

DELEGATED AUTHORITY CONSULTATION REPORT 7730

TRAFFIC ORDERS – COVENTRY STREET, GREAT CASTLE STREET, GREAT MARLBOROUGH STREET, LANGHAM PLACE, MARGARET STREET, REGENT STREET, REGENT STREET ST. JAMES'S.

AMENDMENTS TO PRESCRIBED ROUTES, TAXI RANKS AND WAITING AND LOADING

(Marylebone, St James's and West End Wards)

Background

Regent Street is an iconic destination and highway that provides a vital connection for central London. In recognition of Regent Street's vital role in London and in response to the pandemic, the Council worked in partnership with the Crown Estate to implement a temporary scheme, including a temporary traffic order. The scheme aimed to deliver a greener, cleaner, safer and more accessible West End to facilitate economic recovery of the area.

The Temporary Traffic Order was designed to be in place for two years until the outcome of the pandemic became clear and is coming to an end on 19th July 2023. Therefore, a review was conducted looking at the lessons learned from the scheme and to recommend immediate and long-term next steps to ensure the continued safe and legal operation of Regent Street before the temporary traffic order expires; and to propose a semi-permanent scheme programme of activity to replace the temporary scheme before it reaches the end of its planned life.

The City Council has undertaken detailed analysis of the traffic and air quality monitoring, this data aims to understand the two key areas of concerns for stakeholders. The data shows that since the temporary scheme on Regent Street was introduced, delays in traffic have generally been no worse than pre-pandemic.

Data collected since June 2018 shows an annual Air Quality NO₂ (Nitrogen Dioxide) mean of 67.6µg/m³ which is above the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) air quality objective of 40µg/m³. This value was also exceeded in 2019. In 2020 and 2021 the levels were below the objective for the first time in recent history due to the pandemic and reduced traffic levels. Currently the 2022 NO₂ levels on Regent Street has been lower than 40µg/m³ whilst remaining significantly below 2018/19 levels.

RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

Following the publication / posting of press and street notices between 5th December 2022 and 18th January 2023 and consultation with frontagers and other key parties on the proposed measures, 21 responses were received, as detailed in Appendix B to this report. The extent of the letter consultation included nine Ward Councillors, 11 local residents' associations, 42 statutory bodies and 1834 frontages.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Traffic Orders are made as proposed to facilitate the implementation of the scheme shown on Drawing Nos:

- CSWWES1094-TMO-01 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-02 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-03 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-04 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-05 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-06 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-07 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-08 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-09 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-10 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-11 Rev A;
- CSWWES1094-TMO-12 Rev A; and
- CSWWES1094-TMO-13 Rev A.

Appendices

Appendix A – City Council’s position on commonly cited concerns

Appendix B – Responses to consultation

Appendix C – Images

I agree / disagree with the recommendation.

Signed



Date 06/04/2023

Chris Bowers
Programme and Contract Manager
City Highways, City Management and Air Quality

Signed



Date 06/04/2023

Jonathan Rowing
Head of Parking
City Highways, City Management and Air Quality

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
1.	Making the temporary COVID-19 measures permanent	<p>In early Autumn 2020 the City Council in partnership with The Crown Estate developed and delivered ‘enhanced temporary highways improvements’ along the Regent Street corridor to replace the initial Movement Strategy traffic barriers scheme that was introduced in the Summer 2020 in response to the Covid Pandemic.</p> <p>The enhancements implemented consisted of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - widened footways in temporary construction materials to support safer social distancing as the West End reopened; - introduction of temporary mandatory cycle lanes encouraging sustainable and active travel; - installation of new temporary planters, including seating, adding much needed greenery with several new trees improving air quality and biodiversity; and - provision of visual public security protection measures. <p>All of these measures significantly enriched accessibility, functionality of the local amenity for everyone to experience and particularly to entice visitors back to the area supporting the local economy.</p> <p>The Temporary Traffic Order (TTO) was designed to be in place for two years until the outcome of the pandemic became clear, with funding agreement with the Crown Estates and Cabinet Members agreement the decision was made to launch a future Regent Street Scheme to design to a permanent arrangement.</p> <p>An application to the Department of Transport was made in October 2022 to extend the TTO for 18 months, however this was rejected, six months was offered which is coming to an end on 19th July 2023. Unfortunately, six months does not allow the City Council to undertake the necessary consultation to understand what the community want to see as the future of the scheme, the modelling and design would take at least 18 months depending on the consultation and engagement feedback.</p> <p>Therefore, a review was conducted looking at the lessons learned from the scheme and to recommend immediate and long-term next steps to ensure the continued safe and legal</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
		<p>operation of Regent Street before the TTO expires. It is proposed a permanent scheme to replace the temporary scheme before it reaches the end of its planned life as the immediate step and Phase 1 to the scheme, this will ensure that the current road layout is legal, compliant, and enforceable</p> <p>The long-term step, Phase 2, is to design a future Regent Street allowing the City Council time to publicly engage with residents, businesses, user group communities, stakeholders and others that have a direct interest in the design of the future of Regent Street for input in the design.</p>
2.	Congestion – increase in traffic congestion	<p>Across the city there are a number of busy roads connecting popular routes consisting of single lanes, which at times have congestion caused by a number of different factors, including high level of traffic flow and vehicle breakdowns. The City Council deems Regent Street of relative similarity to other busy roads across the city and London as a whole.</p> <p>Vehicle journey times are a good measure of congestion levels. Concern No. 5 details the impact the scheme has had on bus journey times which are similar to general traffic now that they stop in line with traffic.</p> <p>The City Council has completed some in-depth traffic monitoring and analysis and has seen reduced number of vehicles (similar flows southbound but reduced flows northbound). Meanwhile, there has been an increase in the number of cyclists on the street, particularly in a southbound direction and in the afternoon. For example, In May 2017 there was a peak hour cycling flow of 212, compared to September 2022 when this reached 379.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing congestion levels during the design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
3.	Air Pollution – worsened pollution	<p>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) data has been available from mid-2018 for Oxford Street East which was historically used as the proxy for air quality on Regent Street. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) has set an air quality objective of 40µg/m³. In 2018, Regent Street had an annual NO₂ mean of 58µg/m³ which is above DEFRA air quality objective of 40µg/m³.</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

CONCERN	COMMENTS
	<p>Particulate Matter (PM) is the term used for a mixture of solid particles and liquid droplets found in the air. Particle pollution includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM10 – inhalable particles with the diameter of 10 micrometres or less; and • PM2.5 – inhalable particles with the diameter of 2.5 micrometres or less. <p>Particulate Matter and NO₂ data have been collected on Regent Street since May 2020 and on Regent Street St James’s since December 2020.</p> <p>According to live data monitoring it is evidenced that the following national air quality objectives are achieved on Regent Street (up to February 2023):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂ in full year 2022)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NO₂ one hour mean value of 200 µg/m³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times a year (zero times); and • NO₂ annual mean ≤40 µg/m³ (39.1 µg/m³ in Regent Street North and 37.7 µg/m³ in Regent Street South). <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Particulate Matter (PM10 & PM2.5 in full year 2022)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM2.5 annual mean ≤25 µg/m³ (10.3 µg/m³ in Regent Street South); • PM10 annual mean ≤40 µg/m³ (19.7 µg/m³ in Regent Street South); and • PM10 24H mean value of 50 µg/m³ not to be exceeded more than 35 times a year (eight times). <p>Between May 2020 and April 2021, the NO₂ hourly mean level in Regent Street was similar to the nearby Oxford Street East area. Since temporary scheme construction completed in April 2021, the NO₂ level in Regent Street has been lower than Oxford Street East in most months – this indicates that the temporary scheme has led to a proportionate reduction in NO₂ emission along Regent Street when compared to Oxford Street East.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing air quality levels during the design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
4.	Emergency Services – delays in response times	<p>Since the introduction of the Temporary Traffic Order the City Council has been monitoring the traffic movements on Regent Street and has not received any concerns with regards to operational matters from the emergency services. As part of the proposals of making these temporary measures permanent, key stakeholders, including the emergency services, were consulted between 7th December 2022 and 18th January 2023, and had no comments to make and have not raised any concerns in regard to emergency response times.</p> <p>The carriageways are of sufficient width for a car to pass a broken-down car, but a larger vehicle would block the carriageway area where it is a single lane and when the vehicle has not managed to stop in an inset loading bay or equivalent. This is going to be addressed as part of the future scheme currently in development. It was not possible to remove the central reservation as part of the interim arrangement.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing emergency access and engaging with emergency services during the design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
5.	Public Transport – delays to buses	<p>Transport for London (TfL) buses have reported no significant changes to bus journey times when compared to the pre-pandemic baseline. Data provided by TfL shows that the average bus journey times have broadly stabilised since Spring 2021. Bus journey times have increased slightly southbound but have decreased by a similar level northbound.</p> <p>The carriageways are of sufficient width for a car to pass a broken-down car, but a larger vehicle would block the carriageway area where it is a single lane and when the vehicle has not managed to stop in an inset loading bay or equivalent. This is going to be addressed as part of the future scheme currently in development. It was not possible to remove the central reservation as part of the interim arrangement.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing public transport delays and engaging with TfL during design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
6.	Servicing and Construction – nowhere to park	<p>Vehicles are permitted to load / unload on double yellow lines in neighbouring roads for a maximum period of 20 minutes between 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m., and for an unlimited period outside of those hours, provided that continuous loading activity is taking place and there are no loading restrictions (indicated by signs and yellow kerb markings).</p> <p>Loading / unloading can also be carried out in residents’ parking bays and paid for bays during the hours of control (indicated by traffic signs in the vicinity of the bay) for a maximum period of 20 minutes. There is no restriction on loading / unloading outside of controlled hours.</p> <p>If a tradesperson (i.e. service engineer, etc.) attending a property has easily portable tools and / or materials they can therefore unload their vehicle on the yellow lines in neighbouring roads before moving their vehicle to a nearby pay-by-phone parking place. Where the expected stay period exceeds the maximum allowed in a pay-by-phone parking place, it would be appropriate for the tradesperson to obtain a trade parking permit instead. This permit allows the tradesperson to park in a residents’ parking place between 8.00 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. or in a pay-by-phone parking place or shared-use parking place between 8.30 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. anywhere in the Controlled Parking Zone. Further details are available on the City Council's web site at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/trade-parking-permits.</p> <p>In circumstances where heavy tools or materials need to be unloaded over a longer period of time than ordinarily permitted on yellow lines or where the vehicle needs to be parked close to the property to enable work to take place, the resident or business concerned should contact the City Council's Parking Services Team in the City Management and Communities Department on 020 7823 4567 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 8pm and Saturday 8am to 3pm) to obtain dispensation for that vehicle from the restrictions at that location.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing servicing and construction works during design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
7.	Deliveries – nowhere to load and / or unload	<p>Vehicles are permitted to load / unload on double yellow lines in neighbouring roads for a maximum period of 20 minutes between 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m., and for an unlimited period outside of those hours, provided that continuous loading activity is taking place and there are no loading restrictions (indicated by signs and yellow kerb markings).</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
		<p>Loading / unloading can also be carried out in residents’ parking bays and paid for bays during the hours of control (indicated by traffic signs in the vicinity of the bay) for a maximum period of 20 minutes. There is no restriction on loading / unloading outside of controlled hours.</p> <p>The proposed Order has loading bays operating between midnight and 11am at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great Marlborough Street outside Liberty London; - Regent Street outside Kate Spade, No. 198 Regent Street; - Regent Street outside Russell and Bromley, No. 126 Regent Street; and - Regent Street outside Pinko, No. 100 Regent Street. <p>The loading times are outside busy shopping hours, so as not to disrupt traffic flow or obstruct pedestrians.</p> <p>A majority of the businesses on Regent Street have coordinated delivery plans, allowing vehicles to load / unload goods on quieter neighbouring roads or in private access areas, and they have not raised concerns about receiving goods.</p> <p>The midnight -11 a.m. window for loading on-street is unchanged since before the project. Residential density is very low on Regent Street and its immediate side streets and the vast majority of the servicing for the properties along the Regent Street corridor take place off-street.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing loading areas and times during design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
8.	Cyclists – not enough to warrant cycle lanes	<p>The Westminster Cycling Strategy sets out how the City Council intends to help deliver the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling on a more local level, taking account of the city’s unique circumstances and challenges. The strategy supports cyclists by improving their journey and having sufficient bicycle parking.</p> <p>The City Council’s strategy to promote greener and more active travel is considered a high priority, whilst maintaining sufficient residents’ parking. Providing cycle lanes will support a shift</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
		<p>to active travel which will help to meet Westminster’s air quality and climate change targets. The cycle lanes have assisted residents, visitors, and commuters to cycle rather than contribute to vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The city has seen a shift in modes of transport over the last 5 years, data collected on Regent Street during peak times has shown that in May 2017 there was a peak hour cycling flow of 212, compared to September 2022 when this reached 379. This data suggests the need to retain and improve provisions for cyclists in Regent Street during the design stage for the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
9.	Heritage – negative impact on heritage in the area	<p>Regent Street was built in 1819 under the direction of the architect John Nash, and its Grade II listed buildings represent some of London’s most distinctive architecture. The street has evolved since being built taking inspiration from the heritage of the past whilst looking forward to the future.</p> <p>Prior to the Temporary Traffic Order, the City Council consulted with The Crown Estate and was advised that listed building consent was not required for any of the elements of the proposed scheme, and there were no concerns from a design and conservation perspective.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing heritage compliance during the design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
10.	Pavement and Planters – footway widening restricts traffic and planters obstruct pedestrian movements	<p>The widened footway has created an additional 5,000 square metres of space allowing pedestrians to have the freedom to walk and has created a more pleasing and safer environment.</p> <p>60 mature trees have been planted and 330 planters have been introduced which can be used as seating. This scheme aligns closely with the Council’s City for All – Vision and Strategy, in particular the Greener and Cleaner objective.</p> <p><i>The Trees and the Public Realm</i> – a tree strategy for Westminster document, identifies and acknowledges the value and importance of trees. Trees and plants can provide a wealth of benefits that can positively impact the lives of those who live, visit and work in the city. Alongside their aesthetic benefits, trees provide a myriad of sustainability benefits that in</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
		<p>turn ensure a climate resilient Westminster. As an authority in the heart of central London, the carbon sequestration and storage benefits of trees and plants are of significance as they can help to mitigate against the impact of climate change across the capital.</p> <p>The planters were designed as a family of elements that can be arranged to suit the varying street environments and requirements, with an appropriate scale within the grand proportions of the street. The modular forms, which contained three sizes to speed construction, allows permeable clusters of planters to be carefully arranged along the street to ensure that the composition created a dynamic and welcoming streetscape whilst fully supporting convenient pedestrian movement along and across the street. Seating was incorporated into the planter design in collaboration with accessibility consultants to provide a range of rest opportunities for all along the street.</p> <p>The spacing of the planter clusters was developed to ensure a consistent effect along the whole length. Typically, the planters were placed within the existing street furniture zone to ensure pedestrian footway widening had maximum effect. In collaboration with traffic engineers, WCC highway team and WCC security advisers, each cluster location was reviewed in regard to visual corridors to traffic lights and street signs, appropriate set back from kerb line relative to height of the planter and planting, access to existing service covers and other existing street furniture, cleaning and maintenance of the street around or between the clusters, access to shop frontages and entries, existing basement locations, outdoor seating areas and pedestrian security. Furthermore, the shape, angle and resulting height of the planters was developed to enable suitably low heights nearer the kerb line to provide good pedestrian visibility from the roadway. Higher ends of the planters with sufficient soil depth to achieve larger planting and trees were angled further away from kerb line. Minimum offsets from the kerb for each of the planter types were established in design stage and implemented onsite.</p> <p>Comments from the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit were addressed and revisions incorporated into the design and layout of the planters.</p> <p>The materiality of planters was developed to produce robust elements which could be constructed quickly using readily available, low impact materials such as pre-finished marine-ply and sustainably produced ‘Acoya’ timber. Materials were selected to ensure elements could be either reused, repurposed, or recycled at the end of their time on the street. Detailing such</p>

APPENDIX A – CITY COUNCIL’S POSITION ON COMMONLY CITED CONCERNS

	CONCERN	COMMENTS
		<p>as rounded edges and contrast between the timber top edge and planter body were incorporated for the safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>The Crown Estate are responsible for the planters via a maintenance agreement, the schedule has been agreed to weed, water, fertilise and inspect all planters five times a week to ensure they remain healthy and visually appealing.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing greenery and street furniture during the design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>
11.	Visitors – will deter visitors	<p>Regent Street is a popular attraction, receiving over 7 million visitors a year, the City Council seeks to continue welcoming visitors by making Regent Street appealing to all. The proposed Traffic Management Orders will retain all of the benefits to visitors from the Temporary Traffic Order including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - widened footways; - mandatory cycle lanes encouraging sustainable and active travel; - planters, including seating, adding much needed greenery with several new trees improving air quality and biodiversity; and - provision of visual public security protection measures. <p>Visitors are able to access Regent Street through a variety of different methods, depending on their requirements and choice, data shows in the last quarter of 2022 footfall had returned to pre-pandemic levels, with November and December 2022 exceeding 2019 footfall. This data would imply that visitors are not deterred from the area, and Regent Street remains to be a popular attraction.</p> <p>The City Council will be reviewing visitor levels and improvements during the design stage of the future Regent Street and will be taking all comments into consideration.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
1.	<p>Tim Lord tim.lord@thesohosociety.org.uk</p> <p>Telephone call and email dated 6th December 2022</p>	<p>Is this a temporary proposal or permanent?</p> <p>Just tried to ring you. Can you call me?</p>	<p>Telephoned Mr Lord, and explained the proposals in detail, he advised that he would object formally in writing to the consultation.</p>
	<p>Tim Lord</p> <p>Email dated 4th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) We think the temporary scheme should not be made permanent because the reduced carriageway means ambulances and fire trucks are impeded in reaching their destination in an emergency. This includes destinations within Soho and Marylebone where there are large numbers of residents and businesses.</p> <p>We believe the temporary scheme is therefore dangerous and should be removed as soon as possible with 2 lane working restored.</p> <p>(b) In addition, the temporary scheme slows traffic to the speed of the buses which leads to more congestion and air pollution in Regent Street and in Soho and Marylebone as side streets now congest for longer as the traffic turns in to a single lane not a double one.</p> <p>(c) It may also be encouraging delivery vehicles for Soho choosing to deliver late at night rather than during the day - late night deliveries cause a significant public nuisance in Soho.</p> <p>(d) Soho has a large number of businesses and residents that are dependent on maintenance and service activities much of which can only arrive by car</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comments 2 and 4 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comments 3 and 5 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to comment 7 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to comment 6 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>or van. It is increasingly difficult to get contractors to provide these services in Soho because of the congestion and the time taken in traffic. Soho is being strangled by these restrictions in access and it reduces the chance of a proper return of office workers to Soho who may use public transport but the servicing of their buildings is by vehicle.</p> <p>There remain several large construction projects on foot in Soho - Dean Street Hostel, Broadwick Street hotel and the Poland Street hotel to name but three. All these projects require large numbers of construction vehicle movements into Soho a proportion of which use Regent Street - the additional congestion causes delays more air pollution and increased costs.</p> <p>(e) The scheme was a temporary scheme to deal with COVID social distancing requirements. Those requirements have long since been abandoned - it remains a mystery why the temporary scheme is still in place. If the real purpose of the scheme is to increase footfall and provide a financial benefit to the property companies that own freeholds in the area, we believe that is an improper purpose for the council to pursue unless it can show that the property companies have paid full value for the benefit that has been given to them.</p> <p>(f) We also object on heritage grounds as Nash's Regent Street is an important part of London's history. It should not be fundamentally redesigned without proper assessment of heritage concerns.</p>	<p>(e) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(f) Please refer to comment 9 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		See below [Images 1 and 2 in Appendix B] for pictures showing emergency vehicles being blocked following the introduction of the temporary scheme.	
2.	<p>PC Andy Mays Traffic Management Officer for the Government Security Zone, and the City of Westminster Roads & Transport Policing Command Metropolitan Police Service Merton Traffic Garage (TDV) Deer Park Road, Merton</p> <p>andrew.Mays2@met.police.uk</p> <p>Email dated 8th December 2022</p>	<p>Many thanks for the email. Please can I ask for further details on the proposals, drawings, signage etc. Have we been previously consulted on the schemes – if so, we would have supplied reference numbers.</p>	<p>WSP, on behalf of the City Council, emailed PC Mays the consultation documents and drawings on 9th December 2022.</p>
3.	<p>Lisa Hodson City Promotions, Events and Filming Team Support Officer Westminster City Council</p> <p>lhodson@westminster.gov.uk</p> <p>Email dated 14th December 2022</p>	<p>We do have a number of events that use that area, and whilst it doesn't seem likely the need to excavate, any impact to traffic would need to be reviewed against the event closures.</p> <p>A works schedule when this becomes available would be much appreciated, thank you.</p>	<p>The City Council thanks Ms Hodson for her comments and will share the works schedule once available.</p>
4.	<p>Mark Karpel</p> <p>karpelmarkkeith@gmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 15th December 2022</p>	<p>(a) I am writing to object to all the proposed and existing changes made to Regent Street, Langham Place and Portland Place, all in the name of Covid. The pandemic is over people are trying to get back to how things were prior to the pandemic. These supposed temporary schemes should now be removed.</p>	<p>Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>(b) Reducing Regent Street to one lane in each direction by removing the bus lane has been a disaster. Any vehicle breakdowns now results in gridlock and carnage. Likewise with a paved central reservation along the length of Regent Street vehicles cannot pass buses stationary at bus stops or when broken down, Emergency vehicles cannot get through stationary traffic too.</p> <p>(c) Pavement widening has not been to allow more pedestrians but to house plant pots which actually narrow the paved areas.</p> <p>(d) As for Langham Place and Portland Place. The hardly used cycle lanes result in longer queues of traffic north and southbound, I drive through these areas daily and see huge lines of traffic in the outside lane northbound while the other half of the road, the inside lane for cyclists is normally totally empty. These measures have caused longer journey times, congestion and consequently more pollution. Anyone saying these measures reduce pollution in deluded.</p> <p>Please change these roads back to their pre-pandemic layouts as a matter of urgency and stop these cycling fixated vanity projects. Carry on like this and London, in particular the West End, will never recover from the pandemic.</p>	<p>(b) Please refer to comments 2 and 4 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to comment 10 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to comments 3 and 8 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
5.	<p>Rich Lancaster Public Realm & Transport Advisor New West End Company</p> <p>Richard.lancaster@newwestend.com</p> <p>Email dated 16th December 2022</p>	<p>Would you be able to send me an electronic copy of the Notice of Proposals and the Statement of Reasons.</p>	<p>WSP, on behalf of the City Council emailed Mr Lancaster the Notice of Proposals and Statement of Reasons on 22nd December 2022.</p>
6.	<p>Alexander Mylod</p> <p>amylod@googlemail.com</p> <p>Email dated 24th December 2022</p>	<p>Please could you provide me with the prescribed routes order for the Regent Street scheme with reference 7730/ND.</p> <p>In addition, I note that the Notice of Proposals says “The general effect of the Orders would be [...] b) formally allow vehicles to cross certain lengths of mandatory with-flow cycle lanes in Regent Street for the purposes of accessing kerbside loading bays or taxi ranks”.</p> <p>With-flow mandatory cycle lanes do not require traffic orders. Is such a traffic order proposed anyway? If so, why?</p>	<p>WSP, on behalf of the City Council, emailed Mr Mylod on 3rd January 2023 as follows:</p> <p>With-flow cycle lanes do not require a Traffic Order, however there is not an exemption for vehicles crossing the with-flow cycle lane, therefore we are proposing this exemption at four locations in Regent Street where there are proposed taxi ranks and loading bays.</p> <p>As requested, I have attached the draft Prescribed Routes Order, and the proposed drawings if you wish to view the four locations.</p>
	<p>Alexander Mylod</p> <p>Email dated 3rd January 2023</p>	<p>Regarding the cycle lane aspects of the order, I don't follow the council's logic. The council does not have the power to redefine a cycle lane. The traffic order is futile as cycle lane markings are prescribed in TSRGD 2016 and there is no provision for it to be amended by a traffic order. It is as pointless as implementing a traffic order to redefine a Keep Left/Diag. 610. No matter what the traffic order says, a road user not following the requirements of a Section 36 sign commits an offence.</p>	<p>The City Council has reviewed Mr Mylod's concerns and the proposed Order in question will be abandoned.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>Accordingly, I oppose the order as proposed on the grounds of:</p> <p>(a) it being an ultra vires act as there is no power to for a council to use a traffic order to unilaterally amend the meaning of a S.36 sign;</p> <p>(b) failing to comply with regulation 18 of LATOR 1996 as the signs to be erected do not convey the effects of the proposed order; and</p> <p>(c) no DfT authorisation for the signs to be used with these adapted meanings</p>	
7.	<p>Lyn Davies</p> <p>lyn_davieslondon@icloud.com</p> <p>Email dated 3rd January 2023</p>	<p>I wish to object STRONGLY to keeping the Regents Street 'temporary' carriageway closures permanent. This has been an unmitigated disaster.</p> <p>(a) I understood that Westminster Councils' priority was to reduce harmful traffic fumes for pedestrians and residents and workers. This 'temporary' scheme has caused constant queuing traffic all spewing out damaging noxious fumes as is happening along other 'temporary' closures including Oxford Street and Park Lane.</p> <p>For goodness sake for the health of everyone reverse these ridiculous and totally unnecessary road narrowing closures, does no one at the council or TFL have any basic common sense.</p> <p>By the way the mayor is constantly shouting about making London air cleaner and charging us all a</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comments 1, 2 and 3 in appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		fortune for this and these road narrowing 'temporary' schemes are making polluting fumes 100 times worse.	
8.	<p>Gloria May 26 Wendover Court Chiltern Street London W1U 7NT</p> <p>gloria.may@chilternstreet.co.uk</p> <p>Email dated 4th January 2023</p>	<p>I am writing to add my voice to protests at the proposal to keep the COVID induced changes to Regent Street permanent.</p> <p>(a) As a frequent traveler on foot, bus and car through central London I try to avoid Regent Street as it takes so long to progress down the street, in single file, behind buses at bus stops. There would be plenty of space for pedestrians if those coffin like bins were removed. They are an eyesore and a danger to the visually impaired.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 2 in Appendix A.</p> <p>The public bins are deemed necessary to discourage littering along the street. They are of a specific size to ensure they do not overflow and align with the street cleaning schedule.</p>
9.	<p>Shelia and John Green</p> <p>sj.green125@btinternet.com</p> <p>Email dated 4th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) I am writing on behalf of my husband and I to complain about the disaster happening to Regent Street buses which we as 83 yrs old using a walking stick can only get to on a public bus. We are held up every day by buses and vans stuck in the single lane traffic which it is now reduced to permanently. Not even taxis can travel down there - so we cannot access any of the usual shops as we cannot walk easily from Oxford Circus. Business which is hard enough these days is really suffering due to the nonsensical decision reached by the Crown Estates.</p> <p>We live in Marble Arch (W1H 2ND) and know from many local senior citizens the strong protest against these proposals – also from London Taxis which is a tough enough trade these days.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comments 2, 5 and 11 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		Please take away the central pavement once and for all.	
10.	<p>Nicolas Clemmow</p> <p>nkclemmow@gmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 4th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) I think the temporary scheme should not be made permanent because the reduced carriageway means ambulances and fire trucks are impeded in reaching their destination in an emergency. This includes destinations within Soho and Marylebone where there are large numbers of residents and businesses.</p> <p>I believe the temporary scheme is therefore dangerous and should be removed as soon as possible with 2 lane working restored.</p> <p>(b) In addition, the temporary scheme slows traffic to the speed of the buses which leads to more congestion and air pollution in Regent Street and in Soho and Marylebone as side streets now congest for longer as the traffic turns into a single lane not a double one.</p> <p>(c) It may also be encouraging delivery vehicles for Soho choosing to deliver late at night rather than during the day - late night deliveries cause a significant public nuisance in Soho.</p> <p>(d) Soho has a large number of businesses and residents that are dependent on maintenance and service activities, much of which can only arrive by car or van.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comments 1 and 4 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comments 2 and 3 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to comment 7 Appendix A</p> <p>(d) Please refer to comment 6 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>It is increasingly difficult to get contractors to provide these services in Soho because of the congestion and the time taken in traffic. Soho is being strangled by these restrictions in access and it reduces the chance of a proper return of office workers to Soho who may use public transport, but the servicing of their buildings is by vehicle.</p> <p>There remain several large construction projects on foot in Soho - Dean Street Hostel, Broadwick Street hotel and the Poland Street hotel to name but three. All these projects require large numbers of construction vehicle movements into Soho, a proportion of which use Regent Street - the additional congestion causes delays, more air pollution and increased costs.</p> <p>(e) The scheme was a temporary scheme to deal with COVID social distancing requirements. Those requirements have long since been abandoned - it remains a mystery why the temporary scheme is still in place. If the real purpose of the scheme is to increase footfall and provide a financial benefit to the property companies that own freeholds in the area I believe that is an improper purpose for the council to pursue unless it can show that the property companies have paid full value for the benefit that has been given to them.</p> <p>(f) I also object on heritage grounds as Nash's Regent Street is an important part of London's history. It should not be fundamentally redesigned without proper assessment of heritage concerns.</p>	<p>(e) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(f) Please refer to comment 9 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
11.	<p>Sheila Sprosta</p> <p>ssprosta1409@gmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 4th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) I write with regard to the ref: 7730/ND the narrowing of Regent Street and when we can expect this ridiculous plan to be reversed, it was only a temporary measure apparently and should have ended in 2022 July.</p> <p>(b) I myself find it almost impossible to believe that this has been allowed with the traffic tailing back down Regent Street and if driving into soho from the North (a journey I do often) it is almost impossible to enter down Regent Street.</p> <p>The biggest issue for all though I think is the issue of the emergency services and how they are unable to get through the traffic I'm sure you have seen the various photographs that are circulating and cannot deny there is a huge problem</p> <p>Anyone can see the problems this has caused and as a resident am totally against this being left as it is and would like to see it returned to how it was, it would also give some credit to the Crown Estate if the promise of a temporary road narrowing was kept.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comments 2 and 4 in Appendix A.</p>
12.	<p>Karen Jones</p> <p>11a Montagu Mews North London W1H 2JZ</p> <p>kjones@citywealthmag.com</p> <p>Email dated 5th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) Reference the planted areas – noted that these do not seem to be looked after once they are put onto streets so if their purpose is to create a better environment – often they are full of weeds and dead flowers.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 10 in Appendix A.</p>
13.	<p>Joao Rocha</p>	<p>(a) I am OBJECTING to this Stupid idea to make the totally unnecessary, useless changes made to</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	<p>jonrocha@hotmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 9th January 2023</p>	<p>Regent Street permanent. This should never have happened on the first place.</p> <p>(b) My objection is based on the grounds of air pollution, congestion and safety, for anyone with a brain it is clear to see the amount of congestion and pollution caused by this is enormous. I cannot see many benefits as most of the people still walk on the old part of the pavement, so the extension is unnecessary or needed. Perhaps the argument is for the greening, however, to offset the extra pollution you will need to plant another few thousand trees, which is unfortunately not possible.</p> <p>Please listen to residents, cyclists and businesses which use Regent Street on the daily basics.</p> <p>I have photographic evidence to support my objection if this is necessary</p>	<p>(b) Please refer to comments 2, 3, 4 and 10 in Appendix A.</p>
14.	<p>Jacki Heppard Westmoreland Street, W1</p> <p>jackiheppard@hotmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 13th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) I write to object to the potential permanent carriageway closures on Regent Street whilst the temporary version was a response to Covid challenges there is now no need to make these permanent:</p> <p>(b) The Regent Street consumer experience whether as a pedestrian/shopper, car driver or bus/public transport user is a disgrace due to the congestion these carriageway closures have either caused or intensified - the air pollution, noise pollution and lack of clear lines of sight due to the traffic blockages make for a dangerous and unhealthy experience.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comments 2, 5 and 11 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>(c) The pendulum has swung too far in terms of the widening of the pavements and the cycle carriageway predominance, and it is time to consider a balanced set of needs across the consumer and demographic spectrum for all to enjoy Regent Street.</p> <p>(d) Elderly people or those with mobility issues often find it preferable to use above ground transport e.g., bus or taxi rather than descend below ground to the tube but are seriously deterred from doing so if it traverses Regent Street due to the slow, often static, travel experience due to congestion from inadequately thought through road planning which lacks balance and consideration for all forms of travel and travellers.</p> <p>There's has been mention of the temporary changes making little change to the traffic flow - this is a complete fallacy.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>	<p>(c) Please refer to comment 8 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(d) The current temporary layout of Regent Street was designed with accessibility as a priority. The enhanced footways allow for step-free walking, and space to proceed the lengths of Regent Street. Enhanced bus stops have improved boarding and space for waiting. The City Council will continue to monitor accessibility and review during the design stage of the future Regent Street, all comments will be taken into consideration.</p>
15.	<p>Mike Dunn Vice-Chairman of Residents Society of Mayfair and St. James</p> <p>mike.dunn@newherefordhouse.com</p> <p>Email dated 13th January 2023</p>	<p>I understand that there are legal/technical reasons for the Regent Street traffic scheme being made "permanent". I further understand that there will be a follow-up consultation during the 1st H/Y of 2023. Residents Society of Mayfair and St. James (RSMSJ) feels that for avoidance of doubt and to flag our opposition to the scheme we should nevertheless register our objection at this juncture.</p>	

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>(a) I have seen the comprehensive objection made by the Soho Society and RSMSJ supports that. The points regarding emergency services, air quality, deliveries and heritage are well made. Mayfair is affected by the same issues albeit to a lesser extent at the moment as far as the delivery problem is concerned. However, my 20+ years of living in Mayfair has taught me that in many matters where Soho leads the rest of the West End follows.</p> <p>(b) I would make one additional point. Since the removal of the resident exemption for the ULEZ charge was withdrawn I have given up my car and am now reliant on public transport and I can attest that whereas bus movements along Oxford Street have speeded up significantly there are often major delays for bus journeys involving Regent Street.</p> <p>It is accepted that for the interim this change to permanence of the Regent Steet measures will undoubtedly be approved for the technical/legal reasons earlier mentioned. We nevertheless wanted to register our opposition before the follow-up consultation takes place.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 1 to this report.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comment 5 in Appendix A.</p>
16.	<p>Yoram Blumann Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association and the Marylebone Association</p> <p>yblumann@hotmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 17th January 2023</p>	<p>I would like to provide the following joint comment on behalf of the Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association and the Marylebone Association:</p> <p>With reference to the traffic order proposal dated 07 Dec 2022 titled Regent Street Public Realm traffic order proposal.</p>	<p>The City Council thanks Mr Blumann for his comments and will ensure that Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association and Marylebone Association are consulted on the future Regent Street design.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>The proposal seeks to make permanent a temporary traffic order dated back to 2020.</p> <p>It was made clear by Cllr Geoff Barraclough that WCC's intention is to present new proposals for Regent Street Public Realm later this year, and in the meantime, as the existing Temporary Traffic order is due to expire, it is necessary to replace it with a permanent Traffic Order.</p> <p>At two previous meetings with Cllr Barraclough, we expressed our concerns over the existing arrangement: the impact on traffic congestion, and the ability of emergency vehicles to overtake stationary traffic; we asked for further details of the traffic model, focusing on congestion.</p> <p>Therefore we do not offer comments on the above-mentioned proposal, as it merely extends the existing arrangements, but we reserve the right to comment on the forthcoming set of new proposals for the Regent Public Realm when presented later this year.</p>	
17.	<p>Nicola Gibson on behalf of Dee Corsi, Chief Executive of New West End Company</p> <p>Nicola.Gibson@newwestend.com</p> <p>Email dated 17th January 2023</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of New West End Company, the Business Improvement District (BID) across Oxford Street, Regent Street, Bond Street and Mayfair, to express our support for the permanent retention of the traffic movement controls, kerbside restrictions, cycling amenities and associated measures that were introduced on Regent Street and adjoining key junctions in 2020/21 in response to the pandemic.</p>	<p>The City Council thanks New West End Company for their comments, and statistics shared.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>The interim changes have helped create a greener, safer, and more accessible West End, significantly improving the overall experience for residents, local workers, and visitors.</p> <p>The positive impact of the changes has been reflected in the results of New West End Company's Visitor Experience Surveys. Visitor Satisfaction on Regent Street has grown steadily since the pandemic, hitting 88% in September 2022. This was driven in large part by visitor satisfaction with the appearance and presentation of the street. Regent Street's Street Presentation score (which measures aspects such as general appearance, cleanliness, amount of traffic & green space) increased from 70% just prior to lockdown to 78% in October 2021 (when the Regent Street Public Realm scheme was launched), to 80% in the latest survey. These results are summarised in the following chart [please refer to Image 3 in Appendix B].</p> <p>In summary, we fully support the proposals and look forward to working with Westminster City Council, The Crown Estate, and key stakeholders on the development of long-term plans for the future of Regent Street and the surrounding roads in due course.</p>	
18.	<p>Nicolas Briggs Residents' Society of Mayfair & St James's</p> <p>nickfbriggs@googlemail.com</p>	<p>The Residents' Society of Mayfair & St James's objects to the retention of the temporary public realm measures introduced to Regent Street during the Covid19 pandemic.</p>	

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	Email dated 17 th January 2023	<p>(a) The given primary reason for their implementation was to assist with social distancing during the pandemic, which is no longer necessary, and arguably was never necessary at all.</p> <p>(b) To put it bluntly, the temporary public realm changes to Regent Street have been a disaster. To call them public realm 'improvements' is farcical. They are a punitive action against drivers, designed to discourage car use in London. However, it simply does not work - instead forcing car drivers off the main arteries of the West End and into cut-throughs and back streets where the impact on residential areas is even greater. Regent Street is a wide commercial street with little to zero residential use. The slowing of traffic here (and combined with Park Lane) has forced drivers off this main road to seek out faster routes through residential streets. Local residents are bearing the negative effects of worsening traffic, noise and pollution in previously quiet roads.</p> <p>(c) We understand that the Crown Estate and the New West End Company are pro this scheme as it allows them to try and encourage more pedestrian activity in the area and thus charge more for rent. This experiment is being conducted at the expense of the many residents that live in adjoining areas, who are offered no benefit at all. It will not reduce traffic, only displace it.</p> <p>(d) In addition, the removal of the bus lanes has resulted in increased traffic as vehicles can no longer</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comment 2 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to comment 17 to this report. The Crown Estate is the owner of a majority of Regent Street's land and have worked in conjunction with the City Council to develop and deliver schemes they own.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to comments 5 and 8 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>pass busses that are at bus stops, which causes the traffic to back-up along the street. The placing of taxi ranks and loading bays across the cycle lanes results in danger to cyclists who may be using them. The pavement now snakes in and out creating areas which are of no benefit for pedestrians but can no longer be used by vehicles. I would question the frequency of use for this cycle lane, as it is a shopping and tourist area, however there are better and less invasive ways of creating space for cyclists.</p> <p>(e) The planters that have been placed ad hoc on the pavement inhibit pedestrian flow and counteract the so-called widening of the pavement. They create bottlenecks along the pavement which at peak shopping times makes walking along the street difficult, and even harder for people with prams. They are poorly maintained, adding nothing in terms of increased greening or biodiversity, nor are they attractive or in-keeping with this grand and unique street-scene. It is a prime example of greenwashing.</p> <p>In summary, the RSMSJ would be hard pressed to find a worse, more inappropriate, and ill-conceived public realm measure than that which is currently trialled on Regent Street. I would urge the council to listen to the overwhelming objections from both neighbouring residents' societies and reject these proposals.</p>	<p>(e) Please refer to comment 10 in Appendix A.</p>
19.	Keane Herman General Manager, Regent Street, The Hamleys Group	I am writing to in regards to the making permanent of the widened pavements and other improvements on	The City Council thanks Keane Herman for their comments and support.

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
	<p>Kherman@Hamleys.co.uk</p> <p>Email dated 18th January 2023</p>	<p>Regent Street which were introduced during the pandemic.</p> <p>Hamleys are strongly supportive of these initiatives and the positive impact that they have had to the following areas.</p> <p>(a) Visitor experience - The widened pavements have made it a more pleasant environment and given people adequate room to walk. There have been a number of people who have commented what an improvement it is and how much nicer it has made coming to Regent Street. The planter also modernises the area given it a greener feel.</p> <p>(b) Safety - It is much safer having the extended pavement with less people stepping into the road to bypass other people. This Christmas despite heavy footfall people were able to walk and move with relative ease.</p> <p>(c) Commercial - The footfall this year was improved on pre pandemic levels, and this may be down to the widened pavements and the positive impact this has had to walking down Regent Street. This has led to positive sales.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to keep improving the district and making changes for the positive. I have worked at Hamleys for 20 years and the widening of the pavements on Regent Street is the most positive change that I have seen and would encourage these are made permanent.</p>	

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
20.	<p>Matt Morrell</p> <p>matt_morrell36@hotmail.com</p> <p>Email dated 18th January 2023</p>	<p>(a) I would like to object to the removal of permanent bus lanes in Regent Street. This was originally done to facilitate social distancing, something that is no longer required.</p> <p>(b) All traffic on Regent Street now travels at the same pace as the slowest bus, which is unreasonable. Deliveries and taxi journeys, particularly those for the disabled are important journeys too, and the removal of the bus lane allows no contingency for passing of slow buses or those taking a long time to take on passengers.</p> <p>(c) The new paved areas where the bus lane used to be are rarely used.</p> <p>Several times over the last few years buses have broken down, bringing the entire area to a halt. The same is true when emergency services vehicles are needed on Regent St. no one can get past.</p> <p>(d) On the subject of emergency vehicles, their passage through the area has been significantly slowed down by the removal of the bus lanes, as no one has anywhere to move to allow them past. This should be at the forefront of your mind with Europe's busiest fire station round the corner as well as UCH.</p> <p>(e) The slow passage of idling traffic can only make pollution worse in the area. Bus lanes help all traffic get through the area at a safe pace. Increased pollution as well as the inability to get through or to the area will have a detrimental effect on what is an</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 1 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to comments 2 and 5 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to comment 10 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to comment 4 in Appendix A.</p> <p>(e) Please refer to comment 3 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>important retail and tourism area. Business should be deeply concerned.</p> <p>Removal of the bus lanes permanently would be an awful decision for the reasons listed above.</p>	
21.	<p>Paul Brennan Chairman, Licenced Taxi Drivers Association Taxi House, 133 Great Suffolk Street, London, SE1 1PP</p> <p>pb@ltda.co.uk</p> <p>Email dated 18th January 2023</p>	<p>Further to our recent meeting during which we discussed the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA) concerns regarding the Regent Street Public Realm scheme, I am writing to share our objections to the scheme being made permanent. Please accept this as the LTDA's formal response to the consultation.</p> <p>Regent Street is a vital, strategic route, which plays an important role in the capital's road network. Whilst we recognise the intentions behind this scheme and their importance, the measures that have been put in place are causing significant disruption, adding to congestion and negatively impacting journey times in the area, without delivering significant benefit to other road users. The changes implemented as part of this scheme should be reconsidered following this consultation and should not be made permanent. We have explained our reasoning in more detail below.</p> <p>(a) Increased congestion: Our primary reason for objecting to the scheme being made permanent is the fact that it is causing severe delays and congestion is building up in and around the area, causing significant disruption around Regent Street, as well as upstream in Soho and Marylebone.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to comment 2 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>We understand the desire to reduce traffic and fully support that ambition, in fact licensed taxis are proud to provide a reliable alternative to private car ownership, however we must accept that London is a busy city, which many vehicles need access to on a daily basis and in many cases this is unavoidable. Reducing the useable road space for motor vehicles will not deter their use on such a crucial route and is simply wreaking havoc on the area for the majority of road users.</p> <p>Halving the amount of road space available and leaving just one lane for traffic has proved hugely disruptive for the circulation of vehicles in the area. It has also become extremely difficult to turn on to Regent Street from the side feeder roads or to cross it, as all vehicles now need to merge into a single lane. This is causing tailbacks and congestion radiating out from the scheme. It is also making it hazardous for pedestrians crossing the road at these points or accessing Regent Street from these side roads and making the area feel congested and less safe – defeating the object of the scheme.</p> <p>As a result of the restricted road space, if or when a vehicle breaks down, traffic can come to a complete standstill and the fixed central reservation prevents vehicles from getting around the obstruction. This is a particular challenge when a bus or larger vehicle experiences difficulties, which happens with relative frequency. Once in Regent Street, vehicles are essentially trapped meaning delays can be considerable and cause great inconvenience to</p>	

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>Londoners trying to get to work, local residents accessing their homes and places of work, and of course the many visitors and tourists travelling to the world-renowned shopping destinations and other attractions and hospitality venues in the West End. This scheme has made the area a less appealing place to visit and a lot more difficult to access if travelling by car, taxi or bus. We believe this will already be having a negative impact on the local economy, specifically the many shops, restaurants and bars around Regent Street and in the West End.</p> <p>(b) Impeding access: Licensed taxis are the only fully wheelchair accessible form of public transport, providing a true door-to-door service and this should be promoted and protected. Unfortunately, many of our members tell us that they now avoid servicing the area meaning that will likely be fewer taxis available and plying for hire in the area. This could make the area less accessible and appealing to Londoners and visitors alike, particularly those who require a door-to-door or wheelchair accessible service, who may have no other means of viable means of transport open to them. This includes disabled people and any one with reduced mobility or those travelling with young children and a stroller or lots of luggage, for example.</p> <p>(c) Less appealing destination: Regent Street and the wider West End are famous for being London's premier shopping destination, but for many, the changes will have made it a less appealing place to visit. In fact, our members tell us that if a</p>	<p>(b) The proposed scheme promotes the use of taxis in Regent Street by providing taxi bays. The City Council will be engaging with the Licenced Taxi Drivers Association for the future Regent Street design and have noted their concerns.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to comment 11.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>passenger asks them where to go and where to find the best shopping or places to eat, they will likely advise them to try another area where they are less likely to encounter delays and disruption. As such, what was once a go to destination, risks becoming a no-go zone.</p> <p>Many local residents and businesses have expressed to our members individually and to the LTDA that they did not originally support the scheme and still do not, in light of the serious concerns around increased congestion and negative consequences already set out. This includes the Soho Society, and we share their concerns.</p> <p>The scheme is delivering no clear benefit to the majority of people who live, work in or simply pass through the area on a day-to-day basis, and we would argue is not in the interest of the public as a whole. Whilst a few interest groups and parties may feel minimal benefit from the scheme, this is coming at too higher price, and we believe the negatives far outweigh the positives. We would therefore question whether it is in the public interest to keep it in place, particularly now that the need for social distancing and the challenges presented by the pandemic have abated.</p> <p>(d) Inefficient use of the road network: We believe that more efficient use could be made of the road space in this area that would deliver much wider public benefit. Regent Street is a key link and</p>	<p>(d) Please refer to comments 4 and 5 in Appendix A.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>route for people travelling through the West End in a busy and popular area of London. It is also a key bus route for people travelling North to South / South to North across London for work or leisure purposes.</p> <p>Before the scheme was implemented congestion in the area was rare and almost unheard of. It is now a daily occurrence and is having a knock-on impact on surrounding areas. For taxi drivers and their passengers this is adding significantly to journey times with an impact on fares. Some members have even had complaints about the service they provide as a result, with customers left feeling frustrated and even angry or upset about delays leading to missed appointments and negatively impacting their lives. More broadly, this congestion must be adding to pollution in the areas as vehicles idle in traffic.</p> <p>It is also not just licensed taxis that are being delayed. Our members have also frequently witnessed emergency vehicles being caught up in the congestion and delayed in getting to their destination. The numerous examples of this and evidence to demonstrate the scale of the problem on social media and we have been sent images by our members which we would be happy to share as appropriate. We believe this is also a major concern raised by the Soho Society in their objection to the scheme being made permanent.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the nature of a busy city like London, is that there are always going to be roadworks and other external factors putting added pressure on the road network. It therefore needs to be able to manage</p>	

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>these pressures, as well as balancing the needs of different road users. By reducing the amount of road space available considerably, this scheme has put added pressure on the network, which day-to-day is causing significant problems for the licensed taxi drivers we represent and the passengers they serve, as well as other road users and people who rely on public transport to get around (particularly those with mobility issues who can't walk or cycle).</p> <p>(e) Solutions: We fully support efforts to make Regent Street a safer and more accessible destination for pedestrians and to enhance the experience for visitors, particularly the shoppers who frequent it. However, we believe this can be achieved in a way that does greatly add to congestion and actually make the area a less appealing, more congested and polluted area.</p> <p>On the whole, the widening of pavements and added greenery introduced as part of the scheme are beneficial and make the area a more pleasant one to visit. We believe that the majority of this could be kept in place, perhaps with a few tweaks to accommodate other changes.</p> <p>Westminster Council and the Crown Estate should urgently look to reinstate four lanes for traffic, including the North and South bus lane, with the same permitted access as was previously in place (including licensed taxis). This is vital to reduce journey times, keep the transport network moving and ensure that passengers can rely on buses and taxis</p>	<p>(e) The City Council welcomes the Licenced Taxi Drivers Association's suggestions and will consider this during the future Regent Street design.</p>

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>to provide a reliable and efficient service to get them from A to B. This could be achieved by removing the raised central paving (which is hampering the flow of traffic when there is any kind of obstruction and causing significant delays as it stands) and the cycle lanes.</p> <p>Cyclists using the new cycle lane are generally just passing through the area, often to access Regent's Park or coming from the Park as part of their commute, as opposed to trying to reach destinations within and in the close vicinity of Regent Street, meaning that this change would be far less disruptive to them than the current scheme is proving to buses, taxis, delivery vehicles and local residents and businesses. They would also still have access to the bus lanes and there are numerous alternative routes available to them in and around that area that we feel would be more suitable and allow for better use of what is clearly an important, strategic route.</p> <p>Post-pandemic it has also become clear that the projected increase in the number of people cycling post-pandemic has also not been realised, with the most recent DfT figures showing that the expected increase had not materialised meaning that there is not the level of anticipated demand for cycling infrastructure. This fact combined with the existing cycle path within Hyde Park, mean that the Park Lane cycle lane is essentially unnecessary and is taking much-needed capacity out of the road network to the detriment of many people.</p>	

APPENDIX B – RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

	NAME AND ADDRESS	RESPONSE	OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		<p>We therefore do not believe that the new cycle lane is a productive and efficient use of road space, which in central London, is already at a premium.</p> <p>By making these changes, the benefits of the scheme for pedestrians can largely be retained, whilst making the area more accessible and promoting better flows of traffic and reducing problems associated with congestion and pollution.</p> <p>In order to improve the flow of traffic on Regent's Street and across the wider area we also believe that Westminster should look again at ways to ensure that the bus, taxi and cycle only movements on Oxford Street are properly enforced. This would ensure that non permitted vehicles are not using it and thereby reduce the number of vehicles and congestion much of which then turns into Regent Street. Whilst such movements should not be happening our members report seeing private vehicles frequently using Oxford Street and turning into Regent's Streets and LTDA reps have seen this first-hand on monitoring visits. We also believe that there could be merit in imposing the same restrictions on Regent's Street to reduce the number of vehicles using it and further reduce pressure on the road network in the area. This would perhaps need to be modified to give delivery vehicles access at certain times that are convenient to local businesses and residents.</p>	

APPENDIX C – IMAGES

Image 1
Please refer to item 1 in
Appendix B



APPENDIX C – IMAGES

Image 2

Please refer to item 1 in
Appendix B



APPENDIX C – IMAGES

Image 3
Please refer to item 17 in
Appendix B

