have 'modernised' to see that it doesn't work. The Embankment, Elephant and Castle, Parliament Square, Bayswater Road are all F**KED because of these inept schemes. Add to this, the closure of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road, you will finally put the nail in the coffin. Corrupt, inept, and completely retarded TFL.	<ul> <li>The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:</li> <li>To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;</li> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> <li>There is evidence of benefits from similar schemes in London, such as Piccadilly / St. James's, South Kensington,</li> </ul>
		Tottenham Hale and Shoreditch Triangle, as well as other similar initiatives in major cities around the world.  Accident analysis for Camden Council's West End Project proposals for Tottenham Court Road / Gower Street demonstrates that safety benefits are expected.
24.	Thank you for listening to our concerns. I have the following comments which relate mainly to Diagram 2 (Dorset Square / Gloucester Place area).	Access to Baker Street and Gloucester Place will be maintained. A table was provided at previous consultations ( <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#archive">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#archive</a> proposed and existing traffic flow figures by street) which states the change in traffic flow on all streets in the area as a result of the two-way scheme. This table demonstrates
	The aim of the scheme seems to be to promote business on Baker Street by diverting all traffic (that is not deemed important to business) onto neighbouring roads without due regard to the thousands of residents living on these streets.	that traffic will not get diverted from Baker Street and Gloucester Place onto neighbouring streets. Views of residents have been considered in the previous consultations and changes made to the proposed scheme or responses provided to all issues / concerns.
	The increase in traffic volume on Gloucester Place will result in increased noise and air pollution.  Dorset Square is a conservation area with planning restrictions preventing either double or secondary glazing. There is therefore no ability to protect ourselves from increased noise levels. Baker Street is largely	The air quality impact assessment 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

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	commercial and with partial occupancy can tolerate higher noise levels. As there is going to be a significant increase in traffic noise, we ask that the council reviews their planning restrictions and offers subsidies for residents to double glaze.	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.
	Air pollution exposure is highest for residents who live, work and play in the area currently in levels already in excess of EU requirements. Reducing exposure for visitors is praiseworthy, but this should not be at the	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation.  The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts.
	<ul><li>expense of the residents who already carry the highest burden.</li><li>Widening footpaths and putting in cycle lanes whilst desirable will result in fewer and or thinner traffic lanes.</li></ul>	There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term. From the table cited above, during previous consultations the traffic flow on Gloucester Place will either show no noticeable change or show reduction.
	This is at a time when 4 x 4 traffic is increasing (>20% of new car sales last year). There will be gridlock, increased accidents and more pollution from standing traffic. Can the council consider a ban on larger vehicles?	It is not expected that the proposed scheme would lead to increased noise levels.
	3. We do not wish coaches to route up Gloucester Place, they are heavy pollutants. The current position of the coach stop on Dorset Square will block access to the north side of the square. Traffic will quickly tail back and the resultant gridlock will block Gloucester Place and the surrounding streets. When this happens no doubt, more lanes will need to be added, which we anticipate will be at the cost of losing residential parking spaces. Please move the coach stop - preferably to Baker Street.	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.
		Regarding concerns expressed about lane width, we are proposing standard lane widths and do not expect any problems in large vehicles using these. These lane widths are designed for buses and large commercial vehicles. Swept path analysis has been undertaken on the design.
		It is proposed to relocate the coach stop on Gloucester Place to the same location as the existing bus Stops T and U, which currently provide for all northbound bus services. Northbound buses will be largely relocated onto Baker Street and will no longer stop at the Dorset Square bus stop. Traffic capacity constraints will mean that it is not considered feasible to locate all bus and coach services onto Baker Street.
25.	We wish to record our total objection to everything that is proposed. We do not believe that this will deliver "public realm improvements" and we certainly do not believe it will improve conditions for traffic and buses and it will without doubt increase congestion and cause delays and hold-ups. We do not follow your reference to assisting regeneration of this part of the West End.	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.
	The movement of vehicles up Gloucester Place northwards and down Baker Street southwards facilitates free movement of traffic. There will be enough problems that will emerge from there ten year HS2 construction project which will filter all the way down to the West End without this further unnecessary set of proposals. Your proposals are unnecessary, badly thought out and likely to cause even further congestion and delays far beyond that which is existing. Therefore, we strongly request that these proposals be completely abandoned.	This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or indeed a 30% reduction in network performance.
	We are at least pleased to note no reference to cycle lanes which would cause even greater disastrous hold-ups and congestion.	The concerns regarding traffic congestion and queues / hold-ups have been responded to in previous consultations. Please see link below for details <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a>
	We own 74 and 76 Gloucester Place. Various tenants in these buildings including Goat Fashion have frequent deliveries that come in and frequent collections for goods that go out. They have registered considerable alarm	In the proposed scheme, deliveries can be made from Dorset Street. The restriction on northbound traffic movement at Baker Street is from 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m.
	at your unnecessary proposals. Your proposal to prohibit vehicles proceeding northbound in Baker Street north of York Street the whole business week seems certain to cause confusion and even greater congestion. Presumably that will force such traffic to go north along Gloucester Place.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken that includes the restriction for northbound traffic on Baker Street. The results of this traffic modelling show that there will be no noticeable change in traffic flow on Gloucester Place. A table showing changes in traffic flow on all streets in the area has been made available during previous consultations and at the project website (see link provided). In terms of deliveries, the proposed restriction on
	Deliveries to and from couriers plus frequent movement of occupiers by taxi to these two buildings will be severely damaged by these proposals. It all works perfectly well at the moment so why are you trying to alter it?	Gloucester Place will be between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m. in order to provide mandatory cycle lanes which will greatly improve the cycling facilities in the area.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	Please also spell out if you have any proposals for pedestrians and cyclists which hopefully will not reduce the space on the roads for buses, taxis and cars which will cause yet further congestion. We request that you abandon the entire project.	Loading is allowed outside of Monday to Saturday 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m. on the main Gloucester Road and deliveries can be made from the side roads.
		Extensive traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
26.	I write to you as a resident and as someone who works in the local vicinity. I own and manage XXXXX which is a block of five residential flats situated between Crawford Street and York Street from which I make my livelihood. I am extremely supportive of the two-way scheme and have been from its inception over five years ago. I am in regular contact with XXXXX of the Baker Street Quarter Partnership and have tried to assist wherever possible.  I have been reviewing the TMO consultation and I have one strong concern in respect of the Gloucester Place junction between Crawford Street and York Street. Currently the possibility exists for loading and unloading from 10.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. Monday to Saturday. The new proposal prohibits any loading between Monday to Saturday 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m.  Given both sides of Gloucester Place are mainly residential at these junctions, these proposed times would deny residents the ability to accept any delivery i.e. shopping, larger heavier items etc. during the week. As you may be aware, all access to the Gloucester Place properties are only from Gloucester Place, whereas on Baker Street loading can take place from the rear of the properties through the various parallel mews streets to Baker Street. An alternative may be that loading still be allowed northbound where there will be two lanes with loading / unloading at certain hours as existing with the proposed new restrictions southbound. I note the same loading restrictions are also proposed further south on Gloucester Place and would have a similar negative effect on the substantial Portman Estate properties which have been converted into residential use. Whilst I understand this loading restriction time is currently applicable on Baker Street which is mainly office and commercial retail usage, Gloucester Place is very different in respect of its usage mix ranging from residential, offices and hotels. It would appear Gloucester Place may well suffer as result. I would be very grateful if you can kindly consider this point	The waiting and loading restrictions have to change to facilitate the proposed cycle lane between Crawford Street and York Road.  It is proposed to provide mandatory cycle lanes operating between 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m. These lanes will help in greatly improving the cycling facilities for people in the area encouraging more sustainable means of transport thereby helping in tackling air pollution. Loading will be possible outside of these hours and on the side streets.  Residents will be able to use side street for delivery during the hours of restrictions or schedule delivery outside of the restrictive hours.
27.	<ul> <li>My company is not in favour of the changes. Our business is situated at 10 Portman Square:</li> <li>Vehicular access to our building for clients and customers at certain times of the day is very difficult and I fail to see how reverting to two-way traffic in Baker Street will make this any easier.</li> </ul>	Access to Portman Square will remain as existing from Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Access to 10 Portman Square building for vehicles is provided at the rear of the building and that will not change under the proposal. Loading and waiting restrictions outside 10 Portman Square will remain as existing.
	One major advantage of one-way traffic in Baker Street for pedestrians is crossing the road is significantly	Under the existing one-way system, there are regularly long queues and delays northbound on Gloucester Place towards Marylebone Road and Southbound on Baker Street towards Marylebone Road and Oxford Street. The over-provision of traffic lanes at other locations means that some drivers speed away from traffic lights, and the

NO. (Names	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE  safer when traffic is flowing in just one direction and I am extremely fearful that two-way traffic will make crossing the road significantly more dangerous, particularly for our staff.  • I would consider that a one-way Baker Street would provide much greater scope for providing a dedicated lane for cyclists; however my experience as a pedestrian and indeed as a car driver is that cyclists tend to ignore all the rules and only today a cyclist rode straight at me at some speed as I walking south on the pavement from Waltrose to the entrance of 10 Portman Square.  • Any change to the current layout will take months of work and will cause significant disruption to our business operations and our staff.	lack of crossing facilities (especially on Gloucester Place) means that pedestrians must cross in gaps without any formal control. The wide carriageways and multi-lane traffic flows can be intimidating to cyclists and weaving across the lanes can be hazardous. The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain fucurrent levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway:  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  Crossing Baker Street will be like most two-way street in London. The project is proposing green man crossings on all arms at every signal control junction on Baker Street and most on Gloucester Place. This scheme will therefore greatly improve pedestrian crossing facilities by providing safe crossing points.  Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.  It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awaren
		Implementation of the scheme will be planned to minimise disruption to day to day operation of the businesses and residents. Requirements will be communicated in advance to allow adequate planning.
28.	We operate a business at XXXXX, The Casino, part of the Grosvenor casino chain, a subsidiary of the Rank Group, the largest casino operator in the UK. The Casino has been operating at this site for over 30 years. We have circa 150 team members employed at the club, we cater for the many visitors to the area plus those that reside locally. We are open for 24 hours, 7 days a week, although our busiest periods are between 6.00 p.m. and 2.00 a.m.  Our concerns about the proposed project are with regard to parking restrictions in the area. Currently parking restrictions are in place until 6.30 p.m. or 7.00 p.m. depending on the street. Our business obviously relies on customers having easy access to the club, we operate courtesy cars for some of our customers and being able to drop off and pick up from outside the club is essential. Currently we are able to utilize the street parking on	Due to the two-way movement and number of lanes, the project will not be able to retain the unrestricted parking currently on Baker Street. As previously discussed on 09/10/2015 the resident parking bays on Portman Square, Fitzhardinge Street, Manchester Square, Bakers Mews, and George Street (for example) permit parking for non-residents after 8.30 p.m., and at the moment there is no intention to alter this, so customers of Barracuda may continue to park in these areas as they might do so now. At present, there are no plans to alter the provision of single yellow lines on side roads in the vicinity of Barracuda (Portman Close, for example), and so these areas might also still be available to their customers, however this would be subject to possible requirements to relocate resident or pay-by-phone parking, and TMO consultation.  On Baker Street itself, there will not be an option to permit parking on-street along the west side of the street in

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
	Baker Street and the ability to pick up from outside the club and also park the vehicles.	the vicinity of Barracuda, because the northbound lane will be only 4 metres wide (which is not wide enough to
	Our customers driving into the area also utilize parking in the immediate vicinity so any restrictions on these	allow parking / loading without blocking northbound traffic) and there is a bus stop proposed just to the south of Portman Close.
	could damage our business.	1 of third of osc.
	Team members travelling to the club, night shifts starting between 6.00 p.m. and 11.00 p.m. and finishing	
	between 2.00 a.m. and 6.00 a.m., mostly use cars due to limited public transport availability at these times,	
	utilize the free street parking available. Restrictions that are being proposed, i.e., parking restriction until 8.30 p.m., limited local parking options, no parking on Baker Street, will make huge difficulties for customers and	
	team alike. It would be unsafe for our team members to have to walk long distances to park vehicles late at	
	night, and would cause a great financial burden if they have to pay for parking at these times. If the parking	
	restrictions in the locale could operate until 6.30 p.m. and not to the proposed 8.30 p.m., this would help, as	
	would more parking spaces in the side roads either side of the club.	
29.	I am most concerned about the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street, as this will increase traffic in narrow streets,	The air quality impact assessment report was published as part of the second consultation. Existing conditions
۷٦.	and thus worsen air pollution.	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.
30.	From my own personal observation of existing conditions, I am concerned that what is proposed will be	The scheme design will improve pedestrian access for all road users especially pedestrians. There is adequate
	detrimental to traffic and pedestrian movement in the upper end of Baker Street between Crawford /	single yellow line on Paddington Street and we do not envisage Sherlock Mews been used for loading due to its
	Paddington Street and the Marylebone Road. I am further concerned that service and trade vehicles will find it	restrictive nature and distance from shops.
	more difficult to park albeit temporarily in Baker Street and will use Sherlock Mews instead. We have been fighting an increasingly difficult battle over the last few years to be able to drive out of or into our garages	
	because of the intrusion of such vehicles which ignore the yellow lines or are prepared to run the gauntlet of the	
	wardens. How will the proposed BS2W scheme in any way improve this situation rather than make the problem	
	worse?	
31.	I am opposed to this development. Added to the proposed Kings Cross gyratory system development, the Cycle	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not
<b>31</b> .	Super-Highway routes, and the mooted closures of Oxford Street and Tottenham Court Road this will continue a	be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project
	downward spiral for traffic management. I can understand that the data on pollution may seem damning but	area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the
	this city cannot operate without an efficient road network. I believe that these changes will bring serious	road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and
	problems, particularly around the Oxford Street end of Baker Street and Gloucester Place, where buses will cause	pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.
	a permanent jam during the day.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of these granted as a good activism.
	The current road layout works and the only reason to change it is the pernicious, anti-vehicle rhetoric of the local	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of these proposals on road network performance, traffic congestion etc. A table has been provided that shows the change in traffic flows on streets
	authorities. We desperately need an independent, politically neutral, city-wide infrastructure management and	in the area.
	development agency. I don't believe that TfL meet this criteria.	
	The current headlong drive towards preventing the movement of motor vehicles will have serious effects on the	
	economy and will not chime with the "Britain open for business" mantra of the Brexiteers.	
32.	The current system has been in place as far as I can remember 50+ years this new proposal can only cause more	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not
	congestion, slowly you are killing off London, you can't turn back the clock. Should I start training to drive a	be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project
	horse and carriage again? Not everybody wants to or can get around on a bike so you are stopping those people	area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the
	from coming to London foreign tourist who come and spend money will find other countries to go.	road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and
		pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems. This means that a perceived 30%

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or indeed a 30% reduction in network performance.
33.	I wish to confirm my support for the scheme. The speed and aggression of drivers on Gloucester Place will be considerably reduced by this proposal, and render the area safer for pedestrians and drivers alike.	Noted.
34.	I don't agree with the project, I think the traffic lights need to sync in with all the other traffic lights along Baker Street (at the present time they are out of sync with all the other lights). This project will cause a lot of disruptions and confusion to some people who are not used to driving around London. I don't think this will resolve the traffic issues around Baker Street.	The lights on Gloucester Place and Baker Street are all on the UTC system and are linked to maximize efficiency in signal timings. Implementation of the scheme will be planned to minimise disruption to day to day operation of the businesses and residents. Requirements will be communicated in advance to allow adequate planning.
35.	Requested paper copies	Paper copies sent in post with covering letter on 30/11/16.
36.	We are writing to express or total objection to your proposals. We are one of many small businesses based in buildings on Gloucester Place. As you will know there are no retail establishments on Gloucester Place and as such the street needs no further regeneration. As a small business we rely on couriers such as DHL / Up's to deliver our goods. Currently courier vehicle drivers have easy access onto Gloucester Place and are able to load and unload right outside our building until 4.00 p.m. There are currently no parking bays that could obstruct our courier deliveries.	Loading and parking is restricted outside of this property albeit a single yellow line and single blip is available to serve loading outside of peak hours. In the new scheme, the single yellow line on the north side of Montagu Place remains in existence and can be used for loading activities. There are also single yellow lines on the corner, slightly further west on Montagu Place. These proposed restrictions are to facilitate mandatory cycle lanes that would greatly improve cycling facilities in the area.
	If Gloucester Place were to become a two-way street, the additional traffic and congestion would seriously hamper our couriers and I strongly believe our business would be financially affected. I do not believe it would be possible to have a two-way street with bus lanes and narrower traffic lanes without creating more congestion on Gloucester Place, Baker Street and all the adjacent roads. If your proposals were to go ahead I am afraid our small business and neighbouring small businesses may be forced out of the area, so we urge you to abandon this entire project.	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems. This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or indeed a 30% reduction in network performance.
		It should be noted that no bus lanes are proposed on Gloucester Place. Extensive traffic modelling has been undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed scheme will not cause congestion. Table showing changes to traffic flow on all streets has been provided.
37.	As a resident who lives in Chiltern street over the last 6 years with extensive residential and business developments in the neighbourhood, I have seen a dramatic increase in traffic in Chiltern Street and the streets that run off Baker Street; Blandford Street, George Street, Dorset Street and Manchester Street. I am opposed to the 2 way traffic scheme because I believe that this will further force an increased flow of traffic onto these narrow residential streets, which we do not want, affect parking for residents and increase air pollution.	Extensive traffic modelling has been done and change in traffic flow on all streets because of the proposed scheme is published on the project website <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> Based on this table, no noticeable change in traffic flow is expected on these streets.  The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not
	From a heritage perspective these are charming, quintessential, architectural pockets of London. Charming precisely because they are tucked away and off the beaten track, free-ish (sic) of the density of cars and pedestrians that the main highway veins adequately and affectively take the wait of and filter. The transport links are adequate with nearby tube stations and frequent and efficient bus routes.	be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems. This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity
	If we as a city are moving towards a more car free, cleaner breathing existence, not least for the health of its dwellers but also to meet air quality, pollution targets the surely funds should be spent on schemes that reduce traffic to the centre of town not forcing it onto narrow streets where families, children and their animals reside and where an abundance of schools are.	(because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or indeed a 30% reduction in network performance.  Traffic will not be forced down narrow residential side streets.
		I .

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	I urge you to re-think this entire scheme and be progressive, forward thinking and bold in your creation of streets that are largely pedestrianized with routes available only to taxis, bicycles and vehicular deliveries to shops and businesses made available for a restricted amount of hours a day.	The air quality impact assessment 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.  The Baker Street Two Way project is not pedestrianising any section of road. The short section of Baker Street northbound closed to taxis, bicycles and deliveries at certain times, creates benefits to traffic management to the entire area.
38.	There are a number of taxi ranks that are possibly affected by these proposals which are Baker Street (Dorset Street), Seymour Street, Bryanston Street / Granville Place (Thistle Hotel), Portman Square (Churchill Hotel), Orchard Street (M&S), Oxford Street Selfridges and Oxford Street (M&S). We would need to know how these may be affected. All of these proposals will need to be discussed directly with TfL TPH, including our stakeholders within the taxi trade associations. TfL are responsible for appointing and revoking all taxi ranks within the London boroughs by way of a taxi rank order so direct discussion will need to take place before any changes can be made.  There are various banned turns and changes to permitted movements proposed. We would want to ensure that this would not be disadvantageous to taxi and PHV passengers and negatively affect various passenger fares when travelling in taxis.  Attached copies of responses sent before I response to previous informal consultation.	Site meetings are being arranged to discuss taxi ranks issues and any decision will be taken after the meetings have taken place.
39.	As head leaseholders of XXXXX at XXXXX I would like to echo the sentiments expressed by XXXXX in his email below. We are also opposed to the proposed changes.	Crossing Baker Street will be like most two-way street in London. The project is proposing green man crossings on all arms at every signal control junction on Baker Street and most on Gloucester Place. This scheme will therefore greatly improve pedestrian crossing facilities by providing safe crossing points.  Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.  It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets;  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;  Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;  Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions;  Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
40.	I am providing my representations on the proposed traffic scheme and I am concerned about the effects on me. There are two separate concerns:  1. If I want to drive from my home to the Bayswater Road, I turn right from Green Street into Park Street and	The changes to permitted movements at the Oxford Street junction are necessary to facilitate the proposed introduction of two-way movement on Portman Street while providing appropriate pedestrian crossing facilities. The left turn volume from Park Street to Oxford Street is relatively low, and so although this change might affect specific local routes for a small number of journeys, there are alternative options available. The Green Street

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	<ul> <li>then left at Oxford Street to Marble Arch. The proposal envisages no left turn from Park Street into Oxford Street so that I would be required to drive to the end of Green Street, turn left into Park Lane, move across four busy traffic lanes in relatively short order to do a U turn into Park Lane travelling north. I find it very difficult completing this manoeuvre because of the volume of traffic in Park Lane and the speed at which this traffic is moving which is why I currently use the Park Street / Oxford Street route and would wish this option to be retained.</li> <li>2. I note you are proposing to stop traffic turning right from Orchard Street into Oxford Street. This would force more traffic into North Audley Street which would then seek to turn right into Green Street. This would most likely increase the volume of traffic in Green Street which would be detrimental to the quality of quietness and air pollution for the residents of that street. Green Street is currently two-way. The Council sought to make it one-way but on receiving objections from local residents, the Council fortunately changed its mind on this earlier proposal. Green Street is not wide enough for regular two-way traffic. Accordingly when a car attempts to drive in the section from Park Street to North Audley Street it often confronts oncoming traffic which invariably results in angry hooting causing a disturbance. In addition cars try to squeeze past each other occasionally resulting in scratches to parked vehicles. My concern is any action which results in increased traffic in Green Street exacerbates the issues I have described.</li> </ul>	Strategic traffic modelling demonstrates that the BS2W scheme is largely 'capacity neutral' and there is expected to be minimal transfer of traffic onto local roads outside the main corridor.
41.	I would like to register my objection to an element of the proposed Baker Street / Gloucester Place two-way scheme. By deflecting traffic onto Balcombe Street and permitting right turns from Gloucester Place onto both Ivor Place and Taunton Place, Balcombe Street risks becoming a rat-run for traffic.  At the moment, no significant increase in traffic is anticipated for Balcombe Street, though the intention is clearly to ease traffic on Gloucester Place by allowing the turning onto Balcombe Street, thus inevitably increasing traffic movements.  At present, Balcombe Street is an extremely rare example of a street in Central London with a strong local community, and where is little enough traffic movement that children do feel able to play on the street. The stated aim of the Baker Street Two-Way proposal is to give back Baker Street and Gloucester Place to the community, though by increasing the traffic levels, the current proposals for Balcombe Street appear to do exactly the opposite.	Implement further measures if required.  This is not the intention of the project of the aspiration of the proposal. The scheme as designed will remain traffic neutral with no wholescale displacement anticipated to parallel routes.  Changes to specific junctions have been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation. Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.  It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets;  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;  Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;  Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions.
42.	We only received your letter to residents dated 14 <sup>th</sup> November on 29 <sup>th</sup> November and have thus very little time left in terms of the consultation window. I have tried to see how our part of Park Road will be affected by accessing the diagram on the suggested website but have been unable to work out precisely what is proposed. My particular interest is in whether our residents' parking bay and the current loading bay (that is, on the right hand side of the road, going down towards the junction with Baker Street, in front of the terrace of houses at 1-29 Park Road) will be maintained. If you are able to confirm this, I would be grateful. If it is proposed that these	The existing residents' parking will remain, although it will shift slightly further down towards the Baker Street junction. This is to accommodate a slip lane for cyclists, it will not reduce the number of spaces. The loading bay will also be retained although will be reduced by 10 metres compared to existing.

NO. (Names	DECDONCE	DDO JECT TEAMA DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	will be reduced or removed, please could you clarify the position and take this as a formal objection. To clarify, it is already extremely difficult to find residents' parking bays in this area and even more for tradespeople to load/unload - if the current parking and loading bay is removed or reduced, this will have a significant impact upon the lives of those who live in our terrace.	
43.	<ol> <li>The proposals will increase dangerous air pollution in the north section of Gloucester Place. The air pollution predictions are wrong. The proposed two-way traffic in the north section of Gloucester Place will undoubtedly increase air pollution, severely affecting our health as residents. Coaches will be a key source of air pollution, particularly running engines at coach stops. I strongly object to the coach stop proposed opposite my home. I will claim against Westminster City Council if these proposals go ahead unmodified and air pollution increases as local residents have warned before and are warning you again now. We are monitoring air pollution, to quantify this serious health risk.</li> <li>Cycle lanes are needed in Gloucester Place. It is unsafe for cyclists to use Gloucester Place without cycle lanes.</li> <li>These need to be put in to the proposal to avoid risk of serious harm and death. If not and serious injury / death to a cyclist occurs, Westminster City Council risks claims that they did not sufficiently heed warnings from local residents. 8 people cycle from our house alone, including our 3 children. Their safety on the road is in your hands.</li> </ol>	Coach movements remain largely the same as existing with northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street. The coach and bus stop have been developed with TfL and careful consideration has been given to the location of stops to service both Baker Street and Marylebone Stations.  The air quality impact assessment 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.  Cycle lanes were proposed on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road and were consulted upon during previous consultations. Based on responses received (concerns regarding parking and loading loss and cycle lanes on a busy road) it is now proposed to provide an alternative route on a quieter road, Glenworth Street. A contra flow lane is also proposed on Melcombe Street. This route will link into the cycling facilities on park road and then into regent's park.
44.	I would like to object Baker Street and Gloucester place two-way working. I would like to propose:  1. Ivor place (west) to be one way "out" of the neighbourhood.  2. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way "in" to the neighbourhood.  3. A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
45.	<ol> <li>The proposals will increase dangerous air pollution in the north section of Gloucester Place. The air pollution predictions are wrong. The proposed two-way traffic in the north section of Gloucester Place will undoubtedly increase air pollution, severely affecting our health as residents. Coaches will be a key source of air pollution, particularly running engines at coach stops. I strongly object to the coach stop proposed opposite my home. I will claim against Westminster City Council if these proposals go ahead unmodified and air pollution increases as local residents have warned before and are warning you again now. We are monitoring air pollution, to quantify this serious health risk.</li> <li>Cycle lanes are needed in Gloucester Place. It is unsafe for cyclists to use Gloucester Place without cycle lanes. These need to be put in to the proposal to avoid risk of serious harm and death. If not and serious injury / death to a cyclist occurs, Westminster City Council risks claims that they did not sufficiently heed warnings from local residents. 8 people cycle from our house alone, including our 3 children. Their safety on the road is in your hands.</li> </ol>	Coach movements remain largely the same as existing, with northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street. The coach and bus stop locations have been developed with TfL and careful consideration has been given to the location of stops to service both Baker Street and Marylebone Stations.  The air quality impact assessment 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.  Cycle lanes were proposed on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road and were consulted upon during previous consultations. Based on responses received (concerns regarding parking and loading loss and cycle lanes on a busy road) it is now proposed to provide an alternative route on a quieter road, Glenworth Street. A contra flow lane is also proposed on Melcombe Street. This route will link into the cycling facilities on park road and then into Regent's Park.
46.	<ol> <li>Ivor place (west) to be one-way "out" of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way "in" to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.</li> </ol>	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
47.	My wife and I are very concerned that the proposals will push more traffic into our quiet residential neighbourhood. One of the main reasons why we bought our house in 2013 was because it was quiet and there is very limited traffic. We are surrounded by some of Europe's busiest roads - Gloucester Place, Baker Street and Marylebone Road, not to mention a busy train station - so we treasure the relative peace and low pollution of our immediate area. This peace stands to be destroyed if the proposals go ahead as planned. And we object wholeheartedly to them.  Why should our immediate area pay such a heavy price for making Baker Street 'nicer'? We have a 10 month old daughter and we could quite like her to grow up in the quiet street we planned for her to grow up in. Why should she breathe in more nitrous oxides from car pollution thanks to this proposal? How will my wife safely push a pram down Taunton Mews as she has done since our daughter was born?  The proposals as they stand will push much more traffic into Dorset Square and create rat runs down Ivor Place, Huntsworth Mews / Taunton, Linhope Street, Balcombe Street, and Boston Place.  We believe that no opportunity should be allowed for this to happen. If there have to be any changes they should be made with the intention of reducing traffic in our area, not the opposite.  We suggest the following:  1. Ivor Place (west) should not be a way in to our neighbourhood from Gloucester Place but only a way out from our neighbourhood.  2. The junction of Dorset Square and Melcombe Place must absolutely not have a right hand turn allowed into Melcombe Place.  3. Taunton / Huntsworth Mews could be a one-way in to the neighbourhood only.	A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation. These changes can be seen on the project website <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> . The air quality impact assessment 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.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
48.	I am shocked to see that in spite of the strongest representations in writing and in person at prior consultation meetings the interests of residents of the Dorset Square conservation area are being ignored. One-way entry to Ivor Place from Gloucester Place is a recipe for creating the dangerous rat runs, additional traffic and additional pollution as taxi drivers and satnav directed vehicles attempt to cut through to Marylebone Station and Westway. This is quite unacceptable in such narrow predominately residential streets and completely contrary to the promises that were made at the last meeting.  There is a perfectly good solution for all which would be to:  a) make Ivor Place one-way 'out' (east) of the area. b) make Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way 'in' (west) to the area. c) ban right turns at the junction of Dorset Square and Melcombe Place.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
49.	Further to our earlier email I would like to suggest that if proposals are brought forward the only fair thing to do would be to have an independent investigation of air quality levels and traffic in our area for 3 months prior to any changes being made.	Monitoring strategy (including air quality) – the post-implementation monitoring will assess junction performance (traffic congestion) and changes in traffic flow on residential streets. This will itself provide an indication of any changes to air quality.
	Then the same investigation should continue for another three months after the changes have been made. This will be the only way to ascertain the facts. If there is even the smallest increase the changes should be undone and put back to what they were before. Why should we suffer a diminution in any way in our quality of life as a	There is a strategy in place to monitor all changes made post-construction (including air quality) in order to observe the changes to area and reviewed accordingly. Details of air monitoring strategy is still been worked out.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	result of these proposals?	
	The proposals do not need a statistician, however, to point out the obvious: they are going to wreck the peace and quality of life in the Dorset Square / Balcombe Street area if they go ahead- one of the last enclaves against traffic in Marylebone.	
50.	I am extremely concerned that the BSTW has not taken into account the demands of local residents and threatens to turn our peaceful conservation area into a rat run for traffic heading towards Marylebone station and the A40.	Two rounds of consultation have been held and changes made to the proposals to satisfy requests and requirements of residents.
	The multiple entries into the enclave from Gloucester Place encourage traffic looking for short cuts. This, combined with the narrowness of the streets, not only poses significant dangers with drivers forced into pinched two-way side streets but also will result in increased pollution (both noise and particulate).	Following detailed discussion with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that there is no right turn permitted from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place.
	Members of the local community would like to offer the following alternative to the proposed plan, which will not only discourage rat runners but also avoid congestion and allow for cyclists to use Ivor Place safely.	This consultation relates to the formal Traffic Order process. The scheme has already been through two rounds of public consultation where comments have been received and responded to in detail. The two consultation reports are published on the council website and the project website.
	<ol> <li>Ivor Place (west) to be one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.</li> </ol>	It should be noted that changes have been made to the proposed scheme to meet concerns and responses have been provided to other issues / concerns raised during the previous consultations. Meetings have been held with residents' groups and amenity societies to discuss these concerns.
		Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
		Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
51.	Firstly, I would like to thank you for the clear website and communications that you have sent to residents throughout this consultation process, which has been appreciated. However, we are deeply concerned by the latest plans for BS2W and must object to them as they currently stand. We support an alternative proposal as outlined at the end of this email.	A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation. These changes can be seen on the project website: <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a>
	Our four reasons for objecting to the current proposal are:	The air quality impact assessment 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
	1. We are strongly of the view that the current proposals would increase traffic density on Balcombe Street and the immediate surrounding streets. We believe southbound drivers on Gloucester Place (and taxi drivers in particular) will take advantage of the rat run this proposal creates to reach Marylebone station and/or the Westway by turning right onto Ivor Place and then driving down Balcombe Street or Boston Place to access	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.
	the station.	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation.  The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas
	<ol> <li>Increased traffic will raise air and noise pollution levels on this quiet residential street.</li> <li>A number of children live on the street. Increased air pollution will have an adverse effect on the</li> </ol>	of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
	development of their lungs;  ii. As Balcombe Street is in a conservation area, road-facing windows are not in general permitted to be	The scheme is capacity neutral and there is no intention to divert traffic onto Balcombe Street.  The past manitoring strategy will be repust. It is a tested way of observing and measuring the effect and impact.
	<ul> <li>double glazed, meaning the noise pollution will be a substantial issue indoors too;</li> <li>3. Balcombe Street is not wide enough for cars to pass. Increased southbound traffic from Ivor Place is likely to lead to a significant increase in congestion on Balcombe Street where vehicles driving in opposite directions</li> </ul>	The post monitoring strategy will be robust. It is a tested way of observing and measuring the effect and impact of what is implemented. It helps to reveal what aims have been achieved and efforts can be concentrated on other amendments that can be made to improve on the proposal.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	will have to joust in regular showdowns for who has to reverse back up to a lay by;	The scheme aims to improve local (not rat running) accessibility and direct access from Gloucester Place reduces the amount of traffic forced to use Melcombe Street.
	<ul> <li>4. We are fundamentally opposed to the logic of implementing the current proposal under the proviso of monitoring the traffic flow for three months:</li> <li>i. If the traffic flow is NOT going to be significant, then the rat run should not be approved in the first place as it will not merit sufficient benefit to easing traffic flows on Gloucester Place;</li> <li>ii. If the traffic flow IS going to be significant, then the rat run should not be approved.</li> </ul>	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	We therefore would like to add our support to the proposal made by fellow residents. This proposal calls for Ivor Place to be no-entry from Gloucester Place, with the first southbound option for turning right being Huntsworth Mews (which would allow traffic to reach the Westway via the south part of Balcombe Street only) but with no option to turn right from Dorset Square onto Melcombe Place (to disincentives taxi drivers using it as a cutthrough to reach Marylebone Station).	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	This proposal would still serve the purpose of alleviating traffic build ups on Gloucester Place and giving extra options to reach the Westway while minimising impact on a quiet residential area.	
52.	I would like to object Baker Street and Gloucester place two-way working. I would like to propose:  1. Ivor place (West) to be one-way "out" of the neighbourhood.  2. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way "in" to the neighbourhood.  3. A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
		Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
53.	I am dismayed to see that the latest plans for the Baker Street two-way scheme still puts our narrow streets at risk of being a rat run. And this, notwithstanding the significant feedback in previous consultations, which you seem to be ignoring. We ask you, once more, to ban traffic on Baker Street from turning into Ivor Place. We are not at all convinced that the presence of a pedestrian crossing will deter that move.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	And also, we ask again that there should be no right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place, as a further disincentive to use us as a cut-through.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	Ours is an entirely residential neighbourhood. We look to you to protect it.	
54.	I am concerned about your most recent proposals which (as throughout this whole unnecessary 2-way process) are set to sacrifice the well-being, safety and convenience of residents living in Gloucester Place north of the	The scheme has been designed to ensure the safety of all road users is not compromised.
	Marylebone Road and make life more difficult and dangerous for them. For the average person, making sense of all this documentation is not easy and, despite having a degree, I am struggling to take it all in.	Unfortunately, there appears to have been a delay in the delivery of some consultation letters and this is being investigated. As a result, the consultation period was effectively extended to 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 to ensure that residents had ample opportunity to respond.
	a. Your letter dated 14 <sup>th</sup> November was only delivered to residents in our block on 29 <sup>th</sup> November, thus reducing the consultation time by 2 weeks.	The proposals show new residents' parking and pay-by-phone parking, making it easier for the public to park.
	b. It is difficult to see exactly what is going on online – house numbers are not clear even if the drawings are enlarged and it is hard to compare what you propose with what already exists – one needs to see things side by side. However, as far as I can make out, it would appear that (sic)	There are still loading bays just south of Huntsworth Mews and also further north just before Ivor Place on the opposite side of the road.
	<ul> <li>c. You propose not only to completely remove the 30 minute parking/loading spaces on the left hand side just north of Dorset Square outside 161 Gloucester Place, NW1 6DX but also to</li> <li>d. reduce the waiting time to 20 minutes in similar spaces located further north in Gloucester Place.</li> </ul>	No bus stops are provided in Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road as there are no bus routes proposed to serve this section. Refer to TfL Bus Consultation, 2016 at <a href="https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/baker-street/">https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/baker-street/</a>
	e. You already propose to remove the vital bus stops in Gloucester Place north of the Marylebone Road. Apart from making travelling home from the West End more dangerous for vulnerable older residents (who	There is provision for loading bays in Gloucester Place north. Locations are: a. outside No. 203-205 Gloucester Place (west side) Monday to Saturday for max 20 minutes;

NO. (Names	DECDONCE	DDO ICCT TEAM DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	currently need walk only a few yards to their homes late at night), carrying home bulky and heavy items by bus will no longer be possible for all but the strongest and healthiest (because of the greater walking distance from the proposed new stops) and [combined with the changes in (c) and (d) above], it will be even more difficult for online orders to be delivered, residents' builders, decorators, repair and maintenance men etc. to carry out their business, or for emergency services etc. to stop.  f. By now, I would imagine that many, if not most, people who are aware of and concerned about the two-way proposal and its ramifications are exhausted with all the information which has (quite rightly) been distributed. Please bear in mind therefore, that a limited number of responses to this current consultation may indicate fatigue and the feeling that there's no point fighting what seems to have been a losing battle right from the start, rather than approval.  g. Something desperately needs to be done about the behaviour of cyclists. Whilst the majority obey the rules, I narrowly escape being run over on an almost daily basis by cyclists shooting through lights, cycling along – and diagonally across - pavements meant solely for pedestrians, cycling the wrong way and generally failing to behave responsibly. Perhaps penalties and bans should be imposed on cyclists (as they already are for motorists) in order to curtail this dangerous and anti-social behaviour and prevent accidents to pedestrians. I strongly object to any proposal which allows cyclists to travel in the opposite direction to other vehicles, as seems to be proposed in Schedule 1 item (5) in your letter, as I believe this will lead to accidents.  Finally, your Statement of Reasons seems contrary to what will happen in Gloucester Place north of the Marylebone Road – the proposals would seem to make conditions for pedestrians worse, increase their vulnerability, reduce bus network accessibility and make access for local traffic more difficult.	b. outside No. 187 (west side) operating Monday to Saturday; c. outside Allsop Arms PH (west side) operating Monday to Saturday 10.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m.; d. opposite Allsop Arms PH (east side) operating Monday to Saturday 10.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m.; e. outside No. 3 Dorset Square (east side) operating Monday to Saturday 8.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m.  In addition, it will be possible to load outside the times of the red route restriction subject to there being an available space (Drawing No. 7004044-C-OA-TMO-PR-1 &2 Rev A).  Issues with cyclists disregarding regulations will be passed to the City Council for enforcement. Improving cycling facilities would hopefully prevent them from using footway space. The contra flow lane proposed on Melcombe Street is segregated so should be safer.  The scheme has proposed many improvements for pedestrians in the area north of Marylebone Road, such as crossings, raised tables, wider footways etc.  The proposed changes to bus routes are as a result of the TfL bus consultation undertaken by TfL in summer 2015. Whilst it is accepted that Gloucester Place is more residential they are both currently designated A41 and the Project Team have to balance the flow of traffic evenly to ensure smooth running of the network.  Traffic modelling has been undertaken for the development of these proposals. The table showing changes to traffic flow includes this restriction and shows that there is no noticeable change in traffic flow on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road. http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#archive "existing and proposed traffic flow".
55.	I am very concerned that the proposals will push more traffic into our residential neighbourhood in order to improve Baker Street.  The proposals as they stand will push much more traffic into Dorset Square and create rat runs down the residential areas of Ivor Place, Huntsworth Mews / Taunton, Linhope Street, Balcombe Street, and Boston Place.  If there have to be any changes they should be made with the intention of reducing traffic in our area, not the opposite.  I suggest the following:  1. Ivor Place (west) should not be a way in to our neighbourhood from Gloucester Place but only a way out from our neighbourhood.  2. The junction of Dorset Square and Melcombe Place must absolutely not have a right hand turn allowed into Melcombe Place.  3. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews could be a one-way in to the neighbourhood only.  Furthermore I would like to suggest that if proposals are brought forward the only fair thing to do would be to have an independent investigation of air quality levels and traffic in our area for 3 months prior to any changes being made.  The same investigation should continue for a further three months after the changes have been made. If there is an increase the changes should be undone and put back to what they were before.	Two rounds of consultation have been held and changes made to the proposal to satisfy requests and requirements of residents. Following detail discussion with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that there is no right turn permitted from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  The post-implementation monitoring will assess junction performance (regarding traffic congestion) and changes in traffic flow on residential streets. This will itself provide an indication of any changes to air quality.  There is a strategy in place to monitor all changes made post-construction in order to observe the changes to the area and review accordingly.
56.	I am writing to ask in the strongest terms that you save Balcombe Street from the proposals you have made that will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn	Two rounds of consultation have been held and changes made to the proposal to satisfy requests and requirements of residents. Following detail discussion with resident group representatives and consideration of

NO. (Names	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF	
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (west). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester	alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that there is no
	Place to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway.	right turn permitted from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place.
	Please may we propose an alternative:	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic
	Ivor Place west to be one-way in an easterly direction.  Townton Manual to be one-way in a constant of the state of t	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester
	<ul> <li>Taunton Mews to be one-way in a westerly direction.</li> <li>AND MOST IMPORTANTLY no right turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and</li> </ul>	Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	Dorset Square.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	At present our few streets experience an extraordinary lack of passing traffic that allows our children to play in	The seheme has been designed to be (conseity poutral). This means that in general there is not expected to be
	the street, for us to walk to schools and shops and breathe relatively exhaust-free air. My daughter suffers from chronic asthma, and her suffering increases significantly as we approach the Marylebone Road. Her bedroom	The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads. The traffic
	gives directly onto Balcombe Street. The only traffic that uses our streets is residential or delivery as there is no	modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction
	cut through that will speed up a commute.	effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active
	If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for stressed and frustrated drivers	Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause
	veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway. Please preserve one of	the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.
	the few central London streets where cars occasionally drop off a resident and children and residents use the street to socialise.	The post monitoring strategy will be robust. It is a tested way of observing and measuring the effect and impact
	Street to socialise.	of what is implemented. It helps to reveal what aims have been achieved and efforts can be concentrated on
	The proposal to monitor the effect of your changes AFTER THEY HAVE BEEN MADE is very distressing. There can	other amendments that can be made to improve on the proposal.
	be no justification for pursuing it other than an unwillingness to take our plight into account.	
57.	With reference to your letter to residents of 14 <sup>th</sup> November I would like to make the following comments as you	Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accident across the study area in order to identify
	have suggested. Since the practical outcomes of changes as proposed by the above scheme will only be known after implementation I will make just two general comments:	any particular trends and determine the likely impacts of the scheme on road safety. The results concludes that the number, type and severity of collisions that will occur in the two-way system will be reduced compared to
	My expectation is that Baker Street and Gloucester Place will remain busy roads and that there is likely to be	the two parallel, 3 lane one way streets with high speeds and overtaking opportunities. The accident analysis
	a consequent increase in pedestrian accidents as a result of cars approaching from two directions instead of	report assures drivers in single lane environments are less likely to be distracted by other vehicles and
	one. 2. From experience of other areas and past experiments elsewhere it is likely that retail businesses will suffer	pedestrians crossings in slow moving traffic will have fewer opportunities to step out from a stationary lane into a faster moving lane where they may be unseen by drivers. In treated sites with safer features, such as
	from reduced accessibility arising from the proposed car stopping restrictions.	countdown at pedestrian crossing sites, the reports states that it is reasonable to expect collision rates to go
	As for an any own area if a great interest is compared to an advice that there are a deal of Children County which	down to a level below the borough average.
	As far as my own specific area of interest is concerned, I can advise that I am a resident of Chiltern Court which has access for both people and goods only from Baker Street. It would appear from your proposals that there	Westminster City Council has been working with retail businesses in the Baker Street area, including the Baker
	will no longer be any stopping allowed outside the block by cars or any vehicles other than buses. Bearing in	Street Quarter Partnership, to establish parking, loading and servicing requirements for all types of businesses
	mind that there are 150 flats in Chiltern Court the most of the residents of which have frequent requirements for	and residents. Their input has been used to create the proposed consultation plans. As a general principle, the
	deliveries, guests, families with luggage arriving and departing, plus a constant level of occupiers moving in and out over the year not to mention disabled access requirements for some from the roadside, it would seem that	two-way roads would increase local accessibility although the availability of loading provision will be affected.  However, residents and businesses will still be able to use side roads to undertake their loading requirements
	your proposals will seriously impair residents' ability to live there.	and at certain points along Gloucester Place and Baker Street.
	I note that there are extensive spaces being allocated to bus stops. If buses are allowed to stop then I do not see	The two-way roads would actually increase local accessibility and some degree of parking will still be available
	why cars cannot also be allowed to stop in just the same way for access to and from Chiltern Court.	albeit not to the same level as existing. Residents and businesses will be able to use side roads and loading provision along Gloucester Place and Baker Street.
	I note the slightly fatuous comment at the end of your letter that the City Council is keen that we discuss our	
	needs with delivery and courier companies. As I am sure you will appreciate, the implication that this is somehow a valuable suggestion to solve the problem is totally unrealistic.	The existing loading provision for Chiltern Court on Baker Street is retained to ensure that these loading activities can be undertaken. Based on concerns raised during the first consultation, the "set down and pick up" box has
	and a randal of days and the problem is totally an ounsile.	been included in the design which was shown indicatively on the drawings published as part of the second
		consultation. This box is shown north of the proposed bus stop close to the Baker Street/ Melcombe Street
		junction. The location of this box has been decided after careful consideration of various factors. Under the

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,		proposed scheme, it would not be possible to keep this at its current location due to its impact on the functioning of the Baker Street / Marylebone Road junction.
		Turictioning of the baker street / Ivial ylebone Road junction.
		It is important to achieve a balance on the network especially as there is a high bus demand in the area. Ample loading facilities are retained in the area for residents to use as in the current situation. Due to its close proximity to the Baker Street / Marylebone Road junction, it is important that adequate space is provided to buses for dropping and picking up passengers in front of a very busy tube station. We have ensured that the facility is still retained, just 15m north of the current location.
58.	We are writing to ask in the strongest terms that you save the Dorset Square Conservation Area from the	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic
	proposals that have the potential to destroy the character and community of our neighbourhood. Unlike many parts of central London this area has a settled community, people live here all the time, with many families, children and babies. No one has a garden and our kids have always been able to play out on the streets which	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	are currently safe as vehicular access is restricted to prevent through traffic.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	Currently the plans show a potential north to west turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (west). This will allow vehicles to avoid Baker Street to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and	
	onto the Westway. We hope that this potential cut through can be designed out by the following changes:	
	<ul> <li>Ivor Place west to be one-way in an easterly direction.</li> <li>Taunton Mews to be one-way in a westerly direction</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>AND MOST IMPORTANTLY no right turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset Square.</li> </ul>	
59.	I am writing to ask in the strongest terms that you save Balcombe Street from the proposals you have made that	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic
	will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (west). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway.	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	Please may we propose an alternative:	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	Please may we propose an alternative:  • Ivor Place west to be one-way in an easterly direction.	implement further measures if required.
	Taunton Mews to be one-way in a westerly direction.	Coach movements remain largely the same as existing, with northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and
	<ul> <li>AND MOST IMPORTANTLY no right turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset Square.</li> </ul>	southbound on Baker Street. The coach and bus stop locations have been developed with TfL and careful consideration has been given to the location of stops to service both Baker Street and Marylebone Stations.
	At present our few streets experience an extraordinary lack of passing traffic that allows our children to play in the street, for us to walk to schools and shops and breathe relatively exhaust-free air. My bedroom faces directly onto Balcombe Street. At present I can ventilate the bedroom by keeping this window slightly ajar but this will no longer be possible if the proposed route goes ahead. The only traffic that currently uses our streets is residential or delivery as there is no cut through that will speed up a commute.	The air quality impact assessment 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.
	If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for stressed and frustrated drivers	experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme.
	veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway.	The post monitoring strategy will be robust. It is a tested way of observing and measuring the effect and impact of what is implemented. It helps to reveal what aims have been achieved and efforts can be concentrated on
	The proposal to monitor the effect of your changes AFTER THEY HAVE BEEN MADE is not in accordance with sound policy-making. This is hardly a form of appropriate, meaningful or adequate consultation that should be expected of a council that purports to take its residents lives and views into account. There is no justification for this.	other amendments that can be made to improve on the proposal.
	Please preserve one of the few central London streets where community life still thrives.	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
60.	<ul> <li>I am disappointed to notice that WCC carries on this project despite opposition from concerned citizens. While giving back Marylebone to its inhabitants is a loadable goal I fail to understand how this project will improve the current situation.</li> <li>General points:         <ul> <li>Marylebone is a densely populated area and as such heavy good vehicles should not be allowed inc. on Marylebone Road, Baker Street and Gloucester Place. I support the proposal of declassifying them to B roads.</li> <li>I appreciated that buses are on schedule but they drive far too fast and too close to the pavements - cyclists should have a number plate as they are totally disrespectful of pedestrians and run away even after having knocked people down.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Specific comments on the area:         <ul> <li>The pedestrian crossing of Gloucester place just north of Marylebone Road is extremely dangerous, as vehicles turning left from Marylebone road do so at high speed even if pedestrians are already engaged in crossing. Having their back to traffic they cannot see the incoming cars. Making Gloucester Place two-way will make it virtually impossible to cross. A traffic light is indispensable there.</li> <li>Another problematic place is the pedestrian crossing of Melcombe Place in front of Marylebone Station. At peak time the constant flow of pedestrians coroce ars to wait a long time and some force their way through. This also increases congestion. A traffic light there would be useful.</li> <li>The Landmark hotel seems to have been given permission to have deliveries on Harewood Avenue despite the double yellow lines. This is an unacceptable favouritism and creates congestion in the area (up to 2-3 streets each side).</li> <li>There is a no left turn from Marylebone Road (coming from west) into Balcombe street: not sure this is justified.</li> </ul> </li> <li>I hope that you will take my comments</li></ul>	A formal crossing is being provided to facilitate safe crossing of Gloucester Place.  Improvements to the pedestrian route along the north side of Melcombe Street is expected to reduce the volume of pedestrians crossing at Marylebone Station. WCC seeks to minimise the growth in traffic signal control, because this introduces potentially unnecessary delay outside the peak hours.  Loading along Harewood Avenue is unaltered under the BS2W proposals.  The left turn prohibition is an existing arrangement, which facilitates a green man signal crossing over Balcombe Street. It is not proposed to alter this under the BS2W scheme.  All comments received have been carefully considered by the Project Team.
61.	We are disappointed to see that the 2 way final consultation plans have failed to take heed of the main concerns of residents of the Dorset Square conservation area. We remain concerned that the existing plans allow for the development of a rat run in this wholly residential conservation area with a high risk of creating excessive noise and air pollution. This will considerably jeopardise our quality of life and our health. We wish to draw your attention to the deleterious effects of air pollution on health outlined in the recent report published by the Royal College of Physicians and Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. Further, we would like to know what considerations have been given in this respect to the discussions and recommendations emerging from the Government appointed advisory group, the "Committee on the medical effect of air pollutants" in residential areas such as the Dorset Square area (https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/committee-on-the-medical-effects-of-airpollutants-comeap).  We once again ask that the following changes and considerations be made to the existing plans:  1. Ivor Place one-way heading west so as to allow a way out of the Dorset Square area.  2. Taunton / Huntsworth Mews be made one-way to allow people into this area.  3. Ban a right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.  4. Careful monitoring of air quality before any changes are made in order to be able to be able to assess the impact of the proposed changes.  We trust that this time our concerns will be taken seriously at this final consultation.	The air quality impact assessment 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.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
62.	We are writing to ask in the strongest terms that you save our street from the proposals you have made that will destroy its character. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (west). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway.  The proposal to monitor the effect of your changes AFTER THEY HAVE BEEN MADE is very distressing. There can be no justification for pursuing it other than an unwillingness to take our plight into account.  Please let us propose an alternative:  Ivor Place west to be one-way in an easterly direction.  Taunton Mews to be one-way in a westerly direction.  AND MOST IMPORTANTLY no right turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset Square.  Today our few streets experience an extraordinary lack of passing traffic that fosters a strong sense of community. Children play on the street, and it's a joy to see their after school chalking sessions, and watch them roller-skating up and down the street. Most of the neighbours know each other, and we can stand outside and visit. The only traffic that uses our streets is residential or delivery as there is no cut through that will speed up a commute. If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for stressed and frustrated drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway more quickly. I'm sure they will speed through the neighbourhood, making it both unpleasant and dangerous for residents.  Please preserve one of the few central London streets where cars occasionally drop off a resident and children and residents use the street to socialise.	Two rounds of consultation have been held and changes made to the proposals following responses received.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  It is not considered that the proposals on Gloucester Place and Baker Street will change the sense of community felt by residents.
63.	<ol> <li>I am writing in order to object to aspects of the proposed Two-Way scheme as it concerns access to Balcombe Street and Ivor Place. I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce one-way working westbound in Ivor Place between Gloucester Place and Huntsworth Mews for the following reasons:</li> <li>Together with the proposed southbound right turn from Gloucester Place, this proposal risks introducing a 'rat run' through Balcombe Street for traffic trying to turn right onto the Marylebone Road.</li> <li>The proposed change to one-way traffic on Ivor Place will restrict our options for leaving Balcombe Street by car when travelling north and east.</li> <li>I do not think that a dedicated cycle lane on Ivor Place, which is currently a very quiet residential street, should be necessary – always assuming that there is no anticipated increase in traffic!</li> <li>In summary, I would propose that either:</li> <li>No changes are made to the current traffic use in Ivor Place and that the right turn for southbound traffic from Gloucester Place is disallowed; or</li> <li>Ivor Place is made one-way eastwards and Taunton Mews one-way westwards.</li> </ol>	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration.  The cycle lane provides a quiet facility for cyclists linking their route into Regent's Park.
64.	Requested paper copies.	Paper copies sent in post with covering letter on 06/12/16.
65.	I've read the documentation relating to Traffic Management Proposals with a deadline for responses of December 9 <sup>th</sup> - there are 2 points which I raised in the last consultation which still appear unattended to:  1. with XXXXX on the lack of appreciation that any traffic increase in Porter Street, as you have stated there will be, will mean that Chiltern Street is affected as access to Porter Street is chiefly through Chiltern Street.	Traffic displacement from Paddington Street to Porter Street is not anticipated as general traffic is not estimated to use Chiltern Street - Porter Street - Baker Street as a route northbound, but Crawford Street - Gloucester Place instead. Traffic signal timings and general restrictions will make traffic choose Gloucester Place for all north-south general movements, while Baker Street will attract local traffic.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	Chiltern Street and Porter Street are intensely residential with 120 Portman Mansions' flats plus The Chilterns plus Chiltern Place plus individual dwellings - I am still greatly concerned that traffic displacement into Porter Street from Paddington Street reassignment (which means Chiltern Street) is going to badly diminish the residential quality of life.  2. with XXXXX when there was an e-petition for an extension to the residential parking hours in Chiltern Street due to the activities at the bottom end of the street (Chiltern Firehouse) see the email trail below - this was put on hold because of the Baker Street Two-Way project - all documentation for the proposed Baker Street changes continues to show 8.30 p.m. as the cut off for residents' parking - i.e. now the Project has progressed this far there seems to be no return to considering this e-petition?  3. It's hard to tell from the extensive documentation whether F Zone residents' car spaces are being lost overall across the entire scheme-please can someone elucidate?	Regarding the volume of traffic using Chiltern Street and Porter Street as a rat-run to avoid the Baker Street - Marylebone Road junction. This is an existing issue that has been taken into account in the traffic modelling for the scheme. Evidence shows very low rat-run at this location and although the Baker Street model observed more movements in Porter Street westbound than eastbound, the difference was minimal. A slight traffic increase in Porter Street could be occurring although in very low numbers.  Post implementation traffic monitoring will be targeted at this location and traffic movements will be reviewed if necessary. If traffic volume increases at Chiltern Street.  The request to extend the hours of control has been captured as part of a wider parking initiative. The City Council will commence a comprehensive review of all of its Resident Parking Zones and their controls in late Spring and this concern will become part of that process.
	and an	It was confirmed that there will be no overall change to the number of residents' parking places in F Zone.
66.	Requested paper copies.	Paper copies sent in post with covering letter on 15/12/16.
67.	<ol> <li>The proposal, as part of the plans for two-way traffic in Baker Street and Gloucester Place, to install motorcycle parking on the west side of Park Street between Oxford Street and North Row is misguided in two respects:</li> <li>Impact on through traffic.         Park Street carries an enormous amount of traffic northwards both from south Mayfair and from Park Lane via Upper Brook Street. Whenever the carriageway is blocked and the number of lanes reduced the impact is immediate and serious tailbacks happen.</li></ol>	BS2W prohibits left turns from Park Street onto Oxford Street to facilitate pedestrians crossing. Left turn flow is low but dominates the left turn lane, it can be reassigned onto alternative routes. Motorcycle parking is relocated from Portman Square, in order to maintain current levels of provision.  The proposal will be amended to retain a section of loading area outside the flats on Park Street. Loading is also permitted from North Row, which is within a very short walking distance of the flats. Taxis will be permitted to stop on the east side of Park Street, or at the short section of loading area to the south of the motorcycle parking. The motorcycle parking is at a premium in central London but an alternative location is been investigated to ensure the overall numbers of bays is retained.
	anyone except a few motorcyclists. Please note also that there is already provision within very close proximity for motorcycle parking in North Row, Red Place and Green Street.  Faced with this situation it is perfectly conceivable that some delivery firms will simply refuse to service our building.	
68.	I have not heard from anyone within the Project Team. The consultation ends 9 <sup>th</sup> December. It is essential that they respond urgently to the issues raised otherwise this will affect the validity of the consultation findings.	A response was sent to XXXXX on 06/12/2016.
69.	I am raising objections to the Baker Street 2 way project. I have previously raised objections with many others in our area about the changes which will allow traffic from the north into Ivor Place from where it can cut through via Boston Place, Balcombe Street and Linhope Street to get to Marylebone Station and onwards to the Westway.	The Project Team is now considering banning the right turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place. The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration.  The cycle lane provides a quiet facility for cyclists linking their route into Regent's Park.
	I have lived at XXXXX for 53 years which is a quiet residential area with many small children and has always been spared quantities of through traffic which this scheme will unleash to the detriment of everyone.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Williams	Also having attended planning consultation meetings where the clear impression was given that this issue was understood and would be attended to I am shocked to see that it is still in the plan.  While you plan to monitor the proposed routes I think it should protect this quiet residential neighbourhood in the first instance, from becoming a rat run.  Rather than 'wait and see' I want the road layout designed from the outset to prevent this possibility occurring as 'water flows downhill' so traffic will always seek out a quicker short-cut. I would therefore urge you to make the following changes:  Ivor Place (west) to be one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood.  Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood.  A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
70.	As a resident of XXXXXX I have been made aware of the potential of a motorcycle bay being put on Park Street directly outside the building I live in. I am surprised that this is being considered for multiple reasons:  1. The traffic that is already caused when a car stops outside the building creates a back log that runs most of Park Street. As a driver I would say at least 3 of 7 nights in rush hour the back-up takes at least 10 minutes to drive down. You are effectively going to create that situation constantly. This to me seems totally unproductive for the entire area.  2. If this situation is created there will be nowhere feasible for a lorry or van to stop at any time when dropping something or someone off. Primark sits behind on the other side on North Row and takes up most of the yellow line space with their lorries. Having just completed a refurbishment I can testify to how difficult things have been in the property with access directly outside. With this removed I think you would make the situation almost impossible. This is clearly very unfair to the current residents.  3. Finally and my biggest concern is the general effect you are creating for current residents of XXXXX. This area with Primark is already rife with litter and ridiculous noise from so many people being in such a small space. Add to this the noise of unloading at the back on North Row which goes on constantly. There is simply no space in an already highly congested area. To add to this by putting cycle parking seems like an addition which will put this stretch of road at breaking point. On a more serious note I would seriously look at trying to make this area less cluttered as currently I constantly see so many people putting themselves in dangerous situation with Primark so congested and the subsequent spill over with the general oxford street population.  I am a XXXXX who has no concern for general noise or overcrowding but there are clearly more important concerns here compared to a motorcycle bay and safety surely must be paramount	
71.	I am writing to endorse my neighbour's, suggestions that the scheme that is put in place re Balcombe Street contains the elements highlighted below. My reasoning is not just that of wholly selfish continued enjoyment of an unusually traffic free environment, which may not sway you, but that the notable congestion of traffic in the broader area is not going to be eased but rather added to. The suggestion below has merit in that a right turn towards the station forecourt would merely transform Balcombe Street, Ivor Place and Boston Place into slowly moving emission-emitting(!) traffic jams the scheme below makes considerable sense:  • Ivor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction.  • Taunton Mews to be one-way in a westerly direction.  • AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, no right turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	At present these few streets support one of the most extraordinary environments left in London. Children from neighbouring households and from families with a great range of background / household income play hopscotch and run in happy playing groups up and down the streets. It could be a model of what an inner city area could and should be like and I would greatly commend any Council which recognised that. I am not a parent but wish dearly that a child of mine could enjoy such a safe, socially mixed and free environment.  If the proposals go ahead, our network of streets will become not so much a rat run for stressed and frustrated drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway as a slowly moving parking lot of stressed and frustrated people seeking to cut out Gloucester Place. Nightmare for all concerned.  I agree that the proposal to monitor the effect of your changes AFTER THEY HAVE BEEN MADE is very distressing and must be worthy of review. There can be no justification for pursuing it other than an unwillingness to take our plight into account.	
72.	In conjunction with my previous email a few examples just tonight. Someone has been sick and it has been there since lunch, rubbish everywhere - surely this is the type of thing the council should be attending too in this area.	Noted.
73.	I am writing to ask that you save Balcombe Street from the inevitable traffic rat run that will ensue after the changes have been made to Baker Street, I attended ALL of the community liaison group sessions and it seemed that all parties were happy to implement a NO RIGHT TURN from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (West). Having seen the plans, this has obviously been scrapped.  I am not appealing to you because I don't like change. I am appealing as someone who has lived in this area for 15 years and am fully aware of the driving habits of those eager to reach their destination. Our neighbouring streets - in a conservation area - house many children who play on these streets and walk to school. The inevitable rat run that will occur when people lose patience waiting to turn right from Gloucester Place onto Melcombe Place / Dorset Square will utterly destroy our community.  I would like to respectfully suggest an alternative which will in no way affect your plans, but will protect our community. The two-way scheme is something that local residents were not in favour of, but given that we are powerless to stop it going ahead - may I appeal to your social conscience.  The proposal is as follows:  I vor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction.  Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction.  And most importantly - to avoid a rat run - no right turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset Square.  Please don't let this close-knit community suffer in the same way that others have in our beautiful city.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .  Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation. Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.  It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets;  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;  Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;  Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions.  Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
		Improved local accessibility will help emergency services as more traffic movements will be permitted than currently are.
74.	I wholeheartedly disapprove of any attempt to alter the current traffic flow. The proposals will make an already congested area even more congested with no advantage to anyone. Traffic will be worse, there will be no benefit to pedestrians who will suffer from the fumes of the increased congestion & businesses will suffer too. Whoever dreamed up these idiotic proposals should be moved to another department. There was a time when Baker Street & Gloucester Place had two-way traffic flow; they were made one-way to improve the flow, which worked. Now the proposal is to go back in time & make things worse again. Outrageous, idiotic & unworkable. It will cause chaos.	The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads. The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.
75.	I share the St. Marylebone Society's concerns regarding the possible rat run in near Huntsworth Mews, please work with them to find a optimal solution. Additionally, I trust that as promised, post implementation metrics will be taken and necessary adjustments made in order to insure traffic and pollution on residential roads do not increase.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	Outside of that, I have no objections to the scheme as presented.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
76.	As a resident, I have received the consultation papers relating to the Baker Street two-way project, I also work on Wigmore street and the use the streets under consideration everyday – as a driver and pedestrian.  As a general comment, having read your reasoning for the introduction of two-way traffic, I do not agree that it is an problem, particularly as due to the bus lanes and parking on the streets, it is effectively only one lane for vehicles anyway, introducing two-way traffic is going to greatly increase congestion particularly if you are stuck behind a bus. Lights will also be longer, for example at the junction of Baker Street with Wigmore Street, there are only two phases of the lights, then a period for pedestrian crossing. If cars can go two-way on Baker Street, there will need to be four phases. This means many waiting time at the lights, and fower are pessing each time.	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.  Regarding concerns expressed about lane width, we are proposing standard lane widths and do not expect any problems in large vehicles using these. These lane widths are designed for buses and large commercial vehicles.
	there will need to be four phases. This means more waiting time at the lights, and fewer cars passing each time. Alternatively, much longer waiting times for pedestrians. What are your proposals to combat this?  As a pedestrian, I think the proposals will be more dangerous than current layout, for example at the junction of Seymour Street and Portman Street, there is currently one crossing which is manned by a green / red man light – allowing you cross from Wigmore to Seymour Street. You are able to cross the other three streets using common sense because there is only one-way of traffic on Portman Street and you can judge the lights. If you introduce two-way - pedestrians will have to navigate more traffic at all directions with absolutely no assistance. If you are going to do it, you need to put in pedestrian crossing lights for the whole junction.  I do not understand the need for restrictions on turning onto Oxford Street from Orchard Street and Portman Street. Both are already a nightmare, introducing further restrictions – including for black cabs – will add more congestion and a more circuitous route to get to Grosvenor Square, for instance.	Adequate pedestrian crossing is retained at all signal control junctions and the principle of crossing the road will be no different to any other two-way road in the area. It should be noted at this location, in the proposed scheme, green man crossing will be provided on all four arms of Seymour Street / Portman Street junction. This would greatly improve the pedestrian facilities from existing and would ensure that pedestrians can cross the junction in every direction safely.  This is to effectively manage the network better, with the volume of traffic expected here it is not possible to allow all the movement without gridlocking the junctions. Extensive traffic modelling has been undertaken to test these proposals and guide which movements are permitted where.
77.	I am writing to let you know that while I broadly support the amended proposals I feel that there are a few improvements that could be implemented to protect the interests of residents further.  Specifically, in Zones 1 & 2, there is still a potential "rat run" cut through from Gloucester Place into the western section of Ivor Place and from there via Linhope Street, Balcombe Street or Boston Place towards a right-hand	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to
	westbound turn at the junction of Harewood Avenue and Marylebone Road.  I believe a better solution would be to make the western section of Ivor Place one-way eastbound (opposite to	implement further measures if required.

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
	the current proposal) and correspondingly, Taunton Mews/Huntsworth Mews one-way westbound while simultaneously removing the right-hand turn at Harewood Avenue.	
	This would ensure that residents in these zones do not suffer adversely additional traffic, noise and air pollution.	
78.	<ul> <li>This proposal would amend the flow of traffic to make it two-way in Baker Street and Gloucester Place. I am objecting to the part of the proposal which would install motorcycle parking on the west side of Park Street between North Row and Oxford Street for two reasons:</li> <li>Park Street is a very busy road and takes an enormous amount of traffic from South Mayfair across Oxford Street. There are always traffic tailbacks and at times Park Street is blocked down beyond Upper Brook Street. Please come and take a look. It would be stupid beyond comprehension to block off one of the three lanes as Park Street approaches Oxford Street. I guess it won't be long before more tax payer's money will have to be spent to reverse the error.</li> <li>Secondly, New Hereford House (40 Flats) and the Ask Restaurant next door receive many visitors and many deliveries. The proposed motorcycle parking is right outside New Hereford House and will block off the kerb. As a result deliveries and drop offs will not be able to take place safely. This will seriously and adversely affect the lives of the residents and visitors.</li> <li>There is perfectly adequate motorcycle parking within 200 yards. But if for some reason you believe more is required why not situate it in North Row near to Red Place which has none of the disadvantages of the site identified.</li> </ul>	The proposal will be amended to retain a section of loading area outside the flats on Park Street. Loading is also permitted from North Row, which is within a very short walking distance of the flats. Taxis will be permitted to stop on the east side of Park Street, or at the short section of loading area to the south of the motorcycle parking. The motorcycle parking is at a premium in central London but an alternative location is been investigated to ensure the overall numbers of bays is retained.
79.	I have just opened the plans of the proposals, naturally I looked first at the ones that covered the street I live in – XXXXX – and noticed that it is incorrect. What chances are there that the remaining plans are correct! Has this process been properly audited? Please confirm.	Unfortunately, there was an error on the drawing, which has been rectified. During the detailed design stage, any minor errors will be addressed, but this does not significantly affect the Traffic Order consultation process.
80.	We are not in favour of the scheme. We are not in favour of changing the current arrangements, losing residential parking, pay and display parking or loading bay parking or any changes to times when those bays are in operation.  We are also against the two-way scheme.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
81.	<ol> <li>I would like to object to the councils proposal to install motorcycle parking on the West side of Park Street between Oxford Street and North Row for the following reasons</li> <li>This will reduce the road from three to two lanes causing long tailbacks and congestion in Park street before the traffic lights at the junction of Oxford Street. This area is already very busy with standing traffic and this lane reduction will make it worse and making the air pollution even worse than it is at the moment.</li> <li>There is already adequate provision of motorcycle parking in the near vicinity at North Row, Green Street and</li> </ol>	The proposal will be amended to retain a section of loading area outside the flats on Park Street. Loading is also permitted from North Row, which is within a very short walking distance of the flats. Taxis will be permitted to stop on the east side of Park Street, or at the short section of loading area to the south of the motorcycle parking. The motorcycle parking is at a premium in central London but an alternative location is been investigated to ensure the overall numbers of bays is retained.

withheld)  82. We do vicin some cons  1. F	Red Place. The proposed parking will be right outside the 42 flats at New Hereford House and the ASK restaurant. There will be problems for deliveries to these addresses and people getting into or out of cars and taxies.  e object to the proposed BSTW Scheme, as we have a real concern that the residential neighbourhoods in the cinity of the Baker Street / Gloucester Place two-way realignment will see a considerable increase in traffic – me of which your studies have already predicted. If the scheme does go ahead, we would request that you nsider one the following alternatives to mitigate this impact:  Restrict all residential and surrounding side streets to a 20mph speed limit but allow the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors to have a higher speed limit to encourage use of the main thoroughfares and deter rat runs through the residential neighbourhoods. Provide strict speed enforcement through highly visible cameras and camera signs.  Incorporate traffic calming / management in the residential and adjacent side streets, particularly on north / south streets to deter rat runs.	This area will be monitored as part of the post-implementation strategy and mitigation measures implemented if required. The suggested measures are noted.
82. We do vicin some cons	The proposed parking will be right outside the 42 flats at New Hereford House and the ASK restaurant. There will be problems for deliveries to these addresses and people getting into or out of cars and taxies.  e object to the proposed BSTW Scheme, as we have a real concern that the residential neighbourhoods in the cinity of the Baker Street / Gloucester Place two-way realignment will see a considerable increase in traffic – me of which your studies have already predicted. If the scheme does go ahead, we would request that you nisider one the following alternatives to mitigate this impact:  Restrict all residential and surrounding side streets to a 20mph speed limit but allow the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors to have a higher speed limit to encourage use of the main thoroughfares and deter rat runs through the residential neighbourhoods. Provide strict speed enforcement through highly visible cameras and camera signs.  Incorporate traffic calming / management in the residential and adjacent side streets, particularly on north / south streets to deter rat runs.	
vicin some cons 1. F  2. I  3. F	cinity of the Baker Street / Gloucester Place two-way realignment will see a considerable increase in traffic – me of which your studies have already predicted. If the scheme does go ahead, we would request that you nsider one the following alternatives to mitigate this impact:  Restrict all residential and surrounding side streets to a 20mph speed limit but allow the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors to have a higher speed limit to encourage use of the main thoroughfares and deter rat runs through the residential neighbourhoods. Provide strict speed enforcement through highly visible cameras and camera signs.  Incorporate traffic calming / management in the residential and adjacent side streets, particularly on north / south streets to deter rat runs.	
	Restrict commercial traffic in the residential and surrounding side streets with highly visible cameras and camera signs to enforce the commercial restriction.  /ould appreciate a reply to these suggestions directly or in the next round of proposals.	
we very load.  As brighter a material and a materia	ith reference to the Baker Street Two-Way Scheme, consultation on parking and loading, reference 7149/AJ, a would like to lodge our formal opposition to the ill-conceived plans put forward in respect of parking and ading in this scheme.  business owners we note that you intend to lose the current six parking spaces immediately adjacent to our emises between Crawford Street and Dorset Street and to replace them with two loading only bays – limited to maximum 20 minutes waiting time. We would strongly object to this and other changes on several points:  The current parking spaces are already inadequate to service the requirements of the existing businesses, with often all available space in constant use throughout the day. Local businesses are likely to suffer greatly from their loss.  The loss of Chiltern street car park has put local parking at full capacity and the inevitable loss of parking at nearby Moxon Street, where building is soon to commence will bring untold strain on local parking. The aim of the project was to "transform Baker Street and Gloucester Place into pleasant streets where people can get about easily and safely, relax and spend time". Whilst that is a utopian dream, encouraging visitors into the side streets in search of parking will make it less pleasant and less safe for all, especially residents and pedestrians users of the many side streets. We fear this will be an inevitable consequence of these proposed changes.  The proposal to make Baker Street no stopping at any time other than at designated spaces will bring an unnecessary economic burden to local and surrounding business who rely on the innumerable of customers who park on the current single yellow lines all day Sunday and evenings after restrictions are lifted. We do not believe you have measured, considered or given enough credence to this loss and would ask you to undertake an immediate survey and calculation of the impact this will have on the local economy. It might be salient to point out that business rates are soon to ris	A new loading pad has been introduced at this location which allows loading "at any time" for a maximum of 20 minutes. In addition, two new pay-by-phone bays have been introduced at Montagu Place.  Extensive survey, data collection and analysis has been undertaken to develop these proposals. This information has been used in the traffic models. If parking and loading activities were allowed on Baker Street as it is now, it would not make for an efficient network. It would create bottle necks and overall delay to general traffic and bus passengers.  This request will be passed on the City Council for consideration as it is beyond the scope of the Project Team to grant this dispensation in a singular location.  The Project Team have considered this request but have been unable to increase the size of the loading provision.

NO. (Names	DECDONICE	DDO JECT TEAMA DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	<ul> <li>time" except loading max 20 min's. If this is to be, whilst we recognise a need for disabled parking, we would hope that these bays would not allow 3 hours parking for disabled users as many Westminster loading bays do; but other adequate disabled parking be made available to allow the maximum number of users of these proposed bays and not tie them up for longer periods than necessary.</li> <li>5. Pertaining to point 4, if it is possible to provide two loading bays at this juncture it would be perfectly possible to provide three, four or even five without impacting the traffic flow. We would ask you to consider additional bays as we believe it would lessen disruption to the local business' who form the greatest attraction to incoming visitors wishing to relax and spend time in the vicinity, and whose numbers are likely to increase once the considerable, redevelopment between Blandford Street and George Street is undertaken.</li> </ul>	
84.	Further to your note, perhaps you would ask your colleagues in brief what they perceive to be the actual advantages to road users of making Baker Street and Gloucester Place each two-way. No one that we speak to who actually occupies space here can understand the reasoning behind these unfortunate proposals.  Indeed more one-way streets are needed in this area to allow free flow of traffic for example, Paddington Street, Blandford Street, George Street, Chiltern Street etc. The parking bays for bicycles take up space and there really is no room for two-way traffic on most of the streets east and west of Gloucester Place and Baker Street.  We submit that the existing one-way streets are maintained to avoid further delays, congestion and pollution and that where possible the side streets are also made one-way.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
85.	We wish to add to the objections previously stated regarding the above to point out that if you walk down any time of the day and frequently there are scaffolding, builders and rubbish collection lorries which completely block up one lane and cause tremendous traffic jams already which will only get worse with one/two lanes less. We don't believe that anyone actually does a walk-about to oversee these possible problems and they should do so regularly.  We cross Gloucester Place most days of the week and never find it a problem.	The two-way proposal actually makes both roads more accessible. The servicing of side roads has been adjusted to ensure that traffic still flows following the implementation of the two-way.
86.	With reference to the traffic management consultation process I would like the following points to be considered:	This restriction is between 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m., the volume of traffic within this period predicted by the model has helped shaped the proposal. The restriction will ensure effective traffic flow without causing congestion on either Baker Street or Gloucester Place.
	<ol> <li>Gloucester Place: Routing all northbound traffic from York Street up Gloucester Place is totally unacceptable.         As this would be a major intrusion on residents. Gloucester Place is primarily residential and northbound traffic should be shared equally between Baker Street and Gloucester Place.</li> <li>Coaches: Again, bearing in mind the residential nature of Gloucester Place and Dorset Square, the fulcrum of the Dorset Square Conservation Area, siting a coach stop in the specified vicinity is quite illogical. The</li> </ol>	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Withheld)	majority of individuals who make use of coach transport to airports and other destinations look to Baker Street as the boarding point and this is where the coach stops should be situated. If, for any reason this is not possible, the current coach stop outside the pub in Gloucester place should be retained. Also, it should be borne in mind that unlike buses, coaches tend to take time to board and keep their engines running for long periods, thus greatly adding to the pollution problem in our already vastly over-polluted area.  3. Residents' Parking: Parking in the Dorset Square area is at a premium and the proposal to reduce residents' parking places is also quite unacceptable. Under no circumstances should there be less than four residents' places on the south side of Dorset Square.	Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.  On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.  Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on
		Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.  It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on
		Gloucester Place.  There is no change in residents' parking on the north side of Dorset Square. On the south side, most of the residents' parking bays are being relocated across the road.
87.	<ol> <li>Object to several elements of the two-way scheme in its current form.</li> <li>Objection to coach traffic on Gloucester Place. I object strongly to the presence of north and southbound coach traffic on Gloucester Place for the following reasons:         <ul> <li>Fails to deliver improvement to public realm: One of the stated aims of the scheme is to deliver a public transport system that makes more sense to users. Most coach passengers are seeking to interchange with Baker Street station, so ALL coach traffic should travel along Baker Street.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	The air quality impact assessment 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.
	<ul> <li>Increased pollution/negative impact on environment: Coach traffic is more heavily polluting than the bus traffic it replaces. Southbound coaches queuing at the proposed traffic lights at Melcombe Street will pump fumes into ground floor and basement residences.</li> </ul>	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts.
	It would make more sense to instruct all coach traffic (northbound and southbound) to use the primarily commercial Baker Street. It is noteworthy that all coach operators designate the Gloucester Place stop as Baker Street on their tickets and websites: this suggests that Baker Street is the obvious, known and	There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
	convenient routing for passengers once two-way traffic operation is introduced.  2. Objection to coach stop near residential buildings: I object strongly to the presence of a coach stop north of	Coach movements remain largely the same as existing with northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street. The coach and bus stop have been developed with TfL and careful consideration has been given to their location to service both Baker Street and Marylebone Rail Station.
	Melcombe Street as it will increase pollution for residents. Coaches stand at coach stops with engines running for prolonged periods, much longer than buses. This is unacceptable close to residents of ground	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
	level and basement flats. If coaches are going to run on Gloucester Place, the current siting of coach stops between Marylebone Road and Melcombe Street should be adequate.	However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.
	3. Objection to northbound traffic restrictions on Baker Street north of York Street. I object strongly to the proposal that Baker Street north of York Street should only be open northbound to buses, taxis and cycles for most of the day. This will push all other northbound traffic onto Gloucester Place. In the absence of reciprocal southbound traffic restrictions on Gloucester Place, this will lead to unacceptably high volumes of traffic in Gloucester Place north of York Street, a primarily residential stretch of road. This will increase pollution and have a negative impact on quality of life for residents.	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.
		Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.
		On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.
		Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
		Traffic modelling undertaken for the development of these proposals has taken this restriction into account. The table showing changes to traffic flow includes this restriction and shows that there is no noticeable change in traffic flow on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road. <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#archive">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#archive</a> "existing and proposed traffic flow".
		It should also be noted that this restriction is required to maximise the right turn capacity from Baker Street to Marylebone Road southbound. This would help in reducing rat-run through the area.
88.	Thank you for the letter outlining the consultation process. In accordance I write to you to submit my feedback on the proposal. I have lived in North Marylebone for 6 years in fulfilment of a long term ambition to be here. I have recently had a child and am making plans for her to see her childhood through in Marylebone.	A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation. These changes to traffic flow have been assessed in detail using the TfL central London strategic reassignment model (CLoHAM). This is a regional model of the road network that is firstly validated against traffic turning counts and

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	It therefore disheartens me to see the two-way scheme being pursued at all because I can only see harm coming from it; let me explain further:	origin/destination data of baseline conditions, in accordance with national and TfL accuracy criteria. Changes are then made to the modelled road network to reflect the proposed scheme, and the model is then used to forecast if and how traffic patterns alter as a consequence of the scheme. These traffic models are then independently
	1. Making any one-way street a two-way street does have a negative effect on traffic flow. This is precisely why we have dual carriageways; the presence of the central reservation means there is little to no chance of head on impact and we already know from research that motorways are the safest roads because they carry one-way traffic per carriageway. Reverting back to two-way therefore will slow traffic down, which is contrary to the claim made by the scheme propaganda. Given the traffic problems we already face in North Marylebone, I object to any scheme that slows traffic down.	audited by TfL's Network Performance team. Changes in traffic patterns will inevitably occur when altering a road system from one-way to two-way, as new turning movements and routes are provided. Forecast traffic patterns and any wider reassignment are a function of journey time, and so the model assigns traffic to the network in a way that reduces journey times as much as possible. The modelling carried out for Baker Street Two-Way Project demonstrates that, overall, the traffic on the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors can be reallocated between the streets without significant reassignment impact on the wider area, and that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on local roads.
	2. When traffic moves more slowly, air pollution increases. We know that cars perform at their most economic when travelling at a reasonable speed and as speed slows, so efficiency drops and airflow into engines does also. What this means is more fuel is consumed per mile and more particulates are released from incomplete combustion. It is clear from point 1 above that traffic will flow slower so it follows that the slower traffic will emit more pollutants. I needn't remind you that we live in an area where air pollution is already at unsafe levels. Further, living on a main road as I do, there will be increased air pollution in my home, which I strongly object to as it affects my quality of life.	The air quality impact assessment 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.
	3. Pedestrian safety is adversely impacted because it is far safer to cross a one-way street than it is to cross a two-way street. We presently enjoy big gaps in traffic when the traffic lights are red that allow us to cross Gloucester Place and Baker Street safely away from official crossings, adding to the village feel of the area. With two-way traffic, this will be both less likely and highly dangerous with a risk of being marooned in the middle of the road with traffic passing in different directions either side. The pedestrians needs will be neglected for no gain of any sort and the feel of the local area will change for the worse. As a result, pedestrian journeys will take longer, meaning they will inhale more of the pollution being output by vehicular traffic.	Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users. There will be improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities.  The two-way street will operate for parking and loading like any other two street of which there are many in the area. Analysis of the net loss and gain has been presented as part of the Traffic order consultation. <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs</a> "Summary Table of restriction changes." Overall, the number of available parking remains the same as existing.
	4. Parking will become very difficult and disruptive. Currently, with one-way traffic, if a vehicle intends to park it may block a lane in doing so; the traffic is constrained into the remaining two lanes and once the vehicle completes parking the constraint is gone and normal traffic flow resumes. In a two-way situation with only one lane moving each way, traffic will be forced to stop as a vehicle either enters or leaves a parking bay (irrespective of type) as there are no other lanes to move into. This will cause added disruption and can increase frustration amongst those stuck inadvertently and further contributing to pollution. Further, as it will now take longer to enter or leave a parking bay, the bays will be occupied for longer meaning there is less availability for those that are looking to park their vehicle and therefore there will be more driving around to find a space, compounding the problems.	The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads. No congestion is expected as a result of these proposals.  The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.
	5. Extended journey times. The scheme claims to reduce journey times however given that traffic will be slowed and in some instances stopped I cannot accept these claims. In reality it will take longer to get to North Marylebone, to find parking in North Marylebone, to leave North Marylebone and to pass through North Marylebone. The area will become a driver's nightmare.	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
	6. Noise pollution. With the increased levels of stationary traffic and running engines, I can't help but think that the residual noise in our streets will be greater. Currently Gloucester Place has periods of tranquillity which enhance the experience for residents and this is in jeopardy if we were to move to two-way.	The proposals on Gloucester Place and Baker Street are not looking to change this and the increased accessibility will help businesses and pedestrians visiting the area.  There is no evidence that a two-way road leads to shops and business closure. The increase accessibility should
	7. Impact on traders and facilities for residents. The area in which I live enhances my quality of life – I have access to many shops, bars, restaurants, health clubs and other facilities because it is commercially for these business to appear to in the area. In fact since my arrival in 2010 I have seen an unturn in	actual help all businesses in the area.  The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular dectinations and improving assessibility, which will shorten journey distances.

more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances

favourable for those business to operate in the area. In fact since my arrival in 2010 I have seen an upturn in

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	the services offered in the area, suggesting that Marylebone, as it is currently configured, works. Through reduced footfall because pedestrians find the area polluted and noisy and motorists find they cannot park easily, I fear that some business may be forced to leave, which will have an adverse effect on many local residents.  8. Impact on property values will be felt when shops have to close, residents move to more favourable areas and the investments those residents may have made in property fail to deliver. Considerable fiscal impact may result due to a two-way implementation.	and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;
	I do not wish to take up too much of your time so I won't continue to outline the small points but based on the above I see the two-way scheme as a complete disaster and utterly detrimental to our area. I am vehemently opposed to the proposal as it will adversely impact our health, wealth and way of life. I struggle to understand how the scheme is able to make any claims about making a better environment for residents – these are baseless and should be withdrawn, as should the entire proposal. I am not against change – in fact professionally I deliver change to my clients. I am happy to hear of a better proposal if one exists however the current one must be shelved.	<ul> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> <li>In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.</li> </ul>
89.	The Statement of Reasons appearing at the end of page 3 of the attachment to the letter of 14 <sup>th</sup> November from WCC cannot be substantiated and therefore undermines the rationale of the two-way project in its entirety.  For pedestrians it is obviously simpler and less dangerous to cross a one-way street than a two-way one.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
	Cyclists are being favoured inequitably over other all other road users, including essential vehicles such as public transport, business and service vehicles.	The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;
	For buses, increased congestion caused inevitably by restriction of road space is likely to result in frustration to both bus drivers and bus passengers.	<ul> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> </ul>
	For local traffic there will no improved access, but rather the opposite with increased parking and loading restrictions, increased journey times and increased risk of rat-running to the detriment of road users, residents and businesses.	<ul> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> </ul>
	The final paragraph "make road networks simple to understand for customers (?) and is expected to assist the regeneration of this part of the West End" appears to be a statement of aspiration rather than one which is capable of verification.	Adequate pedestrian crossing facilities will be retained at all signal control junctions. The principle of crossing the road will be no different to any other two-way road in the area. A series of raised table junctions will be provided throughout the area with the objective of reducing traffic speed.
	Furthermore there appears to be an alarming lack of joined-up thinking in relation to other projects which are being planned for the area, such as the Cycle Superhighway (CS11) and the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street.	The needs of all transport modes and road users have been taken into consideration in developing the proposal.  Based on extensive traffic modelling, the best routes have been selected for different types of vehicles using the
	Finally, Marylebone is at the medical heart of London, with many hospitals. The impact of the implementation of the two-way project could have potentially disastrous consequences for emergency service vehicles and at a time when London is at increased risk of terrorist attack.	area. A combination of traffic restrictions and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes and bus journey times are minimised through both streets.
		The scheme has been designed to be capacity neutral and increased accessibility for local traffic. Analysis of parking and loading against existing has also been presented as part of the traffic order consultation.

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs.
		The scheme as proposed will not increase rat running or congestion in the area.
		This project has been carefully developed with the other projects mentioned in mind. The Project Team has been liaising with the teams responsible for CSH11 and Oxford Street to ensure that the proposals are not conflicting.
		Emergency services will not be negatively impacted by the proposals. The increased permeability and accessibility will be an advantage to the vital services they provide. The proposed scheme aims to provide better access for all vehicles, by enabling shorter, more direct journeys and providing new turning opportunities which are currently not possible with the one-way system.
90.	We want to suggest that Porter Street should become a one-way street from west to east, that is, from Baker Street to Chiltern Street. This would prevent it becoming a rat run by drivers seeking to avoid the traffic lights at the junction of Baker Street and Marylebone Road. Porter Street is a very narrow street and the fact that a row of parking bays takes up half the road space means that two-way traffic flow is impossible, and often dangerous to the unsuspecting pedestrians and cyclists.  Furthermore both the pressure on the Porter Street and the noise at night would be reduced if the parking bays on this largely residential street fronted by the properties of Portman Mansions were to be converted into residential parking bays for the use of local residents.	This was considered as part of the initial study. The Baker Street model observed more movements westbound, rat-run could be occurring although in very low numbers. If Porter Street becomes one-way eastbound we do not anticipate there to be a significant impact on the network as a result of reassignment. We have also considered accident records for the street. There are no accidents associated with Porter Street with the exception of two incidents involving car doors being opened onto oncoming cyclists and motorists at Baker Street junction. One-way streets do not accord with the objective of maximising accessibility for residents. The Project Team considers there is insufficient evidence, either in terms of traffic flows, or road safety, to require a change. Post implementation traffic monitoring will be targeted at this location and traffic movements will be reviewed if necessary.
	Finally if making Gloucester Place and Baker Street two-way could share the pressure of bus traffic, this would also assist with the current problem of pedestrians safely negotiating the crossing of Porter Street at the junction with Baker Street where local and express buses come into the two bus stops immediately south of this junction.	No changes to existing parking facilities in Porter Street are proposed, with the exception that the temporary motorcycle bay on the south side, at the junction with Baker Street will be retained on a permanent basis.  The proposed layout in the scheme will resolve the arrival conflict between local buses and the X90 services. The footway is wider with a raised crossing which will assist pedestrian crossing and improve safety.
91.	The Clarence Gate Gardens Residents Association (CGGRA) of Glentworth Street objects to the loss of two residents' parking bays at the south end of Glentworth Street just north of its intersection with Melcombe Street. Can the plans be reworked to allow these to stay or provide equivalent space nearby? Residents of the block already have difficulty finding a place to park.	The loss of two residents' parking spaces in Glentworth Street is acknowledged. Melcombe Street is a very well used pedestrian route connecting Marylebone train station with Baker Street underground station. The new crossing point will create a friendlier junction to all users. As shown in the parking and loading schedule, the total number of B Zone residents' spaces will be increased by 5. This means those two spaces are not lost but relocated elsewhere within B Zone, with an increase in the total number of available spaces. Most of the new spaces will be installed in Gloucester Place, between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street, with a short walk from the lost two spaces.
92.	Having re-read my letter sent to you earlier today I realise that I have not made bullet point 1 clear enough and this email is to clarify what was meant in this revised attachment. Under bullet point 1 (as mentioned in this revised letter) I would like to say that I object to the west arm of Ivor Place being made a one-way entry into this part of the Dorset Square Conservation Area because this will facilitate the rat-run. Please make it a one-way exit instead.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
93.	I would like to once again express my deep concerns regarding the proposed use streets within the Dorset Square Conservation Area as a cut-through in connection with the proposed two-way Baker Street proposal. I believe that the proposal will result in in-appropriate, dangerous and detrimental volumes and type traffic flows through this residential conservation area - of those attempting to access Marylebone station and the Westway.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	<ol> <li>I agree with the revisions to the proposal expressed by our local community groups as follows:</li> <li>Ivor Place (west) should be a one-way out of the neighbourhood – i.e. away from the station.</li> <li>Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be a one-way "in" to the neighbourhood – i.e. towards the station.</li> <li>No Right Turn should be allowed at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place heading towards the station.</li> </ol>	implement further measures if required.
94.	I would like to once again express my deep concerns regarding the proposed use streets within the Dorset Square Conservation Area as a cut-through in connection with the proposed two-way Baker Street proposal. I believe that the proposal will result in in-appropriate, dangerous and detrimental volumes and type traffic flows through this residential conservation area - of those attempting to access Marylebone station and the Westway.  I agree with the revisions to the proposal expressed by our local community groups as follows:  1. Ivor Place (west) should be a one-way out of the neighbourhood – i.e. away from the station.  2. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be a one-way "in" to the neighbourhood – i.e. towards the station.  3. No Right Turn should be allowed at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place heading towards the station.	Detailed analysis has been undertaken of the existing flow and this has been compared with predicted flows. The table shows no noticeable change in traffic flow. The table is available as part of project documentation on the website.  The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .  Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation. Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets:  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;  Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;  Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions.  Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.  Following d
95.	My family and I have been living in XXXXX for over 15 years now. I have seen our children and our neighbours children grow up in this street. What was so attractive about the area when I moved here from Holland was the fact that we could live in central London, without the traffic and noise usually associated with inner city living. Our kids could play outside with their friends and we could cycle to our local shops.	The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .
	I am therefore extremely concerned with the BSTW proposal for our local area! I feel the current proposals do not take any of the residential demands into account and could potentially and most likely turn our peaceful conservation area into a complete and utter rat run. The streets in the area are narrow and if multiple entries from Gloucester Place are allowed, the traffic coming into the area looking for short cuts will pose danger to all	Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	residents, young and old (pollution of air, noise pollution, danger crossing the roads etc.).  The local residents would like to offer an alternative to the current plans, this way discouraging the rat run effect, still avoiding congestion whilst allowing cyclist and pedestrians to use Ivor place safely.  1. Ivor Place (west) to be one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood. 2. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood. 3. A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.  I hope you will consider these suggestions and implement the suggested changes so we can keep enjoying living in this conservation area.	Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.  It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets;  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;  Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;  Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions.  Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
96.	I am raising objections to the Baker Street two-way consultation. While you plan to monitor the proposed routes I think it should protect the residential neighbourhood in the first instance, from becoming a rat run. Traffic will take a right turn from the north into Ivor Place from where it cut through via Boston Place, Balcombe Street and Linhope Street to get to Marylebone Station and onwards to the Westway. Rather than 'wait and see' I want the road layout designed from the outset to prevent the possibility of a rat-run developing. A sensible proposals makes the following changes:  1. Ivor Place (west) to be one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood.  2. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood.  3. A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
97.	<ol> <li>My proposed amendments to the proposals, and the reasoning for these proposed changes, are below.</li> <li>At: 22 and 23 Dorset Street         To: Move Diplomatic Parking Bays one car-length East, retaining 2 car bays, removing car bay from front outside 23 Dorset Street.         Because:         </li> <li>a. Car bays should be directly outside the diplomatic property / Embassy (No.22 - a double-width property), not in front of another residential property (No.23).</li> <li>b. No. 23 lack of property access, plus exposure to noise and exhaust from diplomatic bays is not reasonable zoning; this removes access for 23 while placing an office impact on a residential property.</li> </ol> <li>c. Diplomatic Parking bays can be accommodated in front of No. 22 itself.</li> <li>d. This placement would still leave sufficient free space before the corner with Clay Street.</li> <li>e. This placement would match that of pay parking bays on the south side of Dorset Street x Rodmarton Street.</li> <li>At: 22 and 23 Dorset Street</li>	The majority of parking controls in and around Dorset Street including the diplomatic bay outside Nos. 22 and 23, will remain unchanged. The design of the scheme in terms of waiting and loading restrictions and parking facilities has been carefully reviewed to take into account the needs of all those affected.  Parking restrictions will not be changed unless it is considered essential in terms of safe and effective traffic management, and at this stage in the project it is not considered feasible or practical to review the design of individual bays or lines, unless there are specific reasons to merit it. However, there is a monitoring strategy in place for post-construction, as set out in the consultation report, and any issues that arise will be addressed.

NO. (Names	DECROMOS	DDO JEST TEAMA DESCRIPTION
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	To: Move Diplomatic Parking Only sign and post from in front No.23 to in front No.22 Dorset Street [i.e. to move sign post to Western edge outside front No.22, adjacent to existing Eastern-most diplomatic parking bay]  Because:  a. To match movement of Diplomatic Parking Bays to one car-length east.  b. To remove a sign from in front of residential (non-diplomatic) Property and place it - correctly - in front of Diplomatic property / embassy.	
	3. At: north and south (west and east sides) of Gloucester Place X Montagu Place onto Dorset Street To: Extend double yellow no stopping zone [orange on plans] by 3 car lengths Because: insufficient space for vehicles to use both lanes (ahead and turning) at junction, when cars parked on single-yellow lines; this will result in danger for cyclists and use of horns / hard acceleration out-of-hours: precisely what the scheme has promised to mitigate.  Consider: does this apply to other n/s bound elements of Gloucester Place and Baker Street?	
	4. At: Blandford Street X Gloucester Place North and South (East Side) To: Extend double yellow no stopping zone [orange on plans] by 3 car lengths Because: insufficient visibility for cars joining / leaving Gloucester Place; I currently experience near misses here on a routine basis, as drivers cannot see the turn clearly whether coming from Gloucester Place or Blandford Street.	
	5. At: Blandford Street (Western End, by Gloucester Place) To: Extend double yellow no stopping zone [orange on plans] by 2 car lengths [remove western-most one car bay residents' parking on north side] Because: insufficient visibility for cars joining / leaving Gloucester Place; I currently experience near misses here on a routine basis, as drivers cannot see the turn clearly whether coming from Gloucester Place or Blandford Street.	
	<ul> <li>6. At: Dorset Street, South Side, (facing) between Montagu Mansions and Rodmarton Street To: <ul> <li>a. Remove Solo Motorcycles Parking, and re-locate to north side of Blandford Street, between Rodmarton and Baker Street.</li> <li>b. Replace with 4 hours parking bays x3 (relocated from Blandford Street).</li> <li>Because: <ul> <li>a. Dorset Street is mainly residential, including adjacent to these bays, making multiple motorcycle parking (up to 10/12 vehicles) undesirable.</li> <li>b. Dorset Street residential context damaged by motorcycle noise.</li> <li>c. Motorcycle spaces best placed adjacent to shops and services: none on Dorset Street, many on Blandford Street.</li> <li>d. Better sight lines (less parking) and lower average speeds (no cross road West) on Blandford Street indicates safer motorcycle entry and exit than on Dorset Street.</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>7. At: Dorset Street, south side, between Baker Street and Kenrick Place / Broadstone Place. To: <ul> <li>a. Remove Solo Motorcycles Parking, and re-locate to Blandford Street south side, between Baker Street and Broadstone Place (current plan Residents' Parking Bay).</li> <li>b. Replace with Resident Permit Holders Only bay.</li> <li>Because:</li> <li>a. Immediately adjacent residential and on-street leisure [Barley Mow and above, Galvin, Pure, Ana Capri</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	etc.], making multiple motorcycle parking (up to 10/12 vehicles) undesirable.  b. Dorset Street residential and on-street leisure context damaged by motorcycle noise.  c. Blandford Street immediate context would be between two large non-residential and non-on-street-leisure blocks.	
	<ul> <li>8. At: Dorset Street south side and Blandford Street north sides, between Rodmarton Street and Baker Street; also Blandford Street south side and George Street north side, between Gloucester Place and Baker Street. To:</li> <li>a. Design street parking to provide for inserting Small Public Gardens Spaces, in some current parking bays and carriageway, also taking some current (low use) excess pavement width.</li> <li>b. Negotiate with developers / owners of 39-55 Baker Street and 19-35 Baker Street, to have them provide Small Public Garden Space on their plots, matching new public provision by square foot.</li> <li>c. So, create small enclosed or open areas of trees, plants and greenery: "Pocket Squares" if you like.</li> <li>d Provide an instant green visual link between Montagu Square skyline trees on Montagu Place and George Street, Paddington Gardens skyline trees on Dorset Street x Manchester Street, and Portman Square skyline tree on Baker Street.</li> <li>e. Provide a 'green' visual identify for the whole area.</li> <li>f. Contribute to greening and provision of large-scale planting for the area, in a significant way.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>9. At: All areas within consultation. To: <ul> <li>a. Enact bye-laws (if not already enacted) to forbid idling while stationary.</li> <li>b. Provide parking wardens with powers to collect fines for contravention of bye-laws on idling.</li> <li>c. Provide small format signage to be placed beside all other parking and zone signage to indicate Prohibition of Idling and attendant fines.</li> <li>d. Provide signage at entry to entire area to indicate Prohibition of Idling at all times.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>10. At: All areas within consultation.</li> <li>To: Enact, sign, and enforce a 20mph speed limit zone.</li> <li>Because: <ul> <li>a. High pedestrian and cyclist through-flow indicates risk and unpleasant experience for non-motorists.</li> <li>b. Low overall distance to travel and high traffic light count indicates that speeds above 20mph will make little or no difference in speed of vehicles to final destination.</li> <li>c. Anti-social and criminal driving (primarily from q-car hatchbacks, super-cars and racing type motorcycles) occurs late at night, providing danger and noise disturbance; low traffic levels and empty streets mean that there is no check on achievable top speeds, so speed needs to be policed in order to control this.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
98.	I am writing to object to the new proposals for altering the traffic flow around Baker Street and in particular the channelling of traffic from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place. The Statement of Reason clearly states that "The Baker Street and Gloucester Place two-way scheme will transform the area between Marylebone and Oxford Street by delivering public realm improvements to meet the aspirations of local businesses and the Business Improvement District" There is no mention of the aspirations of residents who will suffer the consequences of this scheme!	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	Traffic entering Ivor Place is expected, by your conservative estimate, to double. It will probably increase more than this. It is inevitable that drivers will use it as a rat run to Marylebone Road.  Ivor Place is completely unsuitable for supporting these increased volumes of traffic. It is a very narrow,	The air quality impact assessment 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

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	predominantly residential street with fragile Regency properties fronting directly on the street. The houses are not set back from the road as in the larger streets like Baker Street and Gloucester Place. This means that our windows (and rooms) are only about 3 feet from the road.	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.
	As a doctor, this causes me concern for the health and safety of both residents and property because of:	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
	<ol> <li>Increased air pollution.</li> <li>a. Due to substantially increased traffic in such close proximity to our homes;</li> <li>b. backup of traffic held up by incredibly busy pedestrian crossings at Marylebone station. The exhaust pipes of stationary cars can often be clearly seen dribbling, and fuming CO, CO2 and NOx at head height when I stand at our basement kitchen window. This is only 5 feet at most away from the road. Co2 and air laden with particulates are of course heavier than air. The fumes entering the kitchen and living room</li> </ol>	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts.  There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
	through our old, single glazed windows can already be smelt. Black particulate deposits also build up inside the windows fronting the street. These are clear signs of pollution already happening. It threatens to become much worse if the scheme goes ahead.	The BSTW changes are not expected to have any changes to the historical and cultural heritage of the area.  Based on the predicted traffic flow table (which can be found at <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> ), there is not expected to be a noticeable change in traffic flow in the area. Hence it is not expected that the proposed scheme will have a detrimental impact on the properties
	2. Increased noise and vibration – these properties are small and shallow, so it will be impossible to escape this.	or the basement underneath.
	3. Fragility of Historic properties.  Damage is inevitable to the Regency housing stock for which Ivor Place is famous. These buildings have shallow footings, extremely vulnerable to damage from vibration caused by traffic passing in such volumes and so close by. It appears that no provision is to be made to stop heavy vehicles using Ivor Place, thus	Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.
	<ul> <li>4. Undermining of the road.</li> <li>Many of the properties abutting the road have extensive coal bunkers under the road itself, weakening the infrastructure from both sides of the road and making it unsuitable for heavy traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:</li> <li>Removal of one-way streets;</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;</li> </ul>
	5. Safety of residents and pedestrians. Children and residents' lives as well as their health will be put at risk - the pavements are narrow and increasing traffic represents a serious hazard to safety.	<ul> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions.</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>Community.</li> <li>We are accustomed to meeting our neighbours on the shallow, narrow pavements outside our homes on the street. This will no longer be safe when large, noisy volumes of traffic are passing at speed, so often and so</li> </ol>	Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
	close by.	Studies from the US have certainly demonstrated reductions in the number of collisions following conversion from one-way to two-way streets.
	7. Narrow street. This means that, in practice, any time a car stops in Ivor Place whether to let off children, or shopping or where deliveries have to be made to homes the road is effectively blocked. At present local drivers know this and, seeing this, will make their away another way around the block. We have in the past seen outsiders become very irate at being delayed, leaning on their horns and becoming physically aggressive. We must only expect this to increase under these proposals. In addition traffic forced to idle creates even more pollution.	The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .
	<ol> <li>Danger to cyclists.</li> <li>We are also concerned that, whilst cycle routes are to be welcomed, it is quite likely that cyclists will be unable to avoid collision with the increasing numbers of cars trying to cut through the block and must expect to suffer a higher risk of accidents as a consequence.</li> </ol>	Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	Our community will clearly suffer disproportionately from this scheme which puts our lives and health at risk. These concerns need to be addressed and Ivor Place and our small conservation area protected.	
99.	As per my previous toxicity concerns in emails and letters to this project, TFL and to the past conservative Westminster MP and Mayor Boris Johnson, I strongly object to the current proposal on the grounds that it violates EU laws on health and the human right to clean air.	The air quality impact assessment 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
	Your proposals do not tackle any of the pressing issues and will cause a bottle neck of traffic, more congestion which will proportionally increase harmful particulates and gases in our air.	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) wi experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme.
	Our children and those with health issues are already affected and this will only be exacerbated with your decision to go ahead with these plans for no good reason except for the economical benefit of corporates and the Portman Estates at the detriment of those good people know as residents and the community.	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square / Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
100.	We object to the introduction of one-way working westbound in Ivor Place between Gloucester Place and Huntsworth Mews. We consider that this part of Ivor Place should be made one-way eastbound for all traffic.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	To make Ivor Place between Gloucester Place and Huntsworth Mews one-way westbound would encourage traffic from the north travelling south down Gloucester Place and aiming to turn west onto Westway to turn right into Ivor Place as an alternative route to Rossmore Road and Harewood Place, thus introducing more through traffic into the residential streets to the north of Dorset Square.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	As a residential street with residents' and other parking, Ivor Place is not wide enough and is unsuitable for use as a through route for traffic not stopping in the immediate vicinity.	
101.	The North Marylebone Traffic Group (NMTG) is a grassroots group of residents in the Dorset Square Conservation Area (DSCA) who came together to jointly evaluate the BSTW proposals and their potential impacts on our area. The NMTG has supported the overall execution of the BSTW scheme on the basis of assurances we were given that it is traffic neutral, improves provision for pedestrians and cyclists, will not increase traffic in	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	residential side streets and will lead to substantial improvements in air quality.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	This consultation on TMOs focuses attention to very local levels and impacts are perceived differently depending on whether people live in an area or not. In developing its response, the NMTG's Steering Group has tried to assess views sent to us by weighing up the gains arising from the scheme against the numbers of homes which might have adverse impacts because they directly front onto the streets affected. This has left one major area which many local people feel very frustrated about; that their repeated request to the Council - to prevent ratruns through a residential enclave - has been disregarded.	Coaches have used Gloucester Place for over 20 years. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. With fewer buses on Gloucester Place northbound, coaches will be able to serve more efficiently.
	We strongly object to the proposed one-way section on the west arm of Ivor Place between Gloucester Place and Huntsworth Mews as a new ENTRY point into this purely residential enclave. It eases the development of ratruns towards Marylebone Station and access to the Westway. As homes in this enclave face directly onto narrow streets, without the benefit of gardens or greenery, they are at risk of more traffic, noise and pollution.	The right turn at Park Road into Rossmore Road improves accessibility to the area and provides wider benefits to the residential character of Gloucester Place.
	Residents throughout the enclave want the following changes:  1. Make that section of the west arm of Ivor Place one-way OUTWARD. In this case, a refuge is not necessary on the crossing (it was introduced solely to deter right turns from Gloucester Place south). Vehicles exiting from the enclave will be able to turn freely to go north or south on Gloucester Place and straight ahead to Park Road and Allsop Place. Without the refuge, cyclists on Ivor Place could also use the crossing over	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
www.mo.oy	<ol> <li>Gloucester Place, avoiding the need for a cycle lane.</li> <li>Make Taunton/Huntsworth Mews one-way INWARD from Gloucester Place up to the junction with Huntsworth Mews. The entry is narrow with minimal pavements and is not suitable for two-way traffic as proposed in the drawings.</li> <li>Most importantly, right-turns must be banned at the junction of Balcombe Street / Dorset Square (west) with Melcombe Place to block access to the destinations of the rat-run.</li> </ol>	
	WCC has shown a willingness to compromise on the design of a strategic route and preferred location for a straight-over pedestrian crossing. The original BSTW scheme had proposed banning the left turn from Gloucester Place north into Marylebone Road; turning traffic was instead to be routed along York Street to access the left turn from Upper Montagu Street. WCC readily acceded to residents' protests in that instance and re-instated the status quo. Our requests in north Marylebone are comparatively minor as they only affect local traffic movements into and out of a small residential enclave. We sincerely hope that Westminster Council and TfL implements them this time.	
	As a final note, the NMTG is aware that two groups in the Dorset Square Conservation Area are responding directly with their objections. The Dorset Square Trust objects to coaches being routed along Gloucester Place and the relocation of a coach stop near Dorset Square. Residents on the Blandford Estate object to the creation of a right turn from Park Road into Rossmore Road.	
102.	I still have serious objections to the Baker Street two-way scheme concerning the residential section of Gloucester Place north of the Marylebone Road.  I believe there will be increased air pollution and a corresponding negative impact on health for the large residential community on the north section of Gloucester Place.	The air quality impact assessment 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
	I object to coach traffic on Gloucester Place, to a coach stop near residential buildings and to northbound traffic restrictions on Baker Street north of York Street. With these three proposals there will be more air pollution.  Most coach passengers need to interchange with Baker Street station, so all coach traffic should travel along	experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme.  The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square / Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
	Baker Street.  Coach traffic is more heavily polluting than the bus traffic it replaces. Southbound coaches queuing at the proposed traffic lights at Melcombe Street will pump fumes into ground floor and basement residences on Gloucester Place.	Coaches have used Gloucester Place for over 20 years. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. With fewer buses on Gloucester Place northbound, coaches will be able to serve more efficiently. Coaches are
	It would make more sense to instruct all coach traffic (northbound and southbound) to use the primarily commercial Baker Street. Coach operators designate the Gloucester Place stop as Baker Street on their tickets and websites: this suggests that Baker Street is the obvious, known and convenient routing for passengers once	required to meet emission requirements set by the Low Emission Zone and forthcoming planned Ultra Low Emission Zone. Many of the coaches using Gloucester Place on scheduled services already meet Euro V and V1 engine standards.
	I object strongly to the presence of a coach stop north of Melcombe Street as it will increase pollution for residents. Coaches stand at coach stops with engines running for prolonged periods, much longer than buses. This is unacceptable close to residents of ground level and basement flats. If coaches are going to run on Gloucester Place, the current siting of coach stops between Marylebone Road and Melcombe Street should be	Northbound buses will be largely relocated onto Baker Street and will no longer stop at the Dorset Square bus stop. Traffic capacity constraints will mean that it is not considered feasible to locate all bus and coach services onto Baker Street.  An interchange with Baker Street and Marylebone stations is maintained with the retention of coach stops on Gloucester Place at Allsop Arms / Dorset Square. Many of the coaches using Gloucester Place on scheduled
	adequate.  I object strongly to the proposal that Baker Street north of York Street should only be open northbound to buses, taxis and cycles for most of the day. This will push all other northbound traffic onto Gloucester Place. In the	services already meet Euro V and V1 engine standards. All queuing traffic will contribute to emissions.  Traffic has to be shared on the network and facility provided at locations central to users in this case Baker Street and Marylebone Stations. These proposals have been modelled and developed with TfL.

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	absence of reciprocal southbound traffic restrictions on Gloucester Place, this will lead to unacceptably high volumes of traffic in Gloucester Place north of York Street, a primarily residential stretch of road. This will increase pollution and have a negative impact on quality of life for residents. I look forward to hearing if these issues can be addressed moving forward.	TfL has discussed the Baker Street Two-Way scheme with the coach industry and their preference is to retain the current arrangement. Coach movements, particularly those services which serve the Baker Street area, remain on the existing routes with southbound coaches using Baker Street and northbound services on Gloucester Place. Coaches passing through the area without stopping are likely to use Gloucester Place. On Baker Street there will be no separate coach stop and coaches will continue to share with TfL buses as is currently the case.
		Coach stop at Dorset Square – it is proposed to relocate the coach stop on Gloucester Place to the same location as the existing Bus Stops T and U, which currently provide for all northbound bus services. Northbound buses will be largely relocated onto Baker Street.
		The coach stop at Dorset Square is required in order accommodate the new controlled crossing and minimise the risk of coaches oversubscribing the stop at Allsop Arms that would risk blocking back into Marylebone Road resulting in wider congestion in the network.
		Based on extensive traffic modelling the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes and bus journey times are minimised through both streets.
		An air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and 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 report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than disbenefits as a result of the scheme.
103.	I am a resident at XXXXX. I have lived here with my wife and two children since 2010. We have one car which we need as my wife works out of town and we have relatives outside London to visit – public transport does not meet our needs. Our two children are 3 years and 3 months old respectively so we have associated paraphernalia to transport – prams etc.	The Council acknowledges the difficulties of finding available parking in the area. The scheme proposes an increase of 5 B Zone resident parking bays north of Marylebone Road, mainly concentrated in Gloucester Place between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street.
	Parking in the area is already very difficult. We often have to 'circulate' for long periods before finding a parking space. We sometimes have to park in Gloucester Place or even Balcombe Street or Boston Place which is difficult with young kids	Unfortunately some sections of parking at the Glentworth Street / Melcombe Street junction need to be relocated to create a safer and more pedestrian friendly junction, where all types of users, including disabled, buggies and cyclists can appropriately use the facilities.
	In our view, any loss of parking provision – even one space – will make it more difficult for residents and exacerbate an already bad situation. We particularly object to the loss of two spaces at the end of Glentworth Street and to the loss of two spaces in Ivor Place. The loss of four spaces in a small area will make it much more difficult in my view to find a free parking space. Ivor Place is a crucial overflow parking area for Glentworth Street. The single yellow line areas are also vital at weekends and evenings.	
	I would urge you to reconsider the loss of these vital parking spaces and to reinstate them into the revised plans. It strikes me that the removal of the spaces at the end of the Glentworth Street is unnecessary as they do not impede pedestrian traffic – even if that increases following the proposed changes.	

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
104.	My family and I reside in XXXXX, north of the Marylebone Road. We are pedestrians and cyclists and commute both by public transport and by car. We range in age from 3 months to 58 years old. We are also a supporter of local small businesses and believe that these commercial residents are key to the success of Marylebone as a neighbourhood. In that sense, I feel that we represent a good cross section of the stakeholder group of this proposal.  Having walked all the streets north of the Marylebone to map out current and future arrangements as per the proposals, although the scheme overall claims to keep the number of available parking bays in Marylebone neutral, I have the following specific observations concerning the local area north of the Marylebone Road as per these proposals:  A loss of two residents parking bays on Ivor Place between Gloucester Place and Park Road (-2 bays) to accommodate the cycle way.  A loss of two residents parking bays on the south end of Glentworth Street with junction Melcombe Street (-2 bays) to accommodate pedestrians.	The Council acknowledges the difficulties on finding available parking in the area. The four bays in Ivor Place and Glentworth Street are not being removed, but relocated within the scheme area, within a five walking minute radius. It is worth noting that the provision of the cycle lane in Park Road between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street will not affect any of the existing resident bays that are currently available. On the contrary, the scheme proposes an increase of 5 B Zone resident parking bays north of Marylebone Road, mainly concentrated in Gloucester Place between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street.
	<ul> <li>A loss of resident parking bays on Park Road (between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street) to accommodate the cycle way.</li> <li>The removal of up to 4 residents' parking bays in the immediate vicinity is of genuine concern to me as I currently walk the round trip to nursery in Paddington, but when I return to work in March 2017 following maternity leave, I will have no option but to commute by car and collect my children from nursery by car (by 17:30 - an hour before traffic restrictions cease). If the proposals go ahead, I could face an additional 30 minutes each evening circling the streets of north Marylebone looking for a residents' parking bay in which to park. Once it took me 30 minutes to drive home and 45 minutes to find a parking space!!</li> <li>I believe that the proposals are more favourable to business and commuters than they are to the residents of Marylebone and urge you to reconsider the proposed removal of these bays.</li> </ul>	
105.	We are residents in this area and are very concerned regarding the proposal in relation to the reference number above. We urge Westminster to make the following changes:  1. Ivor Place (west) to be one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood.  2. Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood.  3. A banned right turn at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
106.	<ul> <li>DORSET SQUARE TRUST POSITION         Strong opposition to the proposal to prohibit motor vehicles proceeding northbound on Baker Street from the junction with York Street between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m. on Monday to Friday.     </li> <li>This means all motor vehicles northbound will be routed via Gloucester Place / east side Dorset Square (residential street) increasing traffic and pollution.</li> <li>Not only Gloucester Place / east side Dorset Square would have all northbound traffic (except buses) but also southbound traffic.</li> </ul>	Based on our extensive traffic modelling undertaken we have selected the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area. A combination of traffic restrictions, including the Baker Street ban mentioned, and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes.
	<ul> <li>We live in an area where pollution legal limits are often breached and we fear this will be made worse.</li> <li>Strong opposition to the coach stop in Dorset Square. Coaches should be routed on Baker Street. Dorset Square is a residential Square and also the heart of the Dorset Square Conservation area.</li> <li>Baker Street should have capacity since ALL cars, trucks will be routed onto Gloucester Place / Dorset Square during the day time hours from York Street onward northbound.</li> </ul>	An air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and 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 report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than disbenefits as a result of the scheme.

NO. (Names	DECDONICE	DDO JEGT TEAMA DECRONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	<ul> <li>Baker Street is mainly a commercial street unlike Gloucester Place mainly residential.</li> <li>There is currently no coach stop in Dorset Square.</li> <li>We residents frequently have to redirect users to the current coach stops in Gloucester Place. The current layout only reflects the coach stop in Gloucester Place north of Dorset Close and not the one south of Dorset Close. Commercial tickets are sold as Baker Street. Having coaches in Baker Street will immediately link coaches with the Underground.</li> <li>Coaches will increase environmental and noise pollution in our area.</li> <li>The proposed coach stop will affect the enjoyment of the Square in particular the north side. It would also increase traffic in Dorset Square by people driving to the coach stop.</li> <li>The coach stop is very likely to block the entry to the square by coaches waiting.</li> <li>If WCC / TFL insist that the coaches will be routed on Gloucester Place then we strongly object to the proposed stiting of a coach stop at Dorset Square which will create increase noise, pollution and nuisance for those living on the north side of Dorset Square and for all of us when using Dorset Square gardens. The two coach stops on Gloucester Place just north of Marylebone Road should continue in operation instead of the proposed new coach stop at Dorset Square as these two existing stops are not directly adjacent to residential properties and are next to each other avoiding the confusion which will inevitably arise for passengers of having one coach stop outside the Allsop Arms public house and one coach stop at Dorset Square.</li> <li>In view of the proposed loss of four residents' parking bays on the south side and the proposed replacement with just two we request that at least 4 residents' parking bays are provided on the south side of the square.</li> <li>Signage (such as board displays indicating parking control hours and street furniture / pavement should be in keeping with the designated conservation status of the Square.</li> <li>Si</li></ul>	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to Tft. who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place. Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place.  However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand. On the project website, we have provided a table Existing and proposed traffic flow albe — listed by street: This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that we have undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.  The Project Team acknowledge the loss of two resident parking bays at Dorset Square. Melcombe Street is a very well used pedestrian route connecting Marylebone frain station with Baker Street underground station.
107.	I would like to point out that the consultation letter sent on the 14 <sup>th</sup> November only arrived on the 29 <sup>th</sup> November. I am also surprised that the street notices do not reflect the proposed prohibition of motor vehicles proceeding northbound from York Street as this piece of information is key.	other route northbound other than Huntsworth Mews.  Unfortunately, there appears to have been a delay in the delivery of some consultation letters and this is being investigated. As a result, the consultation period was effectively extended to 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 to ensure that residents had ample opportunity to respond.

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		T NOSEGY TEXTILITY NEEDS GYACE
	I am also surprised that in the Statement of Reasons you only refer to meeting the aspirations of local businesses and the Business Improvement District. I would think the aspirations of residents should also be always considered.  It is difficult to be positive about the overall scheme when you feel Gloucester Place / east side Dorset Square (mainly residential) would suffer from removing traffic from Baker Street (mainly commercial).  I support all initiatives that encourage pedestrians such as widening pavements in Dorset Square.  My main objections are:  I disagree with the proposal to prohibit motor vehicles proceeding northbound in Baker Street from entering Baker street north of York Street.  It would redirect northbound traffic via our residential street.  Our area already does not comply with pollution legal limits and this change will make it worse.  As a council tax payer I do not want WCC to have to enter in litigation for redirecting extra traffic through an already polluted area.  Dorset Square is a conservation area.  I disagree with routing coaches through Gloucester Place / Dorset Square and locating a coach stop in Dorset Square.  Coaches should be routed via Baker Street as this will connect it with the underground.  There are not coach stops in Dorset Square.	Based on extensive traffic modelling the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions, including the Baker Street ban mentioned, and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes.  An air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and 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 report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the scheme
	<ul> <li>The proposed coach stop sits next to a residential area and coaches operate thorough out the night increasing noise and environmental pollution.</li> </ul>	
108.	<ul> <li>I wholeheartedly endorse the comments from XXXXX (recorded above).</li> <li>Coach stops on Dorset Square will be very detrimental to the Dorset Square area, increasing pollution, noise and congestion to the residential conservation area. It will also restrict access to the square as buses 'back-up' while loading passengers.</li> <li>Routing non-commercial vehicles via York Street and Gloucester Place north during the day will have similar effects on Dorset Square - noise, pollution, congestion.</li> <li>Right hand turn from Dorset Square to Melcombe Place will encourage rat run for vehicles heading south to Marylebone Station and Westway – please apply a no right turn restriction out of Dorset Square – otherwise you run the risk of heavy congestion on Dorset Square and neighbouring streets to the great detriment of residents – not lead the numerous children who play there.</li> </ul>	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.  Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place,
	Please therefore introduce changes that will address these issues.	On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.  Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
		Furthermore, with regards to the query of a banned right turn onto Melcombe place; following detail discussion with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that there is no right turn permitted from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place.
		This should negate the possibility of a rat run through Dorset Square. Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
		Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
109.	I am a local resident, shopper and commuter. Marylebone has been my garden for the last 5 years. I don't use a car very often so I am afraid I cannot say thank you for making it easier for me. The proposal you are making will not address long term traffic congestion in the area.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
	<ol> <li>You are not encouraging any model shift.</li> <li>It won't be easier for pedestrians.</li> <li>It won't be easier for cyclists.</li> </ol>	Cycle facilities have been provided to encourage cyclists and improve their safety. Segregated cycle lanes were considered at feasibility stage but their impact on network resilience and junction operations was too strong to
	4. Just nicer for cars (in the short term, until traffic grow further).	make the traffic model work with the same level of congestion.
	This proposal lacks any vision for cycling despite everything that might be written in it. As an experienced cyclist, this is fine for me. I will get maybe more parking facilitate.  Would it be recommended to a mother with a child / school children to: 1. cycle in the bus lane; 2. Having to overtake buses at stops in the middle of London traffic; or 3. WAIT behind a bus and deep breath the exhaust pipe of their diesel engine?; 4. Cycle in the door zone.	Gloucester Place is a traditional route for buses, they have been using the road for the last 20 years. Narrower traffic lanes and better synchronised signal controlled timings are expected to reduce traffic speeds, making cycle journeys safer. Parking and loading restrictions on mandatory cycle lanes will be constantly monitored and enforced, and we would encourage any road users to report misuse of parking and loading restrictions in any Westminster road. The controls in Westminster generally exclude Sundays and there is no suggestion that this is related to safety.
	Ideally cycling lanes should be segregated / protected from aggressive drivers, two-way segregated cycle lanes also offer a usable alternative for emergency vehicle.	
	The cycling lanes proposed here with "double yellow" lines will constantly be used for loading / unloading at peak hours. You might as well not put them. It avoids the "impression" that there is cycling infrastructures and the disobedient cyclists are not using it.	
	Also there is an imaginary thinking that the road is safer on Sundays or after 7.00 p.m. and that cycling lanes are not needed anymore. This is intellectual fraud. Happy to take you out for a ride if you need a proof of this.	

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
110.	I attach the Baker Street 2 way final consultation Plan. My wife and I reject A. We accept B. [The plans that XXXXX refers to relate to the suggested banned right turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place.]	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
		Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
111.	1. Oxford Bus Company carries over 19 million passengers a year in one of the country's most modern and environmentally friendly fleet of 160 buses & coaches. We have one of the lowest emissions of any operator in the UK. The company operates a fleet of luxury coaches to London as well as Heathrow, Gatwick and	Information at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> . Second consultation report and as part of the initial consultation presentation.
	Birmingham airports, services to and from Oxford's Park and Ride car parks and a comprehensive network of local bus routes.	The traffic modelling has been audited by TfL and approved and TfL is satisfied in overall terms with the impact on buses and coaches.
	2. Route X90 serves a market between Oxford and London connecting to Baker Street, Marble Arch and Victoria up to every 15 minutes from 0430 to midnight and therefore the proposals will have a potentially significant impact upon the operation of coaches through Baker Street and Gloucester Place in particular.	The X90 will now stop on Marylebone Road eastbound (between Balcombe Street and Gloucester Place) which is still within sight of Baker Station, this replaces the existing stop on Baker Street.
	3. There is little detail in the consultation as to the likely delays to traffic as a result of Baker Street and Gloucester Place being made two-way and the likely impact this will have on both general traffic and	This will be taken up within TfL to the relevant teams. A new bus stop can be sited on the Transport for London Road Network without the requirement to make a Traffic Regulation Order.
	buses/coaches in particular.	The X90 stop is relocated. We have accommodated all the existing stops and cannot fit additional stops as requested.
	4. The removal of the current bus stop bay towards the top of Baker Street south of Porter Street will cause inconvenience to our existing users, the vast majority of which use the service to access underground services from Baker Street. The removal of this facility will mean the alternative provision will be much further away which is not ideal when journey times for our customers through central London is variable at best.	This is a separate suggestion for real time information that is outside the current scope of the project. This is not a comment on the Traffic Regulation Order.
	5. The support of TfL locating an additional stop inbound to Victoria on Marylebone Road is appreciated, however whilst this is indicated on the scheme drawings (Drawing No. 70004404-C-OA-TMO-PR-02) it does not appear on the London Buses Baker Street and Gloucester Place Proposed Plan. Please can this provision be confirmed.	
	6. To offset the loss of passengers we expect from the removal of the bus stop provision at the top of Baker Street we would request that the X90 is given access to the at the bottom of Baker Street at Oxford Street adjacent to Selfridges on the inbound, and on Portman Street north of Oxford Street on the outbound service to allow our customers better access to Oxford Street. To facilitate this this we would be happy to forego the stop at the mid-point of Baker Street inbound between Paddington Street and Dorset Street and would like to discuss this with a view to being facilitated as part of the scheme.	
	7. We have been working with TfL with a view to enabling Real Time Information for our services to be displayed on outbound stops on the X90 route. We would like to see this enabled before the schemes goes live.	
112.	I am a resident of XXXXX and I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the traffic scheme around Gloucester Place and Dorset Square. Your latest proposal includes coach stops on the section of Gloucester place starting at Dorset Square in the northward direction. This would create many problems:  1. Coaches and buses would immobilise the only traffic lane going northward as they get in and out of their bus stop, that is why the current scheme with two lanes going north works better, as cars can still move when buses	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles use Gloucester Place.
	manoeuvre.	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	<ol> <li>The extension of the coach stop south of the existing position would create a blockage of the little lane going into the northern side of Dorset Square as the back of the bus would jut out.</li> <li>Adding buses would add to air pollution and noise as buses stay stationed engine running under our windows</li> </ol>	However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place.
	and as a resident I oppose that. I would therefore demand that you abandon your proposed changes.	Under the proposed scheme, buses would not use the section of Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.
		On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.
		Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
113.	I write in opposition to the Baker Street Two-Way Project - Traffic Management Proposals. Overall, I remain opposed to the scheme that will disrupt the Dorset Square Conservation Area, turning its streets into rat runs, increasing pollution and decreasing quality of life for residents and tax payers in the area.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
	The above is one example of how scheme benefits the business of Baker Street between Marylebone Road and Oxford Street to the detriment of all other parties.	The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads. The traffic
	<ul> <li>Further examples:</li> <li>The cycle lanes are temporary cycle lanes, not 24/7 lanes. They cease to exist north of Marylebone Road on both Gloucester Place and Baker Street.</li> </ul>	modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active
	<ul> <li>There is no cycle lane provision on Baker Street.</li> <li>The cycle lane provision on Gloucester Place is non-contiguous and does not go to Oxford Street.</li> </ul>	Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area. In order to achieve a benefit in terms of traffic reduction on Melcombe Street and through Dorset Square, local traffic must be permitted to
	It is not inconceivable that some cyclists will want to continue south through Mayfair. Not all will be turning east or west.	enter the Marylebone area from the Gloucester Place southbound approach from Park Road, though this route will be discouraged through use of traffic calming measures such as the new traffic refuge on Gloucester Place and a new Zebra crossing and raised entry treatment at the junction of Balcombe Street and Melcombe Street.
	If, as stated in a previous consultation, the aim is to widen the pavements on Baker Street between Marylebone	The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	Road and Oxford Street, how will the vehicle traffic lanes meet their minimum width requirements with and safely share a lane with cycles, taxis and buses?	adverse impacts will result in consideration of further mitigation measures.
	The Baker Street traffic flow design has several choke points where the street goes from 3 to 2 lanes - a recipe for traffic slowdown and increased pollution.	The air quality impact assessment 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
	If one of the aims is to lower pollution, why is there a reduction in electric car share spots? Shared cars mean fewer cars, as well as being a trend for inner city travel.	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.
	The absence of disabled parking excludes those people from shopping the neighbourhood.	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square / Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
	Failure to include the changing patterns of residents in the area, especially that north of Marylebone Road. With decreased stopping / loading spaces in the area, the increased number of home delivery vehicles - from groceries to Amazon purchases to just about anything - presents a challenge. The number of online home deliveries is growing. To say nothing of residents moving in and out of homes in the neighbourhood.	Cycle lanes have been timed to provide benefits for the observed time when cyclist flow is highest. Due to the competing requirements of different road users and available capacity it is not possible to provide a 24hr lane all through the scheme. Cyclists will still be able to use the road safely in the proposed layout.
	If the business name is to increase office rental and retail on the ground floor of the Portman Estate properties and BID properties, increasing traffic on the road will not make it more appealing or clean the air.	Please note North of Marylebone Road, the facilities go on the bus lane up to Melcombe Street where the cycle lane turns right, and then left into Glentworth Street, with connections the future Cycle Superhighway at Regent's Park. The cycle provision therefore connects Regent's Park and the future Cycle Superhighway with the
	Add to the mix - pedestrianising Oxford Street, combined with the pedestrianisation of Tottenham Court Road, where do you expect cars to go? Through Marylebone, the Dorset Square Conservation Area and other residential areas - residents who spend money in Marylebone but seem to be the second class citizens in the	existing signed London Network Route East-West at Seymour Street to Wigmore Street. With most buses being re-routed to Baker Street, there was not enough road space for safe cycle lanes.
	equation even though they are paying taxes in the area and will receive no benefit from office workers.  The entire plan is thinking backward, not forward to the way cities looking to the future think.	<ol> <li>The scheme has been designed to be traffic neutral and ensure efficient movement by linking signals.</li> <li>There is no reduction in electrical car ports.</li> <li>There is no plan to reduce disable parking space within the scheme extents.</li> </ol>
	I must also note that a "black design pattern" has been used in this consolation. One cannot "HAVE YOUR SAY" on the website - there is no form. An extra step, and effort, is required to email the consultation team. Email breaks the flow for those who wish to respond via the digital channel. Marketing 101 teaches that a break in flow causes drop-off.	<ol> <li>The issue of home delivery is a wider issue which the scheme is not trying to resolve by its proposals. The volume of individual deliveries is not helping the overall issues but a more strategic level approach is required to solve this.</li> <li>Increase property or rental value is not one of the aims of the scheme.</li> <li>The council must protect data of individual responder hence the approach for comments to emailed in so they can be dealt with. All responses received are then published on the City Council's website. This is has always been standard practice that the scheme is following.</li> </ol>
114.	I wish to respond to your further consultation regarding the Baker Street Two-Way scheme. I have lived in XXXXX and on XXXXX (north of Marylebone Road) for over 40 years and know this area extremely well.	The loss of two residents' parking spaces at Dorset Square is acknowledged. Melcombe Street is a very well used pedestrian route connecting Marylebone train station with Baker Street underground station. Footway widths at this stretch are sub-standard and difficult to use by wheelchair and buggy users. As shown in the parking and
	So far as I am concerned, these proposals show again how flawed this scheme is for local residents and it supports the widely held local view that these flawed proposals are being driven by the Portman Estate in order to make more money irrespective of the impact on residents. It is very telling that the Council's "Statement of Reasons" claims this scheme will benefit a number of potential stakeholders, but it does not refer to local residents even once. That, of course, has potential legal implications for the Council.	loading schedule, the total number of B Zone residents' spaces will be increased by 5. This means that the two spaces are not lost but relocated elsewhere within B Zone, with an increase on the total number of available spaces. Most of the new spaces will be installed in Gloucester Place, between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street, with a short walk from the lost two spaces. The relocation of those bays would also allow a better appreciation of the Dorset Square Conservation Area.
	These proposals are suggesting a significant reduction in local parking availability. These will appreciably (and adversely) affect the lives of residents. It is already hard enough for us to park. We - and visitors, people making deliveries and contractors - frequently have to spend a great deal of time looking for local parking (20 minutes or more is far from uncommon) and it is completely unfair that we are, once again, being used as the scapegoats for	Parking north and south of Marylebone Road fall into separate parking zone. The BSTW is not looking to change this and this is not what this Traffic Order has proposed. The number of residents' parking spaces, north of Marylebone Road, will not reduce as a result of these proposals.
	this scheme and suffering disproportionately. For example, why is parking availability on Dorset Square being dramatically reduced? It is unnecessary in the context of the Baker Street two-way scheme, but an unnecessary road widening means that we are, yet again, being made to suffer for having homes here. It becomes harder to	Parking north and south of Marylebone Road falls within separate parking zones. The Baker Street Two Way scheme is not looking to change zones or making shared zones as suggested. The Council acknowledges the difficulties on finding available parking in the area. The scheme proposes an increase of five zone B resident

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	live and harder for visitors and contractors - and we will simply be passed on contractors' additional costs caused by the difficulties in parking, thereby adding financial loss to all the other issues we face. My submission is simple - there should be no net reduction in residents' parking and parking availability for visitors. Otherwise our lives will become even more intolerable.  In that regard, why has the Council not allowed residents to park south of Marylebone Road to relieve the extreme pressure on parking north of Marylebone Road? Residents with B permits could be allowed to share F permit spaces in the streets immediately south of Marylebone Road. There are precedents for shared residential parking (e.g. in NW8). This would also require a congestion charge residents' discount to be available for residents just north of Marylebone Road, but again there are precedents (most locally for Harley House residents). I ask that the Council looks again at this to relieve the unique suffering that residents just north of Marylebone Road now face through this scheme.  One other observation is the proposal to create a cycling contra-lane on Melcombe Street. The intention of this seems clear - to allow (and even encourage) cyclists to cycle northbound on the northern half of Glentworth Street. This idea also seems flawed. This street is very narrow and it is already hard enough for two cars driving in opposite directions to pass each other. Adding an additional cyclist dimension will simply mean that navigating that street becomes even harder. I struggle to understand why it is necessary.	parking bays north of Marylebone Road, mainly concentrated in Gloucester Place between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street.  Cyclists are encouraged to use Glentworth Street as a quiet and residential street. The proposal does not add any additional cyclist dimensions as cyclists are encouraged to ride in line with other vehicles. Two cars facing will always imply a most restrictive movement than a car facing or overtaking a cyclist.
115.	I have some concerns / questions about the proposals which I explore further below. I am responding on behalf of both myself and XXXXX in regards to where we live at XXXXX.  Looking at the current and proposed permitted traffic movements I note that there is nothing shown at either end of Portman Close which according to the key "where no arrows are shown there are no proposed changes to permitted traffic movements". I am confused. At present we can exit Portman Close on to Baker Street going south but not north as we would be driving headlong into a one-way system. The same goes for exiting Portman Close on to Gloucester Place where at present we can turn north but not south for the same reasons driving headlong into a one-way system.  With both Baker Street and Gloucester Place becoming two-way why does the plan not show on the proposed movements that we can turn either north or south when exiting Portman Close on to Baker Street or Gloucester Place. If you prohibit the ability to exit both ends of the street north or south but maintain the current situation then when we want to exit Portman Close we will always have to fight our way across traffic coming in the opposite direction, including on Gloucester Place a cycle lane, when in probably half the time it would be beneficial to turn straight in to the line of traffic movement i.e. left when exiting Portman Close on to both Baker Street and Gloucester Place.  Turning now to the parking restrictions etc. At present there is no parking permitted other than in designated bays on Portman Close except for Sunday when cars are able to park on both sides of the street and always do.  The Baker Street end of Portman Close was narrowed when the building on the north corner of Portman Close / Baker Street and go every Sunday the gap in between is so narrow that it is only possible to manoeuvre a small family car through the resultant gap. Anything bigger than that is forced to reverse back out on to Baker Street and go round Portman Square. With the road so narrow it	The intention is vehicles will be able to turn out of Portman Close (northbound and southbound) at Baker Street and Gloucester Place. The permitted movement drawing only show changes at signal control junctions not give way junctions.  The Baker Street Two-Way scheme does not change the parking arrangement on Portman Close which has already been designed to cater to a variety of local needs including Sunday parking.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	time that will be taken.	
	The existing and proposed plans show that other than for the corner of Portman Close with Baker Street where there is a change to "no waiting or loading at any time" from ["no stopping (single red line) (Mon – Sat, 8.00 a.m7.00 p.m.) or no waiting and no loading at any time" which is correct I am not sure due to difficulty discerning the closeness of colours on the key] the street parking is coloured orange on both plans which says "no waiting" on the key.	
	However it is clear that this is not 100% correct because at present vehicles are allowed to park in Portman Close on Sundays and presumably it is intended that the same will be the case going forward. If this is permitted, and I am not misunderstanding anything, then the issue of vehicles being able to get through a narrow gap even when the parking is done well by the drivers will continue with the need for vehicles to reverse out into Baker Street having turned into Portman Close only to discover they cannot get through. The issue with emergency vehicles will also persist. I would have thought that parking regulations should not be such that emergency vehicles find themselves prohibited from driving along a road that during all other times of the week is straight forward.	
116.	I largely approve of the proposed changes and in particular I think the solution to Taunton Place (the island to prevent southbound traffic from turning in) is an excellent one.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	However, I am very worried that remaining concerns of residents in the Dorset Square area (of which I am one) have not been addressed. The scheme still allows for traffic to enter Ivor Place and Huntsworth Mews from Gloucester Place. As a resident who (on occasion) drives, this is not necessary. And so the only reason I can see for allowing for traffic to turn into these very small residential streets is to provide an alternative route – or a release valve - for southbound traffic travelling from Gloucester Place through to Marylebone Station and the Westway. However, this is a very quiet residential area – and also a conservation area - and therefore it ought to be protected from becoming a thoroughfare for increased traffic seeking a back-route diversion - in essence, a rat-run. There are issues around pollution (both noise and air), as well as other health and safety considerations (narrow roads, many children and elderly). I strongly urge you to take these factors into account and to amend the scheme so that traffic cannot enter Ivor Place or Huntsworth Mews from Gloucester Place. I believe that this change will make for a much more confident-looking scheme. The Dorset Square Area is a conservation area and needs to be protected.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
117.	My comments below fall mainly into two areas. The first is that the whole scheme is justified as being good for pedestrians, when it is actually being driven and funded by business.  The second is that we already live in a highly polluted area and that slowing traffic down will make this worse.	The air quality impact assessment 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
	PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	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.
	<ul> <li>The proposed two-way system has been largely justified as improving things for pedestrians.</li> <li>This is a false claim, because all of benefits for pedestrians will be gained by smarter crossings – and this can be done cheaply and quickly.</li> </ul>	New signal controlled junctions will have pedestrian count down facilities.
	As an aside, it is shameful that nothing has been done for pedestrians in and around this area. I moved to Gloucester Place in 2009. Since that time, the surrounding neighbourhoods (Oxford Circus, St. John's Wood, Knightsbridge) have all introduced countdown lights – which greatly improve pedestrian safety.	Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally considered that accident numbers and / or severity would reduce as a consequence of:
	Occasionally, 'speed' is mentioned as a problem, and this can be easily and cheaply controlled by introducing one or two average speed cameras.  ALD DOLLHTION.	<ul> <li>Removal of one-way streets;</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>AIR POLLUTION</li> <li>The Marylebone Road is sited as the most polluted air in Europe now. Why would we be introducing a</li> </ul>	<ul><li>countdown;</li><li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li></ul>

NO. (Names	DECDONICE	DDO JECT TEAMA DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	<ul> <li>scheme to cause more stop/start traffic?</li> <li>Reducing lane capacity and causing more holdups when taxis, delivery vehicles, rubbish, scaffolding, and breakdowns occur all the time. What about resident parking? The bays require cars to back into them, there by stopping traffic. Two lanes going in one direction provide a degree of redundancy that is essential for traffic flow. Gloucester Place is named as the A41 – there's a reason for having trunk roads, it leads to the M1 and the M40 – the west and the north. Like it or not, there is through traffic, but there are no real alternatives and the best thing we can do is get it through the area efficiently.</li> <li>At the very least, the proposed plan needs to include an independent monitoring of air quality, before and after, and a guarantee to revert to a one-way system if pollution increases at all.</li> <li>This is a business lead scheme, the residents are not in favour of the proposed scheme, but it is the residents that breathe the air all the time.</li> <li>Recently, more and more is being discovered about the effects of diesel cars. The government encouraged diesel cars. Until they compensate owners by scrapping them early and electric cars reach some momentum, this scheme should not go ahead. Perhaps it could be reconsidered in five years.</li> </ul>	Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions.  Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.  Studies from the US have certainly demonstrated reductions in the number of collisions following conversion from one-way to two-way streets.  The air quality impact assessment 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.  The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.  It is also worth noting the Baker Street Two Way includes the widening of footways in Dorset Square and Melcombe Street (for the pedestrian link Marylebone Station – Baker Street), Park Road (opposite Regent's Park), Baker Street (between Dorset and Blandford Streets), Portman Mews South and Orchard Street. Together with new pedestrian crossings in one stage at some key junctions (as Marylebone Road – Baker Street or Park Road) will create benefits for pedestrians using the area
118.	You have requested comments on the parking regulations. I live in Gloucester Place – above the Marylebone Road. There are lots of vehicles that come through regularly, and stop and start – including refuse, laundry deliveries, post, etc. I myself get regular deliveries from Amazon and Ocado. There are lots of hotels and lots of flats used by "Air B n B". These residents use taxis and Uber a lot, they use the loading bays to pick up and drop off passengers. Furthermore, builders and scaffolding need a place to be they aren't that rare. Also, there are some numbers of breakdowns.  The need to get items like this off the road is key. I wonder whether this factor was taken into account when the traffic flow and pollution studies were done?	Regarding deliveries and loading points, the proposals show specific loading points and their hours of control.  Regarding data used for traffic counts and air quality studies, traffic counts in the United Kingdom are taken following Department for Transport guidelines and recommendations. These are obtained in a consistent manner, excluding unusual peaks or valleys on data (for instance school holidays). Datasheets are contrasted with other datasheets within the historic database before they are validated. The industry has a series of competent validations that make data reliable and usable for all traffic engineers throughout the country
119.	<ul> <li>As a resident I would like to OBJECT to the proposals for the following reasons:</li> <li>Excessive pay-by-phone parking bays;</li> <li>Pay-by-Phone bays encourage people to access central London by car (rather than use public transport). It encourages congestion and increases pollution along with well documented health issues. This is counter to providing a modern sustainable city environment.</li> <li>Pay-by-Phone bays are also combined with residents' parking bays - significantly reducing residents' access to available parking bays which are already in short supply: you will note central London residents tend to use their cars infrequently and predominately for journeys out of London, so overall the contribution to daily congestion and pollution is proportionally limited.</li> <li>My concern is these bays are aimed at generating revenue for the local authority rather than working towards a sustainable city.</li> </ul>	As shown in the parking and loading schedules for Gloucester Place, which includes Montagu Place, there is a loss of pay by phone bays. This information can be found on the Baker Street Project website - <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation.">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation.</a> The Project Team has chosen to reduce the number of pay by phone bays to avoid a loss of resident bays. A total of six pay by phone bays and one shared-use bay are lost, while the total number of resident bays is kept constant.
120.	We have reviewed the consultation documents for the above project and make the following comments with	There will be no changes to the existing residents' bays and single yellow lines in front of the entrance at 103

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Withinelay	<ul> <li>regard to the proposals identified on Drawing No. 70004404-C-TMO-PR-11 Revision A for your review and consideration. We have attached a marked up copy of this drawing which illustrate the issues associated with the comments below:</li> <li>1. It appears that the existing Resident Permit Holder bays in front of 103 Wigmore Street entrance are being reduced from what is currently marked on site, providing a slightly longer single yellow line in front of the entrance. However, the drawing notes that these are existing parking bays. Could you please clarify if these are being reduced if the length of single yellow line is being adjusted to suit? We would not want the ability for vehicle to drop off on this single yellow line at the building entrance to be compromised.</li> <li>2. It appears that there is an additional pay-by-phone parking bay being introduced adjacent to the 103</li> </ul>	Wigmore Street.  There will be no changes to the existing pay-by-phone bays and single yellow line in front of the entrance at 103 Wigmore Street.  Bus shelters are generally being relocated when bus clearways are affected. This is the case at the bus stop at Orchard Street southbound. The relocated bus shelters will be installed in accordance with Transport for London guidance notes at the beginning of the bus clearway. It is our intention to merge the two shelters into one single bus shelter in the more southern part of the bus clearway. The new location is well away from the Selfridges entrance.
	Wigmore Street entrance. However, the drawing indicates that these are existing bays. There are 5 parking bays currently marked on site however the drawing indicates 6 parking bays. Could you please clarify if this will be an additional parking bay, or whether the overall bay length is being maintained with shorter individual parking bays, and if the length of single yellow line is being adjusted to suit? We would not want the ability for vehicle to drop off on this single yellow line at the building entrance to be compromised.	Site meetings are being arranged to discuss taxi ranks issues and any decision will be taken after the meetings have taken place.
	3. The Orchard Street southbound Bus Stop carriageway markings appear to be slightly shorter and moved slightly further north than the current alignment, which we support. We note the drawings do not indicate the existing bus shelter locations and do not indicate the proposals for removal or relocation of the bus shelters, and we would like the proposals for these to be clarified. There are two bus shelters associated with the existing southbound bus stops - one is approximately midway along the new Bus Stop carriageway marking on your proposed drawing and the other is to the south of the new Bus Stop carriageway marking on your proposed drawing, immediately north of the existing cycle hoops. The relocated Bus Stop marking suggest the southern of the two bus shelters could potentially be removed which we would support, as it is currently directly outside Selfridges entrance doors.	
	4. The proposals indicate that the existing Bus Stop on the northern side of Oxford Street is being moved east and the existing Taxi Rank being moved west (i.e. the two are swapping locations) with the small kerb build out being removed. The drawings do not indicate the existing bus shelter locations and do not indicate the proposals for removal or relocation of the bus shelters and we would like the proposal for these to be clarified.	
	The proposed taxi rank location will now be further from the Selfridges main entrance on Oxford Street and we would query whether it is necessary for the Bus Stop and Taxi rank location to be transposed. Selfridges would prefer for the Taxi Rank location to remain as existing.	
121.	Further observation to the traffic flow proposal:  It is not clear from the drawings if the minimum traffic lane width and minimum cycle lane width are met by the proposal.	Information shown in the Consultation Report shows cycle lane width to be 2 metres. Traffic lane widths vary slightly but are generally around 3.5 metres wide.
	Minimum cycle lane width = 1.5m, recommended 2m.  Minimum traffic lane width = 3.2m (very tight as lorries and waste collection vehicles are 3m width AND 3.2m may not conform to minimum fire access width). The neighbourhood lost Chiltern Street Fire Station years ago.	
122.	I respond as a resident of nearly 40 years and a freeholder, residing with my daughter, and on and off, her family, at XXXXX. It is one of the streets affected by the proposed traffic changes.	The air quality impact assessment 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

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	We comment as supporters of the two-way scheme. We are confident that the well-being of residents and businesses which we have enjoyed for so long can be carried forward without disturbance to the existing quality of life, and that the repeated bottle-necks at the convergence of Baker Street with Park Road, and, travelling north, where Gloucester Place feeds into Marylebone Road can be removed.	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.
	Implementation of the two-way scheme must involve resolution of aggravated air quality issues. To do this productively TfL and Westminster City Council need to ensure urgent application of air quality improvement measures (action rather than further monitoring) in relation to reduction and control of road traffic and railway emissions from diesel trains (Marylebone Road and Marylebone Station).	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square / Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester
	Through traffic must continue to be routed away from (not through) the Conservation Area ensuring a lessening of pollution to these residential streets.	Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	The primary issues poor air quality and its cause, traffic volume must be addressed. Dispersing traffic through minor local streets is no solution at all. Why bother? London's reputation (and indeed the City of Westminster's) depends on quality of urban life issues attested to in the high amenity value and very specific character of its many and varied garden squares, conservation areas and their accompanying and diverse street patterns. Here they provide the vital urban context for Regent's Park.	Currently all northbound traffic uses Gloucester Place, including buses, coaches and HGVs. In the proposed scheme, buses will use Baker Street. It is not expected that the number of HGVs or coaches on Gloucester Place would increase to the extent that of damaging the road structure. The table provided ( <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> ) shows that this section of Gloucester Place will actually
	Inappropriate volumes of traffic and inappropriately heavy use by coaches and heavy goods vehicles, downgrade the built environment: places to get away from as quickly as possible.	experience no change or reduction in traffic  Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website. Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of
	Heavy traffic in historic areas also physically degrades the fabric of the buildings themselves, subjecting them to intermittent, but regular, vibrations. A balcony recently collapsed in Balcombe Street provoked, it is said, by vibrations from a slamming car door. The modest terraced houses at the north end of Gloucester Place and in Ivor Place and the streets round about are already subjected to regular and intense noise and vibrations. This should be carefully taken into account.	receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme. This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
	We note the steps taken in the revised application to protect the identity of the Dorset Square Conservation area. These could usefully be improved.	It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
	1. Given the Square's relatively modest size, works to pavement and traffic management should be accomplished discretely. The zebra crossing suggested would be visually intrusive and inappropriate.	
	2. The raised section indicated in the south-west corner of the square (Melcombe Street Gloucester Place intersection, should match that on the northern intersection, which works well.	
	<ol> <li>The proposed one-way entry from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place. This would allow multiple routes though modest residential streets for through traffic to Marylebone Station, the fly-over and points west. Instead we strongly support the St. Marylebone Society's suggested revision, made in response to residents' concern. It is suggested that:         <ul> <li>Ivor Place (modestly scaled residential) should serve as a one-way route into Gloucester Place.</li> <li>Taunton Place – Huntsworth Mews should offer a one-way entry to the Conservation Area core.</li> <li>There is no need for the potentially disruptive turning into the south side of Dorset Square from Balcombe Street/Dorset Square west side proposed. Nor, indeed, from the southern end of Boston Place. Instead traffic should at that point continue across Marylebone Road. The mews features of Boston Place should be recognized and the acoustic effect of the solid wall to Marylebone Station on the west side.</li> <li>A further 'entry' to the core Conservation area may be provided (as existing) at the Gloucester Place</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	Huntsworth Mews junction.	
	The removal of buses from Gloucester Place and its proposed use by coaches is of concern especially as coach numbers and frequency may be expected to increase to fill the gap left by the removal of buses to Baker Street.	
	Gloucester Place at its northern end is a highly residential street fronted by modest houses set back hardly a metre from the public highway. Residents are vulnerable to noise and pollution produced throughout the day and during much of the night already. This proposed use is likely to exacerbate both. Streets such as this, with high cambers generally have a central brick arched sewer. Massively well-built, but subject of late to repeated impact from an unusual number of HGVs. It is worth remembering that neither the pavement (typically 4 inches of earth over brick arched coal cellars beneath), nor the roads themselves are on solid ground. They remain vulnerable to inappropriate over-use.	
	The existing position of the coach stop just north of Marylebone Road has been a persistent blight in the area for some years, perhaps more use could be made of Rossmore Road in this respect. In the interests of connectivity the area west and north of Marylebone Station could be considered.	
123.	I am emailing to express my strong objection to the proposed Baker Street and Gloucester Place two-way scheme. My main reasons are:	Traffic conditions have vastly changed since 1961 and are not comparable with the current situation.
	<ol> <li>I have lived in the vicinity since 1946, and I remember how clogged with traffic Baker Street used to be when it was a two-way street up to 1961. In that year, in part because of this, the one-way system was introduced, for an experimental period of six months. It proved a success, and was thus continued when the experimental period was over. It is absurd to drop this tried and tested successful system and - without any corresponding trial and at a cost of several million pounds - to return to an earlier one which had itself to be dropped because of its failings.</li> </ol>	Based on extensive traffic modelling the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of the bus services and taxis would be transferred to Baker Street northbound. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes.
	2. The changes in bus routes which are connected with the scheme would be extremely inconvenient to the numerous residents living in and to the west of Gloucester Place. We would lose all our north going buses, and would have to walk several hundreds of feet further in order to be able to find them in Baker Street - which is likely anyway to be clogged with its extra two-way traffic. Nor would we indeed get any compensatory south going buses.	The resiting of bus stops is part of the consultation that Transport for London has carried out for relocation of bus services. Unfortunately the Council does not have any control of the bus routes.  The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local resident roads. The possible rat-run have been analysed through the various stages of the project. In coordination with neighbours and businesses a
	<ul><li>3. The arrangements proposed for Marylebone Road are likely to increase the use of the smaller streets west of Gloucester Place as rat-runs, seriously disturbing the residents' peace and quiet.</li><li>I hope you will get rid of this dreadful proposal.</li></ul>	series of turning movements have been banned and a number of streets will change direction or become one way in order to control and reduce rat-run through residential streets. Please note that following this consultation the right turn southbound from Gloucester Place to Ivor Place west has also been banned following discussions with neighbours in the Dorset Square area. This new banned movement would stop possible rat-run
		from Gloucester Place to Marylebone Station through the north of Dorset Square
124.	As a resident, I am responding again to register my strong objection to this project on the following main grounds:	Based on extensive traffic modelling the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. The scheme has been designed so that traffic demand on the current one way road network can be largely accommodated under the two way scheme through simple transfer of traffic between Gloucester
	<ol> <li>Present through traffic volumes will not be safely accommodated;</li> <li>The huge and unnecessary cost financially and in disruption to normal business;</li> <li>The increased danger and inconvenience for pedestrians and cyclists in Baker Street and Gloucester Place.</li> </ol>	Place and Baker Street. A combination of traffic restrictions and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of the bus services and taxis would be transferred to Baker Street northbound. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the
	I hope that the considerable opposition to the project will prevail.	two routes.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		It is acknowledged that disruption that the construction of the scheme would create disruption. However, the scheme would ultimately result in a better environment. The Transport for London Active Traffic Management Strategy would be in place before the start of works. The Project Team will try to reduce traffic flows on Baker Street and Gloucester Place during works by controlling through traffic on the radial approaches to Central London.
		Westminster City Council's consultants carried out an analysis of accident across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impacts of the scheme on road safety. The results concludes that the number, type and severity of collisions that will occur in the two way system will be reduced compared to the two parallel, 3 lane one way streets with high speeds and overtaking opportunities. The accident analysis report assures drivers in single lane environments are less likely to be distracted by other vehicles and pedestrians crossings in slow moving traffic will have fewer opportunities to step out from a stationary lane into a faster moving lane where they may be unseen by drivers. In treated sites with safer features, such as countdown at pedestrian crossing sites, the reports states that it is reasonable to expect collision rates to go down to a level below the borough average. It is worth noting that crossing the road away from official crossings in traffic gaps as mentioned is not a safe practice and it should be discouraged.
		Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
		Studies from the US have certainly demonstrated reductions in the number of collisions following conversion from one-way to two-way streets.
		It should be noted that as per the table published in previous consultations, there will be no noticeable change in traffic flow on Bryanston Street as a consequence of the two-way proposal.
125.	This Company is the long-standing owner and occupier with tenants and a multi-story car park at 21 Bryanston Street. After careful consideration of your detailed information it is of the opinion at this juncture that the pace of traffic movement in this very busy business area will reduce and cause further congestion.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
	In particular the movement of vehicles in Bryanston Street is already restricted by the Council on street parking arrangements, two hotels, a casino and a restaurant, a situation which will be worsened by the large development in progress on the north side of the street. Your traffic proposal could worsen the situation.  In all the circumstances the Company is of the view that it must raise strong objection to your traffic proposal until further detailed consideration and information.	The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads. The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.
126.	My neighbourhood is threatened with becoming a 'rat-run' in the current proposals. I propose that the lay-out of roads is designed from the outset to prevent the possibility of a 'rat-run' developing, and believe this can be assured by the following changes:	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	<ol> <li>Ivor Place (west) to be the one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be the one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>A banned right turn when driving south at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Street.</li> </ol>	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	I have previously stated in responses to the BS2W proposal that the existing relatively low pollution and traffic	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	levels in this almost entirely residential neighbourhood should not be sacrificed. Many people in our neighbourhood are very concerned that this will happen if the TfL/WCC proposals are implemented as they currently stand.	
127.	I note that, yet again, Harewood Avenue has been excluded from any proposals.  You are aware that residents and other stakeholders are opposed to most of the current proposals which effect this road.  I give up trying to make anyone understand the implications of the combination of two-way, Cycle Quietway and Cycle Superhighway on this road. If we are right, then we will have to rely on corrections being made post implementation.  My proposal that the traffic flows of Harewood Row and Hayes Place should be reversed, which would lead to a great improvement to existing traffic flow at the junction of Melcombe Place, Harewood Avenue and Harewood Row, has not thus far been accepted (or even, as far as I know, been considered and discounted).	No changes to parking, loading and waiting restrictions are proposed on Hardwood Avenue as part of this project, hence it has not been included in this consultation.  Since the BS2W project is not proposing changes on Harewood Avenue, this request has been passed on to be investigated as part of the Cycle Quietway scheme.
	Virtually no cost is involved for a great deal of benefit. Even if the effects of the three schemes made no difference to existing flows this would be a sensible move.	
128.	I would urge you to take note of the local society's views and make Ivor Place one-way out of the neighbourhood.  Taunton / Huntsworth Mews one-way in and ban a right turn at Dorset Square Melcombe Place.  I live in Linhope Street a very quiet area about to suffer increased air pollution and more traffic and years of disruption for no benefit at all to any group.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  The air quality impact assessment 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.
129.	I am a resident of XXXXX and have reviewed the final plans for BS2W.  The one major objection I have is the possibility of creating a rat run through Dorset Square by allowing vehicles to turn tight off Gloucester Place (southerly direction) into Ivor Place or Taunton Mews and then from Dorset Square onto Melcombe Place. This has the potential to create very high volumes of traffic heading for Marylebone station and Westway – I'm sure taxi drivers will spot this shortcut very quickly when faced with queues down Gloucester Place.  The streets immediately to the north of Dorset Square are currently very quiet, low traffic areas where children play, residents enjoy the local pub and walk their dogs. The creation of this 'rat run' has the potential to change	The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .  Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation. Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally considered that accident numbers
	the nature of this quiet area fundamentally.  I request that you take measures to prevent his happening, i.e.:  • enforce no right turn South from Gloucester Place; and	<ul> <li>and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:</li> <li>Removal of one-way streets;</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;</li> </ul>

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	<ul> <li>no right turn out of Dorset Square;</li> <li>make Ivor Place one-way in an easterly direction;</li> <li>make Taunton Mews one-way into from Gloucester Place (left turn only from Gloucester Place).</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions</li> </ul>
	These simple measures have the potential to preserve the quiet, residential nature of this area.	Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
		Improved local accessibility will help emergency services as more traffic movements will be permitted than currently are.
		Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
		Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
130.	<ol> <li>I am writing to object to the proposed Baker Street / Gloucester Place two-way scheme as both a local resident and a Mayfair shopkeeper.</li> <li>The over-riding point of my objection is the total unfeasibility of the scheme. Baker Street and Park Road are currently three lane thoroughfares. Were it possible to squeeze the width of two bus lanes and two traffic lanes into each road, which is highly questionable, the risk of lateral collision would be enormous. To contemplate adding cycle lanes, widening existing pavements and planting additional trees is risible. Bus stops, taxi drop-offs, good deliveries and refuse collections would simply halt the flow of traffic: accidents or minor road-work closing part one lane would be catastrophic for the flow of London's traffic were the proposed scheme to be adopted.</li> <li>The Portman Estate states on its website that it has been working to find a way to reduce the impact of the A41 in Marylebone with the aim to move the emphasis away from fast moving traffic. Despite empty assurances on the Two-Way website that the project should help traffic circulation, careful examination of the traffic routing plans, the statements by the players who have the most to gain financially from the proposed scheme and simple common sense, indicates that the main purpose of the proposals is to slow down the speed of vehicular traffic. The resulting traffic jams would have dire effects on the mobility of the emergency services. Local fire brigade, ambulance and police call outs would be greatly impeded. At this time of rising terrorism any restriction to traffic response-time in case of a major incident in central London</li> </ol>	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
	would be disastrous.  The current one-way system did not evolve by chance but was introduced fifty years ago with the express aim of reducing traffic congestion then, let alone now. The under-estimated cost of works of fifteen million pounds is not only a huge waste of public money but would be dwarfed by the sum required to reverse the scheme when London is forced into gridlock. According to the Centre for Economics and Business Research, London drivers spent more than 250 hours idling in traffic, double the UK average. Last year congestion cost the UK economy £13 Billion.	The proposed scheme will improve accessibility and should make it easier for emergency services to respond to calls.  The scheme is expected to improve traffic flow. There is a monitoring strategy in place for post-construction, as laid out in the consultation report - this will monitor effects of the works. Due to rigorous layout change it is not possible for a trial period.
	To even contemplate a scheme that would further slowdown the flow of London Traffic is quite shocking.  2. As a local resident and together with hundreds of neighbours living in the many flats in this terrace, I am	The change in parking (residents' and pay-by-phone) has been clearly provided on the project website throughout its development. Other responders have accessed this information on the project website: <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs</a> . The document Summary table of restriction changes gives all the information.

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	acutely aware of the huge inconvenience that the scheme will bring to access to our homes by car or taxi should Ivor Place become one-way. The scarcity of residents' parking places is already a huge problem for the residents of Park Road and the proposed scheme will only exacerbate the situation. The off —road parking spaces in Glentworth Road belonging to homes in Park Road will become inaccessible to their owners. Significantly the description of the proposed scheme fails to disclose whether there will be an overall increase or decrease of residents' and non-residents' parking places.  The busiest entrance to Regent's Park is from the top of Baker Street and is used by thousands of pedestrians and myself every week. The introduction of dedicated cycle tracks at the junction between Baker Street, Park Road, Alsop Place and the Outer Circle will force pedestrians to negotiate perilous crossings with cyclists. With the best will in the world from cyclists, pedestrians and motorists alike, accidents and fatalities are bound to occur at what will become a notorious danger spot.  The environmental impact of the scheme locally seems to have been left unaddressed. With proposed additional pedestrian crossings, installation of cycle tracks and general slowing of traffic, particularly starting and stopping, the problem of fuel emissions in a heavily populated residential area will increase significantly. From a purely selfish perspective, buses would be thundering northbound feet away from my windows, emitting fumes day and night. An unseemly clutter of chained and fallen bicycles would diminish the visual amenity of a fine early 19 <sup>16</sup> Century terrace of Grade II listed houses. Restriction of vehicular access would cause the value of my property to drop.  3. As the owner of the well-established jewellery business Bentley and Skinner at the junction of Piccadilly and Old Bond Street, I am particularly aware of the likely effect of the proposed traffic changes on the level of West End trading generally. The Baker Street	The layout has been carefully designed taking into consideration the needs of different modes. The layout should provide an environment where all modes are aware of other road users and act as expected. If used correctly it should not endanger any road user.  The air quality impact assessment 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. The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.  Baker Street and Park Road are already bus routes with all southbound buses using this road along with coaches. It is expected that some of the southbound traffic will shift to GP so total traffic on Baker Street would still be roughly the same.  The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  Concerns of local stakeholders and residents have been addressed in the previous two consultations by either providing a response or making changes to the design. Meetings have been held with various residents' groups and amenity societies to discuss these concerns. Responses to all concerns raised have been provided in
131.	I am writing to object to the new proposals for altering the traffic flow around Baker Street and in particular the channelling of traffic from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place.  The Statement of Reasons clearly states that "The Baker Street and Gloucester Place two-way scheme will	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that there is no right turn permitted from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place.

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
and addresses withheld)	transform the area between Marylebone and Oxford Street by delivering public realm improvements to meet the aspirations of local businesses and the Business Improvement District	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.  In order to achieve a benefit in terms of traffic reduction on Melcombe Street and through Dorset Square, local traffic must be permitted to enter the Marylebone area from the Gloucester Place southbound approach from Park Road, though this route will be discouraged through use of traffic calming measures such as the new traffic refuge on Gloucester Place and a new Zebra crossing and raised entry treatment at the junction of Balcombe Street and Melcombe Street. The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration of further mitigation measures.  The air quality impact assessment 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. The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square / Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and Bibs.  A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outwelph the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term. There is no aspiration to divert traffic into lvor Place or any residential roads, the scheme has been designed to be tr
132.	We are writing to ask in the strongest terms that you save the Dorset Square Conservation Area from the proposals that have the potential to destroy the character and community of our neighbourhood. Unlike many parts of central London this area has a settled community, people live here all the time, with many families, children and babies. No one has a garden and our kids have always been able to play out on the streets which	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
	are currently safe as vehicular access is restricted to prevent through traffic.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	Currently the plans show a potential north to west turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (West). This will	Implement faction measures in required.
	allow vehicles to avoid Baker Street to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and	
	onto the Westway. We hope that this potential cut through can be designed out by the following changes:	
	Ivor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction.	
	Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction.	
	AND MOST IMPORTANTLY	
	No Right Turn where Balcombe Street/Dorset Square meets Melcombe Place.	
133.	I am writing to ask in the strongest terms that you save Balcombe Street from the proposals you have made that	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic
	will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester
	from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (West). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester	Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	Place to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway.	
		This would avoid the potential rat-run to Marylebone Station and the Westway. Taunton Mews and Balcombe
	Please may we propose an alternative:	Street will remain as existing.
	Ivor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction.	
	Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to
	AND MOST IMPORTANTLY:	implement further measures if required.
	No Right Turn where Balcombe Street and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset Square.	
	At present our few streets experience an extraordinary lack of passing traffic that allows our children to play in	
	the street, for us to walk to schools and shops and breathe relatively exhaust-free air. My daughter suffers from	
	chronic asthma, and her suffering increases significantly as we approach the Marylebone Road. Her bedroom	
	gives directly onto Balcombe Street. The only traffic that uses our streets is residential or delivery as there is no	
	cut through that will speed up a commute.	
134.	In supporting the proposal to make Baker Street two-way, we suggest that Porter Street should become a one-	This was considered as part of the initial study. The Baker Street model observed more movements westbound,
	way street from west to east, that is, from Baker Street to Chiltern Street. This would prevent it becoming a rat	rat-run could be occurring although in very low numbers. If Porter Street becomes one-way eastbound we do
	run by drivers seeking to avoid the traffic lights at the junction of Baker Street and Marylebone Road. Porter	not anticipate there to be a significant impact on the network as a result of reassignment. We have also
	Street is a very narrow street anyway and the fact that a row of parking bays takes up half the road space means	considered accident records for the street. There are no accidents associated with Porter Street with the
	that two-way traffic flow is impossible.	exception of two incidents involving car doors being opened onto oncoming cyclists and motorists at Baker
		Street junction. One-way streets do not accord with the objective of maximising accessibility for residents. The
	Both the pressure on Porter Street and the noise at night would be reduced if the parking bays on this largely	Project Team considers there is insufficient evidence, either in terms of traffic flows, or road safety, to require a
	residential street fronted by the properties of Portman Mansions were to be converted into residential parking	change. Post implementation traffic monitoring will be targeted at this location and traffic movements will be
	bays for the use of local residents.	reviewed if necessary.
	If making Gloucester Place and Baker Street two-way could share the pressure of bus traffic, this would also	As shown in the consultation material the motorcycle bay in Porter Street will be relocated to Baker Street by
	assist with the current problem of pedestrians safely negotiating the crossing of Porter Street at the junction	request of stakeholders. This bay would be replaced for a pay by phone bay, to match the existing provision in
	with Baker Street where local and express buses come into the two bus stops immediately south of this junction.	Porter Street.
		The Baker Street Two Way scheme already results in a loss of 6 pay by phone bays in this area, in order to keep
		the existing provision of resident bays. At this time, the provision of resident bays cannot be increased, although
		further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme.
		The proposed layout in the scheme will resolve the arrival conflict between local buses and the X90 services. The
		footway is wider with a raised crossing which will assist pedestrian crossing and improve safety.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld) 135.	I live on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road, so I will be greatly affected by the proposed two-way system. I remember earlier in the consultation, that a traffic flow survey (not sure what it was called), suggested that throughput would be the same, despite the lanes carrying traffic was to be reduced by around a third. Subsequently, I heard or read, that the Air Quality – overall – would not be affected given the introduction of a two-way system. Where could I get a copy of the parameters used for both of these studies? In particular, I'm interested in how many taxi drop offs, pick-ups, laundry deliveries, scaffolding setups, rubbish collections, breakdowns, rail replacement coaches, etc. were used to come up with these conclusions.  Finally, where can I find out which buses are now proposed to come up Gloucester Place?	All of the project information has been published online and can be found here <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> Bus routes can be found on the BSTW website.
136.	I think the overall scheme of the new layout looks very interesting. However, as a resident of Balcombe Street for many years (my family have lived in the street since the late 50's) I am concerned about the potential "rat run" you will create by the one-way system from Gloucester Place onto Ivor Place.  This would be better off being no entry from Gloucester Place to prevent those travelling south from trying to cut through to enable an easier right hand turn on Marylebone Road.  As I understand there will be no right hand turn onto Marylebone Road from Gloucester Place I am not sure how all the traffic that currently turns right from Baker Street onto Marylebone will now do so?  The only other current right hand turn onto Marylebone road is via Harewood Avenue and this is always jammed.  Blowing (sic) more vehicles to enter into this via Balcombe Street and Boston Place will only worsen this situation.	The right turn from Gloucester Place to Marylebone Road is being retained as shown in turning movements document included in consultation information.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	The logical approach would be to allow traffic to turn right at the junction of Gloucester Place and Marylebone Road.	
137.	<ol> <li>In addition to the comments listed below please note the errors in your current diagrams:</li> <li>On the north side of Dorset Square adjacent to Gloucester Place you currently indicate 4 bays as resident bays this is an error.</li> <li>The current coach stop in Gloucester place south of Dorset Close is not reflected in the current layout.</li> </ol>	Unfortunately, there was an error on the drawing; the existing bays are pay-by-phone bays and remain so in the new scheme. No change is proposed here. The existing bays are not part of the consultation.  The coach bay south of Dorset Square is shown on the consultation drawing.
138.	<ol> <li>I was only waiting for answers from you [JO] to the two specific questions I had raised in my emails which required clarification in order that the consultation could be responded to in a meaningful manner. The two questions were:</li> <li>Confirmation about the residents parking bays at Dorset Square as shown in your consultation diagram. Thank you for addressing this point in your email where you confirm that your diagram is incorrect and wrongly shows 4 pay and display bays at the north-east corner of Dorset Square as residents bays. This error will of course effect the accuracy of the consultation findings as many residents will be led to believe (wrongly) that these 4 spaces are replacing the 4 residents spaces you are removing from the south side of the Square.</li> <li>Confirmation of the locations of the Southbound coach stops on Baker Street as these are missing from your</li> </ol>	Unfortunately, there was an error on the drawing; the existing bays are pay-by-phone bays and remain so in the new scheme. No change is proposed here. The existing bays are not part of the consultation.  Coaches will share the bus stops in Baker Street with buses as they currently do. Coaches will only run southbound in Baker Street and will stop in the relocated stops close to Baker Street / Melcombe Street and Baker Street / George Street.  The Project Team contacted XXXXXX via telephone and email to explain the Statement of Reasons.
	<ol> <li>Confirmation of the locations of the Southbound coach stops on Baker Street as these are missing from your consultation diagrams (point 6 of my email dated 22/11/16). Unfortunately, you did not address this point in</li> </ol>	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Williams	your email and I should be grateful if you could answer this question.  Also, I sent an email dated 30/11/16 requesting clarification about the Statement of Reasons contained at the bottom of page 3 of the consultation letter dated 14/11/16 (I will forward another copy to you for ease of reference) and I should be grateful if you could address the points I have raised about the Statement of Reasons or if you could forward my email to the appropriate person for reply.	
139.	My wife and I are close to exchanging on a flat in Dorset Square and are expecting to move in early next month. We were informed yesterday that a letter was sent out to residents informing them that the most recent proposals of the Baker Street two-way project do not include making Gloucester Place two-way, north of the Marylebone Road. Are you kindly able to confirm if this is the case and if so what you think the reasoning is? Lastly if this is the case, how concrete a decision do you think this is and if you think there is any chance it will be reversed?	The Project Team contacted XXXXX directly to discuss his concerns and provide further information.
140.	I am objecting to your plans for traffic changes to Baker Street.  This can only make the congestion worse for both residents and those that, through no fault of their own, rely on driving for a living.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; the road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
141.	Overall we strongly oppose the proposals which continue to disregard the significant number of articulate objections from people who cycle, who made clear their concerns about dangerous junctions and the limited hours of operation of the cycle lanes. Local people have written to us commenting "What about Sundays, when I do my Breeze ladies' rides?" and "Sundays are when families and less confident people cycle because there's less traffic". The proposed Monday to Saturday 7.00 a.m. – 7.00 p.m. cycle lanes do not accord with the Council's Cycling Strategy Vision 'to make Westminster a national leader in cycling provision, making it safer and more attractive for a greater number of people from all backgrounds, to cycle more frequently'. We ask the Council for proof that there is higher car parking demand on Sundays that justifies the part-time cycle lanes decision.  We will however comment on the detail of the proposals:  It is disappointing that the restriction of the section of Baker Street north of York Street to buses, taxis, cycles and vehicles requiring access would only apply on Mondays to Fridays 7.00 a.m. – 7.00 p.m. The part-time nature of this restriction makes it less clear and reduces the benefits of motor traffic reduction it might have brought to businesses, visitors and residents on Baker Street. Why must this restriction be part time?	The hours of operation were part of the first consultation, and Mon - Sat 7.00 a.m. – 7.00 p.m. received the greatest support. The need for this provision is not just for parking, but also to provide for deliveries, drop offs etc. Properties on Gloucester Place do not have rear access and therefore need to carry out servicing from the road itself.  The restriction is only required at the busiest periods of the day. This is because northbound traffic demand needs to be minimised when there is a high demand for the southbound right turn from Baker Street, which is opposed by northbound traffic. Retaining the southbound right turn is important, because this minimises the risk of rat-running through the north Marylebone area. The scheme in itself is not designed to require traffic reduction to be able to operate successfully, yet it is likely that the wider TfL strategic traffic management strategy will result in reduced levels of traffic in the near future.  The prohibited turns are to minimise the risk to the expected higher volumes of cyclists on George Street from turning traffic. The predominate movement is expected to be east-west, and full turns are provided at Baker Street, where traffic turning flows and risks to cyclists are expected to be lower.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	It is regrettable that cyclists would be prohibited from turning right from George Street (west) into Gloucester Place (south). Could this perhaps be enabled using a two-stage cyclist right turn? Likewise cyclists would be prohibited from turning left from George Street (east) into Gloucester Place (south). Gloucester Place is BSTW Project's designated north-south cycle route and George Street is part of the Council's east-west Hyde Park-to-Fitzrovia Quietway.	This movement is not permitted because pedestrians receive a green man invitation to cross Gloucester Place while traffic on York Street (including cyclists) receive a green signal. Traffic capacity at this location is extremely sensitive (because of the reduction in traffic lanes) and a two stage right turn will remove traffic capacity and this will either increase the risk of traffic congestion, or result in traffic reassignment onto local roads, which is not desirable.
	It is also regrettable that cyclists would be prohibited from turning right from York Street (west) into Gloucester Place (south). Could this perhaps be enabled using a two-stage cyclist right turn?  It is equally regrettable that cyclists would in future be prohibited from turning right from Oxford Street into Portman Street (Gloucester Place). Could this perhaps be enabled using a two-stage cyclist right turn? Likewise cyclists would be prohibited from turning left from Portman Street (Gloucester Place) into Oxford Street. This seems at odds with the promotion of Gloucester Place as BSTW Project's flagship cycle route.  Is there a reason why northbound cyclists would be prohibited from turning right from Orchard Street into Wigmore Street, and would they in future also be prohibited from turning right from Portman Street into Portman Square (south section)? These bans combine to make it very difficult for northbound cyclists to turn eastbound onto Wigmore Street, which is a popular route parallel with Oxford Street.  We are pleased that access for northbound cyclists from Baker Street into Regent's Park has been restored and permeability for cyclists on side streets has been increased as a result of our earlier comments. We suggest that the detail of the east end of the Melcombe Street mandatory cycle should be adjusted to make it easier and safer for eastbound cyclists to turn right into Glentworth Street (south).	Changes to the method of control and permitted move at the Oxford Street junctions are necessary to facilitate the two-way proposals while retaining pedestrian crossings and not giving rise to additional traffic (especially bus) delays. A two stage right turn would have a detrimental impact on traffic capacity, and this will either increase the risk of traffic congestion, or result in traffic reassignment onto local roads, which is not desirable.  With the expected traffic levels northbound at both locations, and especially the amount of buses, there is considered to be a risk to cyclists that might wait in the middle of the junction to turn right. Cyclists might be expected to use Edwards Mews to travel eastbound from Oxford Street to gain access to Wigmore Street via Duke Street, where there is a dedicated right-turn lane.  Cyclists might choose to undertake an informal two stage right turn, however it is not considered appropriate to formally feed cyclists into a section of carriageway where motor vehicles will be turning right out of Glentworth Street.
142.	My preferences for routing of traffic are below. They have been discussed with other residents and aim to leave sufficient entry and exit points to and from this residential area.  • The arm of Ivor Place which runs west of Gloucester Place should go one-way eastwards from the	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	intersection with Huntsworth Mews to Gloucester Place so that vehicles may go north or south along Gloucester Place, or east on Park Road and Allsop Place.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	<ul> <li>The extreme south arm of Huntsworth mews should be one-way into the area from Gloucester Place. The pavements would need to be widened as it is too narrow for the two-way entrances and exits proposed. It would also be desirable for signage indicating this is not the preferred route to Marylebone Station.</li> <li>Right turns from the west side of Dorset Square (called Balcombe Street) into Melcombe Place should be forbidden. That junction is often very congested with buses and taxis coming north from the Marylebone Road.</li> </ul>	The air quality impact assessment 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.
	I am mindful that one of the aims of the two-way system is to improve air quality. However, if more traffic comes through the Balcombe Street-Dorset Square Conservation Area, the opposite may occur for residents who live there. Thus, local monitoring of air quality before changes are made is essential in order to measure the impact of the proposed changes.	
143.	This email is to register and stress my strong opposition to the proposal to prohibit motor vehicles proceeding northbound on Baker Street from the junction with York Street between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m. on Monday to Friday.	Based on extensive traffic modelling undertaken the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions, including the Baker Street ban mentioned, and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Willieldy	<ul> <li>This means all motor vehicles northbound will be routed via Gloucester Place / east side Dorset Square (residential street) increasing traffic and pollution.</li> <li>Not only Gloucester Place / east side Dorset Square would have all northbound traffic (except buses) but also southbound traffic.</li> <li>I live in an area where pollution legal limits are often breached and we fear this will be made worse.</li> <li>In addition, I strongly oppose the placing of a coach stop in Dorset Square. Coaches should be routed on Baker Street. Dorset Square is a residential Square and also the heart of the Dorset Square Conservation area.</li> <li>Baker Street should have capacity since ALL cars and trucks will be routed onto Gloucester Place / Dorset Square during the day time hours from York Street onward northbound.</li> <li>Baker Street is mainly a commercial street unlike Gloucester Place mainly residential.</li> <li>There is currently no coach stop in Dorset Square.</li> <li>I frequently have to redirect users to the current coach stops in Gloucester Place. The current layout only reflects the coach stop in Gloucester Place north of Dorset Close and not the one south of Dorset Close. Commercial tickets are sold as Baker Street.</li> <li>Having coaches in Baker Street will immediately link coaches with the Underground.</li> <li>Coaches will increase environmental and noise pollution in our area.</li> <li>The proposed coach stop will affect the enjoyment of the Square in particular the north side. It would also increase traffic in Dorset Square by people driving to the coach stop.</li> <li>If WCC / TFL insist that coaches will be routed on Gloucester Place then I strongly object to the proposed siting of a coach stop at Dorset Square which will create increase noise, pollution and nuisance for those living on the north side of Dorset Square and for all of us when using Dorset Square Gardens. The two coach stops on Gloucester Place just north of Marylebone Road should continue in operation.</li> </ul>	Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes.  An air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and 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 report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the scheme.  It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.  The proposed location of the coach stops ensures it is central for this mode to access other public transport networks at Marylebone Station and Baker Street. Northbound coaches will be on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street.
144.	I am greatly disappointed to learn that the two-way scheme will proceed as it will clearly harm the quality of life in our neighbourhood. I also strongly doubt the proposed "business benefits" will materialise. What will happen is increased traffic being routed into the Dorset Square residential neighbourhood with substantially reduced quality of life for residents.  Specifically, I would like to object strongly to the proposal to move the coach stop from just north of Marylebone Road to right in front of Dorset Square. This will block access to the Square for cars and pedestrians. Indeed we already experience the entrance being blocked with Transport buses. There is no need for this additional insult to the situation. Given that tickets for these coaches are sold as "Baker Street" coaches, I fail to understand why the stops cannot be sited on Baker Street, which is a commercial street and therefore more appropriate for this traffic.  I also strongly object to all northbound traffic being directed to Gloucester Place while adding in southbound traffic. Routing all northbound traffic on Gloucester Place was logical when Baker Street took all the southbound traffic, but as the powers that be seemed to think a two-way scheme is preferably, than make it a fair two-way scheme and allow two-way traffic on both arteries. Otherwise you have reduced traffic along a commercial street at the expense of a residential neighbourhood. It's bad enough that this scheme is proceeding over the strong objections of all residents (catering to "business interests" only), at least make the flow of traffic fair.  Lastly, I would ask that you find replacement for all residents' parking that is being eliminated by this scheme.	All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, please be assured that the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles use Gloucester Place.  All comments regarding coach routes and coach stops will be passed on to TfL who liaise with coach operators. However, the current proposals of keeping northbound coaches on Gloucester Place is not expected to cause congestion nor impact the air and noise quality adversely. Currently, all northbound traffic including buses, coaches, cars, delivery vans, lorries, heavy goods vehicles uses Gloucester Place north of Marylebone Road, and only two services (Routes 30 and 74) would continue northbound on Gloucester Place from Portman Square, while the remaining services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses (as well as potentially tourist coaches), taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Scheduled coaches would continue to travel northbound on Gloucester Place. However, this is not expected to lead to congestion on Gloucester Place, because traffic management measures will be used to control traffic demand.  On the project website, a table has been provided 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals. This is based on the extensive traffic modelling that has been undertaken. This table demonstrates that the section of Gloucester

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		Place between Marylebone Road and Ivor Place will actually experience a reduction in traffic flow both in AM and PM peak. The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.
		Coach stop at Dorset Square – it is proposed to relocate the coach stop on Gloucester Place to the same location as the existing Bus Stops T and U, which currently provide for all northbound bus services. Northbound buses will be largely relocated onto Baker Street.
		The coach stop at Dorset Square is required in order accommodate the new controlled crossing and minimise the risk of coaches oversubscribing the stop at Allsop Arms that would risk blocking back into Marylebone Road resulting in wider congestion in the network. The existing split of stops (one each side of Melcombe Street) will be grouped, as now, by airport (i.e. separate stops for Luton and Stansted).
		This restriction is between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m., the volume of traffic within this period predicted by the model has helped shaped the proposal. The restriction will ensure effective traffic flow without causing congestion on either Baker Street or Gloucester Place.
		The project team has worked to retain as much of the residential parking across the scheme. As shown in the parking and loading schedule, the total number of Zone B resident bays in this area will be increased by 5, meaning some resident bays are not lost but relocated within Zone B, with an increase on the total number of available bays. Most of the new bays will be installed in Gloucester Place, between Ivor Place and Melcombe Street, opposite Dorset Square.
145.	I have lived in Balcombe Street for 25 years during which this quiet enclave has been protected from through traffic by the one-way operation of Gloucester Place.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	I fully appreciate the overall benefits of the BSTW scheme and have supported the project, in the face of considerable hostility from many neighbours, on the understanding that our residential amenity would be protected from southbound vehicles seeking cut-through to Marylebone Station and access to the Westway. It is very disheartening that this request on a peripheral aspect of the design has been ignored, while others involving	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	strategic elements of the scheme design have been readily granted e.g. at the junction of Gloucester Place and Marylebone Road.	Removal of some of the parking bays in this part of the project is to facilitate the cycle lane. There are still areas of single yellow that can be used for loading and other parking bays that are not too far away.
	I strongly object to making the west arm of Ivor Place a one-way entry point into this area from Gloucester Place. This opens up a rat-run despite the placement of a refuge on the pedestrian crossing. With the burgeoning of Uber, minicab and PHV services and wide use of sat-navs, this may not be evident in the immediate post-implementation period, but will grow over time.	These additional signage are been considered as part of the scheme but this need must be carefully balanced and not lead to clutter on the highway.
	The proposed design must be changed. Discussions amongst neighbours have identified the following as our preferred solution:	
	<ol> <li>Make the west arm of Ivor Place one-way OUTWARDS between Huntsworth Mews and Gloucester Place.         Exiting vehicles can then go north or south along Gloucester Place, or east via Park Road and Allsop Place.         The island on the crossing is not necessary, and its removal will enable cyclists to use the crossing to get over Gloucester Place safely.     </li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Make Taunton Mews one-way INWARDS from Gloucester Place up to the junction with Huntsworth Mews and widen the pavements. The opening onto Gloucester Place is too narrow and dangerous for two-way entrances and exits as proposed.</li> <li>Ban right turns from the west side of Dorset Square into Melcombe Place. That junction gets very congested</li> </ol>	

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	in the rush periods with buses and taxis coming north from the Marylebone Road. This would still leave sufficient entry and exit points from this residential enclave to access all directions.  Contra-flow cycle lanes. The one proposed on Dorset Square (west) is fine as it allows cyclists to enter the enclave safely. I do object to such a cycle lane in Ivor Place (west) if it means the loss of parking bays in this narrow street. Paid for parking spaces are being taken out of Dorset Square and we cannot lose any more, especially in Ivor Place which is centrally placed in the enclave. There is already a shortage of paid for parking for visitors and tradesmen. Needing to refurbish a flat, we have had difficulty finding tradesmen willing to take work in the area because of the time and money they waste finding parking and walking between premises and their vehicles to access tools and materials.  Experience over 25 years shows that, once inside this enclave, road space is shared by all users and this moderates speeds and fosters mutual courtesy. I am not aware of any accident figures that indicate otherwise even though Ivor Place, with its parking bays, has been two-way for vehicles and cyclists.  Signage In earlier consultations we were assured that TfL will sign access to Marylebone Station along their strategic route i.e. traffic from the north will be signed along Park Road, Baker Street and Melcombe Street. The station warrants better signage now that it offers intercity services to Birmingham and Oxford as well as commuter trains.  WCC also indicated it would place signage on its road near the junction of Rossmore Road with Park Road to show the most direct route to Marylebone Station from the north.  In addition to these, I urge that the one-way IN sign at the entrance to Taunton Mews should also state "No Access to Marylebone Station".	
146.	I wish to make several objections to the Council's proposed plans for the Baker Street Two-Way Project.  The Dorset Square Conservation Area is a quiet and historic residential area. Children feel safe enough to play games on the pavements, many young and old people live in the 1820's housing. The streets in the late Georgian era would have felt very wide. Today they still do, yet parking for the many hundreds of people in the area make passing in the roads tricky even at the least busy times. I have lived on Balcombe Street for all my life (35 years) and have seen it go from being a shabby and somewhat dirty area to a clean, safe and tidier place. There is a very strong neighbourhood feel, plenty of children, dogs and a number of disabled people - the fact that this conservation area is not a rat-run for speedy drivers has made it a safe place to be.  I do not think the build environment would cope with the new rat-runs, let alone the young families and other residents.  I hope this is helpful - it is something I feel strongly about, not so much for my own sake (my flat faces the station and would not be too badly effected), but for the sake of my neighbours and this precious Georgian environment we are all lucky to call home - it is a miracle the area has survived so well since the 1820s. This is one of the biggest threats to this conservation area in its history.	The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
147.	I strongly support the two-way changes to these streets, and appreciate the modifications that have already been made to improve the scheme for local residents and those who work or visit the area.	Support for the scheme is noted.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	However there is one aspect of the scheme which still appears to me to have a likely damaging outcome:	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	Allowing the southbound right turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place seems likely to open up a rat run for traffic coming south and wanting to go east on the Marylebone Road.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	I know the proposed traffic island is supposed to 'discourage' this, but in my experience if a route is possible, that allows regularly commuting traffic to jump queues on other routes, it will always be taken.	
	In addition a route that avoids queues is always likely to end up on Sat Nav systems.	
	This is a particular problem for these streets (Ivor Place, Linhope St, Balcombe St) as the roadway is narrow, and the pavements are narrow, so the houses are packed very close to the traffic.	
	These streets are in a conservation area, and have an unusually high proportion of families for central London, who are very worried about this outcome.	
	It would be serious blot on the overall scheme, and probably generate a damaging amount of negative publicity for what should otherwise be a positive scheme.	
	Obviously this is not an intended outcome, so it would seem to be to be prudent design it out, rather than just hope it does not happen.	
148.	For this consultation, we have concentrated on the area North of the Marylebone Road.  We have had very few responses from local residents in this area on the details of parking and loading, except at a few specific places. However, there are several areas of concern in the proposal which are causing significant anxieties for some residents, and these are covered in our comments below.  Baker Street  Residents of Chiltern Court (over Baker Street station) which consists of 150+ flats, always have significant difficulties with loading and unloading because they lack a dedicated vehicle entrance, and wish to ensure that their needs are met. [We note that there is a two minute loading box just south of Melcombe Street junction on the East side of Baker Street].  Bus stop northbound between Marylebone Road and Melcombe Street. We had a comment that the location of this means that there is no passing room between bus stops north and southbound. However we note that the section of Baker Street north of the Marylebone Road will only be carrying taxis buses, and cycles northbound, because of the junction configuration Baker St. Marylebone Rd.  Proposed Loading bay on west side of Baker Street between Melcombe Street and Park Road: given that northbound traffic here will be buses and taxis, we wonder how this will be accessed.  We have had no comments on Baker Street from Chalfont Court or Berkeley Court.  Glentworth Street and Clarence Gate Gardens Contra-flow for cycles on Melcombe St. between Gloucester Place and Glentworth St. The design implies a	<ol> <li>The existing loading provision for Chiltern Court on Baker Street is retained to ensure that loading activities can be undertaken. Based on concerns raised during the first consultation, the "set down and pick up" box has been included in the design which was shown indicatively on the drawings published as part of the second consultation. This box is shown north of the proposed bus stop close to the Baker Street/ Melcombe Street junction. The location of this box has been decided after careful consideration of various factors. Under the proposed scheme, it would not be possible to keep this at its current location due to its impact on the functioning of the Baker Street/ Marylebone Road junction.</li> <li>Low traffic levels mean that a passing gap" is not necessary.</li> <li>The restriction for northbound general traffic on Baker Street is from 7am to 7pm only. The other 12 hours of the day allows northbound movement when the loading facility can be accessed. In addition, access to the loading bays between 7am and 7pm can be gained by travelling southbound on Baker Street.</li> </ol>
	N turn into Glentworth St, and a built-out pavement on the NE corner of junction will discourage cyclists from continuing against the traffic to the junction with Baker St. There was scepticism that this	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RES	SPONSE	PROJE	CCT TEAM RESPONSE
withineld)	<ol> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> </ol>	discouragement would work as cyclists already commonly cycle against the traffic on Melcombe St. to the Baker St. junction. The 1 block contraflow might even encourage cyclists to continue to Baker St. Perhaps the contraflow should be extended all the way to Baker St acknowledging the current situation. (We understand that the BS2W team does not wish to encourage cyclists to turn into Baker Street).  Glentworth St is a 2-way street but often becomes effectively 1 way because of double-parking by various delivery vans – is this dangerous to cyclists? (What is the destination of North bound cyclists who would otherwise have gone up Gloucester Place? Regents Park/ Swiss Cottage / Maida Vale?)  (Tesco) Loading bay on Glentworth St S of Melcombe St. There is a lot of illegal use of this bay by many different kinds of vehicles, which means that quite often the Tesco van can't get into it and parks with the back of the lorry extending far into Melcombe St. [It may be that the Tesco van doesn't come in the hours that it is supposed to]. In any case this is a far from ideal situation which impacts on other road users. Could any improvements be made?  Junction of Glentworth St and Ivor Place. This junction is problematic and should be discussed with the school. The additional signalling for North to Eastbound vehicles is helpful. There was a suggestion that this should have a proper stop sign. This would be in addition to the signage at Ivor Place/Park road. It was also suggested that there should be a warning sign about the cycle lanes along Ivor place for northbound drivers. Visibility for these drivers (north to East on Glentworth St) is not bad towards the East, but very bad for things coming from the West because of the corner of St Cyprians church. This part of Ivor Place is a short stretch of road, but school kids cross all along it as parents drop off on both sides. Fears have been expressed that the demands on the narrow section immediately to the north of St Cyprians Church are very great, creating concerns abo	<ol> <li>1.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>7.</li> </ol>	The Project Team does not consider Baker Street the safest route to access Regent's Park and the future Cycle Superhighway. The proposed buildout on the north-eastern corner of the junction has been designed to discourage cyclists to continue in Melcombe Street, as the recommended route to travel northbound to Regent's Park is via Glentworth Street. The cycle route has been designed following Ouletways principles, linking the London Network Route east-west at Wigmore - Seymour Street with the future Cycle Superhighway in Regent's Park. The use of Melcombe Street and Glentworth Street is encouraged as the preferred route for all trips northbound.  Glentworth Street forms part of the London Cycle Grid Quietway due to very light traffic flow. The destination for northbound cyclists is access into Regent's Park via Ivor Place and Park Road.  The issues with the loading bay on Glentworth Street will be passed to the City Council's Parking Enforcement Team for consideration.  Safety of school children is indeed paramount. The Ivor Place / Park Road junction will be signalised and therefore stop signs are not required. Proposed cyclist directional signs and road markings will alert drivers that the cycle path continues through Ivor Place and Glentworth Street. Cyclists will be entering an elevated cycle path so their speed would be very reduced. Regarding the junction Ivor Place / Glentworth Street, the concerns are acknowledged regarding the school and visibility: however the removal of residents' bays in this area is not possible due to current demands. Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement any measures at this location if required  In order to facilitate the proposed layout, two residential bays have In order to facilitate the proposed layout, two residential bays have been removed of this location and relocated elsewhere within the zone. It is worth noting the Baker Street Two Way scheme has a positive balance of five new resident bays
		hard to tell where they are changing these and some people are concerned that there has been a reduction.		
	6.	The issue of dividing Parking Zone B in two was raised by Clarence Gate Gardens residents. There is a perception that residents from the north section of this zone come and park near Baker Street/ Marylebone Station so that they can easily access public transport. This issue is not part of this consultation, but it is raised regularly, so we have noted it.  We have received no comments on Glentworth street either from residents of Dorset House or from residents of Berkeley Court.		
	7.	We have had one very strong objection to the entire scheme from a resident of Park Road, living between Baker Street and Ivor Place. Monitoring of the effects of the design will be needed to demonstrate		

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheid)	whether or not such concerns are justified.	
	Harewood Avenue There are a number of residents living on Harewood Avenue who oppose the BS2W project because they fear additional traffic towards Marylebone Station passing down their street. They would prefer the Rossmore Road/Park Road junction not to allow this.	
	We have not received any other specific representations about the design of this junction in the TMO consultation. Residents of Harewood Avenue are also concerned about the Harewood Avenue cycle Quietway and what the joint effect of these two projects will be on the roads around Marylebone Station and the Landmark Hotel.	
	While we recognise that this is also not part of the TMO consultation, we have been asked to mention the idea that the junction of Melcombe Place and Harewood Avenue would be improved by reversing the directions of Harewood Row and Hayes Place. This is an interesting idea and we would like to see any future traffic studies showing the effect of this change, should there be more efforts to improve this junction.	
	Dorset Square and the Dorset Square Trust View. Junction of Dorset Square/Balcombe Street with Melcombe Place There are strong calls from local residents living on Balcombe Street, Ivor Place, and on Dorset Square for banning a right turn towards Marylebone Station at this junction. See further discussion in the Ivor Place/Balcombe St section.	
	The coach stops  The Dorset Square Trust would prefer coaches to run northbound on Baker Street, and if they must remain on Gloucester Place, for the relocated coach stop to be north of Dorset Square rather than being where bus stop T is now. As this stop extends north so that at least 2 coaches can be accommodated at once, we can't see that the entrance into Dorset Square just south of the stop will be blocked by coaches in the TMO proposal. DST is also worried about pollution, and coaches not turning their engines off when they stop is currently a serious problem for local residents. Some way of enforcing this needs to be found. We don't think it is possible to accommodate buses and coaches on the upper part of Baker street in this project, as they generally have separate stops. [We did ask in the previous consultation whether coach stops could be on Park Road, but understand that the stops are required to link up with the underground stations as closely as possible].	
	To have only coaches stopping on Gloucester Place is a significant improvement over the current situation.  But DST feels that there will be more traffic on Gloucester Place despite the predictions in the Peak Hour  Traffic Flow Change Forecast showing a reduction in this sector (except at the Ivor Place junction).	
	Residents Parking bays  DST is unhappy about losing residents parking bays along the south side of the Dorset Square Garden where the pavement is to be widened. We support the widening of the pavement here, and the re-siting of the hire bike stands. It seems that some of the existing pay and display bays in Dorset Square – just behind bus stop T and mislabelled in the TMO drawings as Res Park – are to be converted to residents parking in the proposed scheme, so we think that there is no change overall in the immediate vicinity.	
	Signage  We agree that street clutter should be kept to a minimum and that the Conservation status of the area	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	should be taken into account when signage for the new arrangement is installed. For new signs, the internally illuminated pattern is preferred.	
	Single yellow lines Yellow lines in Dorset Square seem to be shown in the key to the scheme as "no waiting at any time". But it's hard to tell from the key to the drawings, as the colours for "no waiting" and " no waiting" at any time are similar. We note that residents feel they should be "no waiting at any time".	
		There is expected to be a minor net increase in traffic flow on Rossmore Road and Harewood Avenue as local traffic seeks a more convenient and shorter route to the Marylebone area, but this is unlikely to be through traffic to Marylebone Road because there is no change to the traffic capacity at the Harewood Avenue / Marylebone Road junction, and strategic traffic is expected to remain on Baker Street. The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration.  The proposed location of the coach stops ensures it is central for this mode to access other public transport networks at Marylebone Station and Baker Street. Northbound coached will be on Gloucester Place and southbound on Baker Street. Traffic is expected to remain on Baker Street. The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration.  Unfortunately, the drawing incorrectly labelled the pay and display as residents' bays. Overall there is a net gain of five residents' parking spaces.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Single yellow lines (shown in yellow in the plan) generally mean no waiting restriction during the hours of the CPZ (controlled parking zone). For a no waiting at any time restriction, double yellow lines are required on the floor (these are shown in orange in the plan). Existing single yellow lines in Dorset Square are to remain as existing.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required. A post monitoring strategy has been developed to monitor the before and after effects of the scheme.
	Gloucester Place and Huntsworth Mews.  In discussions residents appeared to accept that taking the cycle lane off the upper portion of Gloucester	
	Place and having 2 indicative cycle lanes in Glentworth Street and Balcombe Street instead was a general improvement in the area as it makes more space available for parking and loading on Gloucester Place.	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	Some residents see the junction of Melcombe Place/Dorset Sq./Balcombe street as proposed and the junction at Boston Place/Melcombe Place as actually dangerous – potential conflict areas - because of the increased emphasis on protecting commuter footfall between the two stations.	
	There is a lot of anxiety about possible increased taxi use of Ivor Place/Balcombe Street in the direction of Marylebone Station if the BS2W suggested configuration is implemented.	
	There is currently a growing problem with Uber drivers in this area: there is nowhere for them to park as (we believe) they can't use the Black cab rank at Marylebone Station and so they park with their engines running in the back streets in this section. This has been witnessed in Huntsworth Mews north and south and also in Dorset Square, as the minicabs wait to pick up clients from the Landmark Hotel/Marylebone Station. Residents don't know how to stop this, or if it is possible, and the fear is, that if it's easy for them to enter the area, this problem will get worse.	
	We did not receive any specific comments about parking and loading changes in this area apart from those concerns mentioned above. There have been some general comments that residents would like Dorset Square Conservation Area - and the wider area – to be 20mph. We have not received comments from residents of Boston Place and Taunton Mews / Huntsworth Mews South about this area or about the residents' proposal above.	
	Rossmore Road Residents see that there will be an increase in traffic along Rossmore Road as a result of direct access to Marylebone Station and the right turn into Marylebone Road. [BS2W predictions are for a "minor increase"]. Residents say that there have been a number of accidents at the Rossmore Road/ Harewood Avenue junction, and that the area is heavily residential with many children living in the vicinity. Pedestrians crossing Rossmore Road northwards at this junction have difficulty seeing traffic coming from the East, and would like a proper pedestrian crossing here. Residents also say that traffic backed up along Harewood Avenue will mean drivers behind on Rossmore Road continuing westwards and threading their way through the residential streets of Church Street Ward, which hold several schools and nurseries. High traffic speeds in the small streets here is already a problem.	
	<ul> <li>The residents are opposed to a new right turn into Rossmore Road unless:</li> <li>there is a zebra crossing from Harewood Avenue to Lilestone Street</li> <li>measures to slow traffic approaching this junction, such as a 20mph speed limit</li> <li>Right turns from Lisson Grove into Broadley Street and Bell Street and from Harewood Avenue into Broadley Terrace are banned.</li> </ul>	
	If WCC proceeds with the Rossmore Road right turn without these measures then these residents would oppose the entire two-way project.	
	Cycle lanes  We received a comment that there is no mention of a cycle crossing to the anti-clockwise lane of the outer circle from the cycle lane entering the park at Clarence Gate, and that it seems a cycle link is missing here.  [Do the Royal Parks/TfL have a plan to provide this in the CS11project?]. Otherwise there have been no comments on the cycle routes other than discussed above.	
	Mitigation Assurances/proof that monitoring of the scheme will be carried out and that mitigating measures will put	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	in place should parts of the scheme prove to be problematic, are needed, especially in light of the financial cuts taking place locally and nationwide.	
149.	I am a resident at XXXXX and have been for 12 years.	Unfortunately, there appears to have been a delay in the delivery of some consultation letters and this is being
	Please could you respond in depth to the following five points.	investigated. As a result, the consultation period was effectively extended to 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 to ensure that residents had ample opportunity to respond.
	1. Firstly may I say that the letter from Parsons Brinckerhoff took two weeks to arrive, written Nov 14, arrived Nov 28: please explain this breakdown in communication on a matter with permanent ramifications for the community.	Comments from residents over the first two consultation have been addressed and taken into consideration in developing the proposals where possible.
	2. Given that this proposal will permanently change our lives and homes and the lives of future generations here in the Dorset Square Conservation Area, please explain why our previous objections and comments have not been taken on board.	The air quality impact assessment 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
	3. UNIQUE CHARACTER OF THE AREA Please explain in depth how the proposal will not adversely affect the	experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme.
	unique character of the area, with specific answers to points 1-5 / a-e below.  This is an historically and culturally significant Westminster Conservation Area. This proposal will significantly and irrevocably alter the character of the neighbourhood.  I am retired and chose Linhope Street and the surrounding area specifically for its unique character in central	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
	London: a peaceful oasis with no through traffic. It's distinctive character includes:  1. Quietness 2. Relative lack of pollution - clean windows for London!	A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
	<ul> <li>3. Safety for my toddler grandson and pet dogs</li> <li>4. Neighbourliness: we chat across the street without playing second fiddle to passing cars.</li> <li>5. Historic and cultural significance. Can you show me where the following have been given consideration in your proposal:</li> </ul>	With regards to safety; Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.
	<ul> <li>(a) The world's biggest cricket brand, Marylebone County Cricket Club, had its first home in Dorset Square when it was Mary-le-Bone field. Thomas Lord of Lord's played to crowds of five thousand here. A plaque that your consultants should be well aware of marks the spot. Relatively unpolluted and tranquil place to sit.</li> <li>(b) The classic novel and numerous film adaptations of 101 Dalmatians by Dodie Smith were inspired by</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:</li> <li>Removal of one-way streets</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;</li> </ul>
	life in Dorset Square, where another plaque marks the home of Smith. Smith, who really did have a Dalmatian, famously walked these streets from Dorset Square to Regents Park - a Dorset Square tradition dog-owners preserve to this day. How will you protect dog owners from rat runs and racing vans?	<ul> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>(c) The Feathers, London's smallest pub, sits on the corner of Linhope Street and Ivor Place. Passionate local community support has successfully prevented attempts by developers to turn it into an executive home. What chance has it as a pleasant place to sit, if traffic is rushing past?</li> <li>(d) Oasis' Noel Gallagher is able to run a world famous music business from the corner of Linhope Street</li> </ul>	Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
	with total privacy from the media and paparazzi - the tucked away character of this inner London street means hardly anyone knows he's there. What benefit will traffic bring?  (e) The Beatle's legendary chase scene in It's A Hard Day's Night was filmed in Boston Place, instantly	Studies from the US have certainly demonstrated reductions in the number of collisions following conversion from one-way to two-way streets.
	recognisable to any local resident. How will Boston Place benefit?	The BSTW scheme is not expected to have any impact on the historical and cultural heritage of the area.
	Please explain how the above will be not be adversely affected and what consideration has been given.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic
	4. AMENITY - A quiet, safe, unpolluted street and garden square are valuable amenities. The proposal compromises these amenities. Noise and pollution destroys them. Please address. If you propose an	management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.

NO. (Names	DECDONICE	DDO JECT TEAMA DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	alternative amenity, let us know what it is.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	5. PHYSICAL ACCESSIBILITY OF THE STREETS	
	The streets proposed for the rat run are narrow. So narrow in fact that –	
	<ol> <li>Parking bays are not even wide enough for modern saloon cars.</li> </ol>	
	2. Passing vehicles must mount the kerb.	
	3. To see oncoming vehicles at the junction of Ivor Place and Linhope Street pedestrians have to step off the pavement and look round the corner.	
	I see no point in creating potentially lethal rat runs in a largely residential area of Boston Place, Linhope Street, Balcombe Street and Ivor Place so that vehicles may get more quickly to the Westway. You are proposing four cut through for traffic.	
	The residents have an alternative based on actually living here. It's much more practical.	
	1. Ivor Place should be one-way, running East out of the neighbourhood.	
	2. Huntsworth Mews should be one-way, running West.	
	3. No right turn from Balcombe Street onto Melcombe Place.	
	The above mean traffic has one flow, not four, and we can know where traffic is coming from. It would preserve one of London's last historic sanctuaries, which we would never get back if it were gone.	
150.	This is to object to all the traffic orders comprising the scheme.	The cycle route included in the scheme links the London Network Route at Seymour Street with Regent's Park and the future Cycle Superhighway.
	The reason for this is that the scheme's provision for cycling, as designed, incurs several critical fails on the	
	Cycling Level of Service assessment.	Timed cycle lanes have been chosen at Gloucester Place to provide benefits when cyclist flow is highest.  Mendetery cycle lines and double yellows lines will allow both the Metropolitan Police and Westminster City.
	This indicates that the scheme as designed is unsafe for anyone who chooses to use it on a bike. There needs to be fundamental redesign to make it safe for all users. Therefore all traffic orders involved in the scheme will	Mandatory cycle lines and double yellows lines will allow both the Metropolitan Police and Westminster City Council to enforce the timed lanes. Due to the competing requirement of different road users and available capacity it is not possible to provide a 24hr lane all through the scheme.
	need to be re-assessed before they are implemented.	Management and the second winds to the second secon
		Measures such as early release and right turn in two stages are also proposed at junctions along Gloucester Place. North of Marylebone Road, the facilities go on the bus lane up to Melcombe Street where the cycle lane turns right (controlled by signal right turn in two stages) to access quieter roads, contraflow in Melcombe Street and then into residential Glentworth Street and Ivor Place.
		Finally the route connects with Regent's Park through a new signal controlled junction at Ivor Place / Park Road and through a new elephant footprint crossing for cyclists southbound in Baker Street / Park Road junction. The route ends in Regent's Park in the connections to the future Cycle Superhighway. With most buses being rerouted to Baker Street, it is not considered to have several critical fails as suggested. The Project Team would welcome specific suggestions on how to improve the cycle route.
		The advisory cycle lane on the south side of Park Road passes a resident parking bay, yet the road is wide enough to provide a buffer zone of 0.5m, as recommended in the London Cycling Design Standards. The proposed advisory cycle lane includes this buffer zone.
151.	I am very concerned to see in the latest proposals for the Baker Street Two-Way scheme that it is proposed to create a "rat run" for southbound traffic on Gloucester Place through Ivor Place and Taunton / Huntsworth Mews. From these streets, traffic heading for the westbound Marylebone Road will fill Huntsworth Mews, Linhope Street, Balcombe Street and Boston Place with traffic. These narrow residential streets are quite	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	unsuitable for such traffic. Please reconsider.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
with in Sidy	I have one more comment to make about the Two-Way scheme in general. It is quite astonishing that, at a time when traffic speeds are at their lowest for decades, you are proposing to introduce a scheme, one of whose main objectives is to slow down traffic still further in Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Moreover, by installing more traffic lights, you will be creating long queues of stationary cars and lorries, many of which will be adding considerably to the already polluted air in this part of London.  The Two-Way scheme should not be implemented.	implement further measures if required.  The number of signalised junctions is not going to increase.
152.	XXXXX, as a local housing provider, has major assets and holdings in and around the proposed Baker Street & Gloucester Place two-way proposal, particularly a whole block of flats along Seymour Place and street properties off Lisson Grove.  The Baker Street & Gloucester Place gyratory is unlike any other one in London, as it has a substantial residential population in and around it, where tenants and residents are very much a part of the local community. Indeed we feel it operates much like the road grids in Manhattan, New York, where the through traffic can pass through very quickly on the Avenues and much of the local street life exists off them. This is very much in keeping with what we have in Marylebone, with traffic along Baker Street taking you into the West End swiftly, while Gloucester Place can get the traffic out of the West End, and the streets off them and parallel, where local residents live, like Melcombe Street, north of the Marylebone Road, and York Street & Paddington Street, as well as Lisson Grove and Seymour Place.  Coming from this position, we do not see any improvements to the public realm in the Traffic Order consultation, or increased accessibility along Seymour Place or Lisson Grove, where it is likely to be needed the most. We anticipate increased road traffic along Seymour Place and Lisson Grove, from traffic displaced from both Baker Street and Gloucester Road, moving more slowly than the traffic does on the present one way system. Furthermore, we anticipate increased traffic noise and public nuisance for our residents, particularly along Seymour Place. The Baker Street two-way proposal, now in its third consultation, has yet to address these well held fears and concerns.	It is not expected that traffic flows on both these roads will increase noticeably as a result of this scheme. Hence it is not expected to have an adverse impact on air and noise pollution there. Traffic modelling has been undertaken and approved by TfL and, it is not expected that displacement will lead to an increase in traffic.
153.	As a resident of the section of Gloucester Place immediately to the north of Dorset Square, I would like to strongly endorse the specific objections made below by the Dorset Square Trust.  Like many other residents of upper Gloucester Place I also have an overriding general objection to the proposal to introduce two-way traffic on our doorsteps: this section of road is too narrow to accommodate two-way flows of vehicles of modern sizes.  At busy times (i.e. most of the daylight hours nowadays) any vehicle that stops on our section of the road will cause an immediate backup, with further frustration, noise and above all air pollution in an already toxic environment. Apart from the now widely recognised detrimental effects on human health and mortality, this will impose further liabilities on the responsible public authorities for fines due to infringements of environmental laws and regulations.  The price that will be imposed on residents in the northern sections of the two-way scheme by the vested interests of those to the south is unacceptable. If the scheme goes ahead this will become clear, to the detriment of all.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
154.	Providing a right turn from A41 Park Road on to Rossmore Road will result in a significant increase in traffic on Rossmore Road. Once traffic crosses the railway bridge it enters a very densely populated residential area which is home to many children and vulnerable adults. The Church Street locality has 11,000 residents densely packed into 43 hectares and its the most densely packed ward in the UK.	While there is expected increase in traffic on Rossmore Road, it is not expected on Harewood Avenue. This is because most of the increase will be local traffic and not through traffic. The capacity at the Harewood Avenue / Marylebone Road junction will stay the same. Hence, there is not expected to be an increase in traffic in the Church Street area.
	The junction of Rossmore Road with Harewood Avenue has long been accident-prone, with a number of vehicles having crashed into the wall of the rectory southwest of the junction over the years. For pedestrians attempting to cross Rossmore Road from Harewood Avenue northwards it is very difficult to see approaching traffic on their right due to the bend of Rossmore Road over the railway bridge and vehicles parked close to the junction	Accident data at Rossmore Road / Harewood Avenue junction does not show any accidents in the last three years. It should also be noted that right turn capacity at Baker Street / Marylebone Road junction is being retained to discourage rat-run.
	blocking the view east.  The extra vehicles, will be expected to turn left into Harewood Avenue with the aim of turning right at Marylebone Road. However, Harewood Avenue is already frequently congested due both to back up of vehicles waiting to turn into Marylebone Road as well as taxis and other service vehicles bound for Marylebone Station. More traffic will only exacerbate the problems.	There is expected to be a minor net increase in traffic flow on Rossmore Road and Harewood Avenue as local traffic seeks a more convenient and shorter route to the Marylebone area, but this is unlikely to be through traffic to Marylebone Road because there is no change to the traffic capacity at the Harewood Avenue / Marylebone Road junction, and strategic traffic is expected to remain on Baker Street.
		The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration.
	Many drivers will therefore be tempted to proceed past Harewood Avenue and onto Lisson Grove, which provides no right turn onto Marylebone Road and also experiences back up. They will then seek to continue their westward journey along Broadley Street or Bell Street, taking them through residential streets and extremely close to two primary schools (St Edward's, Christchurch Bentinck) and one secondary (King Solomon Academy), the Portman Early Years Centre, IMPS mother and toddler centre and the Broadly Gardens and Lisson Gardens play areas. The speed of vehicles using these streets is already a concern and a substantial increase in traffic would be potentially catastrophic.	
	We therefore strongly oppose the option of a right turn from Park Road onto Rossmore Road. To improve pedestrian safety for the many people crossing between Harewood Avenue and the entrance to Lisson Green via Lilestone Street, we believe a zebra crossing must be installed across Rossmore Road to link the eastern pavements of Harewood Avenue and Lilestone Street. Should the option of the right turn from Park Road to be pursued we would insist on this as a pre-condition. The crossing must be signalled by flashing lights.	
	Similarly to improve safety at the junction of Rossmore Road and Lisson Grove, measures need to be introduced to slow traffic approaching the junction along Rossmore Road, such as a lower 20mph speed limit.	
	Further, if the Rossmore Road right-turn option is pursued, right turns from Lisson Grove into Broadley Street and Bell Street and from Harewood Avenue into Broadley Terrace should be banned.	
	If the Council wishes to proceed with the Rossmore Road right turn without the ameliorative measures proposed here then regrettably I must be counted as opposing the entire two-way working scheme.	
155.	For over 25 years I have lived in the quiet residential street of XXXXX and I supported the introduction of the BSTW based on the unequivocal assurance from TFL and WCC that the BSTW scheme, in making Gloucester Place two-way, would not facilitate a rat-run by funnelling southbound traffic for the Westway and Marylebone Station, through the network of quiet residential streets to the west of Gloucester place (such a rat-run is	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	impossible under the current arrangement because southbound traffic comes down Baker Street not Gloucester Place).	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	<ol> <li>I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to make a stretch of Ivor Place one-way from Gloucester Place westwards, which would facilitate a rat-run for southbound traffic to Marylebone Station and the Westway.</li> </ol>	
	2. On the contrary, I, along with many other residents I have spoken to, want the stretch of Ivor Place that joins Gloucester Place from the west to be made one-way out (east). This would allow residents a ready route from this network of streets to the north, without having to go further south to go north.	
	3. A consequence of making Ivor Place one-way out of this enclave of streets is that we would need to access the local area from the north via Huntsworth/Taunton Mews, which should be made one-way in (i.e. west from Gloucester Place) because it is too narrow to be two-way as is currently proposed.	
	To prevent the rat-run to Marylebone Station and the Westway simply developing one street further south, there must be a "NO RIGHT TURN" westwards from Balcombe Street onto Melcombe Place. Given the widespread use of sat navs this route would be used if it was not pre-empted by specifically prohibiting this right turn.	
	5. I also object to a proposed cycle lane westwards along Ivor Place, if it will mean a loss of parking bays. We have a major problem with contractors being reluctant to work in our area because of the lack of sufficient paid-for parking bays. It would massively exacerbate this problem if there was a reduction in the number of paid-for parking bays in Ivor Place to the west of Gloucester Place.	
	I trust TFL and WCC will honour their unequivocal undertakings to residents about not facilitating rat-runs when implementing the BSTW scheme.	
156.	I once again raise the issue relating to the 2 Way Traffic proposed for Gloucester Place North of Marylebone Road. Directly opposite the entrance of Dorset House are 2 coach/bus stops. The first bus stop has the following list of coaches/bus stopping - 2, 755, 757, 758, 771, 772, A1 and Golden Tours to Harry Potter. Bus stop 2 has A6 and A20.	The safety and operational characteristics of two-ways have been investigated. Generally all buses will be on Baker Street, whilst coaches will be on Gloucester Place (northbound) and Baker Street (southbound). In the southbound direction the coach stops will be shared with buses.
	There are currently 3 lanes of north bound traffic. At times there are 2 or 3 coaches lined up at the coach/ bus stop picking up passengers. In order to leave the bus stop a coach/bus can pull out into the second or third lane. With the proposal for traffic coming in the opposite direction, there will be one accident after another. I have photos which I can send you showing the line-up of coaches and a coach pulling out into the 2nd and 3rd lane after picking up passengers. I can also show you photographs of accidents which have occurred at the corner of Marylebone Road and Gloucester Place north which is currently a danger spot and have involved police and ambulance. Please urgently reconsider your proposal for 2 way traffic on Gloucester Place North.	
	I ask you to please Investigate further and I await your response.	
157.	My comments on this Scheme are mainly concerned with the proposal to reinstate two-way traffic on specific extents of Baker Street and Gloucester Place.  I strongly object to this proposal because, first, there has been no evidence of widespread local demand for the	It is not unusual for major estates, land owners and developers to approach the City Council with concepts/ ideas of public realm improvements which are then developed further by the City Council in partnership with them. These schemes, when delivered, not only provide improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and residents but also help in economic regeneration of those areas. One of the commitments under 'City for All' is 'to invest, with our
	change. Such demand as there may have been seems to have been confined to a limited number of commercial/business/ property interests which are influential in the area and which are evidently prepared to make a significant financial contribution to realising the Scheme. They believe the Scheme will increase the profitability of their assets. Such demand does not seem to be adequate justification for realising the Scheme unless	partners, in new public realm schemes, including walking and cycling improvements, and road safety schemes'.  Concerns have been raised about the perceived traffic capacity reduction by 30% and that it may lead to traffic congestion and rat-runs into residential streets.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheid)	accompanied by substantial popular support – which, as indicated above, does not appear to exist.  My second reason for objection is that some of the likely consequences of realising the Scheme would be highly negative. Despite a range of proposed ameliorative changes to road arrangements, there would almost inevitably be increase traffic congestion and disruption. While it is arguably desirable to slow down, to an extent, traffic he roads affected, the disruption caused by the Scheme would go far beyond what is tolerable. The negative effects of roadworks and accidents would be multiplied by the new two-way configuration of the roads. Then there is the highly important question of pollution, which is likely to be magnified by the implementation of the Scheme, including by slower and denser traffic with more congestion and stopping-and-starting. I have read somewhere that a study has shown that the Scheme would be broadly neutral as regards pollution. I have also read that such studies contain unjustified assumptions and are not reliable.  The documentation about the Scheme that I have seen contains many proposals for improving the area affected by the Scheme, the "Public Realm", etc. Many of these would be desirable irrespective of the central feature of the Scheme, the Two-Way system itself.  Possibly the worst or most disruptive feature of the local road system, apart from its excessive volume of pollution, is the huge volume of east-west traffic on the Marylebone Road. A scheme to reduce and/or divert this, though admittedly a daunting prospect, would be a far more worthwhile objective for the Council to adopt than the highly flawed and suspect BSTW.	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.  This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or indeed a 30% reduction in network performance.  It should also be noted that traffic will balance across two southbound and northbound routes, as opposed to the single routes that are currently available.  The scheme has been designed to be "capacity neutral". This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads. The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (Tift) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.  Any change to traffic patterns within the local area as a consequence of the two-way arrangement will follow from the introduction of new permitted turns at junctions and greater accessibility. This will result in a reduction in journey distances, as vehicles no longer have to negotiate the one-way system and can take shorter, more convenient routes. This mea
		The air quality impact assessment 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

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		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.
		The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
		A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts.
		There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
		The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
		<ul> <li>To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;</li> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> </ul>
		In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
		Marylebone Road is on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and forms part of the London Strategic Route Network. It carries all traffic east-west through the internal London ring road. Due to the strategic importance of this road, it is directly managed by TfL. The BS2W scheme only proposes changes in Marylebone Road at the junctions with Gloucester Place and Baker Street, as a minimal change to make the two-way scheme operational. Any queries regarding Marylebone Road should be sent directly to TfL as highway authority for Marylebone Road.
158.	As before, our response primarily addresses the scheme to the south of Marylebone Road, the area covered by the Marylebone Association's planning remit.	Comments on the Quietway cycle route on Harewood Avenue have been passed to the Cycle Grid Team for consideration.
	However, we would strongly request another look at proposals for cycling north of the Marylebone Road in the light of our previous objections to cycle lanes planned for Enford Street and Harewood Avenue. We, and the St Marylebone Society, are firmly of the opinion that the Enford/Harewood plans are dangerous and need to be reconsidered. An overall review needs to take place to produce a safer solution based on the cycle lanes planned	Based on extensive traffic modelling undertaken the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme.
	for the Baker Street scheme.	The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street.  Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	One of our concerns remains in the latest drawings i.e. that the northbound coach services will stay on Gloucester Place. As we said in our previous objection, Baker Street will have a northbound bus lane at the approach to Marylebone Road and will therefore cope better with the coaches. Secondly, many of the passengers are joining coaches from the underground at Baker Street Tube Station and would save the additional walk and road crossings, relieving the pedestrian congestion between Baker Street and Marylebone Stations. We also still believe that Gloucester Place will be underserved by buses compared with Baker Street but we are still discussing the broader bus changes currently being proposed by TfL.  We object to the resitting of the southbound bus stops on Baker Street from south of Porter Street to south of Paddington Street. Many passengers change buses from the Baker Street Station stop on Marylebone Road to the stops currently near Porter Street. Adding a whole block and another street crossing to this walk is an unnecessary inconvenience and a real drawback for infirm or disabled passengers.  Provision of parking in the Bus & Taxi Only lane on Baker Street is likely to cause serious confusion amongst drivers — what precisely does "for access" mean? If a vehicle has parked in one of these spaces can it then continue north to Marylebone Road or make a U-turn to go south? Would it not make sense to move this parking to the east side of Baker Street, south of Paddington Street, and leave the bus stops where they are, south of Porter Street?  Residents of Bickenhall Street will find access at the west end much more difficult with the need to cross opposing vehicle and cycle lanes without traffic lights to help. Equally, leaving the east end brings them into the centre of the bus and taxi only lane with a right turn the only option — or does the access provision allow them to turn left to reach Marylebone Road?  We are not convinced that loading provisions are adequate on the sections of Baker Street where	buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes. Not all users of coach services are coming from Baker Street tube station, but a great part is coming from Marylebone Station as well, for this reason it is important that a balance between Gloucester Place and Baker Street is kept.  The resiting of bus stops is part of the consultation that TfL has carried out for the relocation of bus services. The bus stop has been relocated away from Marylebone Road to declutter the public realm around Marylebone Road. The services southbound will stop outside Baker Street tube station, in the stretch between Allsop Road and Marylebone Road. All passengers wishing to change to the underground at Baker Street or change to a different bus service along Marylebone Road will be encouraged to alight before buses crossing Marylebone Road. The following stop southbound, located south of Paddington Street, will serve the area of Baker Street south of Marylebone Road. This provides greater opportunity for local businesses to be able to use a transport mode.  There is not going to be any carriageway space to be able to provide a dedicated right turn lane for local traffic entering Bickenhall Street. However, traffic can wait in the northbound outside lane for a suitable gap in opposing southbound traffic. Gaps will be created by the traffic signals on Marylebone Road, because there is no traffic turning from Marylebone Road when it is on a green signal, which is for a good majority of the cycle time.  Traffic leaving Bickenhall Street will be able to turn both left and right onto Baker Street. If it turns left, then it can only travel northbound ahead onto Baker Street.  The Baker Street Two-way team has consulted businesses to understand servicing requirements and considers that the loading provisions for the entire scheme are met, not only using Baker Street but also through side ro
159.	I strongly object to the Baker Street two-way proposals on the basis that it will cause increased traffic movement in residential areas and create unacceptable levels of risk to health of residents and pedestrian safety and cause unacceptable level of air pollution in residential areas. Moreover I am alarmed by the way proposals appear to being pushed through with total disregard for residents previous objections and no clear information that issues of public health and safety are being given any consideration.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of

NO. (Names	DECDONICE	DDO JEGT TEAMA DECROMEE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,		Marylebone Road.
		Regarding the concerns on air pollution and risks to health of residents, an air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and 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 report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than disbenefits as a result of the scheme. The report can be found on the Baker Street Project website - <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a>
160.	I have lived in North Marylebone for 2 years. I have recently had a baby and am making plans for her to be brought up in Marylebone therefore it bothers me a lot to see the two-way scheme being pursued at all, it really	Concerns have been raised about the perceived traffic capacity reduction by 30% and that it may lead to traffic congestion and rat-runs into residential streets.
	<ul> <li>hasn't been well thought out and will lead to so many problems. Here are some of my thoughts:</li> <li>Making any one-way street a two-way street does have a negative effect on traffic flow. This is precisely why we have dual carriageways: the presence of the central reservation means there is little to no chance of head on impact and we already know from research that motorways are the safest roads because they carry</li> </ul>	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity.
	one-way traffic per carriageway. Reverting back to two-ways therefore will slow traffic down, which is contrary to the claim made by the scheme propaganda. Given the traffic problems we already face in North Marylebone, I object to any scheme that slows traffic down.	It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems. This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or
	2. When traffic moves more slowly, air pollution increases. We know that cars perform at their most economic when travelling at a reasonable speed and as speed slows, so efficiency drops and airflow into engines does also. What this means is more fuel is consumed per mile and more particulates are released from incomplete combustion. It is clear from point 1 above that traffic will flow slower so it follows that the slower traffic will emit more pollutants. I needn't remind you that we live in an area where air pollution is already at unsafe levels. Further, living on a main road as I do, there will be increased air pollution in my home, which I strongly object to as it affects my quality of life.	It should also be noted that traffic will balance across two southbound and northbound routes, as opposed to the single routes that are currently available.  The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads.
	3. Pedestrian safety is adversely impacted because it is far safer to cross a one-way street than it is to cross a two-way street. We presently enjoy big gaps in traffic when the traffic lights are red that allow us to cross Gloucester Place and Baker Street safely away from official crossings, adding to the village feel of the area. With two-way traffic, this will be both less likely and highly dangerous with a risk of being marooned in the middle of the road with traffic passing in different directions either side. The pedestrian's needs will be neglected for no gain of any sort and the feel of the local area will change for the worse. As a result, pedestrian journeys will take longer, meaning they will inhale more of the pollution being output by vehicular traffic.	The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.  Any change to traffic patterns within the local area as a consequence of the two-way arrangement will follow from the introduction of new permitted turns at junctions and greater accessibility.
	4. Parking will become very difficult and disruptive. Currently, with one-way traffic, if a vehicle intends to park it may block a lane in doing so; the traffic is constrained into the remaining two lanes and once the vehicle completes parking the constraint is gone and normal traffic flow resumes. In a two-way situation with only one lane moving each way, traffic will be forced to stop as a vehicle either enters or leaves a parking bay (irrespective of type) as there are no other lanes to move into. This will cause added disruption and can increase frustration amongst those stuck inadvertently and further contributing to pollution. Further, as it will now take longer to enter or leave a parking bay, the bays will be occupied for longer meaning there is less availability for those that are looking to park their vehicle and therefore there will be more driving around to find a space, compounding the problems.	This will result in a reduction in journey distances, as vehicles no longer have to negotiate the one-way system and can take shorter, more convenient routes. This means that on some streets traffic levels may rise slightly, and on others it will reduce. For example, southbound traffic on A41 Park Road heading for the Marylebone area must, at present, use Melcombe Street and pass through Dorset Square. Under the scheme proposals, this traffic will take a more direct route via Rossmore Road, thus avoiding Dorset Square.  A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation.  These changes to traffic flow have been assessed in detail using the TfL central London strategic reassignment

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		
	5. Extended journey times. The scheme claims to reduce journey times however given that traffic will be slowed and in some instances stopped I cannot accept these claims. In reality it will take longer to get to North Marylebone, to find parking in North Marylebone, to leave North Marylebone and to pass through	model (CLoHAM). This is a regional model of the road network that is firstly validated against traffic turning counts and origin/destination data of baseline conditions, in accordance with national and TfL accuracy criteria.
	North Marylebone. The area will become a driver's nightmare.	Changes are then made to the modelled road network to reflect the proposed scheme, and the model is then used to forecast if and how traffic patterns alter as a consequence of the scheme. These traffic models are then
	6. Noise pollution. With the increased levels of stationary traffic and running engines, I can't help but think that the residual noise in our streets will be greater. Currently Gloucester Place has periods of tranquillity which enhance the experience for residents and this is in jeopardy if we were to move to two-way.	independently audited by TfL's Network Performance team. Changes in traffic patterns will inevitably occur when altering a road system from one-way to two-way, as new turning movements and routes are provided.
	7. Impact on traders and facilities for residents. The area in which I live enhances my quality of life – I have access to many shops, bars, restaurants, health clubs and other facilities because it is commercially favourable for those business to operate in the area. In fact since my arrival I have seen an upturn in the services offered in the area, suggesting that Marylebone, as it is currently configured, works. Through reduced footfall because pedestrians find the area polluted and noisy and motorists find they cannot park easily, I fear that some business may be forced to leave, which will have an adverse effect on many local residents.	Forecast traffic patterns and any wider reassignment are a function of journey time, and so the model assigns traffic to the network in a way that reduces journey times as much as possible. The modelling carried out for Baker Street Two-way Project demonstrates that, overall, the traffic on the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors can be reallocated between the streets without significant reassignment impact on the wider area, and that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on local roads.  Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.
	8. Impact on property values will be felt when shops have to close, residents move to more favourable areas and the investments those residents may have made in property fail to deliver. Considerable fiscal impact may result due to a two-way implementation.	<ul> <li>It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:</li> <li>Removal of one-way streets</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and</li> </ul>
	I see the two-way scheme as a complete disaster and utterly detrimental to our area. I am strongly opposed to	pedestrian countdown;
	the proposal as it will adversely impact our health, wealth and way of life. I struggle to understand how the scheme is able to make any claims about making a better environment for residents. I am happy to hear of a better proposal if one exists however the current one must not go ahead.	<ul> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions;</li> </ul>
		Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
		Studies from the US have certainly demonstrated reductions in the number of collisions following conversion from one-way to two-way streets.
		The air quality impact assessment 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.
		The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
		A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
		Westminster City Council's consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	REST ONSE	TROJECT TEAMTREST ONSE
		identify any particular trends and determine the likely impacts of the scheme on road safety. The results conclude that the number, type and severity of collisions that will occur in the two way system will be reduced compared to the two parallel, 3 lane one way streets with high speeds and overtaking opportunities.
		The accident analysis report assures drivers in single lane environments are less likely to be distracted by other vehicles and pedestrians crossings in slow moving traffic will have fewer opportunities to step out from a stationary lane into a faster moving lane where they may be unseen by drivers. In treated sites with safer features, such as countdown at pedestrian crossing sites, the reports states that it is reasonable to expect collision rates to go down to a level below the borough average. Crossing the road away from official crossings in traffic gaps as mentioned is not a safe practice and it should be discouraged.
		The scheme has been modelled to ascertain the impact of two-way working at both Baker Street and Gloucester Place. The results of the model were approved by Transport for London and indicates improvements in flows throughout the scheme. The access and use of parking and loading provision will be exactly the same as any other two-way roads in London.
		The air quality impact assessment 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.
		The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs. A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.
		The two-way proposal actual makes both road more accessible. The servicing of side roads has been adjusted to ensure that traffic still flows following the implementation of the two-way. It is not expected that air pollution and noise pollution will increase as a result of the scheme. Hence the adverse impact on local businesses is not expected.
161.	With congestion at record levels any road space reduction would increase emissions and congestion to even higher levels. This will just displace traffic load onto residential streets around the Baker St area. Please rethink this consultation and find better ways of managing surface transport. Emergency services are struggling to reach	Concerns have been raised about the perceived traffic capacity reduction by 30% and that it may lead to traffic congestion and rat-runs into residential streets.
	their destinations and this will just make their job even harder. This is actually one of the better traffic flowing areas in London so am concerned as to why you are even considering these drastic changes!	The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads.
		The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years. It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.
		Any change to traffic patterns within the local area as a consequence of the two-way arrangement will follow from the introduction of new permitted turns at junctions and greater accessibility. This will result in a reduction in journey distances, as vehicles no longer have to negotiate the one-way system and can take shorter, more

NO. (Names	DECDONOS	DDG IFOT TEAMA DECORONOE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,		convenient routes. This means that on some streets traffic levels may rise slightly, and on others it will reduce.
		For example, southbound traffic on A41 Park Road heading for the Marylebone area must, at present, use Melcombe Street and pass through Dorset Square. Under the scheme proposals, this traffic will take a more direct route via Rossmore Road, thus avoiding Dorset Square.
		A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation.
		These changes to traffic flow have been assessed in detail using the TfL central London strategic reassignment model (CLoHAM). This is a regional model of the road network that is firstly validated against traffic turning counts and origin/destination data of baseline conditions, in accordance with national and TfL accuracy criteria.
		Changes are then made to the modelled road network to reflect the proposed scheme, and the model is then used to forecast if and how traffic patterns alter as a consequence of the scheme.
		These traffic models are then independently audited by TfL's Network Performance team. Changes in traffic patterns will inevitably occur when altering a road system from one-way to two-way, as new turning movements and routes are provided.
		Forecast traffic patterns and any wider reassignment are a function of journey time, and so the model assigns traffic to the network in a way that reduces journey times as much as possible.  The modelling carried out for Baker Street Two-way Project demonstrates that, overall, the traffic on the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors can be reallocated between the streets without significant reassignment impact on the wider area, and that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on local roads.
162.	We have received your notification regarding the above mentioned proposal and are writing to lodge our objection to this scheme.	There is an existing single yellow line waiting restriction (7am to 7pm) with a single blip loading restriction 8am to 7pm), meaning passengers can be dropped at any time but waiting, parking and loading is prohibited during controlled hours.
	We have premises in Portman Square and we are dependent on customers being able to be dropped off and collected from the road outside our shop.  In addition we have regular collections and deliveries of stock throughout the working week. Should your proposal proceed we believe that this would be extremely damaging to our business and would possible result in us having to re-locate to another area, which is something that we would very much not like to be obliged to do.	The Baker Street Two Way scheme will change the restriction to a double yellow line / single blip restriction, meaning passengers can still be dropped at any time. Waiting will be prohibited "at any time", and loading will be restricted between 7am and 9pm. This is three hours less than the current provision, but these timings are considered necessary to keep the right lane of Baker Street fluid and allow all through traffic that wants to turn right into Wigmore Street.
	I trust that you will take note of our objection and that this will be taken in to account when you make your final decision.	Deliveries and collections should be arranged to take place during the hours of the revised restrictions, or use the sections of single yellow line proposed outside 40 Portman Square or at the Seymour Mews / Wigmore Street junction.
163.	Making Gloucester Place two-way will increase the amount of traffic passing this property. It is already very difficult to load/unload because of the red route, so stopping, even for a short time, will become increasingly difficult, plus the noise level increase.	There are loading facilities and residential parking allowed along Gloucester Road. Side roads can also be used to service loading within the hours of restriction. The overall traffic flow is not expected to increase significantly.
164.	I am a resident at XXXXX. Currently, coaches stop for drop off in front of my building. In the proposed new traffic scheme, the coach drop off location is not identified. Please can you tell me where the coaches are expected to drop off passengers in the new scheme?	The existing coach stop will be merged with a TfL bus stop. Therefore, it will not affect the drop-off location.  This area caters to a large passenger number as it is a major interchange and a transport hub. The two-way project will not change this status but will look to make the footway free of clutter as much as possible.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	There is a tremendous amount of coach and TFL bus traffic in front of our building now causing congestion and pollution fumes. All too often the side walk congestion due to the travellers and their luggage is overwhelming for residents (especially families like mine with buggies). In the photo below you will see that multiple busses stop at once, clogging up the entire Baker Street view.  Can we not have the coaches just stop at bus depots at Victoria and then require the travellers to use the rest of public transportation to travel intra London.	TfL have plans to consult on amending bus frequencies as part of wider changes in central London in response to changes in demand. TfL have a separate programme to upgrade buses using cleaner engine technology to Euro VI standards. No footway widening is feasible in the northern section of Baker Street without disbenefiting traffic resulting in increased queuing and the probability of greater emission levels.  Coaches are part of the public transport network, and the Baker Street area is a well-used by coach passengers who would be disadvantaged by this suggestion.
165.	Yesterday (29th November 2016) the letter dated 14th November 2016 regarding the TMO consultation was delivered to addresses at Dorset Square. Why was this so late after the consultation had started effectively cutting short the consultation period for many residents? The consultation letter was dated 14th November and yet delivered 29th November. Please can you explain as it appears this consultation is not being conducted fairly and correctly.  Personally, I have been following and commenting on the BSTW scheme online and have already submitted my comments and objections by email in which I raised several questions where clarity was required or errors identified in the TMO consultation documents and to date I have received no reply. It is crucial to the fairness of this consultation that your diagrams and information are as accurate as possible otherwise this will affect the value and validity of this consultation exercise and accordingly I should be grateful if you could reply to the points I raised as soon as possible in order that I may feedback to the Dorset Square Trust and to my neighbours all of whom are awaiting your clarification in order to be able to comment on the consultation in a meaningful and accurate manner.	The Project Team have been in direct contact with XXXXX and has provided detailed responses to all of his queries within this report.
166.	Further to my email sent a few minutes ago, I should be grateful if you could clarify one further key point which is unclear in your consultation letter dated 14/11/2016. At the bottom of page 3 under the heading Statement of Reasons it is stated that the scheme will transform the area between Marylebone and Oxford Street. What is meant by Marylebone? This statement appears rather meaningless and requires urgent clarification.  Also, in the Statement of Reasons, there is no mention of the scheme being designed to meet the aspirations of residents or to improve conditions for residents. Why are the needs of residents not being taken into account in the aspirations and reasons for this scheme? I assume this is one of the fundamental reasons why traffic is being diverted Northbound from Baker Street (commercial road) to Gloucester Place/Dorset Square (residential) North of York Street! This requires urgent clarification.	The Project Team has been in direct contact with XXXXX via email and telephone to explain that Marylebone in the context of the scheme refers to "Marylebone Road", and to explain the statement of reasons.
167.	We are writing in regard to the most recent iteration of the Baker St 2 way proposals. As residents of Balcombe Street with a young child, we are concerned that the current plans are conducive to a rat run forming from the north via Ivor Place to Marylebone Station and the Westway. We believe that this will result not only in additional traffic with the resulting noise and air pollution that will bring, but also in an increase in the speed of the traffic in an almost exclusively residential neighbourhood which is home to quite a number of children (not just ours!) It is important that it is made less attractive as a rat run. We feel this could be achieved by:  1. Making Ivor St West one-way 'out' rather than one-way 'in' 2. Making Taunton/Huntsworth Mews one-way 'in' 3. Banning right turns at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Place	The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .  Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation.  Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation.  Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally

NO. (Names	DESPONSE	DDG JEGT TEAM A DEGROAMSE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withinitial		considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:
		<ul> <li>Removal of one-way streets;</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown;</li> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions;</li> </ul>
		Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.
		Improved local accessibility will help emergency services as more traffic movements will be permitted than currently are.
		Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
		Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
168.	OBJECTIONS  1. The proposals will increase dangerous air pollution in the north section of Gloucester Place. The air pollution predictions are wrong. The proposed two-way traffic in the north section of Gloucester Place will undoubtedly increase air pollution, severely affecting our health as residents. Coaches will be a key source of air pollution, particularly running engines at coach stops. I strongly object to the coach stop proposed	The air quality impact assessment 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
	opposite my home. I will claim against Westminster City Council if these proposals go ahead unmodified and air pollution increases as local residents have warned before and are warning you again now. We are monitoring air pollution, to quantify this serious health risk.	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.
	Cycle lanes are needed in Gloucester Place. It is unsafe for cyclists to use Gloucester Place without cycle lanes. These need to be put in to the proposal to avoid risk of serious harm and death. If not and serious	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
	injury / death to a cyclist occurs, Westminster City Council risks claims that they did not sufficiently heed warnings from local residents. 8 people cycle from our house alone, including our 3 children. Their safety	Air quality report; air quality assessment included in monitoring strategy.
	on the road is in your hands.	Cycle lanes were proposed on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road and were consulted upon during previous consultations. Based on responses received (concerns regarding parking and loading loss and cycle lanes on a busy road) it is now proposed to provide an alternative route on a quieter road, Glenworth Street. A contra flow lane is also proposed on Melcombe Street. This route will link into the cycling facilities on Park road and then into Regent's Park.
169.	Do you not think you people have gridlocked London enough ???	Comments noted.
	You have all ruined every major junction in London Yet more road works Please tell me if one project that you have undertaken that has improved the flow of traffic ?	
	You are all very incompetent.	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheid)	All trying to justify your jobs and at the same time bringing London to a standstill Totally Failing London Useless Have your consultation No matter what the outcome you do what you want anyway  Disgrace.	
170.	I do not drive a car in London but I have done so in the past. I also rode a bike until it was stolen a few years ago. I walk and I take buses. I am sorry, but I just cannot see how this change is going to benefit local residents. In fact, I feel it is being driven by some agency, possibly outside this part of Westminster. As I see it, life is going to become more complicated, and I fear there will be greater pollution on Baker Street because it will become very congested and traffic (comprising most buses both ways) will creep along on Baker Street in both directions, with consequent emissions.  We on the west side of Gloucester Place will certainly be disadvantaged, since we will be losing most of our buses.  Finally, I am really surprised that you are not having a trial period to see whether this system really works. As you doubtless have been told, in the 1960's when the one-way system was introduced there was a six month trial period before a final decision was made.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.  The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:  To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;  To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;  To improve local accessibility;  To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;  To provide greater route choice for local traffic;  To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.  In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause congestion. No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone Road. Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.  Details of the TfL Bus Consultation on changes to bus routes in the Baker Street and Gloucester Place area can be found at: https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/buses/baker-street  There is a monitoring strategy in place for post-construction. Due to rigorous layout change it is not feasible for a trial period.
171.	<ul> <li>Pollution: <ul> <li>Dramatic increase in pollution;</li> <li>Damage to historical buildings causing erosion of the stone work;</li> <li>Damage to conservation areas;</li> <li>Extreme adverse effect on the health of children and the elderly;</li> <li>Additional lead pollution will cause high risk to primary school children walking to school and playing in their grounds;</li> <li>Additional pollution due to traffic waiting for express airport busses;</li> <li>Additional pollution due to traffic waiting for loading and unloading of goods for commercial properties.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Safety: <ul> <li>Safety risk for children crossing the street from two-way traffic;</li> <li>Restricted access for emergency services due to potential blockages;</li> <li>High risk to elderly people walking on road;</li> <li>Hindrance to emergency services.</li> <li>Congestion: <ul> <li>Additional congestion caused by blockage of streets due to one-way;</li> <li>Additional congestion due to traffic waiting for express airport busses to load and in load their pox;</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	The air quality impact assessment 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.  The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.  A noise impact assessment report for the proposed scheme was published as part of the second consultation. The results show that the beneficial impacts outweigh the localised adverse impacts. There are some small areas of localised adverse impacts which will be moderate in the short term but minor in the long term.  Concerns were raised by some respondents during the first consultation over safety of people and children in particular, on side streets due to a perception of substantial increase in traffic on quiet residential streets due to

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	<ul> <li>Additional congestion due to traffic waiting for loading and unloading of goods for commercial properties.</li> <li>Lack of Impact Studies on:</li> <li>True traffic flow impact in the evening and weekends;</li> <li>Increased pollution because if waiting traffic on both sides;</li> <li>No impact study on pollution impact on preserved building;</li> <li>No impact study on risk to young children;</li> <li>No environmental impact study.</li> <li>Other Considerations and Vital Questions:</li> <li>The original 2 way system in the 60's which has served the neighbourhood very well and safely for 50 years.</li> <li>The Government is liable for the health effects on young children at St Vincent's School with the increase of pollution in the side streets as can be seen with the increased traffic around Aybrook street and Moxon Street.</li> <li>This scheme assumes that drivers will not take short cuts or rat runs to avoid the congested two-way streets.</li> <li>the parking and loading plans have not taken into consideration for shops that do not have access apart from Baker Street.</li> <li>What provisions have been made for the emergency services - they will need to double park, so how will traffic get through?</li> <li>The new scheme will put life and limb in danger.</li> <li>How will widening the pavement on Baker Street make traffic flow more easily?</li> <li>Chaes on our roads as traffic will backed up if it is blocked.</li> <li>Incorrect analysis of percentage residential vs commercial property on planned changes. (39% residential?? - How was this figure calculated?)</li> </ul>	rat-runs.  Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.  It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets  Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches:  Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown:  Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists:  Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions:  Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.  Studies from the US have certainly demonstrated reductions in the number of collisions following conversion from one-way to two-way streets.  Concerns have been raised about the perceived traffic capacity reduction by 30% and that it may lead to traffic congestion and rat-runs into residential streets.  The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity.  It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.  This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic a
<u> </u>		i a sange and a grand and a gr

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		This will result in a reduction in journey distances, as vehicles no longer have to negotiate the one-way system and can take shorter, more convenient routes.
		This means that on some streets traffic levels may rise slightly, and on others it will reduce. For example, southbound traffic on A41 Park Road heading for the Marylebone area must, at present, use Melcombe Street and pass through Dorset Square. Under the scheme proposals, this traffic will take a more direct route via Rossmore Road, thus avoiding Dorset Square.
		A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation.
		These changes to traffic flow have been assessed in detail using the TfL central London strategic reassignment model (CLoHAM). This is a regional model of the road network that is firstly validated against traffic turning counts and origin/destination data of baseline conditions, in accordance with national and TfL accuracy criteria.
		Changes are then made to the modelled road network to reflect the proposed scheme, and the model is then used to forecast if and how traffic patterns alter as a consequence of the scheme.
		These traffic models are then independently audited by TfL's Network Performance team. Changes in traffic patterns will inevitably occur when altering a road system from one-way to two-way, as new turning movements and routes are provided. Forecast traffic patterns and any wider reassignment are a function of journey time, and so the model assigns traffic to the network in a way that reduces journey times as much as possible.
		The modelling carried out for Baker Street Two-way Project demonstrates that, overall, the traffic on the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors can be reallocated between the streets without significant reassignment impact on the wider area, and that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on local roads.
		Studies on traffic flow, pollution and safety have been carried out and can be found on the BSTW website; <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> .
		In addition a post monitoring strategy has been developed to monitor the before and after effects of the scheme. The report is also on the website.
		The air quality impact assessment 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.
		The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf</a> .
		Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation. Views were also sought on

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation. Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:  Removal of one-way streets; Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches; Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and pedestrian countdown; Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists; Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions; Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.  Improved local accessibility will help emergency services as more traffic movements will be permitted than currently are.
172.	Looking at the current and proposed permitted traffic movements I note that there is nothing shown at either end of Portman Close which according to the key "where no arrows are shown there are no proposed changes to permitted traffic movements". I am confused. At present we can exit Portman Close on to Baker Street going South but not North as we would be driving headlong into a one-way system. The same goes for exiting Portman Close on to Gloucester Place where at present we can turn North but not south for the same reasons driving headlong into a one-way system.  With both Baker Street and Gloucester Place becoming two-way why does the plan not show on the proposed movements that we can turn either north or south when exiting Portman Close on to Baker Street or Gloucester Place. If you prohibit the ability to exit both ends of the street north or south but maintain the current situation then when we want to exit Portman Close we will always have to fight our way across traffic coming in the opposite direction, including on Gloucester Place a cycle lane, when in probably half the time it would be beneficial to turn straight in to the line of traffic movement i.e. Left when exiting Portman Close on to both Baker Street and Gloucester Place.  If I have not made this clear then please do not hesitate to call me for clarification.  Turning now to the parking restrictions etc. At present there is no parking permitted other than in designated bays on Portman Close except for Sunday when cars are able to park on both sides of the street and always do.  The Baker Street end of Portman Close was narrowed when the building on the north corner of Portman Close /Baker Street was erected a few years ago and the pavement widened. As a consequence when cars park on both sides of the road as they do every Sunday the gap in between is so narrow that it is only possible to manoeuvre a small family car through the resultant gap. Anything bigger than that is forced to reverse back out on to Baker Street and go round Portman Squa	Where no arrows are shown there are no proposed reduction on already permitted traffic movements. Both the turn left into Baker Street (north) and the turn left into Gloucester Place (south) will be new permitted movements.  All movements will be permitted at either side of Portman Close.  The existing parking restrictions in Portman Close will remain as existing. Unfortunately this situation only occurs in hours where the controlled zone is not in operation. Emergency vehicles drivers are experienced in operating in narrow roads. The two-way scheme would increase general accessibility to Portman Close, from both Baker Street and Gloucester Place.  There is a "no waiting" restriction proposed at this location.  All parking restrictions on Portman Close will remain as existing. Changes to this road are not part of this scheme.

NO. (Names	DECDONCE	DDO JECT TEAMA DECDONICE
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	there is a change to "No waiting or loading at any time" from ["No Stopping (single red line) (mon-sat 8am-7pm) or No waiting and no loading at any time" which is correct I am not sure due to difficulty discerning the closeness of colours on the key] the street parking is coloured orange on both plans which says "No Waiting" on the key.	
	However it is clear that this is not 100% correct because at present vehicles are allowed to park in Portman Close on Sundays and presumably it is intended that the same will be the case going forward. If this is permitted, and I am not misunderstanding anything, then the issue of vehicles being able to get through a narrow gap even when the parking is done well by the drivers will continue with the need for vehicles to reverse out into Baker Street having turned into Portman Close only to discover they cannot get through. The issue with emergency vehicles will also persist. I would have thought that parking regulations should not be such that emergency vehicles find themselves prohibited from driving along a road that during all other times of the week is straight forward.	
	Again if I have not been clear in my points do not hesitate to contact me by phone.	
173.	Please find below an exchange with Councillor Glanz which supports the objection I have made.	BS2W prohibits left turns from Park Street onto Oxford Street to facilitate pedestrians crossing. Left turn flow is low but dominates the left turn lane, it can be reassigned onto alternative routes. Motorcycle parking is
	"Thank you for your email on this. I had not seen the specific proposals for south of Oxford Street in relation to the two-way.	
	I will agree with you that that junction already gets snarled up and that to lose a lane of traffic is unlikely to assist. I also think it needs to be properly analysed in connection with proposals to pedestrianise Oxford Street.	
	In the meantime I would support your position in respect of the bike installation."	
174.	I, along with many hundreds of others, work in Baker Street and am amazed that any consideration has been given to two-way vehicle movement along the street and that it is seen as progressive in any way.	Under the existing one-way system, there are regularly long queues and delays northbound on Gloucester Place towards Marylebone Road and southbound on Baker Street towards Marylebone Road and Oxford Street.
	The road is busy as it is and the idea of doubling that flow up and down the street will not only increase pollution but also increase the level of danger for the many people who traverse the street at either end of the day (to and from work) and in the middle of the day (lunchtime).	The over-provision of traffic lanes at other locations means that some drivers speed away from traffic lights, and the lack of crossing facilities (especially on Gloucester Place) means that pedestrians must cross in gaps without any formal control.
	What is really wrong with the current system?	The wide carriageways and multi-lane traffic flows can be intimidating to cyclists and weaving across the lanes can be hazardous.
	Perhaps if motor vehicles were banned altogether, then a two-way system could well work.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
		<ul> <li>The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are stated below:</li> <li>To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway</li> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic.</li> </ul>
		To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withinelay		There is evidence of benefits from similar schemes in London, such as Piccadilly/ St James's, South Kensington, Tottenham Hale and Shoreditch Triangle, as well as other similar initiatives in major cities around the world.
		Accident analysis for Camden Council's West End Project proposals for Tottenham Court Road/ Gower Street demonstrates that safety benefits are expected.
		It is considered that, overall, the scheme is unlikely to result in any change to the number of accidents, but that it could reasonably be assumed that there is expected to be a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injury of at least 50%.
		<ul> <li>It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce under a two-way arrangement as a consequence of:</li> <li>reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances;</li> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions;</li> </ul>
		Retaining the current one-way system, with footway widening to provide opportunity for public realm improvements, was considered at an early stage of scheme development.
		It was always recognised that this would not achieve all the objectives of the key stakeholders (TfL, Westminster City Council, Baker Street Quarter Partnership and Portman Estate) and would, if pursued, be designed in such a way that it would not prejudice conversion to two-way at some point in the future.
		Also, the cost of undertaking these works would be significant for relatively minor gains for any road user or pedestrian.
		<ul> <li>The proposed conversion to two-way working was identified as the preferred scheme for a number of reasons:</li> <li>The Mayor's Transport Strategy and cycling strategy includes policies to remove one-way gyratory;</li> <li>The TfL's Roads Task Force aspiration for a High Street environment (as opposed to its current form of a major road Connector) with permeable streets and safe speeds to enhance town centre vitality;</li> <li>TfL's aspiration for provision of both northbound and southbound bus services on the same road as far as possible.</li> <li>There is no funding for a one-way alternative, other than the standard maintenance budget which does</li> </ul>
		not allow for public realm enhancements, improvements to street lighting (new lamp columns, white light – with related safety benefits), improved footway materials or much needed improvements to and the addition of new pedestrian crossings (due to imminent growth in pedestrian numbers from Chiltern Railways at Marylebone Station and Crossrail) and cycling facilities (as a consequence of rapid growth in cycling across London and the opening of the cycle superhighways);
		It prevents the need for several stages of scheme implementation, reduces costs and disruption due to works, and delivers a greater degree of benefits within a shorter timeframe.
175.	It not good idea because traffic jams.	The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity. It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.

NO. (Names		
and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		Regarding concerns expressed about lane width, we are proposing standard lane widths and do not expect any problems in large vehicles using these. These lane widths are designed for buses and large commercial vehicles. Swept path analysis has been undertaken on the design.
176.	Thank you for the opportunity of providing an opinion. I doubt that you will like what I say. The number 1 priority of Westminster Council and TFL is air quality. The appalling toxicity of London's air is number 1; number 2, number 3 and number 4 priority.	The air quality impact assessment report was published as part of the second consultation and can be found on the Baker Street Project website - <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a>
	Any investment and any change made to the current road system must prioritise air quality.	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.
	Every 1 second that a vehicle is slowed down means an increase in air pollution.	The number of receptors where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted.
	I have read through the proposals and it will mean significant reduction in vehicle speeds. It will increase idling. It will increase congestion. It will significantly increase air pollution. It will increase deaths.	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.
		The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
177.	I live at XXXXX which is on the corner of Gloucester Place and Marylebone Road. I once again raise the issue relating to the 2 Way Traffic proposed for Gloucester Place North of Marylebone Road.	The safety and operational characteristics of two-ways have been investigated. Generally all buses will be on Baker Street, whilst coaches will be on Gloucester Place (northbound) and Baker Street (southbound). In the southbound direction the coach stops will be shared with buses.
	Directly opposite the entrance of Dorset House are 2 coach/bus stops.	South Board an estient the seast stope will be shared with bases.
	The first bus stop has the following list of coaches/buses stopping - 2, 755, 757, 758, 771, 772, A1 and Golden Tours to Harry Potter. Bus stop 2 has A6 and A20.	
	There are currently 3 lanes of north bound traffic. At times there are 2 or 3 coaches lined up at the coach/ bus stop picking up passengers.	
	In order to leave the bus stop a coach/bus can pull out into the second or third lane. With the proposal for traffic coming in the opposite direction, there will be one accident after another. I have photos which I can send you showing the line-up of coaches and a coach pulling out into the 2nd and 3rd lane after picking up passengers. I can also show you photographs of accidents which have occurred at the corner of Marylebone Road and Gloucester Place north which is currently a danger spot and have involved police and ambulance. Please urgently reconsider your proposal for 2 way traffic on Gloucester Place North. Please Investigate further and I await your response.	
178.	These anti four wheel traffic schemes are crippling the city. The 9500 people who die every year as a result of pollution will increase because this continual war on the motorist causes more fumes as there is no emphasis on ease of traffic flow. I strongly disagree with this scheme.	An air quality assessment of the scheme was carried out by Westminster City Council in 2016 and published as part of the second consultation. The assessment and can be found on the Baker Street Project website - <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a>
		Existing conditions within the study area show poor air quality and the site lies within an Air Quality Management Area. The report indicates that the scheme will have a significant beneficial air quality impact. The number of locations where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted. The report also states that a substantially greater number of residential properties will experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the scheme.
179.	It is that the descriptions of the parking restrictions are in correct on at least one parking bay on the as is	Unfortunately, there was an error on the drawing, which has been rectified. During the detailed design stage,

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	drawing, giving no confidence in the accuracy of any of the information presented.	any minor errors will be addressed, but this does not significantly affect the Traffic Order consultation process.
180.	There is a real danger that, as a result of your proposals, Balcombe Street will become a short cut from Gloucester Place to Westway. By permitting traffic to turn into Ivor Place and then Balcombe Street you will transform them from quiet well-integrated neighbourhoods into noisy and fume-ridden locations, threatening the health and happiness of both the young and the old who so much enjoy living here.  We strongly support the alternative proposed by XXXXX and others of making Ivor Place one-way in an easterly direction; Taunton Mews one-way in a westerly direction; and abandoning plans to permit a right turn where Boston Place and Balcombe Street meet Melcombe Place and Dorset Square.	In order to achieve a benefit in terms of traffic reduction on Melcombe Street and through Dorset Square, local traffic must be permitted to enter the Marylebone area from the Gloucester Place southbound approach from Park Road, though this route will be discouraged through use of traffic calming measures such as the new traffic refuge on Gloucester Place and a new Zebra crossing and raised entry treatment at the junction of Balcombe Street and Melcombe Street.  The post-implementation monitoring strategy provides for a review of traffic flow changes on this route, and any adverse impacts will result in consideration of further mitigation measures.  Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
181.	This is just to object to all the TfL traffic orders for the Baker Street two-way scheme, (RSM/PI/STOT/TRO, GLA/2016/0001,9,18 & 20) on the grounds that the entire scheme is dangerous for users on bikes (with several LCDS CLOS critical failures across the scheme) and therefore should not be going ahead in its current form.  (Incidentally - this is a truly terrible scheme that spends a vast amount of money to build new shortcuts for taxis, while making cycling more dangerous, and doing nothing to speed up buses, or to make significant improvements to pollution, congestion, and road danger in the area. Consultation came out, unsurprisingly, 60-40 against. With all the upcoming budget restrictions, why are TfL putting money into it?)	The issues with critical failures for cycling have been addressed in section 8, p51-54 of the second Consultation Report, which can be found on the BSTW website: <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> The two-way project meets key TfL aspirations and delivers benefits to all modes of traffic.
182.	I am writing to confirm my objection to one element of the above traffic consultation, namely the restriction northbound on Baker Street (north of York street) from 7am-7pm to non bus/taxi traffic. This will force all other traffic onto Gloucester place, which goes against the "statement of reasons" of making the road network simpler to understand and improving access for local traffic.  The consequence of these restrictions is that the majority of northbound traffic will still travel on Gloucester Place, which will be narrowed to one lane to accommodate southbound traffic. With the addition of a coach stop on Gloucester Place, traffic will be stuck in a bottleneck unnecessarily.  It would be more logical to either divert all coach traffic along Baker Street, along with the buses and other public transport (making Baker Street a true public transport hub) or to allow all other traffic to use both Baker Street and Gloucester Place un-restricted, hence reducing the northbound burden to one single carriage of Gloucester Place.  The current proposal does not reduce northbound traffic and adds at least 50% of southbound traffic, therefore the air quality and standard of living for residents on this stretch of Gloucester Place will be compromised.	Based on extensive traffic modelling undertaken the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions, including the Baker Street ban mentioned, and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. This means that traffic flows are to a great extent balanced between the two routes.  On the project website, there is a table named 'Existing and proposed traffic flow table – listed by street'. This table shows changes to traffic flow on each road as a result of these proposals and can be found at <a href="https://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a> The section of Gloucester Place between Marylebone Road and Portman Square will experience either a reduction or no change in traffic flow.  Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the reports have been published on the project website.  Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors. This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'.

figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on of Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.  It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse Cloucester Place.  Northbound buses will be largely relocated onto Baker Street and w stop. Traffic capacity constraints will mean that it is not considered onto Baker Street.  The air quality impact assessment report was published as part of the within the study area show poor air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where the benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where street that will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into two Place (West), This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use liver Place to use liver Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway.  If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway.  We have a 1 year old daughter and we would like her to grow up on the Balcombe Street we know and love: one where traffic is very limited. Please help us preserve its character.  We propose an alternative:  We propose an altern	NO. (Names and addresses withheld)  RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
stop. Traffic capacity constraints will mean that it is not considered onto Baker Street.  The air quality impact assessment report was published as part of the within the study area show poor air quality and the site lies within a the study area show poor air quality and the site lies within a the study area show poor air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where the street in the proposals you have made for Balcombe street that will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into lvor Place (West). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use lvor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway. If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway.  We have a 1 year old daughter and we would like her to grow up on the Balcombe Street we know and love: one where traffic is very limited. Please help us preserve its character.  We propose an alternative:  Nor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction.  Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction.  AND MOST IMPORTANTLY No Right Turn where Balcombe St and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on
within the study area show poor air quality and the site lies within a The proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number wis specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater nume experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number wis specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater nume experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number wis specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater nume experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number wis specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater nume experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number wis specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater nume experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme will be proposed as a result of the proposed scheme will be proposed as a result of the proposed scheme will improve air under the number wis specific regard to residential properties, a substantial properties, as substantial properties, as substantial properties, as substantial properties, as ubstantial properties, as t		Northbound buses will be largely relocated onto Baker Street and will no longer stop at the Dorset Square bus stop. Traffic capacity constraints will mean that it is not considered feasible to locate all bus and coach services, onto Baker Street.
where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number with specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater nume experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scilland street that will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into lvor Place (West). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use lvor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway. If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway.  We have a 1 year old daughter and we would like her to grow up on the Balcombe Street we know and love: one where traffic is very limited. Please help us preserve its character.  We propose an alternative:  We propose an alternative:  Ivor Place West to be one-way in a Westerly direction.  Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction.  AND MOST IMPORTANTLY No Right Turn where Balcombe St and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset		The air quality impact assessment 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.
street that will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (West). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway. If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway.  We have a 1 year old daughter and we would like her to grow up on the Balcombe Street we know and love: one where traffic is very limited. Please help us preserve its character.  We propose an alternative: Ivor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction. Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction. AND MOST IMPORTANTLY No Right Turn where Balcombe St and Boston Place meet Melcombe Place and Dorset		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.
Square.	street that will destroy the character and community of our home. As they stand at present the plans show a potential turn from Gloucester Place into Ivor Place (West). This will allow vehicles experiencing a bottle-neck on Gloucester Place to use Ivor Place and Balcombe Street as a route to Marylebone Station and onto the Westway. If the proposals ago ahead, our network of streets will become a rat run for drivers veering off Gloucester Place trying to get to Marylebone Station or onto the Westway.  We have a 1 year old daughter and we would like her to grow up on the Balcombe Street we know and love: one where traffic is very limited. Please help us preserve its character.  We propose an alternative: Ivor Place West to be one-way in an easterly direction. Taunton Mews to be one-way in a Westerly direction.	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited. This would avoid the potential rat-run to Marylebone Station and the Westway. Taunton Mews and Balcombe Street will remain as existing  Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
7pm along the one lane of Gloucester Place. I believe that the northbound traffic should either be able to turn right onto Marylebone Road or that the restriction on vehicles should not exist. I understand that the traffic predictions have been modelled but I do not believe that the option of providing a right hand turn onto Marylebone road for the northbound traffic on Baker street has been explored.  The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound traffic outes. The right hand turn into Marylebone Road from Baker Street model came with better results keeping that right turn where curre manoeuvre together with the restrictions and signal timings will material traffic will choose Gloucester Place, traffic flows will be to a great expense.	7pm along the one lane of Gloucester Place. I believe that the northbound traffic should either be able to turn right onto Marylebone Road or that the restriction on vehicles should not exist. I understand that the traffic predictions have been modelled but I do not believe that the option of providing a right hand turn onto	Based on extensive traffic modelling undertaken the best routes for the different types of traffic vehicles using the area have been selected. A combination of traffic restrictions, including the Baker Street ban mentioned, and signal timings will create a scenario where levels of congestion are not increased throughout the scheme. The current proposals keep northbound coaches on Gloucester Place and southbound coaches on Baker Street. Most of the bus services are transferred to Baker Street northbound. Baker Street north of York Street will have buses, taxis and cyclists and will of course also have southbound traffic, also comprising all southbound bus routes. The right hand turn into Marylebone Road from Baker Street was assessed at feasibility design but the model came with better results keeping that right turn where currently is at Gloucester Place. The ban of the manoeuvre together with the restrictions and signal timings will make buses choose Baker Street while general traffic will choose Gloucester Place, traffic flows will be to a great extent balanced between the two routes  Air quality impact assessment and noise impact assessment have been undertaken for these proposals and the

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		Pages 12-14 in the air quality report show the location of receptors and Table A6.1 on Pages 49-55 shows the predicted changes to NO2 and PM10 as a result of the proposed scheme at each of these receptors.
		This table shows that the impact of the proposals on air quality on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is either 'substantially beneficial' or 'neutral'. Figure A2-1 on Page 22 in the noise report shows the change in noise level because of the proposed scheme.
		This figure shows that the impact of these proposals on noise levels on Gloucester Place (between Taunton Place and Marylebone Road) is 'negligible' or 'slightly beneficial'.
		It is therefore, not expected that the proposals will have an adverse impact on congestion, air quality or noise on Gloucester Place.
185.	The proposals will increase dangerous air pollution in the north section of Gloucester Place. The air pollution	The air quality impact assessment report was published as part of the second consultation.
	predictions are wrong. The proposed two-way traffic in the north section of Gloucester Place will undoubtedly increase air pollution, severely affecting our health as residents.	Existing conditions within the study area show poor air quality and the site lies within an Air Quality Management Area.
	Coaches will be a key source of air pollution, particularly running engines at coach stops. I strongly object to the coach stop proposed opposite my home. I will claim against WCC if these proposals go ahead unmodified and air pollution increases as local residents have warned before and are warning you again now. We are monitoring air pollution to quantify this serious health risk.	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.
	Cycle lanes are needed in Gloucester Place. It is unsafe for cyclists to use Gloucester Place without cycle lanes. These need to be put into the proposal to avoid risk of serious harm and death. If not and serious injury / death occurs WCC risks claims that they did not sufficiently heed warnings from local residents.8 people cycle from our	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.
		The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
		Cycle lanes were proposed on Gloucester Place, north of Marylebone Road and were consulted upon during previous consultations. Based on responses received (concerns regarding parking and loading loss and cycle lanes on a busy road) it is now proposed to provide an alternative route on a quieter road, Glenworth Street. A contra flow lane is also proposed on Melcombe Street. This route will link into the cycling facilities on Park road and then into Regent's Park.
186.	I am writing to object to the proposed Baker Street/ Gloucester Place two-way scheme as both a local resident and a Mayfair shopkeeper.	The proposed two-way scheme is expected to maintain the current levels of traffic flow while distributing traffic more appropriately for particular destinations and improving accessibility, which will shorten journey distances and reduce everall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving
currently three linto each road, wassign cycle land good deliveries part one lane wood the Portman Estin Marylebone was the Two-way we	The overriding point of my objection if the total unfeasibility of the scheme. Baker Street and Park Road are currently three lane thoroughfares. Were it possible to squeeze the width of two bus lanes and tow traffic lanes into each road, which is highly questionable, the risk of lateral collision would be enormous. To contemplate assign cycle lanes, widening existing pavements and planting additional tress is risible. Bus stops, taxi drop offs, good deliveries and refuse collections would simply halt the flow of traffic; accidents or minor road-work closing part one lane would be catastrophic for the flow of London's Traffic were the proposed scheme to be adopted.  The Portman Estate states on its website that it has been working to find a way to reduce the impact of the A41 in Marylebone with the aim to move the emphasis away from fast moving traffic. Despite empty assurances on the Two-way website that the project should help traffic circulation, careful examination of the traffic routing plans, the statements by the players who have the most to gain financially from the proposed scheme and simple	and reduce overall journey time across the network. The traffic benefits can be achieved in addition to improving public realm; providing benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.
		<ul> <li>The main aims of converting the two roads to two-way are:</li> <li>To remove the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes, which give a sense of an urban motorway;</li> <li>To provide a balance between 'movement' and 'place' function of these streets;</li> <li>To improve local accessibility;</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>To reduce vehicle journey distances, as the need to circumnavigate the one-way system is removed;</li> <li>To provide greater route choice for local traffic;</li> <li>To have both northbound and southbound bus services on the same streets as far as possible, which is more intuitive and improves bus passenger amenity.</li> </ul>
	common sense, indicates that the main purpose of the proposals is to slow down the speed of vehicular traffic.	In addition, traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed scheme does not cause

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	The resulting traffic jams would have dire effects on the mobility of the emergency services. Local fire brigade,	congestion.
	ambulance and police call outs would be greatly impeded. At this time of rising terrorism any restriction to traffic	
	response-time in case of a major incident in central London would be disastrous.	No bus lanes are proposed on Baker Street and Gloucester Place; road width on Gloucester Place will stay the same; the footway is proposed to be widened only on the eastern side of Baker Street, south of Marylebone
	The current one-way system did not evolve by chance but was introduced fifty years ago with the express aim of reducing traffic congestion then, let alone now. The under-estimated cost of works of fifteen million pounds is	Road.
	not only a huge waste of public money but would be dwarfed by the sum required to reverse the scheme when London is forced into gridlock. According to the Centre for Economics and Business Research, London drivers	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that proposed scheme does not cause congestion.
	spent more than 250 hours idling in traffic, double the UK average. Last year congestion cost the UK economy	It is not unusual for major estates, land owners and developers to approach the City Council with concepts/ idea
	£13 Billion.	of public realm improvements which are then developed further by the City Council in partnership with them.  These schemes, when delivered, not only provide improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and residents but also
	To even contemplate a scheme that would further slow down the flow of London Traffic is quite shocking.	help in economic regeneration of those areas. One of the commitments under 'City for All' is 'to invest, with our
		partners, in new public realm schemes, including walking and cycling improvements, and road safety schemes'.
	As a local resident living at 25 Park Road, NW1 6XN and together with hundreds of neighbours living in the many flats in this terrace, I am acutely aware of the huge inconvenience that the scheme will bring to access to our	Deskground information can be found here, bttp://www.bekerstreettwewey.co.uk/#desumentation
		Background information can be found here: <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#documentation</a>
	homes by car or taxi should Ivor Place become one-way. The scarcity of Resident's Parking places is already a huge problem for the residents of Park Road and the proposed scheme will only exacerbate the situation. The off	Information about parking loss and gain is detailed on the project website as part of the Traffic order
	-road parking spaces in Glentworth Road belonging to homes in Park Road will become inaccessible to their	consultation:
	owners. Significantly the description of the proposed scheme fails to disclose whether there will be an overall	http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/#tmo-docs
	increase or decrease of residents' and non resident parking places.	Tittp://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.ak/#titlo-aocs
	and reason along case of residents and norm establish parking places.	The document "Summary Table of restriction changes" has all this information
	The busiest entrance to Regent's Park is from the top of Baker Street and is used by thousands of pedestrians	
	and myself every week. The introduction of dedicated cycle tracks at the junction between Baker Street, Park	The proposed layout has been safety audited and further audits are proposed for the future. It is a shared space
	Road, Alsop Place and the Outer Circle will force pedestrians to negotiate perilous crossings with cyclists. With	but this arrangement is not unusual in London.
	the best will in the world from cyclists, pedestrians and motorists alike, accidents and fatalities are bound to	
	occur at what will become a notorious danger spot.	The air quality impact assessment 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 environmental impact of the scheme locally seems to have been left unaddressed. With proposed additional	
	pedestrian crossings, installation of cycle tracks and general slowing of traffic, particularly starting and stopping,	The proposed scheme will improve air quality in some locations but worsen it in others. The number of receptor
	the problem of fuel emissions in a heavily populated residential area will increase significantly.	where benefits are predicted is almost twenty times the number where adverse impacts are predicted.
	From a purely selfish perspective, buses would be thundering northbound feet away from my windows, emitting	With specific regard to residential properties, a substantially greater number of properties (up to 190 times
	fumes day and night. An unseemly clutter of chained and fallen bicycles would diminish the visual amenity of a	more) will experience benefits than dis-benefits as a result of the proposed scheme.
	fine early 19th Century terrace of grade II listed houses. Restriction of vehicular access would cause the value of	
	my property to drop.	The City Council has been successful in its Low Emission Neighbourhood (LEN) bid for the Bryanston & Dorset
		Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
	As the owner of the well established jewellery business Bentley and Skinner at the junction of Piccadilly and Old	
	Bond Street, I am particularly aware of the likely effect of the proposed traffic changes on the level of West End	The proposed scheme is looking to declutter the street and cycle parking provisions will only be located where
	trading generally. The Baker Street Quarter Partnership declares its aim to be that the Baker Street area becomes	they will not obstruct the public highway.
	a destination in its own right. Counsellor Robert Davis identifies Baker Street as one of our key commercial	
	districts. The clear objective of the local business and landlord collaboration is to strangle movement away from	One of the aims of the scheme is to improve accessibility and make local journeys shorter. The proposals have
	and commerce outside the narrow area of their own financial interests. Half of my customers visit my shop from north London and beyond and Baker Street is their principal route. When Baker Street grinds to a standstill, as it	been carefully modelled to ensure the network does not become gridlocked.
	undoubtedly will should the project go ahead, people will stop travelling to the West End and local Marylebone	The project has had two rounds of pubic consultation prior to this Traffic order consultation and views of
	businesses, although not Marylebone over all, will benefit. Benefitting too will be the local landlords, the	residents have been taken on board in coming up with amendments to the scheme.
	Portman Estate and local shopkeepers, as well as the various agents, consulting bodies and Public Relation firms	residents have been taken on board in coming up with afficiliations to the scheme.
	and lobbyists where their sole interest is to extract profit from the promotion of the Scheme.	Removing the wide, imposing carriageways with multiple lanes will serve to make better balance between
	and 1999, 1919 Where their 3010 interest is to extract profit from the profitotion of the 3010 inc.	'movement' and 'place' function of both Baker Street and Gloucester Place. Extensive traffic surveys were carried
	In conclusion Linvite you to drive or stroll down Baker Street and Gloucester Place together with me and an	out to feed the traffic model with latest traffic volumes and speeds. The traffic model for the two way system

out to feed the traffic model with latest traffic volumes and speeds. The traffic model for the two way system

In conclusion I invite you to drive or stroll down Baker Street and Gloucester Place together with me and an

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	experienced old London cabbie or two, to observe the width of the roads and to ask yourself whether you really believe that two wide bus lanes, two traffic lanes, two bicycle tacks, and two wider pavements are actually possible down these narrow roads?  I urge you and the relevant authorities not to be taken in by the slick P.R. and polished website of the TWO-WAY Project. Rather, please consider primarily the wishes and convenience of the local householders and residents of Baker Street and wider London areas who will otherwise suffer needlessly the general disruption and distress brought about by this opportunist scheme.	results in better and more efficient traffic management and improved accessibility to local streets without increasing congestion. Vehicle journey distances are also reduced, as the need to circumnavigate the one way system is removed. A better positioning of bus and couch routes will also make possible a more efficient traffic management, which aims for slower but more fluid traffic flows in the area. Emergency services' input is normally taken into consideration when preparing highway proposals in the strategic route network
187.	When I first rented in Balcombe Street in the early 1970s, the houses were generally in very poor repair, containing mixtures of students, nurses and elderly pensions in basements. In common with other neighbours in the early to mid-1970s we took over freeholds and the responsibility to restore the buildings, basement to roof, because we appreciated the quiet location and incidentally provided habitable accommodation for likeminded neighbours within the buildings. Our house, for example, now has three flats forming a share of freehold company with leaseholds.  If the proposed traffic cut-through are imposed upon us all by the Baker Street two-way project, our street and others will be transformed into canyons of traffic exhaust, high in particulates, which will linger in the narrow streets between the five-storey buildings. Older people and families with small children in the basements will be the most badly affected.  I personally spent some 5 years as in renovating No. 63 in the evenings as weekends while carrying on a full-time job in cancer research at Charing Cross Hospital, and, now retired, have had many enjoyable years here.  The most important objection is air quality due to diverted rat-run-traffic, trapped between high buildings in our narrow street, as in fact in all the streets affected by this proposal. I repeat, the mist important objections I have is the likely deterioration in air quality due to diverted traffic though our neighbouring narrow and high-walled streets.  I am enclosing a copy of the information provided to me by the Marylebone Society of which I am a member outlining their proposals which might lessen the impact of traffic redistribution.  Incidentally, as an example of current deteriorating change, the pedestrian crossing in the se corner of Dorset Square is no longer effectively iit to signal whether a pedestrian car cross south to north. Yu have to look above your head to the right at the centre of the crossing and "cross-interpret" the light signal meant for cars. With neck ar	<ul> <li>identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety. It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:</li> <li>Removal of one-way streets</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and</li> </ul>
	<u>I</u>	

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)		Square/ Marylebone ward area, which was supported by the Estates and BIDs.
		Concerns have been raised about the perceived traffic capacity reduction by 30% and that it may lead to traffic congestion and rat-runs into residential streets.
		The issue of road capacity and network performance (how close to capacity a street might operate) should not be confused. Detailed analysis of traffic conditions shows that there are a lot of junctions throughout the project area that operate with spare, and therefore potentially wasted, capacity.
		It is therefore possible to reduce the road width on Baker Street to provide wider footways, and on Gloucester Place to provide cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings, without giving rise to traffic congestion problems.
		This means that a perceived 30% reduction in road capacity due to lane loss does not necessarily result in a 30% reduction in actual capacity (because the amount of green time provided to traffic also affects capacity) or indeed a 30% reduction in network performance.
		It should also be noted that traffic will balance across two southbound and northbound routes, as opposed to the single routes that are currently available.
		The scheme has been designed to be 'capacity neutral'. This means that in general there is not expected to be any significant reassignment of traffic away from the main roads onto local residential roads.
		The traffic modelling is considered to be a worst case, and does not make any allowance for the likely traffic reduction effects of other major schemes that are to be introduced across London over coming years.
		It does not also take into account the wider benefits that are to be achieved through the current Transport for London (TfL) Active Traffic Management (ATM) strategy, which is designed to ensure that traffic is kept moving and does not cause the levels of congestion that might lead to rat-running within the study area.
		Any change to traffic patterns within the local area as a consequence of the two-way arrangement will follow from the introduction of new permitted turns at junctions and greater accessibility.
		This will result in a reduction in journey distances, as vehicles no longer have to negotiate the one-way system and can take shorter, more convenient routes.
		This means that on some streets traffic levels may rise slightly, and on others it will reduce. For example, southbound traffic on A41 Park Road heading for the Marylebone area must, at present, use Melcombe Street and pass through Dorset Square. Under the scheme proposals, this traffic will take a more direct route via Rossmore Road, thus avoiding Dorset Square.
		A table showing changes to traffic flow, as a result of the proposed scheme, on various streets within the study area was provided as part of the consultation documents both during the first and second consultation.
		These changes to traffic flow have been assessed in detail using the TfL central London strategic reassignment model (CLoHAM). This is a regional model of the road network that is firstly validated against traffic turning counts and origin/destination data of baseline conditions, in accordance with national and TfL accuracy criteria.
		Changes are then made to the modelled road network to reflect the proposed scheme, and the model is then used to forecast if and how traffic patterns alter as a consequence of the scheme.

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
		These traffic models are then independently audited by TfL's Network Performance team. Changes in traffic patterns will inevitably occur when altering a road system from one-way to two-way, as new turning movements and routes are provided.
		Forecast traffic patterns and any wider reassignment are a function of journey time, and so the model assigns traffic to the network in a way that reduces journey times as much as possible.
		The modelling carried out for Baker Street Two-way Project demonstrates that, overall, the traffic on the Baker Street and Gloucester Place corridors can be reallocated between the streets without significant reassignment impact on the wider area, and that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on local roads.
		This will be inspected and addressed if the standard of lighting in the traffic signal is defective.
188.	XXXXX have been chosen by the property owner XXXXX to be the operator of the petrol filling station on the corner of Gloucester Place and Marylebone Road.	The Baker Street Two-way Scheme will allow access into the petrol filling station forecourt from Gloucester Place only.
	Although the filling station has been out of use for at least 2 years XXXXX retail have recently taken the view that there be sufficient viability in a restored facility, noting the lack of refuelling options within central London and, specifically, the Westminster authority area.	Vehicles arriving from the west or north will be able to turn directly into the site. Vehicles arriving from the south will be able to do so by waiting for a suitable gap in southbound traffic in the designed right-turn storage area which will incur a minimal delay.
	In moving towards completion on a 15-year Agreement for Lease the results of Local Searches recently revealed to us the scale and complexity of the Gloucester Place / Baker Street Two-Way scheme. This scheme has now been examined in great detail.	Vehicles arriving from the east will be able to make the G-Turn using York Street that is signed from Marylebone Road to the A41 and will therefore arrive at the site form the south.
	The purpose of this letter is to register a number of concerns about the potential impact of this scheme on the filling station's rate of patronage and operational viability.	Vehicles will be required to exit the site onto Marylebone Road eastbound where they will be able to head in all directions via either Glentworth Street (northbound), Baker Street (southbound) or use York Street to head westbound.
	At a point just west of Gloucester Place, Marylebone Road is posting a two-way traffic count of c.80,000 vehicles per day. So it is a reasonable assumption that eastbound is roughly half of that figure, approaching the Gloucester Place junction.	Other than direct access southbound onto Gloucester Place, the Dorset House routes towards Marylebone Road would stay the same.
	Obviously the Marylebone Road flow is very important to Dorset Street filling station and when previously trading it was very easy for motorists requiring fuel to turn left into (northbound only) Gloucester Place and	The left turn onto Marylebone Road would follow the same route used at present, which is via Balcombe Street. The right turn onto Marylebone Road also follows the same route as present, which is via Harewood Avenue.
	immediately right into the facility. They would then exit back onto Marylebone Road eastbound.	Access to the potential Petrol Filling Station was a specific consideration in the design of the BS2W scheme.
	By way of comparison there are 14,000 vehicles per day heading up Gloucester Place. Dorset House would have been less relevant to northbound traffic because once refuelled, customers would have been forced out onto Marylebone Road.	The traffic signals will be controlled in such a way that there will not be a queue forming between Marylebone Road and the secondary upstream stop line at the pedestrian crossing north of the petrol filling station access. Both southbound vehicular and cyclist traffic will be stopped, allowing northbound right-turning traffic to enter the petrol filling station safely.
	As a consequence of Gloucester Place reverting to two-way traffic:	The hatched area has been shown because it was unknown during the design stage what would happen to the
	Dorset House would gain access to a new southbound flow, even though the potential gain may be pegged back by the exit onto Marylebone Road (eastbound).	site, and so it was necessary to preserve an area specifically for the right-turn.
	Dorset House is at risk of losing business from Marylebone Road because the turn-in via Gloucester Place would now be imposed by a single-lane of southbound traffic which, invariably, would be queuing for the traffic lights.	The area in the centre of the carriageway provides sufficient storage area for vehicles waiting to turn into the petrol filling station and a right-turn marking could be provided.
	There would also be the additional hazard of a cycle-lane to crossover.	The issue of the left-turn route through the petrol filling station was considered at design stage. Although the

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	The current indication is that between the northbound and southbound lanes, immediately north of the Marylebone Road lights, there would be a short section of hatched reservation.	route is theoretically possible, there are not many traffic routes towards Marylebone Road from the north that would gain any advantage by using the petrol filling station as a cut-through to avoid the left-turn ban.
	It is also noted that southbound traffic would be prohibited from turning left at the Marylebone Road lights. There is real concern here that it could encourage rat-running through the filling station which, we would suggest, is neither desirable or safe.	Longer distance traffic from Gloucester Place will use the strategic route via Allsop Place.  Traffic from Melcombe Street will use Glenworth Street, and traffic from Dorset Square or Marylebone will use Balcombe Street.
	It is of course true that the unique characteristic of Central London means that regular users of the local road network may acquire a detailed knowledge of one-way streets and turning restrictions. Nevertheless, from an investment perspective, it is not enough to rely on the fact that "this is Central London so it is bound to work".	There are therefore very few origins of potentially undesirable left-turn cut-through traffic, and possibly actually limited to Dorset House residents.
	With only one curved island and two multi-product dispensers it is vital that the restored facility has the ability to conveniently service demand from Marylebone Road as well as Gloucester Place (future southbound). It is	It is agreed that there may not be any benefit in attempting to reverse the official direction of ingress and egress. The various alternative options have been explored and it is necessary to maintain ingress from Gloucester Place, egress onto Marylebone Road.
	also worth noting that there does not appear to be any benefit from attempting to reverse the official direction of ingress and egress - and this view is reinforced by the proposal to prohibit any left-turn out of Gloucester Place southbound onto Marylebone Road eastbound.	The design is considered appropriate, provides adequately for the operation of the petrol filling station and does not require revision.
	<ul> <li>XXXXX request that:</li> <li>You reconsider the approach dynamics for Dorset House filling station and make practical revisions which will maximise safe and effective access.</li> <li>In order to assist a safe right-turn into the site from Gloucester Place, a right turn refuge should be</li> </ul>	The hatched area was intended to preserve a right-turn area and it is feasible (and was always the intention) to provide a right-turn arrow for visitors to the petrol filling station. This needs to be located at the north end of the hatched area, so that maximum queue space can be provided.
	<ul> <li>specifically marked for the PFS.</li> <li>On the southbound approach some form of KEEP CLEAR box should also be considered to support the above.</li> <li>You allow a left hand turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Marylebone Lane.</li> </ul>	A left hand turn from Gloucester Place Southbound into Marylebone Road is not technically feasible (because it has a major impact on the operation and capacity of the junction) and is not considered necessary.
100		
189.	The owner of Dorset House, XXXXX, has appointed XXXXX as managing agents of the ground floor retail units. We refer to a letter dated 6 December 2016 by XXXXX in regard to the road proposals known as the two-way project. We confirm XXXXX has been chosen to operate the petrol station on the corner of Gloucester Place and Marylebone Road and the views expressed in their letter are endorsed by XXXXXX and by XXXXXX.	The Project Team has responded directly to comments made by XXXXX, understood to be a representative of XXXXX, about issues surrounding the Petrol Filling Station.
190.	With reference to your letter of 14/11/16 I submitted my many objections to this scheme on 10/6/15. However, it is now necessary to reiterate the seriously detrimental effect it is going to have on my way of life.	The concern about rat-running on residential streets has been addressed during previous consultations and the information provided shows that there are not expected to be significant changes to traffic flows on residential roads. This information can be found at <a href="http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-">http://www.bakerstreettwoway.co.uk/pdfs/Baker-Street-Two-Way-</a>
	The Mews roadway behind the north Terrace of Dorset Square (Huntsworth / Taunton Mews) is extremely narrow with minimal pavements at each end. There are ten flats / cottages with 7 lock-up garages. Both sides of the road have double yellow lines and residents are not allowed to use outside dustbins. There are two car parking bays and a motorcycle bay which sometimes has to accommodate more than a dozen cycles. Therefore, it is vital a ban must be imposed on all southbound traffic in Gloucester Place from turning into this Mews. It is	Consultation-Response-Report-second-round.pdf.  Changes to specific junctions have also been considered in order to address concerns about rat-running. These proposed changes have been consulted upon in the second phase of consultation.
	totally unsuitable to become a rat-run for all the reasons listed in the consultation response dated December 2015.	Views were also sought on post implementation monitoring strategy as part of the second consultation.  Westminster City Council consultants carried out an analysis of accidents across the study area in order to identify any particular trends and determine the likely impact of the scheme on road safety.
	Taunton Place and Ivor Place have proper pavements on both sides of wider pavements, but it seems that the residents of this smaller street are to be cursed still further than they are already by the frequent obstruction of delivery juggernauts and other HGVs outside the public house at 21 Balcombe Street the drivers staying beyond the designated unloading times.	<ul> <li>It is generally considered that accident numbers and/or severity would reduce as a consequence of:</li> <li>Removal of one-way streets;</li> <li>Reduced vehicle speeds, arising from narrower streets and removal of the multilane approaches;</li> <li>Improved and increased availability of formal pedestrian crossings, shorter crossing distances and</li> </ul>
	Having lived in St Marylebone since 1930 I cannot express myself adequately on this Project - my opinion of the	pedestrian countdown;

NO. (Names		
and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	Portman Estate, the rubbish-food pedlars, TfL & WCC is unprintable.  (On marked up copy of notice - removing bus routes from upper Gloucester Place will make my freedom pass virtually useless. Why can't one Finchley Road bus route (13/82/113) be retained. My taxi bills will double. I am an octogenarian pensioner with osteoarthritis. I cannot walk with shopping bags.	<ul> <li>Improved cycle facilities and greater driver awareness of cyclists;</li> <li>Greater driver awareness due to two-way operation legibility, fewer weaving manoeuvres and the increase in conflicts at junctions;</li> <li>Similar schemes to convert one-way traffic to two-way at Shoreditch Triangle, Piccadilly and South Kensington seem to provide evidence that it is reasonable to expect at least a reduction in the proportion of accidents resulting in serious injuries to road users.</li> <li>Improved local accessibility will help emergency services as more traffic movements will be permitted than currently are.</li> <li>Bus consultation has been carried out separately by TfL. The proposed location of the stop is to provide greater opportunity for local business users to be served by a transport mode.</li> </ul>
191.	In amongst all the mess that TfL has made of London this will be another serious mistake and this change will make the Baker Street Marylebone road junction a complete car park, I wonder who at TfL actually has a brain and understands how traffic flows because as a long time driver in London almost all your changes have been worse for all road users so clearly this process isn't working.	This response is not specific to traffic order. There was a Public Consultation exercise to which this comment relates to.
192.	Ridiculous in the extreme. Look around you. Traffic is being killed slowly but surely.	Noted.
193.	Sir, I have looked at the proposals for this project but I have serious concerns about my access to my home. As you can see I live in XXXXX. Bickenhall Street is one-way, West to East. Therefore I have to access it from Gloucester Place.	There is not going to be any carriageway space to be able to provide a dedicated right turn lane for local traffic entering Bickenhall Street.
	Currently, when returning to London along the Westway, I enter Upper Montague Street from the Marylebone Road, turn left onto York Street and then left again onto Gloucester Place and then right into Bickenhall Street.	However, traffic can wait in the northbound outside lane for a suitable gap in opposing southbound traffic. Gaps will be created by the traffic signals on Marylebone Road, because there is no traffic turning from Marylebone Road when it is on a green signal, which is for a good majority of the cycle time.
	To do this, there are lights at the junction of Gloucester Place and York street, which is not always a straight forward turn, I enter Gloucester place in the far right lane to facilitate my turning into Bickenhall Street.	Traffic leaving Bickenhall Street will be able to turn both left and right onto Baker Street. If it turns left, then it can only travel northbound ahead onto Baker Street.
	Gloucester Place is always full, with a left turn lane, straight on lanes and a turn right lane. At times I have counted as many as 20 vehicles waiting in this the far right turn lane, hence why sometimes it is not always easy for me to access it, as the traffic is backed up towards Crawford Street.	
	Now, the proposal is to have the far right lane, as a south lane (and a bicycle lane) down Gloucester Place and only 2 lanes for the rest of the traffic, heading North, West or East.  I will now have to enter the middle lane and then wait for a break in the traffic heading south and therefore blocking the northbound lane, so that I can enter Bickenhall Street.	
	Now, for leaving Bickenhall street. Currently on leaving Bickenhall Street, I wait for the lights to change on Baker Street and Marylebone road and turn right into Baker Street and then right into York street. With the new proposal, I will have to cross a lane heading north, which I believe will be for buses and taxis only, join the middle lane? heading south and then again block the lane whilst I wait to turn into York Street.	
	I fear for my safety with both of these scenarios, from the accident waiting to happen angle and from the road rage angle that will occur whist I am blocking these lanes. I suggest that you seriously look at this again, and I can assure you I am not the only one concerned about this.	
194.	Stop messing with the streets layoutis a joke to say that cars are speeding between the traffic lightstraffic	Noted

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
,	lights they are never phasedand they are 50 meters apartand also road is very bumpy you will wreck your vehicle if you do more than 20 miles/hr  Is just an excuse for council to waste money to fill pockets to very known contractors. Money that council spend is tax payers money so should leave streets alone and spend for hospitals and education!!!	
195.	Surly u r not serious?!! I think it's a disastrous idea.	Noted
196.	We object to the proposed taxi rank orders to re-site current taxi ranks, in Orchard Street which serves Mark & Spencer; in Oxford Street which serves Selfridges; and also in Baker Street where the rank serves No. 55, Baker Street. None of the proposed arrangements would work for taxis and their passengers. We anticipate further discussions on these ranks with WCC and TfL but for now we wish to register a formal objection.	Site meetings are being arranged to discuss taxi ranks issues and any decision will be taken after the meetings have taken place.
	We also have concerns over the proposed restriction on taxis from turning right from Orchard Street into Oxford St which is proposed to be buses and cycles only. Taxis pick up many passengers in Orchard Street and require as much flexibility at the junction as possible to cater for passengers requirements.	
	We are also concerned over the prohibition of right turns from Orchard Street into Wigmore Street; Portman Street into Portman Square South; and Oxford Street into North Audley Street. As well as the left turn from Park Street into Oxford Street.	
	We would welcome further discussions over these restrictions with Westminster.	
197.	My neighbourhood is threatened with becoming a 'rat-run in the current proposals. I propose that the lay-out of roads is designed from the outset to prevent the possibility of 'a rat-run' developing, and believe this can be assured by the following changes:	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	<ol> <li>Ivor Place (west) to be the one-way 'out' of the neighbourhood</li> <li>Taunton/Huntsworth Mews to be the one-way 'in' to the neighbourhood</li> <li>A banned right turn when driving south at the junction of Dorset Square with Melcombe Street.</li> </ol>	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	I have previously stated in responses to the BS2W Proposal that the existing relatively low pollution and traffic levels in this almost entirely residential neighbourhood should not be sacrificed. Many people in our neighbourhood are very concerned that this will happen if the TfL/WCC proposals are implemented as they currently stand.	
198.	Proposed changes A501 Marylebone Road/ Balcombe Street/ Upper Montagu Street junction North of Marylebone Road.	The coloured surfacing has been used on the scheme as a feature to highlight areas of pedestrian traffic. It has been implemented on other projects in London.
	COMMENTS  A - POLICY OUTLINE  The Paker Street Two way project as a whole involves two simultaneous policy requirements of equal weight	Following detailed discussions with resident group representatives and consideration of alternative traffic management options put forward by the resident group, it is now proposed that the right turn from Gloucester Place southbound into Ivor Place will be prohibited.
	The Baker Street Two-way project as a whole involves two simultaneous policy requirements of equal weight. Traffic reassignment and simultaneously 'improving the public realm and conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users.' (10.7_) The three categories are taken to be of equal importance as there is no indication otherwise.	Further monitoring of the network will be undertaken after the implementation of the scheme with a view to implement further measures if required.
	A1 City Council's General Power of Competence is constrained under Part 1 of the Localism Act 2011 to the over-riding requirement 'to improve the well-being of its area (under section 2 of Local Government Act	

NO. (Names and addresses	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
withheld)	2000 (Deferences from The Cabinet Meeting Depart on the Second Dound)	
	<ul> <li>2000. (References from The Cabinet Meeting Report on the Second Round)</li> <li>A2 City Council is duty bound to give over-riding importance to improving the area as a whole, without imposing harm (which would not be an improvement). The character of the existing Conservation Area is intrinsic to the particular issues raised here. It is hardly mentioned.</li> </ul>	
	B - THE GARDEN SQUARE CONTEXT	
	Cabinet Members' Post Consultation Report Appendix	
	A. There should be no problem tweaking this minor but important aspect of the BS2W proposal which as a whole is welcome in so many different ways.	
	B 1 The officer's comment on the objection to the zebra crossing at the Balcombe Street Melcombe Street junction is based on the presumption that the stated goal of attracting pedestrians to the north pavement along Melcombe Street can be attained solely by the use of this highly signalled road surface treatment, one which is needlessly intrusive given its garden square context.	
	Dorset Square is recorded on John Nash's fifth plan for the Regent's Park Estate of 1826 which is illustrative of his concern with the creation of an illusion of an extensive garden setting within the Park. The Square's presence (there was no requirement for it to be shown) is indicative of the importance of the Park's wider context for the success of his designs for Regent's Park. The context is shown as non-industrial. The Conservation Area continues to provide, thanks to City Council's policies, a welcome and salubrious contrast to the traffic hub comprised of Marylebone and Baker Street stations, hence its importance.	
	B3 A salient factor which has been given insufficient attention, is that periods of maximum footfall are intermittent. Even taking increased use into account, it will prove not only visually over-dominant but also, for much of the time, serve no useful function at all. It will still, however, be intrusive and therefore cause harm to the fine setting of the garden square and to the conservation area context of its listed buildings, contrary to local and national planning policy.	
	CONCLUSION	
	Other much less intrusive road surface treatments could be considered. TfL have been notably successful in handling fine-grained urban landscapes elsewhere in London.	
	C - BAKER STREET TWO-WAY PROJECT POST CONSULTATION Balcombe Street rat run Residents' alternative traffic management proposal is likely to discourage through traffic further, but includes significant design and enforcement issues, and increases total traffic journey distances	
	C1 Allowing through traffic access to selected sections of the Conservation Area will not solve traffic problems that originate elsewhere and depend on a general diminution of road traffic.	
	The risk is harm to the Conservation Area. This has already been recognized in the many amendments to the original proposal. The hierarchy of through roads, side streets and mews, within the conservation area already, if respected, requires only the most minor adjustments to retain and develop the liveable neighbourhood aspirations embodied in City Council's policy on walking. It is the use of the existing main roads (strategic route C) that will still require facilitating.	
	Rejection of the residents' alternative traffic management proposal on the grounds that it would increase total traffic journey distances, cannot be sustained. Journey distance (for motorized transport) is given an unwarranted priority over journey time, air quality and amenity.	
	C4 Policy requires equal weight be given to pedestrian use. The increased journey distances and times which the existing and increasing heavy traffic (Marylebone road and south, down Harewood Avenue and Park Road and Baker Street) and its resulting air pollution has required of pedestrians wishing to avoid it, has not been taken into account.	

NO. (Names and addresses withheld)	RESPONSE	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
	CONCLUSION Policy requires a level playing field for bus users, cyclists and pedestrians. City Council's response admits that the alternative proposals discussed above would discourage through traffic. In these circumstances and with so much at stake, the rather minor design and enforcement issues mentioned as obstacles could usefully and positively be addressed.	