



# Cabinet Member Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for City Highways</b> <b>Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>23 August 2017</b>
<b>Classification:</b>	<b>For general release</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Berkeley Square North Public Realm Improvements</b>
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>West End Ward</b>
<b>City for All Summary:</b>	<b>This decision involves the removal of existing traffic signals, widening of footways, installation of new, high quality footway and carriageway paving materials, installation of new pedestrian crossing facilities, improved lighting and drainage, new trees and new cycle parking provisions.</b>
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Financial Summary:</b>	<b>This report seeks approval for capital expenditure of £4,783,000 to cover costs associated with design and implementation of the proposals identified in this report. This spend will be funded in full by the Grosvenor Estate under the terms of an Agreement pursuant to Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.</b>
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director of City Management and Communities</b>
<b>Report Author:</b>	<b>Michelle Lucas-Jones - Project and Programme Manager</b>

## **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1 The Berkeley Square North Public Realm Improvement scheme is being developed in partnership with, and will be fully funded by, Grosvenor Estate and Lancer.
- 1.2 The City Council will implement the works using its service provider FM Conway Limited. Although the scheme is being jointly funded, the City Council will fully recover all costs from Grosvenor through an agreement pursuant to section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 1.3 This report presents proposals to improve the public realm on the public highway of the northern side of Berkeley square and the surrounding area, and seeks approval to:
  - Implement the public realm improvements identified in section 4.2 of this report and as shown in Appendix B;
  - Capital expenditure required to complete the detailed design and implementation of this scheme;
  - Enter into an agreement with Grosvenor Estate pursuant to section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to secure funding for the scheme;
  - Modify and make traffic regulation orders necessary to accommodate the scheme;
  - Delegate authority to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities to approve minor modifications to the scheme as necessary in consultation with the Cabinet Member for City Highways and the Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm.
- 1.4 Subject to approval of this report, the programme and phasing for implementation of this scheme will be determined following agreement with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm, the Cabinet Member for City Highways and the West End Ward Councillors.

## **2. Recommendation**

### **Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm**

- 2.1 That approval is given to carry out detailed design and implementation of the proposed public realm improvements set out in section 4.2 of this report, shown on Plan A included in Appendix B.

- 2.2 That implementation dates and phasing of work will be agreed following further discussion with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm, the Cabinet Member for City Highways and West End ward councillors.
- 2.3 That approval is given to commit capital expenditure of £4,783,000 necessary to carry out detailed design and implementation of the scheme. All costs are to be paid in full by Grosvenor Estate in accordance with the section 278 agreement.
- 2.4 That delegated authority is given to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities to enter into an agreement with Grosvenor under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to deliver the public realm improvements to the north side of Berkeley Square.
- 2.5 That delegated authority is given to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities to approve minor modifications as necessary to the approved scheme, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm and the Cabinet Member for City Highways.

#### **Cabinet Member for City Highways**

- 2.6 That approval is given to modify and make traffic regulation orders in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, necessary to accommodate the highway improvements.
- 2.7 That the Cabinet Member concurs with the decisions of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm to the extent that these are within his terms of reference.

### **3. Background and further information**

- 3.1 The City Council is committed to working with the Grosvenor Estate to improve the public realm in West End, Belgravia and Mayfair. The proposed public realm scheme identified in this report will make a significant improvement for the general public and complement public realm improvements in the wider area, including works in Bond Street and Davies Street, by repaving the highway in high quality robust materials, modifying traffic flows, improving and updating street lighting, providing new cycle parking provisions and planting several new trees.
- 3.2 A concept design has been developed by BDP on behalf of Grosvenor Estate, for which the City Council have appointed its service provider FM Conway Limited to review the design to ensure compliance with City Council standards.

- 3.3 The estimated cost of developing the project, including design and implementation is £4,983,000 which includes the City Council's costs, risks and contingencies and will be fully funded by Grosvenor Estate in accordance with the terms of the section 278 agreement. Expenditure of £200,000 was approved in February 2017 via the Delegated Authority of the Executive Director for City Management and Communities to allow for the commencement of initial design and consultation.
- 3.4 Subject to approval of this report, the City Council will appoint its service provider FM Conway Ltd to produce a detailed design and implement.
- 3.5 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm and the Cabinet Member for City Highways are therefore recommended to approve the proposals outlined in this report and capital expenditure necessary to implement the works.

#### **4. Scheme Design Proposals**

- 4.1 The objective of the proposals is to significantly improve the visual amenity, accessibility and functionality of the public realm in the area of Berkeley Square for all highway users.
- 4.2 The proposals are shown in Appendix B and includes, but not limited to the following:
- Removing the traffic signals at the junction of Berkeley Square, Mount Street and Davies Street and introduction of a two-way traffic operation across the junction following the implementation of the Davies Street two-way project.
  - New ducting and signal infrastructure will be implemented at the junction of Mount Street, Davies Street and Berkeley Square to allow for new signals to be implemented at this location at a later date should traffic flows be deemed to become problematic following completion of the scheme.
  - Introduction of pedestrian crossings aligned with pedestrian desire lines and destinations;
  - Widening and repaving the footways of Berkeley Square, Mount Street and Davies Street in high quality stone paving;
  - Installation of granite setts to the carriageway at the junction of Mount Street, Berkeley Square and Davies Street, including granite setts in a contrasting colour mix at the pedestrian crossings;
  - Installation of granite setts to the parking and loading areas;
  - Raising of footway level and installation of granite setts to carriageway at the junction of Berkeley Square and Bruton Place;

- Creating a space for temporary public art installations at the north western corner of Berkeley Square;
  - Planting of new trees within the western footway of Davies Street immediately south of the junction with Mount Street and within the north-eastern footway of Berkeley Square;
  - Installation of seating within north-eastern footway of Berkeley Square;
  - Introduction of 27 cycle parking spaces in widened areas of footway;
  - Improved public lighting along the extents of the scheme;
  - Relocation of some parking bays from Berkeley Square to adjacent streets and rationalisation of the parking and loading throughout the northern side of Berkeley Square;
  - Improving surface water drainage across the scheme.
- 4.3 Extensive traffic modelling has been carried out to assess the implication of reducing the carriageway width on the northern side of Berkeley Square, as well as the implication of removing the traffic signals at the junction of Davies Street and Mount Street. The modelling has been approved and signed off by Transport for London on the basis that the modelling does not show a negative impact on existing traffic movements in the area.
- 4.4 The proposals to realign the kerb lines and widen footways will require the reshuffling of parking provision in the area. However the proposals will result in the overall number of parking spaces being reduced by one parking space (namely a Pay by Phone bay).

## **5. Programme**

- 5.1 The start date and phasing of the works will be agreed in consultation with the Cabinet Member for City Highways, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Public Realm and the West End Ward councillors. It is anticipated that the works will take approximately twelve months to complete.
- 5.2 Coordination will be carried out with other highway works expected to be carried out on the highway during the same time to ensure disruption to frontages and traffic movements are kept to a minimum.
- 5.3 It is intended that the proposals will tie in with the completion of a new two-way traffic system on Davies Street as best as possible, which is scheduled to be completed in August 2017. However this will be subject to agreement on implementation dates following consultation with associated ward councillors and Cabinet Members. All design features and modelling have been carried out with

consideration of the new the new two-way system that will be in place on Davies Street.

## **6. Outstanding Issues**

- 6.1 Subject to approval of this report, the Executive Director for City Management and Communities will instruct Tri-Borough legal services to draft and enter into an agreement pursuant to section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 with Grosvenor Estate to secure funding for this scheme. Works will not commence on site until this agreement is in place.
- 6.2 Subject to approval of this report, the Executive Director for City Management and Communities will initiate procedures to modify and make traffic regulation orders to accommodate the proposed changes to traffic restrictions and parking provisions.

## **7. Financial Implications**

- 7.1 All costs for the design and implementation of the public realm improvements, are being funded by Grosvenor Estate and will be secured under the terms of a section 278 agreement.
- 7.2 The overall cost of this scheme including all design, implementation and third party costs is £4,983,000. A total of £200,000 was approved in February 2017 via the Delegated Authority of the Executive Director for City Management and Communities to allow for the commencement of initial design and consultation to be carried out on this scheme. A copy of this Delegated Authority is attached in Appendix D. This report therefore requires approval of the remaining £4,783,000 to cover all costs associated with detailed design and implementation of this scheme. This cost includes an allowance for risk and contingencies.
- 7.3 This scheme is included within the City Council's current approved 5-year capital programme.

## **8. Legal Implications**

- 8.1 Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 enables a Local Authority, acting in its capacity as "Highway Authority" to enter into agreements with third parties to

undertake alterations or improvements to the public highway at the developers own cost and expense.

- 8.2 The pre-conditions for an agreement under section 278 are firstly that the Local Authority should be satisfied that it will be of benefit to the public to enter into the agreement for the execution of the works by the authority and secondly that the works must be such that the Local Authority are authorised to execute, i.e. they must fall within the highway authorities powers of road building, improvement or maintenance.
- 8.3 The proposed changes to parking locations and designation as part of this scheme will require a Traffic Order to be made under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Any objections the City Council receives during the Traffic Order making process should be delegated to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities (or such other authorised officer) in line with the current Traffic Order making process.
- 8.4 The City Council has a General Power of Competence under Part 1 of the Localism Act 2011 to improve the well-being of its area the former power being under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000.

## **9. Consultation**

- 9.1 Extensive informal consultation has been carried out by Grosvenor Estate with local frontages and key stakeholders including the West End Partnerships and Ward Councillors. All comments received during this process have been incorporated within the design currently being proposed.
- 9.2 A consultation exercise involving Ward Councillors, the local amenity society and section 6 stakeholders including adjacent frontages was carried out in April 2017 for a period of three weeks. Details of the consultation exercise and a summary of responses is attached in Appendix C.

**If you have any queries about this report please contact: Michelle Lucas-Jones on 020 7641 8142, or email [mljones@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:mljones@westminster.gov.uk).**

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for City Highways**

**Declaration of Interest**

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

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

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

State nature of interest if any .....

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

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation(s) in the report entitled Berkeley Square North Public Realm Improvements

Signed .....

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

Date .....

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

Additional comment: .....

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

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



## Appendix A

### Other Implications

#### 1. Resources Implications

All costs associated with checking designs and monitoring site works including Westminster City Council costs will be recovered from the developer as a scheme cost.

#### 2. Business Plan Implications

No implications.

#### 3. Risk Management Implications

No implications.

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

Disruption during works will be carefully managed to minimise negative impacts such as dust and noise.

#### 5. Crime and Disorder Implications

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

#### 6. Impact on the Environment

Wherever possible existing materials that are taken up will be recycled. New tree planting and gentrification of the streetscape will not only add to the visually amenity of the streetscape, but will also assist with sustainable urban drainage, by reducing surface water runoff into the sewer and reducing CO2 levels. Cycle parking provision will also encourage people to use a sustainable means of transport to access the local shopping parade and places of work.

## **7. Equalities Implications**

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

## **8. Staffing Implications**

No implications.

## **9. Human Rights Implications**

No implications.

## **10. Energy Measure Implications**

No implications.

## **11. Communications Implication**

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

**Consultation Plan and Scheme Proposals**

### Consultation Response Summary

#### Public consultation on the Public Realm Improvement Scheme for Berkeley Square North Public Realm Scheme – April 2017 - Response Summary

##### West End Ward Members and Cabinet Member Responses

Councillor	Comments	Officer Response
Councillor Glenys Roberts	<p>The proposals does not addresses traffic needs. Widening pavements may be very well for pedestrians but the North Side of Berkeley Square is heavily used by feeder traffic from three directions which already leads to back ups. You are now proposing to add a fourth feeder from Davies Street. There are issues with crossing points in Berkeley Square but what you propose in the North won't solve them and will make things worse. Also has no one learned from the public realm in Mount Street the carriageway is now so narrow ( and you say you are proposing to repeat this in Davies street) that there is a punch up between drivers most days and peace is only kept by Scotts doorman.</p> <p>I'm fed up of being consulted when people who don't live locally and don't drive these routes or even walk them have already made the decisions and intend implementing them. It is a waste of my time</p>	<p>Davies Street does not attract 'new' traffic as such, this has been transferred from Bruton Street, and some of that traffic is likely to find alternative routes away from the area.</p> <p>WCC's specialist consultants Norman Rourke Pryme (NRP) have modelled the operation of Davies Street, Berkeley Square and the wider area in detail, taking account of the pedestrian crossing issues. This is why on their specific advice it is proposed to retain 2 lanes of circulating traffic.</p> <p>Two-way traffic on Davies Street is a separate project to the proposed improvements to Berkeley Square North. The carriageways to Berkeley Square have been designed to support the volume and mix of vehicle types using the streets.</p> <p>The perceived narrowness of Mount Street (kerb lines were retained) is intended to keep traffic speeds low, and discourage traffic movements. If streets are wider, then passage is indeed easier, but that makes them more attractive as rat-runs, encouraging higher traffic flows.</p> <p>A site meeting has been held between the design team and the ward councillor to discuss the proposals and modelling carried out in respect of the issues raised.</p>
Councillor Jonathan Glanz	Has concerns about the narrowing of the highway, the effects this may have on traffic and the disturbance this may have on residential properties	A site meeting has been held between the design team and the ward councillor to discuss the proposals and modelling carried out in respect of the issues raised.
Councillor Paul Church	Supports what Councillor Glenys Roberts has raised from a driver's perspective	A site meeting has been held between the design team and the ward councillor to discuss the proposals and modelling carried out in respect of the issues raised.
Councillor Danny Chalkley	Supports wards members objections and comments	A site meeting has been held between the design team and the Cabinet Member to discuss the proposals and modelling carried out in respect of the issues raised.
Councillor Daniel Astaire	No response received	N/A

## Section 6 Stakeholders Consulted

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
British Telecom	London Ambulance Service	Licensed Private Hire Car Association
Westminster City Council – Special Events	Crown Estate Paving Commission	Thames Water
British Medical Association	The British Motorcyclists' Federation	The Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association
London Cycling Campaign	Freight Transport Assoc. Ltd	
Westminster Living Streets Group	Transport for London	London Cab Drivers Club
Royal Mail	Metropolitan Police Service	Unite the Union (Cab Section) Transport House
English Heritage	NOKIA	Cab Shelter Fund
The Road Haulage Assoc. Ltd.	Westminster City Council - Highways	Taxi & Private Hire Transport for London
Westminster Property Owners Association	The Owners Drivers Society	Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
London Fire Brigade	Westminster Ambulance Station	Westminster City Council - Planning
Westminster City Council – Street Licencing	Atkins Telecom	Westminster City Council - Parking
Westminster City Council – Street Management	Westminster City Council - CCTV	Westminster City Council – Asset Management
EDF Energy	RMT London Taxi Drivers Bench	Network Rail
National Grid	London TravelWatch	London Chamber of Commerce
Energis		

## Section 6 Stakeholders Responses

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response
Westminster City Council – Special Events	<p>There are some events planned in the area before and during the implementation of this scheme.</p> <p>First Event between the 6<sup>th</sup> -20<sup>th</sup> June 2017            Second Event is a big operation before and during the works. From the 30<sup>th</sup> August until the end of October 2017.            Various filming events taking place within the square also.</p> <p>Articulated lorries deliver considerable amount of equipment on the week in advance</p>	<p>The events taking place in the area will be considered as part of the works phasing strategy.</p> <p>The project team is liaising with the special event team to keep them up to speed regarding construction phasing and dates.</p>

	<p>of the event. Entrance to the square takes place from Davies Street.</p>	
<p>London Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>The proposals introduce expensive materials while shying away from addressing some important issues.</p> <p>The proposals retain a two-lane gyratory system around Berkeley Square. Cyclists continuing around the square at the junctions are forced to weave into the right-hand lane. This is not safe and will not attract new people to cycling, especially women, families and older people. Because the square remains one-way, some vehicles (including cycles) have to make longer journeys than would otherwise be necessary. As a result, there are more vehicles going around the square than would be the case with a two-way scheme.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian crossings fail to give pedestrians priority over vehicular traffic. The uncontrolled crossings of two-way streets could be particularly difficult for pedestrians to use. Additionally we have some doubts whether the mini roundabout at the junction with Mount Street will work, given that there is likely to be a predominant traffic flow from Berkeley Square.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the granite setts at the approaches to pedestrian crossings could cause discomfort and distraction to cyclists including disabled people who use cycles as a mobility aid. We ask that any granite setts have a flush and not cobbled finish, like the good example at Charles II Street / St Alban's Street.</p> <p>The drawing shows negligible increase in cycle parking and no Santander Cycle Hire docking station.</p> <p>We would support a scheme which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• - Reduced the Berkeley Square gyratory to one lane or enabled two-way cycling</li> <li>• - Provide safe zebra or signal-controlled crossings for pedestrians</li> <li>• - Provided a Santander Cycles Hire docking station and increased cycle parking so more people could ride to Berkeley Square by bike to relax, shop or work</li> </ul> <p>As it is, we regret that we do not support the Berkeley Square North Public Realm Improvements as currently proposed.</p>	<p>The overarching design intention is to calm traffic, reduce speeds and reduce vehicle domination across the scheme area.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that gyratory systems may not always provide a convenient and comfortable environment for cyclists, there is no particular evidence that the current gyratory arrangement results in safety issues for cyclists (TfL website on accident data shows 3 accidents between 2010-2016).</p> <p>Reducing Berkeley Square to a single circulating lane will not provide sufficient traffic capacity to accommodate current or post-Bond Street levels of traffic demand. Without a reduction in overall traffic demand, this would either result in increased traffic congestion, which will affect cyclists' ability to move around local streets safely and in comfort, or will result in reassignment onto alternative, potentially less suitable or congested streets.</p> <p>The intention is for a wider area to be created (including the Mount St / Davies St junction and south to Berkeley Square) that sees a better balance between all modes of travel, cyclists included. The proposed granite setts have a fine picked finish and will be consistent with the high quality, even finish to the setted surfacing installed on the adjacent Mount Street, Bourdon Street and Grosvenor Hill Public Realm Improvement Schemes.</p> <p>The proposed traffic island in the square that splits traffic between north to Davies Street and clockwise towards Bruton Street has been designed to be indicated by paint only rather than a conventional design with kerbs. As such it will provide a degree of scope for cyclists to keep to the nearside of the circulating lane whilst permitting traffic to pass at an appropriate distance and speed. There is also good inter-visibility between cyclists going around the square and drivers heading south from Davies Street.</p> <p>Existing Santander Cycle Hire docking stations are located in three nearby locations: Farm Street (100m to the west); Bruton Street (150m to the north east); and Grafton Street (350m to the east) which offer 53 hire spaces.</p> <p>The provision of additional on-street cycle parking is being considered during subsequent detailed design. The installation of an 'EcoCycle' docking station with a capacity of c.200 cycles is also being investigated, again subject to detailed design.</p>

<p>Taxi and Private Hire, Transport for London</p>	<p>We have two taxi ranks that are within the works foot print that are no shown on the diagram.</p> <p>Berkeley Square (40 Berkeley Square) No. 5868 for three taxis in operation at all times Berkeley Square (North West Corner) No. 5862 for two taxis in operation at all times (this is located in the centre of the road near the solo bikes).</p> <p>Has any prior discussion taken place regarding this public realm improvement scheme with the taxi trade associations?</p> <p>I would suggest that you table this to be discuss at the next WEP meeting where changes to ranks in Westminster are discussed. I have copied in Sarah Rye.</p>	<p>There will be no loss of taxi parking spaces as part of these proposals.</p> <p>Two Taxi bays will be located on the north eastern part of the square and three more taxi bays are proposed along Davies Street south of the junction of Mount Street.</p>
<p>Taxi and Private Hire, Transport for London</p>	<p>I believe a response has already been provided on this but we cannot see our taxi ranks in the plan and we have several very busy taxi ranks in Berkeley Square. TfL would therefore object very strongly to these proposals without further discussion. The Cab Ranks' Committee and TfL meet regularly with Westminster to discuss projects that may affect taxi ranks and this is organised by Sarah Rye.</p> <p>May I suggest that you contact Sarah directly and request a spot on the agenda so that the plans can be discussed further and appropriate compromises made.</p>	<p>There will be no loss of taxi parking spaces as part of these proposals.</p> <p>Two Taxi bays will be located on the north eastern part of the square and three more taxi bays are proposed along Davies Street south of the junction of Mount Street.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss the proposals further was held on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017 and minor adjustments to the location of the taxi bays have been made to accommodate taxi concerns raised.</p>
<p>Transport for London, Surface Transport</p>	<p>Mount Street is an essential bus diversion route. I am concerned that any realignment at the junction will prevent buses from making the left turn into Mount Street from Berkeley Square.</p> <p>Please can you provide a swept path analysis drawing to prove if a 12 metre rigid bus can make the manoeuvre?</p>	<p>The proposed kerb line radius on this junction will allow for this movement to take place.</p> <p>A vehicle swept path analysis drawing will be provided showing the area to be covered by a turning vehicle.</p>
<p>Unite the Union (Cab Section)</p>	<p>Having looked at the plan we have noticed that two existing taxi ranks located at the north of Berkeley Square are absent from the new layout.</p> <p>Obviously Berkeley Square and the surrounding area are very important to the London taxi trade. Therefore if it is the case that these two taxi ranks are to be lost the London Cab Ranks Committee would oppose the proposed scheme.</p> <p>We also have concerns, as with every new traffic scheme that there is potential for increased congestion because of road space narrowing. Particularly in this case as there will be south bound traffic coming into the</p>	<p>There will be no loss of taxi parking spaces as part of these proposals.</p> <p>Two Taxi bays will be located on the north eastern part of the square and three more taxi bays are proposed along Davies Street south of the junction of Mount Street.</p> <p>A meeting to discuss the proposals further was held on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017 and minor adjustments to the location of the taxi bays have been made to accommodate taxi concerns raised.</p>

	<p>square from Davis Street.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could confirm exactly what the intentions are regarding these two pre-existing taxi ranks.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling demonstrates that the proposals could accommodate current and expected traffic demand. It is possible that traffic demand will increase around the north side of Berkeley Square, yet maintaining the two circulating lanes provides resilience to increased congestion.</p>
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>As you will be aware, in addition to being a London Square, Berkeley Square Garden is covered by several heritage designations. These cover the shelter and the statue of a Woman of Samaria located within the garden, which are grade II listed; the garden itself is on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at grade II; and the site is located in the Mayfair Conservation area. Around the square are eighteen listed buildings, including three (nos. 44-46) that are grade I listed, and 47 Berkeley Square which is listed grade II. These designations underline the quality of the build environment that has characterised this part of Mayfair since its construction in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. By undertaking a map regression exercise going back to the earliest phases of development of the square, it appears that the pavement layout to the north and west of the square has scarcely changed. As such, the relationships between the houses surrounding the square and the public realm, including the garden, which make up part of one another's setting and contribute to the character of the area, retain much of its authentic historic quality. Similarly, it appears that tree planting in the square has always been limited to the public garden, which has a strong boundary, and whose verdant quality is in contrast to the surrounding townscape. These clear and historically designed delineations between spaces are distinctive local characteristics whose legibility will be reduced by the current proposals. In our view, this would cause some harm to the significance of the heritage assets. The information that has been published for consultation does not seek to analyse the contribution that the public realm makes to the setting of the heritage assets (or visa versa) that will be affected by the proposals, or to justify any harm that the alterations may cause.</p> <p>This is in contrast to the thorough analysis recently undertaken by the City Council for the upgrading of Hanover Square. In line with the NPPF paragraphs 128, 129 and 132, Historic England encourages the City Council to consider the impact of these proposals on all of the heritage assets in and around the square, including on their setting.</p>	<p>We understand that these comments are based on the information provided by WCC and would welcome the opportunity to meet and take Historic England through the analysis and rationale that lies behind our proposals for Berkeley Square.</p> <p>We recognise the characteristics described and have considered these alongside analysis of the way in which the square is used today and will be used in the future.</p> <p>The overall vision for Berkeley Square is to create a vibrant and coherent place for people where traffic plays a complimentary role rather than leading or dominant one. We place huge value on the central garden and its relationship to the wider square and estate as a whole. We have given this careful consideration and can elaborate with sketches and other material on how the proposals will augment, rather than harm the character of this important square.</p> <p>A meeting was held with Historic England on 11 July 2017 to discuss the comments raised.</p>



	<p>In addition to the above concern, Historic England notes that there appear to have been two major changes to Berkeley Square since it was first laid out which have fundamentally altered the impact that traffic has on the Square. The first was the replacement of smaller scale domestic buildings with large scale offices on the east and southern sides of the square in the 1930s, which along with the construction of other large offices in Mayfair the 20th century has greatly increased daytime activity around the square. The second major change was the creation of a through route to Curzon Street in 1964-65. The road layout at the north end of the square appears to respond to these works, and we acknowledge that it presents numerous opportunities for enhancement.</p> <p>In addition to these major changes to the square itself, other alterations to the road layout of surrounding streets, such as the separation of Old and New Bond Streets, and the motorwayification of Park Lane and, more recently, the blockage of Davies Street for Crossrail, are also likely to have had an impact on the traffic in Berkeley Square. The proposed works do not appear to address these wider causes for traffic in Berkeley Square. While we are not suggesting that it would be possible to undo any of these historic changes that have affected traffic in the square, we note that by not studying them or acknowledging their impact, it seems unlikely that the proposed works will provide the optimum solution to the problem. We would encourage the City Council to consider the wider implications of these works on this part of the conservation area, as it seems likely there would be knock-on effects that have the potential to change local character elsewhere.</p> <p><b>Next Steps</b> We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss these proposals, and explore the justification for the changes to the historic street layout, and the potential for amendments to preserve heritage significance where this might be affected. This includes the archaeological implications of the potential cycle facility, which has not been illustrated on the drawing, but which is described as having the potential to include a structure potentially housing a café, flower stall, kiosk and advertising hoardings. We would also encourage you to discuss these proposals with the City Council's own conservation specialists.</p> <p>Finally I must note that this opinion is based on the information provided by you and for the avoidance of doubt does not take precedence over our obligation to advise you</p>	
--	--	--

	on, and potentially object to development proposals which may subsequently arise from these public realm works and which may have adverse effects on the environment.	
Thames Water	Instructions on excavation depths and location of apparatus.	No response required

## Residents and Business Responses

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response
1. Mount Row	<p>There appears no provision for pedestrian crossings in this scheme. At present there is a partial zebra crossing of Berkeley Square and markings for pedestrians to cross Davies Street at the corner of Davies Street, Berkeley Square and Mount Street. This is particularly dangerous if there is a waggon/lorry parked outside Phillips' auction house, as it can obscure the red light and a pedestrian trying to proceed from the half Zebra crossing can't see the other two sets of red lights.</p> <p>It is good news that you propose to replace this very dangerous arrangement, but you don't appear to go far enough with your raised carriage way crossing proposal. There doesn't appear to be provision in this for any Zebra crossings and I would question whether this is safe.</p> <p>Furthermore the raised carriage way crossing in Mount Street is poorly sited if one is proceeding north along Berkeley Square with the aim of crossing Mount Street to go to the Porsche garage or to proceed up the west side of Davies Street. Cars turning left out of Berkeley Square into Mount Street aren't going to see pedestrians looking to cross the</p>	<p>WCC's specialist consultants Norman Rourke Pryme (NRP) have modelled the operation of Davies Street, Berkeley Square and the wider area in detail, taking account of the pedestrian crossing issues.</p> <p>No crossing provisions will be removed as part of this scheme, although the form in which these will take may change slightly.</p> <p>The issue regarding parking clocking sight lines is being reviewed as part the design process. It is intended to have new waiting and loading restrictions in place to ensure pedestrian sight lines are maintained at key crossing locations.</p>

	<p>road. Furthermore pedestrians looking to cross the road here are going to have to look over their shoulders to see the oncoming traffic from Berkeley Square. This could be made even worse, particularly in summer, if the planned tree on the corner of Berkeley Square and Mount Street is actually planted, as its foliage could be in everyone's sightlines.</p> <p>Pedestrians crossing either Davies Street, Berkeley Square or Mount Street would have to look in two directions while crossing the road. At present for the Zebra, one currently has to look in only one direction. To complete the crossing of Berkeley Square one only have to look in one direction, while if one is crossing Davies Street to Mount Street one has to look in two directions, but only ninety degrees different, i.e. either at traffic coming from Berkeley Square or from Mount Street. Pedestrians aren't going to do this and could get stranded half way.</p>	
2. Mount Street	<p>Looking at the plans I can't see anywhere for the 50 or so motorcycles that park in the parking bay everyday.</p> <p>Please also could you tell me why this is being considered in the first place – at present the system works well – why change it just for the sake of it?</p> <p>How much will this cost?</p>	The existing motorcycle parking is being re-provided within the scheme area.
3. Charles Street	<p>I am concerned about the proposed changes to the southern footpath in Charles Street, I cannot see if the proposal is to widen this? If so it is of great concern as at the moment on a Saturday night cars are left overnight on both sides of the road at Charles Street at the Berkeley Square end i.e parked in residents parking bays as well as on single yellows. Absolutely every Sunday, without exception, a large vehicle usually a coach gets stuck at the end of Charles Street close to Berkeley Square as the road is not wide enough with the parked vehicles.( During the week it isnt a problem with a single row of cars parked)</p> <p>Also I could not see if the number of car parking spaces on Berkeley Square North would be reduced? As I am not permanently in London I cannot get a parking permit so the</p>	<p>The extent of the scheme does not cover Charles Street.</p> <p>The net amount of Resident bays will not change. There will be no loss of existing resident parking bays.</p>

	availability of parking overnight in Berkeley Square is critical to me.	
4. Berkeley Square	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you provide a timeline with dates for all works, broken down by section, along with an estimation of the total length of time the project will take to complete?</li> <li>2. Please can you re-confirm that Davies Street and Berkeley Square sides will not be worked on at the same time, so we always have one access point to the galleries?</li> <li>3. Could you confirm that noisy works can be limited during auction days, ensuring that there is no noise during the auctions themselves, if we give notice of these days /times?</li> <li>4. Fire escapes must be taken into account; therefore we'd like you to consult with us on fire exit strategies during this time of works around our building. Our fire assembly point is Berkeley Square itself.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project team are currently working on the construction phasing strategy. When this is agreed this information will be shared with all stakeholders. A detailed programme for all phases will be discussed.</li> <li>2. The works will be phased in order to minimise disruption to adjacent properties. At least one access to the galleries will be maintained at all times during the duration of the works.</li> <li>3. Please provide us with a programme of the auctions in order to be able to incorporate this on the construction programme.</li> <li>4. Fire escapes will be taken into account while the works take place.</li> </ol>

## **Appendix D**

### **Delegated Approval for Initial Design and Consultation Process**