

From: [Dorward, David: WCC](#)
To: [Alex Walker-Robson](#)
Cc: [Morrison, Ian: WCC](#); [Mark Knibbs](#)
Subject: Victoria Tower Gardens - UKHM - Highway issues
Date: 31 May 2019 12:02:00
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Alex,

Please see below a some concerns relating to highway issues.

Evidence Base

The applicant references multiple documents and surveys which they have not provided to the Council. The evidence base cannot be independently assessed and therefore cannot be considered robust or relied upon to reach conclusions (particularly the positive ones the applicant does). These need to be provided, along with the methodology of the surveys for further discussions.

Pedestrians/Footways

While the applicant has undertaken work to demonstrate the impact on the existing footway widths (deteriorating), the assessment of does not seem to consider loss of footway width due to groups waiting for/boarding coaches. This is important given the level of activity the proposal would generate on the surrounding highway and the impact this would have on other highway users. This work needs to be reviewed.

On-Street Servicing/Coaches

The on-street servicing and coach activity will affect existing highway users, including bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists as well as other motorists. The fact the applicant believes their scheme will require a dedicated on-street loading bay and not rely on careful management to allow coaches and servicing to utilise the same section of carriageway (at different times) clearly indicates that the level of activity will be significant. The movement of goods from the delivery point (throughout the day) will conflict with pedestrians, including visitors to the memorial (and coach passengers awaiting to board or alighting). It would appear no consideration has been given to off-site freight consolidation to limit the number of servicing trips to the site. This aspect needs to be reviewed.

Healthy Streets

The adverse impacts of the proposals are highlighted in the applicants own assessment against the Healthy Street criteria – with a reduction of 5 points and the addition of a zero score – when compared to the existing highway environment. The applicant is offering no alternative design, management or mitigation to address this. This aspect needs to be reviewed.

Cycle Parking

The site does not contain cycle parking to accommodate visitors. The reasoning (constraints of the site) highlight overall problems with site to accommodate the proposal in highway and transport terms and impact on the surrounding highway and it's users. Further, given the increased volumes of people in the area, locating the short term cycle parking on highway will create additional obstructions to pedestrians. The location of short term cycle parking needs to be reviewed.

Ian and I are happy to meet you and your transport consultants to discuss these concerns. Let me or Ian know if you want a meeting to discuss.

Kind regards

David Dorward

Area Planning Officer (South)
Development Planning
Growth, Planning & Housing

Westminster City Council
PO Box 732
Redhill
RH1 9FL

Tel: 020 7641 2408

www.westminster.gov.uk



Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender, and whilst given in good faith, do not necessarily represent a formal decision of the Local Planning Authority unless a statutory application is or has been made and determined in accordance with requisite procedures, planning policies and having had regard to material considerations.