Begin by considering the rendering of $A \leftrightarrow B$.

This is:
$$\neg \vee \neg \vee \neg A B \neg \vee \neg B A.$$

So it has eight symbols together with two occurrences of $A$ and two of $B$.

Next consider the assemblage corresponding to $\{x\}$. Here I am basically in agreement with ARDM’s calculation. It has length 107 and 10 occurrences of $x$. However, it has 26 links rather than 14. [The difference is traceable to the use by ARDM of the incorrect version of Proposition 3.7 in the text.]

We turn now to the assemblage corresponding to $\{x, y\}$. Our calculation will closely parallel that given for $\{x\}$ in the text.

$\{x, y\}$ is the term $\tau_w \forall z (z \in w \iff [z = x \lor z = y])$.

The assemblage corresponding to $[z = x \lor z = y]$ has length 7, no links, 2 occurrences of $z$ and 1 occurrence of each of $x$ and $y$.

Call $f(x, y, z, w)$ the assemblage corresponding to $(z \in w \iff [z = x \lor z = y])$. Using the result in the first paragraph of this note one sees easily that this has length $(8 + (2 \times (7 + 3))) = 28$. It has 6 occurrences of $z$ and 2 each of $x$, $y$ and $w$. And it has no links.

Next consider the assemblage corresponding to $\forall z f(x, y, z, w)$.

It has length $(6 + 1) \cdot (28 + 1) + 1 = 204$. It has 14 occurrences of each of $x$, $y$ and $w$. And it has 36 links.

Finally we come to the assemblage corresponding to $\{x, y\}$. It has length 205. It has 14 occurrences of each of $x$ and $y$. And it has 50 links.

We now consider the assemblage corresponding to the Kuratowski pair $(x, y)$. It is obtained by substituting the assemblages corresponding to $\{x\}$ and $\{x, y\}$ for $x$ and $y$ respectively in the assemblage corresponding to $\{x, y\}$. 
It has length \((205 - 28) + (14 * (205 + 107)) = 4545\). It has \(14 * (10 + 14) = 336\) occurrences of \(x\) and \(14 * 14 = 196\) occurrences of \(y\). And it has \(50 + (14 * (26 + 50)) = 1,114\) links.

I suspect that you defined the Kuratowski pair by using the \(\tau\) construction rather than substitution. This is a very inefficient way to proceed.