

**Hill Lee**

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 17 January 2018 15:11  
**To:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** FW: Regent's Park

---

**From:** Max Jack [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@cepc.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk)]  
**Sent:** 13 October 2017 10:34  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner); Andrew Scattergood  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** RE: Regent's Park

Will

Happy to meet for a discussion.

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director CEPC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 13, 2017 8:35 AM  
**To:** Andrew Scattergood; Max Jack  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** Regent's Park

Dear Andrew and Max

Andrew, it was good to see you yesterday.

As we discussed, I think the next step is for us all to get together and agree a way forward that everyone is comfortable with. I'm going to ask Sarah (cc-ed) to help find a time for yourselves, Danny and Robert from Westminster and me to get together.

With best wishes

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

## Hill Lee

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 17 January 2018 15:00  
**To:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** FW: CEPC - CS11

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Sent:** 13 December 2017 21:45  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel  
**Subject:** RE: CEPC - CS11

Dear Max

It is clear to me that trialling the two gate closure option, that was discussed in the meeting of the 6th November, is now the only deliverable option on the table to reduce road danger in Regent's Park. This provides increased access to the park over the original proposal and enhanced benefits to pedestrians, while still reducing traffic from current levels to facilitate a safer route for cyclists

All the key stakeholders, apart from yourselves, have compromised their original positions and agreed to proceed with this approach.

Westminster City Council is clear that it cannot support a four-gate closure option at this stage. They have said that they are content that the two gate solution represents a reasonable compromise which they can support on an experimental basis.

I have spoken to the London Borough of Camden who are also prepared to support this approach.

As you know, the Royal Parks would also prefer a four gate closure proposal, but are prepared to progress with the two gate closure rather than do nothing at all.

The Park represents an urgent safety concern. The most recent data shows that the Outer Circle continues to be significantly more dangerous than other comparable roads. The data set shows that there were 100 collisions on the Outer Circle in the 36 months to 31st December 2016. This represents 7.40 injury collisions per km per year, compared with only 2.60 across comparable Inner London Borough roads.

I'm extremely disappointed that the Crown Estates Paving Commission, under your leadership, seems to not recognise the urgency of this issue. By continuing to oppose the deliverable solution that all other stakeholders are in principle agreeing to, the much needed road safety improvements are being further delayed.

I am perplexed about the legal ambiguities you refer to. The Crown Estates Paving Commission's website clearly states that one of the organisation's functions is "to provide and maintain day and night gate keepers at certain entrances into Regents Park to control traffic". This is a task that the CEPC have been undertaking for many years. I do not understand what has changed.

As you can tell, I am getting increasingly frustrated by the delays and want to resolve this issue as soon as possible.

Regards,

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Mayor's Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

---

**From:** Max Jack [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@cepc.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk)]  
**Sent:** 13 December 2017 15:34  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel  
**Subject:** CEPC - CS11

Dear Will

The Commissioners met last week and discussed at some length your compromise proposals to take CS11 forwards. Their discussion reflected the view that the idea of 2 full gate closures with a partial closure at Hanover, offers a far from ideal outcome for the park, even with the much reduced periods of weekdays only closure that we discussed with Westminster councillors. They are however still of the view that the original TfL proposals for four gate closures would materially change the park's traffic patterns in a way that would improve road safety sufficiently to support the introduction of the cycle route.

Bearing in mind the high level of opposition from Westminster CC and its groups of local residents, concerns of greater immediacy to the Commissioners are the potential legal issues that may well arise if daytime gate closures were to be agreed and introduced. Clearly this is something that the CEPC needs to seek expert advice about and it is now in the process of doing so.

What level of clarity that advice will actually bring is a moot point. But without some level of comfort that the Commission will not be immediately vulnerable when stepping into the firing line of angry residential groups, it is going to be difficult to make further headway with discussing any gate closure proposals.

I will revert to you as soon as I have a better picture of what the advice is indicating.

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director

Crown Estate Paving Commission  
12 Park Square East  
Regent's Park  
London NW1 4LH

  
@CEPavingComm  
[www.cepc.org.uk](http://www.cepc.org.uk)

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

## Hill Lee

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 17 January 2018 14:57  
**To:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** FW: CS11 and Regent's Park meeting

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Sent:** 23 October 2017 10:59  
**To:** Danny Chalkley ([REDACTED]) Robert Rigby ([REDACTED]) Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); Andrew Scattergood; Max Jack  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** CS11 and Regent's Park meeting

Dear Danny, Robert, Nigel, Andrew and Max

Thank you for getting back to Sarah regarding dates.

I think it's critical that we all sit down together to discuss how we progress. I know this can be a challenge for people's diaries, but without everyone in the room I don't think we are going to be able to move ahead.

Danny, could you let us know some times which would work for you, and we can try and work around those?

Many thanks

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

**From:** Danny Chalkley <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** 22 October 2017 at 15:55:01 BST  
**To:** "Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)" <[REDACTED]@TfL.gov.uk>  
**Subject: Re: Regent's Park meeting**

Sorry, I'm already booked 7th. I'm happy for Robert to represent me

On Oct 19, 2017, at 10:41 AM, Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL) <[REDACTED]@TfL.gov.uk> wrote:

Good morning all,

I just wanted to send a quick update on where we are at in planning this meeting.

Cllr Danny Chalkley is on leave at the moment so I am yet to receive his availability, however, everyone else has confirmed that they can do either the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> November. As such, if you had a hold on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November could you please release this and keep holding the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> November for now. When Cllr Chalkley returns next week we can hopefully firm up either the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup>.

With best wishes  
Sarah

**Sarah Herbert**

**Personal Assistant to Will Norman Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

Palestra – 7<sup>th</sup> Floor (7B4) 197 Blackfriars Road, Southwark, London, SE1 8NJ

Auto: [REDACTED] Direct dial: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED] [tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)

**Sent:** 17 October 2017 16:00

**To:** 'Max Jack'; 'Danny Chalkley'; [REDACTED] [westminster.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk);

[REDACTED] Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship)

**Cc:** Jo Jackson; Pick Caroline; 'William Bradley'

**Subject:** RE: Regent's Park meeting

Good afternoon all,

My apologies for the delay in getting back to you to get this meeting in the diary – Ideally we want to get a slot that everyone can attend. The following slots work for both Will and Andrew Scattergood and it would be great if we could try and get this in on the 2 November:

2 Nov 09:00-10:30

6 Nov 09:00-10:30

7 Nov 09:00-10:30

The meeting would be held in Hyde Park and it would be appreciated if you could let me know your availability at your earliest convenience.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best wishes  
Sarah

**Sarah Herbert**

**Personal Assistant to Will Norman Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

Palestra – 7<sup>th</sup> Floor (7B4) 197 Blackfriars Road, Southwark, London, SE1 8NJ

Auto: [REDACTED] Direct dial: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED] [tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 13 October 2017 12:21  
**To:** 'Max Jack'; 'Danny Chalkley'; [REDACTED] [westminster.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk);  
[REDACTED] Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship)  
**Cc:** Jo Jackson; Pick Caroline; William Bradley  
**Subject:** Regent's Park meeting

Good afternoon,

Will has asked me to set-up a meeting regarding Regent's Park with himself and the following attendees:

Andrew Scattergood  
Max Jack  
Cllr Danny Chalkley  
Cllr Robert Rigby  
Nigel Hardy

Ideally we would like to get this meeting in as soon as possible so we are looking at dates next week, and I am sorry for any disruption to your diaries. Both Andrew and Will can make the following dates work, Max, Cllr Chalkley, Cllr Rigby and Nigel, could you please let me know if either of them are able to work for you?

Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> October 09:00-10:30 (Room available at the Old Police House, Hyde Park)  
Friday 20<sup>th</sup> October 09:00-10:30 at (Room available at Rangers Lodge, Hyde Park)

Your earliest response would be most appreciated.

Best wishes

Sarah

**Sarah Herbert**  
**Personal Assistant to Will Norman Walking & Cycling Commissioner**  
Palestra – 7<sup>th</sup> Floor (7B4) 197 Blackfriars Road, Southwark, London, SE1 8NJ  
Auto: [REDACTED] Direct dial: [REDACTED]  
Email address: [REDACTED] [tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

## Hill Lee

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 17 January 2018 15:14  
**To:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** FW: CS11 follow up

---

**From:** Max Jack [mailto: [REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 22 August 2017 14:43  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); William Bradley; Ibitson Ami  
**Subject:** RE: CS11 follow up

Dear Will

Very happy to meet and discuss – it would need to be the following week, Wed 6<sup>th</sup>, Thurs 7<sup>th</sup> or after 11.00am on Fri 8<sup>th</sup> Sept.

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director CEPC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [mailto: [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 21, 2017 10:09 AM  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); William Bradley; Ibitson Ami  
**Subject:** RE: CS11 follow up

Dear Max

Thank you your email. Apologies for my delayed response, I've been away and have only just got back to the office.

I think it would be helpful to get together and discuss this further. I'm sure there is a way we can reach a viable proposal. Could we meet the week beginning the 29<sup>th</sup> August? I'm happy to host.

My colleague Ami (cc-ed) can help find a time.

With best wishes

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

---

**From:** Max Jack [[mailto: \[REDACTED\]@cepc.org.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk)]  
**Sent:** 15 August 2017 13:29  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); William Bradley  
**Subject:** RE: CS11 follow up

Dear Will

I welcome your discussion with Westminster Councillors in an attempt to find a successful way forward for CS11. A key factor for the CEPC in lending its support to any cycle route proposals that will bring more commuting cyclists onto the Outer Circle will be that those proposals must appropriately address the already identified road safety issues faced by Regent's Park and not simply exacerbate them. I am sure that TfL will want to satisfy itself on this point as well.

TfL's original CS11 consultation proposals recognised the essentially circular nature of the park. Isolated gate closures will be of little use in reducing through-traffic because, once inside the park, vehicles just move round to the next open gate, increasing congestion at those points. This congestion will actually make the road safety situation worse, particularly for cyclists. Where proposals are likely to focus traffic and congestion down only one side of the park, and to the detriment of park users and residents, they are also unlikely to win CEPC support.

This park was designed with only a limited number of access points. The CEPC is unlikely to favour measures which will unduly interfere with the flow of park related traffic unless there is a consensus that the overall benefits that accrue to the park greatly outweigh the problems which will also be created. For this reason we do not believe that permanent gate closures and banned turns should be significant parts of any proposals.

It is for all of these reasons that the CEPC believes a wiser course of action, if CS11 is to be introduced, would be to initiate sufficient gate closures to reduce the volumes of through-traffic, yet to adjust incrementally the times of those closures so that disruption levels can be managed and minimised. Active monitoring of road safety on the Outer Circle can then be used to demonstrate whether or not adequate levels of safety improvements are being achieved.

The compromise proposals made recently by TfL combine a number of elements which, as explained above, make them difficult for the CEPC to support, a position, I understand, that is also currently taken by the Royal Parks board. We are, however, very willing to discuss all these points further in an attempt to work towards viable proposals.

Regards

Max Jack  
Director CEPC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [[mailto: \[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 31, 2017 10:27 AM  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); William Bradley  
**Subject:** RE: CS11 follow up

Dear Max,

Thank you for your email and confirmation that CEPC and The Royal Parks believe from a safety perspective the "do nothing" option for Regent's Park is not a viable one.

I absolutely agree the current focus should be to develop wider consensus amongst stakeholders; our first step in achieving this is to reach an agreement with Westminster City Council, The Royal Parks and CEPC on an acceptable proposal.

Nigel Hardy and I had an extremely useful meeting last week with Cllr Chalkley and Cllr Rigby, and following this meeting we believe Westminster would be willing to consider an incremental approach for Regent's Park, which could be in the form of a reduced number of park gate closures.

We still believe our revised proposals represent the best way to progress towards an acceptable position, and in order to seek a wider consensus we wish to share these plans publically and carry out the necessary consultation to make changes in future.

As such, I would be grateful if you could confirm whether CEPC are willing to support a consultation on the revised gate proposals, subject to us seeking an agreement with The Royal Parks and Westminster City Council.

If you think it would be helpful, I'd be happy to meet with you and the CEPC Commissioners.

With best wishes

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

---

**From:** Max Jack [<mailto:██████████@cepc.org.uk>]  
**Sent:** 26 July 2017 11:38  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); William Bradley; ██████████ [royalparks.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:██████████@royalparks.gsi.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** RE: CS11 follow up

Dear Will

Thank you for your email seeking clarification of the CEPC's position with respect to CS11.

You will appreciate that the CEPC is a small statutory organisation whose principal concern must be to satisfy its statutory duties at Regent's Park. Having some management obligations for the Outer Circle, it welcomed the opportunity recently offered by TfL to seek improvements to the park's roads in ways that it felt would be beneficial to road safety, pedestrian access and to other aspects of the park's environment. It remains highly committed to achieving those things through its active engagement with TfL and other stakeholders.

The road safety issues highlighted by the preliminary studies carried out by TfL for CS11 are matters of great concern to both ourselves and to Royal Parks, and both organisations are keen to work towards effective interventions that will improve the safety situation, whether those interventions are introduced by TfL, by ourselves or by others. From the safety perspective, both we and Royal Parks agree with you that the "do nothing" option is not a viable one.

However, there is a wide range of stakeholders having legitimate interests in the park. Those who surround it are considerably affected by what happens within it due to the park's dominant geographical position in the traffic environment of central London. Both the encompassing London boroughs have Traffic Authority powers within the park. Their views cannot be ignored by the CEPC in establishing the details of proposals as significant as those for CS11, or when exercising whatever powers it has to close the park gates. So whilst the CEPC will always act within its local powers and with the park's best interests at heart, it can only

do so cognisant of the views of adjacent authorities who have legitimate interests. With the park issuing directly onto the Marylebone Road red route, TfL itself should hardly expect the CEPC's approach to be otherwise.

This situation demands that as wide a consensus as possible needs to be achieved if successful proposals are to be introduced. As the principal player in co-ordinating London's traffic issues we would encourage TfL to consider how best to generate that consensus about its cycle route proposals so that the CEPC can play its part in bringing them successfully into operation. In the meantime, the CEPC is very willing to continue to discuss its part in these matters with TfL.

The CEPC understands that the Royal Parks has appropriate mechanisms available to it in parliament to introduce a 20mph speed limit for the park - a measure which the CEPC supports. We hope that this can be achieved soon and we will assist that process in any way we can as part of a package of measures that will make the park's roadways safer for all their users.

In answer to your request for clarity about the CEPC's powers over the park's roadways, I should point out that the park is Crown Land. As a result, many of the powers relating to its roads that would in other circumstances be expected to be allocated to local authorities and highway authorities, etc., are not so allocated. In their absence the CEPC has some wide but general statutory powers to manage the roadways, although the legal situation is considerably less clear than many would wish - a situation that only reinforces our desire to see a viable consensus developed about any major proposals that affect our roadways and the park.

I would be very willing to discuss any of these matters further with you to find a viable way forward.

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director CEPC

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [[mailto: \[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:31 AM  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship); William Bradley  
**Subject:** CS11 follow up

Dear Max

Thank you for your recent meeting with Nigel and I. It was very helpful to understand the nature of discussions at meetings of The Royal Parks Board and CEPC Commissioners regarding CS11.

I am concerned it appears that CEPC are stepping away from supporting the principle of gate closures in Regent's Park; a proposal TfL have developed in partnership with you over the last 3 years and which has already been publically consulted on with the support of The Royal Parks and CEPC.

Whilst I feel our original proposal, which introduced four gate closures, would provide a suitable environment for cyclists to use the CS11 route without the need for kerb segregation, I am acutely aware of wider stakeholder concerns surrounding access and traffic movement.

As such, TfL have worked hard to develop a compromise solution that takes into account the specific constraints for such a unique setting as Regent's Park, whilst also addressing these stakeholder concerns. The revised option developed provides increased access into the park over the original proposal, and enhanced benefits to pedestrians, whilst still reducing traffic from current levels to facilitate a safer route for cyclists. Collectively we have sought to maintain your requirements, notably those surrounding heritage,

and provide an incremental improvement that Westminster City Council are far more likely to support, and I feel this proposal offers something for everyone. Given safety concerns surrounding existing vehicle speeds and the high collision rate compared to other roads, I do not feel that a 'do nothing' or 'do minimum' option is possible.

I was surprised to hear concerns were expressed over future traffic volumes in the park if gate closures and restrictions are implemented. The revised plans retain access restrictions at three of the park gates, which we expect will reduce the flow of vehicles travelling through the park compared to the current day situation. In particular, TfL expect large reductions in traffic on the western side of the Outer Circle, which will help to facilitate the movement of cyclists along CS11. TFL believe both of the proposed options would reduce overall traffic flow around the Outer Circle, making this a far more pleasant environment for park users and cyclists. I have asked that you are furnished with the latest traffic modelling information and would be happy to facilitate further information on the traffic impacts of both options to address any concerns you may have.

I was also surprised to hear of concerns regarding the potential for cyclist and pedestrian conflict in the park. The danger of heavy traffic, often travelling above the speed limit far outweighs an alternative where much of the traffic is replaced by an increased number of cyclists, still on a road (as opposed to any form of 'shared' provision) travelling at a far lower average speed.

Val Shawcross has committed to announcing a way forward for Regent's Park over the summer and I remain extremely concerned that if we cannot agree on a solution, then we will be left with no scheme at all.

I would be grateful if you could confirm whether CEPC are willing to support either gate closure option for Regent's Park.

During the meeting yourself and Andrew also indicated that you were of the opinion that highways issues, including the permissions for gate closures and restriction of vehicle turning movements were the responsibility of CEPC. Could you please confirm that also, along with the timescales, promoter and nature of the legislation required for a reduction of the speed limit to 20mph in the park?

With best wishes,

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

## Hill Lee

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 17 January 2018 14:58  
**To:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** FW: Phone call this week?

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Sent:** 22 May 2017 11:02  
**To:** 'Max Jack'  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** RE: Phone call this week?

Fantastic – speak tomorrow. My mobile is below

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**  
Mob: +44 (0) [REDACTED]

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

---

**From:** Max Jack [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@cepc.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk)]  
**Sent:** 22 May 2017 11:01  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** RE: Phone call this week?

Yes, that's fine – 2.30pm on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> May.

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director CEPC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 22, 2017 10:46 AM  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** RE: Phone call this week?

Thanks Max – could we make it 14:30?

W

**Will Norman**

**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

---

**From:** Max Jack [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@cepc.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk)]  
**Sent:** 22 May 2017 10:45  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** RE: Phone call this week?

Will

Tuesday pm would be best for me. Shall I call you around 2.00pm?

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director CEPC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 22, 2017 10:38 AM  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** Phone call this week?

Dear Max

I hope you are well.

Do you have time for a 20 minute phone call this week? I'd like to have a catch up on CS11 and Regent's Park. Tuesday afternoon or Wednesday morning would work for me.

With best wishes

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**  
 Mob: +44 (0) [REDACTED]

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

## Hill Lee

---

**From:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Sent:** 17 January 2018 15:18  
**To:** Herbert Sarah (PA to Deputy Chair of TfL)  
**Subject:** FW: Regents Park

---

**From:** Max Jack [mailto: [REDACTED]@cepc.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 19 September 2017 14:03  
**To:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)  
**Cc:** 'William Bradley'; Hambridge Christopher; Andrew Scattergood; Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship)  
**Subject:** RE: Regents Park

Dear Will

I met with Andrew Scattergood and the Park Manager on Friday and we discussed the various options now available. It is still our view that the hard won agreement that led to the original consultation proposals is the best point at which to reopen any dialogue with Westminster and Camden to see if a way forward can be found, based on modifications to the gate closure times that we discussed at our recent meeting. Both our organisations feel that the latest draft proposals only lead in a direction that doesn't address the needs of the park taken as a whole and therefore could not win our support as a way forward or as the basis of a second consultation.

Regards  
Max

Max Jack  
Director CEPC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner) [mailto: [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2017 11:35 AM  
**To:** Max Jack  
**Cc:** 'William Bradley'; Hambridge Christopher; Hardy Nigel (RSM Sponsorship)  
**Subject:** Regents Park

Dear Max,

Thank you for your time at our meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> Sept. I believe we share the same objectives for The Regent's Park in improving safety - in terms of both reducing the volume and speed of traffic using the park - making improvements for pedestrians, and also providing a suitable facility for cyclists.

I trust the information we provided has alleviated your concerns of any increased congestion in the park in that the revised proposal would look to reduce the volume of traffic on the western side whilst not increasing the level of traffic on the eastern side of the park. I appreciate your concern about avoiding disruption to users of the park which will of course be balanced against the success of reducing both the volume and speed of through traffic; ensuring the park is no longer an attractive rat-run whilst ensuring genuine users of the park are not unduly impacted. We feel we've struck the right balance with the new proposal but would be happy to continue discussing with you the timing of the restrictions, which you agreed to take away and give some thought to.

The proposed banned turn at Hanover Gate forms a key part in ensuring traffic doesn't simply re-route back into the park, but we agreed that we would look into whether this restriction could be timed in line with the proposed gate closures.

You also highlighted that you would want to see further pedestrian improvements than those already included in the proposed option. As we outlined we feel we have developed a strong package of improvements for pedestrians throughout the park, including the vehicle and speed reduction measures (including the 20mph limit) and new crossings, however we discussed with you the possibility of including additional raised tables which you confirmed you would also consider in detail.

In terms of next steps, we obviously need to reach consensus with yourself and the Royal Parks, and with this in mind you are going to speak to Andrew Scattergood around the revised proposal, including the option for additional raised tables and timing of the restrictions. We would then reconvene with yourself and Andrew within the fortnight to follow up on these discussions. With this in mind Chris will contact you directly to arrange a suitable time.

As mentioned to you, we will also be discussing the proposals with WCC directly on 25 September, and would also be very happy to come and provide the detail direct to the commissioners and answer any questions they might have.

I look forward to seeing you again soon.

Kind regards,

Will

**Will Norman**  
**Walking & Cycling Commissioner**

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.