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3.1 Introduction

Translating our Design Approach and related objectives into solutions on the ground necessitates detailed guidance on the physical aspects of the public realm.

There is a very wide range of issues to be covered, from the strategic down to the minutiae. Part 3 of the Handbook addresses this complexity, and how interventions to the public realm of the estates should be physically implemented on the ground. Detailed guidance is presented under the following headings:

- Access and Movement
- Ground Surfacing
- Street Furniture
- Wayfinding
- Lighting
- Planting
- Arts
- Water Features
- Events and Activities
- Street Trading
- Maintenance
- Sustainability

3.1.1. The Audley Public House on the corner of North Audley Street and Mount Street, Mayfair
3.1.2. The Thomas Cubitt Bar and Restaurant, Elizabeth Street in Belgravia
3.1.3. External dining at the corner of Weighhouse Street and Duke Street.
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Introduction

The historic grid layout of Mayfair and Belgravia has much to commend it in terms of accessibility and permeability. The streets and open squares within both Estates complement the varied and often outstanding architecture found within. Whilst these streets and spaces were originally intended to create high quality living spaces they have in many cases ended up becoming transport corridors where traffic speeds are too high, parking is intrusive and the needs of pedestrians and cyclists are not prioritised. The increasing dominance of car traffic over recent decades has eroded the special character of the Estates and resulted in poor pedestrian conditions, visual obstruction, noise pollution and a deterioration in air quality.

This section of The Handbook sets out Grosvenor’s aspirations for improving access and movement within the estates based on the themes identified by ‘Places for People’ and the broad guidance within Westminster Way. Proposals within this section will be subject to further technical study and testing.

The starting point is to recognise that all streets and spaces have two purposes – as a ‘link’ which promotes movement and access, and as a ‘place’, which recognises each space’s role as an area for social interaction, activity, public realm and as a destination in its own right. Our approach is based upon an appreciation of the importance of the estates distinct context and architecture, a recognition that traffic should fulfil a complementary role. The guidance in this handbook recognises that streets within the Estates were originally designed and laid out with greater pedestrian priority, and to accommodate slower moving, and a lower volume of, horse-drawn vehicles.

Whilst streets need to be able to accommodate higher volumes and fast moving vehicles they also need to be designed as permeable and legible pedestrian networks. Pedestrian friendly streets that are able to support improved access to public transport interchanges within and on the periphery of the estates will help to reduce the overall impact of traffic.

Street designs should reinforce a sense of arrival, create distinctive spaces with a clear definition between the public and private realm, and ensure that routes and spaces are attractive to people.

National guidance such as Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007) and Link & Place: A Guide to Street Planning and Design (2007) reinforces these principles.

Fig 3.2.1
Strategic routes should be able to efficiently move vehicles without forming a barrier to pedestrians and cyclists within and at the edge of each Estate.

Fig 3.2.2
Streets like Park Street in Mayfair were not designed to perform a distributor function. Whilst streets should enable efficient vehicle movement, cars should not dominate.

Fig 3.2.3
Local Connector routes should not be dominated by parked cars, excess street furniture and traffic signing/lining.
Access and Movement Strategy

Our access and movement strategy sets out how the afore-mentioned objectives and principles can be delivered and how pedestrian priority can be achieved whilst accommodating vehicles (including access, movement and parking) within the public realm. The strategy also addresses inclusivity, cycling and public transport within the estates. The strategy provides guidance that recognises that a balance needs to be found between a street or space’s role as a link accommodating vehicular, pedestrian and cycle movement, and as a place and destination in its own right.

The role that streets in particular fulfil as vehicular transport corridors and links for movement can be defined on a sliding scale; from having higher levels of through movement and greater vehicular space and capacity requirements to being characterised by local access and requiring lesser vehicular space and capacity requirements. Streets have historically been classified within the estates by their vehicular role. Classifications would be typically based on Westminster UDP hierarchy (Jan 07), with strategic routes being UDP Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), distributor routes being UDP distributor and connector and the remainder of routes recognised as comprising local routes and access. Vehicular classifications are illustrated in figures 3.2.6 + 3.2.7.

Based upon this vehicular classification, broad design parameters have been identified in this handbook to establish a guide as to how streets and their public realm should be treated to address their link function and their ability to accommodate different types and volumes of vehicular movement. (Refer to figures 3.2.8 to 3.2.12).

This type of classification and guidance does not however take into consideration the role that streets and spaces fulfil as pedestrian movement corridors or as places and destinations in their own right. As such, this handbook seeks to identify an alternative ‘place’ centered classification (refer to p46) that better reflects the role that streets and spaces fulfil as corridors for pedestrian movement and as characterful places for people.
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Fig 3.2.6 Vehicular Route Classification for Mayfair

Fig 3.2.7 Vehicular Route Classification for Belgravia
### KEY DESIGN PARAMETERS FOR STRATEGIC ROUTES

The following parameters are suggested (with local variation as applicable) in the design of streets classified as strategic routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>30mph. Maximum speeds of 20mph are to be encouraged within each estate through public realm improvements, changes in road geometry, the conversion of selected one-way streets to two way operation and the removal of signs and markings where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>Minimum 7.0m width for single carriageway plus parking. Some of these routes will have two lanes in each direction. Minimum allowance of 3.2m per lane, plus allowance for advisory on street cycle lanes to be included where appropriate with a minimum width of 1.5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large vehicle access</td>
<td>Allowance for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV’s) including swept path analysis at all junctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Limited/none incorporated into the carriageway providing pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footways</td>
<td>Allowance of at least 3m, where possible. Absolute minimum of 1.5m for pinch points and 2.0m for constrictions of 3-6m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic routes experience the highest vehicular flows in the Masterplan areas and contain a high proportion of traffic that is travelling beyond the local area. They are signed and act as the major thoroughfares within central-south-west London. They include routes designated as TLRN and strategically important routes controlled by TfL. Any changes to these routes or their junctions will probably have wider impacts and are likely to require extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. As such, changes to the TLRN should be minimised.

Although inherently busy there is still the need to provide for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. Roadwidths should be designed for accommodating freight vehicle flows and their respective turning movements at junctions.

Nearly all examples of strategic routes in the Estates are classified as TLRN and so are out of the direct control of Grosvenor/Westminster City Council. Examples of strategic routes include Park Lane in Mayfair and Grosvenor Place, Grosvenor Gardens and Buckingham Palace Road (east of Belgrave Road) in Belgravia.
KEY DESIGN PARAMETERS FOR DISTRIBUTOR ROUTES

The following parameters are suggested (with local variation as applicable) in the design of streets classified as distributor routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>30mph. Maximum speeds of 20mph are to be encouraged within each estate through public realm improvements, changes in road geometry, the conversion of selected one-way streets to two way operation and the removal of signs and markings where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>Minimum 5.5m width but generally 7.0m plus parking. Advisory on street cycle lanes where appropriate at minimum width of 1.5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large vehicle access</td>
<td>Allowance for HGVs including swept path analysis at all junctions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Minimum 2.0m (1.9m in exceptional circumstances) width parking incorporated into the carriageway providing pedestrian crossings and pinch points where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footways</td>
<td>Allowance of at least 2m, more where possible, particularly on busier traffic routes and where pedestrians flows / frontage activity is high. Absolute minimum of 1.0m for pinch points and 1.5m for constrictions of 3-6m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributor routes experience some of the highest vehicle flows and contain traffic that is travelling both locally and further a field. They act as the main thoroughfares within the Mayfair and Belgravia Estates and are signposted as such.

Along these streets there can be a variety of uses including residential, shopping, and community facilities. Public transport services use some of these streets, providing connections to a range of destinations. They are also important routes for pedestrians and cyclists.

There is considerable variation in the character of these streets and so changes should be designed to reflect local character and context. Higher traffic flows will limit the scope for interventions due to the risk of significant journey delay, traffic congestion, and traffic re-routing along alternative routes.

Road widths should be designed for accommodating freight vehicles, accommodating two HGVs passing in opposite directions at the same time.

Examples of distributor routes include Oxford Street, Park Street (north of Upper Grosvenor Street), North Audley Street, Brook Street, Upper Brook Street, Grosvenor Street and Upper Grosvenor Street in Mayfair and King's Road, Belgrave Square, Grosvenor Crescent, Upper Belgrave Street, Belgrave Place and Eccleston Street in Belgravia.
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**KEY DESIGN PARAMETERS FOR CONNECTOR ROUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>30mph. Maximum speeds of 20mph are to be encouraged within each estate through public realm improvements, changes in road geometry, the conversion of selected one-way streets to two way operation and the removal of signs and markings where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>Generally 5.5m plus parking reducing to minimum of 4.8m width at pinch points. Advisory on-street cycle lanes where appropriate with a minimum width of 1.5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large vehicle access</td>
<td>Occasional access for HGVs – swept path analysis allowing full lane width usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>2.0m (1.9m in exceptional circumstances) minimum parking bay width incorporated into the carriageway providing pedestrian crossings and pinch points where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footways</td>
<td>Allowance of at least 2m. Absolute minimum of 1.0m for pinch points and 1.5m for constrictions of 3-6m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connector routes typically link local access routes to more significant strategic routes.

Connector routes within Mayfair and Belgravia contain a variety of uses including residential, shopping, and community facilities. Public transport/tourist coach services may also use these streets, providing the most significant local service penetration. Pedestrian and cyclist priority should be improved through the layout and design of streets. There is considerable variation in the character of these streets and so changes should be designed to reflect local character and context.

Examples of connector routes include Duke Street, Davies Street, Carlos Place, Mount Street, South Audley Street in Mayfair and Ebury Street, Lower Belgrave Street, Elizabeth Street, Eaton Terrace, Chesham Place, Wilton Crescent, Wilton Place and West Halkin Street in Belgravia.

---

Fig 3.2.10 Connector Routes
KEY DESIGN PARAMETERS FOR LOCAL ROUTES

The following parameters are suggested (with local variation as applicable) in the design of streets classified as local routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>30mph. Maximum speeds of 20mph are to be encouraged within each estate through public realm improvements, changes in road geometry, the conversion of selected one-way streets to two way operation and the removal of signs and markings where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>Generally 4.8m plus parking reducing to a minimum of 4.1m width at pinch points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large vehicle access</td>
<td>Only occasional access for HGVs – swept path analysis allowing full carriageway width usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>2.0m (1.9m in exceptional circumstances) minimum parallel parking bays incorporated into both the carriageway (providing pedestrian crossings and pinch points where appropriate) and/or into the footway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footways</td>
<td>Allowance, where possible, of 2m to 3.5m. Absolute minimum of 1.0m for pinch points and 1.5m for constrictions of 3-6m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local routes are streets within predominantly residential areas that feature segregated footways and carriageways. Pedestrian and cyclist priority is achieved through the layout and design of their public realm.

These streets should be designed to reflect their ‘local’ nature, to encourage low vehicle speeds and discourage through traffic. They are generally wider than spaces and streets classified as local access and this will typically allow wider carriageways and footways to be specified. Although segregated from the carriageway, pedestrians should be able to cross the street without feeling intimidated by high traffic volumes or speeds.

Where there are junctions with more major roads the design of junctions should reflect different levels of priority, vehicle flows, and vehicle speeds. Junction crossing points should be improved with enhanced pedestrian priority and footways widened alongside residential properties. This would still permit vehicle parking but would reduce carriageway width and vehicle speeds.

Examples of local routes include North Row, Woods Mews, Balderton Street, George Yard, Aldford Street, Brook’s Mews, South Molton Lane, Adam’s Row and Mount Row in Mayfair and Halkin Street, Eaton Place, South Eaton Place, Chester Square and Bourne Street in Belgravia.
Local access streets and spaces are areas where pedestrians and cyclists typically have priority over vehicles in a shared space or surface environment. This is typified by mews in which there is often no change in level between footway and carriageway or delineation of specific areas. This provides a distinctive character, encourages lower vehicle speeds and helps to create an environment in which pedestrians can walk, stop and interact without feeling intimidated by vehicular traffic.

Traffic within local access areas should be limited to those requiring direct access only. Parking spaces should be provided wherever possible for residents and should be designed to complement the nature of the street.

Where there are junctions with more major roads there should be clear design ‘signals’ used to indicate that these streets are for low speed, non-through traffic. Where there is no conventional kerb to guide blind/partially sighted pedestrians, alternative means of guidance will need to be considered in the design of these spaces.

Examples of local access streets and spaces include Brown Hart Gardens, Lumley Street and Grosvenor Hill in Mayfair and Kinnerton Street, Ebury Mews, the mews to Eaton Square and the periphery of Eaton Square in Belgravia.
Important Pedestrian Routes, Spaces and Destinations

Although Mayfair and Belgravia can both be considered as walkable estates with good levels of pedestrian permeability, there is scope for the quality of their environment to be improved and to better ensure that the transport needs of those who live in, work in and visit Mayfair and Belgravia can be satisfied without using a motor vehicle. Measures by which greater pedestrian priority can be achieved include:

- Increasing the amount of pedestrian space through increased footway widths particularly in retail and recreational areas.
- Introducing shared spaces in selected strategic locations (e.g. Brown Hart Gardens, Carlos Place and Elizabeth Street).
- Improving pedestrian crossings, including taking pedestrian surfacing across junctions and the access to mews.
- Ensuring consistency in road crossings to provide clarity for road users and pedestrians.
- Responding to desire lines through the implementation of ‘straight-across’ layouts and the elimination of traffic islands.
- The strategic and selective introduction of raised tables to slow traffic and prioritise pedestrians, particularly those with sensory and mobility impairments.
- Consideration of reductions in speed limit where appropriate.
- Converting selected one-way streets to two way operation.
- The removal of street clutter including guard railings, unnecessary signs, parking meters, control equipment and excess or uncoordinated street furniture.

Figures 3.2.15 and 3.2.16 illustrate important pedestrian routes, spaces and destinations within each estate. This handbook advocates that a particular emphasis is placed on making these streets and spaces more convivial to pedestrians and in ensuring that the speed and dominance of vehicles in their vicinity is significantly reduced.

Many of the measures identified above are illustrated and explained in more detail within section 3.3 Ground Surfacing, 3.4 Street Furniture and section 3.5 Orientation and Signage. The opportunity to prioritise pedestrians through the conversion of one-way streets to two way operation is explained in the following text and illustrated in figures 3.2.20 and 3.2.21.

Fig 3.2.13 & 3.2.14
This photograph and accompanying illustration show how pavement widening and environmental improvements, including the introduction of trees and enhanced materials, could transform Elizabeth Street in Belgravia.
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Important Pedestrian Routes, Spaces and Destinations

KEY

- Pedestrian Routes
- Spaces and Destinations

Figure 3.2.15 Important Pedestrian Routes, Spaces and Destinations in Mayfair

Figure 3.2.16 Important Pedestrian Routes, Spaces and Destinations in Belgravia
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One-Way and Two-Way Streets

Although one-way streets can provide greater vehicle capacity, consistent vehicular speeds, and the more efficient use of vehicular movement space, they adversely impact upon pedestrian amenity and safety. For both vehicles and cyclists, one way streets often result in less direct routes and lower permeability (particularly if contra-flow cycle provision is not enabled). This also means vehicles are travelling for greater distances, and for longer. Converting some streets back to two-way operation could have a positive impact on pedestrian and cycle movement within the estates and would reduce visual clutter. The consequences of potential changes need to be fully considered (technical studies and testing will be required) on an area-by-area basis. Five primary considerations are:

- The impact of changes on the wider road network.
- The physical layout and ability of the street to accommodate two-way traffic flows.
- The operation of junctions, particularly those controlled by traffic signals.
- The potential for rat-running, which should be avoided where possible.
- Any consequential loss of parking.

Figures 3.2.20 and 3.2.21 illustrate streets where consideration should be given to the removal of one way operation. These include the eastern side of Grosvenor Square, Brook Street, Grosvenor Street and Davies Street (south of Brook Street) in Mayfair and Upper Belgrave Street, Lower Belgrave Street, Belgrave Place, Eccleston Street and Ebury Street in Belgravia. A closure point may be required in Ebury Street (south of Eccleston Street) to prevent potential rat-running.

All circulation proposals are aspirational by Grosvenor, and will be subject to further technical study and testing.

Unnecessary street clutter can impact upon the appearance and function of streets. Reducing clutter by rationalising and removing unnecessary furniture and equipment results in a more open, attractive and better functioning public realm. This can be reinforced by 'passive' and 'secondary' design-led traffic management measures, including shared surfacing, pedestrian crossings and on-street parking.
One-Way and Two-Way Streets

- **KEY**
  - Orange: Existing One-Way Streets
  - Blue: Existing Two-Way Streets that should be retained where possible
  - Red: Streets where consideration should be given to two-way working
  - Gray: Possible closure point

Figure 3.2.20 Conversion of Selected One-Way Streets to Two-Way operation in Mayfair

Figure 3.2.21 Conversion of Selected One-Way Streets to Two-Way operation in Belgravia
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Cycling Considerations

Although there is little specific provision within the estates, cycling enables people to cover greater distances than walking and can provide a realistic option for undertaking an entire journey without resorting to a private car.

A reduction in traffic speeds, and general humanising of the public realm, will help to create more attractive conditions for cycling. In busier streets, specific consideration of cycle measures might be necessary including changes to road surfacing to ensure a smooth ride, direction signing and the removal of street clutter and guard railing.

It is not always necessary to make specific provisions for cyclists if general traffic conditions are pleasant – i.e. low speeds and traffic flows and if streets are well designed. Wherever possible, the use of coloured surfacing, bold lining and one-way streets should be avoided.

Where specific provision may be required (e.g. at busy junctions), it is important that the design of this provision is integral to the overall design and character of the space in which it is to be placed.

Cycle parking should be provided through the introduction of cycle stands at regular intervals in retail and commercial areas. As a guide, two or three stands located every 50m or so is more efficient and practical than large clusters of parking placed sporadically.

Fig 3.2.22
A reduction in traffic speeds and a humanising of the public realm will help to create more attractive conditions for cycling.

Fig 3.2.23
Careful consideration should be given to the positioning of cycle stands (and other furniture) to avoid clutter.

Fig 3.2.24
Consideration should be given to the introduction of a 'hire cycle' system - Fareham, Hampshire.
Public Transport Considerations

There is limited public transport penetration in the estates, and major public transport ‘hubs’ are located towards their periphery, including at Marble Arch, Bond Street, Oxford Circus, Green Park, Knightsbridge, Sloane Square and Victoria. These will be augmented in time by the opening of Crossrail at Bond Street.

There are also limited opportunities for introducing new public transport routes, and so the focus must remain on enhancing existing public transport services and interconnections with walking and cycling networks. Public realm improvements should be designed to support the main pedestrian routes to major transport hubs, such as Victoria, and facilitate convenient pedestrian movement.

Consideration will also need to be given to tourist buses where these follow routes through Mayfair and Belgravia. Where routes pass through each estate it will be necessary to ensure that associated vehicles are able to safely and efficiently navigate without endangering other road users or causing excessive delays.

Car Clubs and Electric Vehicles

Car clubs and electric vehicles provide an alternative to conventional car ownership and use patterns. The public realm should accommodate recharging facilities and the provision of specific car club parking spaces in accessible locations where appropriate and possible. Increased use of car clubs by residential communities can result in a reduced demand for residents’ parking. The design and siting of recharging facilities should follow the approach described in Section 3.4 Street Furniture.

Further information on car clubs and electric vehicles is provided in Section 3.13 Sustainability.
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Car Movement and Parking Considerations

Finding an acceptable balance between the need for access and parking and the need for pedestrian amenity and aesthetics is one of the key challenges facing the evolution of the estates over the coming years. These challenges should be met by:

- Preventing rat-running, whilst providing convenient, legitimate access.
- Reducing speeds through design and layout.
- Reducing speeds through applied speed constraint.
- Positively accommodating necessary car parking within the public realm and in under used off-street locations.

The design of streets should seek to minimise the visual impact of parked cars. This may involve the creation of smaller blocks of parking broken by spaces for crossing, areas of seating, public art or tree planting. Varying parking layout between parallel and echelon parking in wider streets may also help create diversity and can help to reduce traffic speeds if designed with care. Consideration must be given to avoiding visual clutter, retaining the linear form and topography of streets and respecting the subtle proportional relationship between footways, buildings and carriageways.

Although it is not an objective to reduce parking provision in its own right, some reductions might be necessary to achieve other objectives.

Where changes to parking provision are necessary, convenient parking for residents should remain a priority. Alternative parking locations should be identified wherever possible to minimise any net reduction.

Wherever possible, care should be taken to ensure that parking areas are overlooked by commercial or residential premises and that they benefit from good levels of natural/passive surveillance. The street should look equally attractive with or without parked cars (empty bays should not dominate the street). Consideration should also be given in the positioning of parking bays to the avoidance of any conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. As a guide clear pedestrian crossing points should be no further than 100m apart.

Many of the existing parking bays within Mayfair and Belgravia are located close to junctions. Visibility and vehicle turning requirements will need to be carefully considered when reviewing the positioning of parking near junctions.

Fig 3.2.28
Currently dominated by vehicles, Lumley Street could provide an attractive pedestrian link between Oxford Street and Brown Hart Gardens.

Fig 3.2.29
Consideration should be given to the removal of one-way working and the improved integration of cycle facilities in Ebury Street, Belgravia.

Fig 3.2.30
Moving parking further from junctions could reduce the impact of cars and improve conditions for pedestrians.
Manual for Streets suggests that pedestrian desire lines should be kept as straight as possible at side road junctions, and notes the effect that corner radii can have on desire lines. This is illustrated in figures 3.2.31 and 3.2.32.

When considering the proximity of parking bays to junctions, corner radii for HGVs and pedestrian accessibility, a balance should be sought between all three factors depending on the nature of road, the frequency of pedestrian and HGV movement and the demand for parking.

At the very least, it is essential that all parking bays are located sufficiently distant from junctions and to ensure that servicing vehicles (and potentially HGVs) can safely negotiate all permitted turning movements. Consideration should be given as to whether large vehicles:

- Are able to track beyond the carriageway width of both the street they are turning from and the street they are turning into (tightest radius turn with bays closest to the junction).
- Are to stay within the carriageway width of the street they are turning from but can use in excess of the carriageway width of the street they are turning into.
- Are to stay within the carriageway width of both the street they are turning from and the street they are turning into (least tight radius turn with bays furthest from the junction).

For Local Access streets where there are only very limited movements of large vehicles it may be more appropriate to allow them to use the full width of both carriageways when turning corners. This would allow parking bays to be placed relatively close to junctions and would reduce the width of carriageways.

In contrast, on busy roads such as Strategic Routes it may be more appropriate to ensure larger vehicles remain within their carriageway width. This could mean locating parking bays further away from junctions, and providing adequate lane widths for relatively unobstructed manoeuvres.
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Standard swept-path analysis would need to be undertaken at junctions to calculate minimum distances between junctions and parking bays.

The other major factor to be considered is junction visibility. It is standard practice when designing junctions to provide ‘visibility splays’ that ensure good inter-visibility between vehicles on major and minor arms. An example of a visibility splay diagram is shown in figure 3.2.35.

In principle, the area of footway and road above the red lines should be clear so that vehicles on the minor arm have good visibility. The ‘X distance’ is generally assumed to be 2.4m (but can be reduced in low-flow conditions to 2.0m) whilst the ‘Y distance’ is dependent on vehicle speed on the major arm. For vehicles travelling at 20mph the ‘Y distance’ is 22m. The table in figure 3.2.35 illustrates minimums that might be employed if taking a traditional approach to highway design.

Linked to this is Highway Code Rule 243 which states: “DO NOT stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space.”

However the ‘Manual for Streets’ states that: “Parking in visibility splays in built-up areas is quite common, yet it does not appear to create significant problems in practice… in some circumstances, where speeds are low, some encroachment may be acceptable.”

It is increasingly recognised that putting more emphasis on ‘place’ and breaking away from traditional highway design guidance can improve the quality of urban streets with the added benefit of lowering vehicle speeds due to an inherent calming effect.

Locating some parking bays within the ‘Y distance’ from a junction, as exists today can therefore continue to occur and be incorporated into the design proposals. Each junction should be reviewed on an individual basis but, as a general rule, parking bays can be located closer to a junction on quieter streets than on busier streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Rd</th>
<th>Local Access</th>
<th>Local Route</th>
<th>Connector</th>
<th>Distributor</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Rd</td>
<td>11m</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access</td>
<td>11m</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Route</td>
<td>11m</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>39m</td>
<td>43m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributor</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>39m</td>
<td>43m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>39m</td>
<td>43m</td>
<td>43m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loading/Unloading Considerations

Convenient provision for access and loading to commercial premises is an important, but often forgotten component in the street scene. Provision should be made for large vehicles to reach all public areas and private accesses where necessary. The level of provision will vary according to local demand and should take into account the role of each space as a movement corridor and place.

The current de facto system in operation in Westminster for enabling and (passively) managing loading/unloading is to use single yellow lines with no kerb ‘blips’. These markings ban all vehicles stopping on the carriageway in question with the exception of vehicles loading/unloading. This is generally understood to be up to a maximum of 20 minutes, but has recently been extended to 40 minutes in London after a Test Case taken through the High Court.

In general the 40 minute restriction applies between 11am and 6.00pm. Outside of these times commercial vehicles are allowed to park as long as necessary (as indeed any vehicle is, especially residential parking). Loading/unloading is also permitted during the day in empty residents’ parking bays.

Where particular constraints are present, specific time limits can be introduced using kerbside ‘blips’ and associated signage.

Whilst there is flexibility in its usage, there is little active management of the kerbspace - those businesses, employers, etc who have frontages onto the street have no direct influence on how loading/unloading is undertaken.

In combination with the current system of road marking there is scope to introduce more active management of kerbspace. This could take place through ‘memorandums of understanding’ between tenants requiring access to a particular loading bay or length of kerb and Westminster City Council which allows loading for a particular period, say between 9am and 11am. Within that time, the tenants are responsible for ensuring that all loading activities take place to their premises. Outside of this period, the loading bays could be made available for other uses, e.g. pay parking, pedestrian movement or street cafes.

In some instances it may be appropriate to ban larger vehicles on certain street types (e.g. Local Routes and Local Access typologies) except with special prior permission (e.g. construction or when moving house).
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A ‘place’ classification for the streets and spaces of each estate.

Best practice guidance contains a number of underlying themes and principles on sustainability, character, movement, public realm, land-use and security that together combine to promote the creation of high quality people based places that are easy to navigate around and that are desirable to visit or live in.

In recognition of this, we have developed a classification of streets and spaces that better reflects the character and use of Mayfair and Belgravia than the link and traffic based classification illustrated in figures 3.2.6 and 3.2.7. This place classification (illustrated in figures 3.2.36 and 3.2.37) recognises that the estates contain a number of strategic spaces, including the likes of Grosvenor Square and Eaton Square, and that both estates are set out with a strong rectangular grid of primary streets that is subdivided by distinctive network of intermediate streets, mews, yards, lanes and alleyways. These streets and spaces give the estates their distinctive character, are often the means by which people navigate, and often influence the disposition of different land uses including commercial activity, residential property and the location of embassies and hotels.

The classification we have established, and refer to in subsequent chapters, is as follows:

- Strategic Spaces
- Secondary Spaces
- Primary Streets
- Intermediate Streets
- Mews, Yards and Residential Forecourts
- Lanes
- Alleyways

It is recognised that there will be some competing pressures between the role that the estates’ streets and spaces fulfil as links for vehicles and the role that they need to fulfil as places for people. Some of the areas where there will be competing pressures are identified as follows:

- The environs to Underground stations where pedestrian access and volumes dictate a greater space and capacity requirement and enhanced pedestrian linkages; e.g. Bond Street Station, Marble Arch Station and potentially any new access points provided as a part of Crossrail in Mayfair, and Hyde Park Corner Station, Victoria Station and Sloane Square Station in Belgravia.
- Other key public transport access points where pedestrian access and volumes dictate a greater space and capacity requirement and prioritised pedestrian linkages; e.g. Marble Arch and Park Lane’s coach and bus stops in Mayfair and between Victoria Coach Station’s arrivals and departures areas in Belgravia.
- Streets and spaces in Mayfair where their role as a destination or place supports the introduction of a variant treatment and greater pedestrian emphasis; e.g. Lumley Street leading to Brown Hart Gardens, the interface between Duke Street and Brown Hart Gardens, the junction of Mount Street and Davies Street by Berkeley Square, Carlos Place, Aldford Street and along Avery Row and South Molton Lane.
- Streets and spaces in Belgravia where their role as a destination or place supports the introduction of a variant treatment and greater pedestrian emphasis; e.g. Elizabeth Street between Ebury Street and Chester Row, Orange Square, Belgrave Square and Eaton Square.
- Other streets containing retail and hotel uses requiring greater pedestrian emphasis; e.g. Duke Street and North Audley Street in Mayfair and Motcomb Street/West Halkin Street and Eccleston Street in Belgravia.
- Strategic routes that sever wider pedestrian connectivity; e.g. Park Lane between Hyde Park and Mayfair and Knightsbridge/ Grosvenor Place between Belgravia and Hyde Park and Green Park.

These locations will require a considered response to successfully resolve potential conflicts between people and vehicles. Projects in these areas may require additional traffic flow data, analysis of pedestrian movement and a rationalisation of facilities for parking and loading.
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Place Classification

KEY
- Strategic Space
- Secondary Space
- Primary Streets
- Intermediate Streets
- Mews
- Lanes
- Alleys

Figure 3.2.36 Place Classification for Mayfair

Figure 3.2.37 Place Classification for Belgravia