



Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee

Date: TUESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2020
Time: 10.30 am
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Oliver Sells QC (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Peter Bennett
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Sheriff Christopher Hayward
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Shravan Joshi
Deputy Alastair Moss
Alderman Alison Gowman (Ex-Officio Member)
Christopher Hill (Ex-Officio Member)
Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)
Barbara Newman (Ex-Officio Member)

Enquiries: Joseph Anstee
tel. no.: 020 7332 1480
Joseph.Anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk

N.B. Part of this meeting may be subject to audio-visual recording.

Lunch will be served in the Guildhall Club at 1.00pm.

**John Barradell
Town Clerk**

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 3 December 2019.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 8)
4. **150 BISHOPSGATE (HERON PLAZA)**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment

For Decision
(Pages 9 - 16)
5. **GREENING CHEAPSIDE: SUNKEN GARDEN (PHASE 1B); ST. PAUL'S TUBE STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE 1)**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment

For Decision
(Pages 17 - 20)
6. **BERNARD MORGAN HOUSE PUBLIC REALM**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment

For Decision
(Pages 21 - 30)
7. **55 MOORGATE - SECTION 278 PUBLIC REALM AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment

For Decision
(Pages 31 - 36)
8. **ST MARY AXE EXPERIMENTAL TIMED CLOSURE (WITHIN CITY CLUSTER VISION PHASE 1 - ACTIVATION, GREENING AND EXPERIMENTS PROGRAMME)**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment

For Decision
(Pages 37 - 50)

9. **CITY LIGHTING PROGRAMME UPDATE**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment
- For Decision**
(Pages 51 - 58)
10. **SPECIAL EVENTS ON THE HIGHWAY**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment
- For Decision**
(Pages 59 - 68)
11. **ANTI-TERRORISM TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment
- For Decision**
(Pages 69 - 74)
12. **FANN STREET - TRAFFIC INCREASE**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment
- For Decision**
(Pages 75 - 78)
13. **72 FORE STREET**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment
- For Decision**
(Pages 79 - 82)
14. **JB RINEY'S HIGHWAYS TERM MAINTENANCE CONTRACT**
Report of the Director of the Built Environment
- For Information**
(Pages 83 - 88)
15. **ANNUAL ON-STREET PARKING ACCOUNTS 2018/19 AND RELATED FUNDING OF HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND SCHEMES**
Report of the Chamberlain
- For Information**
(Pages 89 - 92)
16. **RESOLUTION OF THE RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB COMMITTEE**
To consider a resolution of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee.
- For Information**
(Pages 93 - 94)

17. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

Report of the Town Clerk

For Information
(Pages 95 - 96)

18. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

Report of the Town Clerk

For Information
(Pages 97 - 98)

19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

20. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

MOTION – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act as follows:-

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

21. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2019.

For Decision
(Pages 99 - 100)

22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 3 December 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Oliver Sells QC (Chairman)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)	Shravan Joshi
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Alastair Moss
Sheriff Christopher Hayward	Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Olumayowa Obisesan	- Chamberlain's Department
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment
Kristian Turner	- Department of the Built Environment
Melanie Charalambous	- Department of the Built Environment
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Sarah-Jane Enson	- Department for the Built Environment
Sufina Ahmad	- Town Clerk's Department

Also in attendance:

John Edwards

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Randall Anderson (dialled in) and Alderman Alison Gowman.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

The Deputy Chairman declared an interest in Item 4 by virtue of his ex-officio membership of the Barbican Centre Board.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 15 October 2019 be agreed as a correct record.

4. BEECH STREET TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment seeking Members' authority to implement two-way zero emission

restrictions along Beech Street under an Experimental Traffic Order, with options for consideration, and informing Members of work and findings to date, risks and next steps.

The Chairman introduced the item, a ground-breaking scheme to address important concerns and unacceptable levels of pollution in the vicinity, before drawing Members' attention to the key points and reiterating that the interim scheme was an experiment that would provide further opportunities for monitoring and consultation.

In response to questions from Members, the Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee on modelling and monitoring of nitrogen dioxide levels in the area and the consultation that would be undertaken, also clarifying points on the project funding and traffic modelling. The Sub-Committee was assured that the interim scheme would be designed in a way that could accommodate roadworks and emergencies.

Members were very supportive of the project and proceeded to discuss the options for the interim scheme. A detailed case for supporting Option 2 was made by a Member, on the basis that it would enact less behavioural change, would reduce the chances of misdirected penalty charges, and was less open to manipulation, whereas Option 1 would require a more extensive white list and would force longer journey times. The Sub-Committee also noted that the Barbican Centre was supportive of Option 2.

The Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee that both options would be effective, and that Option 1 had been recommended largely based on ease of enforcement. The options were marginal in terms of benefit, cost or implications and officers were happy to be guided by the Sub-Committee's preference.

Arising from the discussion, the recommendations were put to vote amongst eligible Members, who voted unanimously in favour of proceeding with the project, and then in favour of approving Option 2 as the interim scheme.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

Subject to the scheme receiving TMAN approval from TfL and the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairman, deciding to proceed with the making of the ETO as set out:

1. Approve Option 2 as the Interim Scheme;
2. Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment to enter into a Section 8 agreement with Islington Council for implementing works on Islington streets, e.g. signage and traffic mitigation measures;
3. Approve a sum of £1,119,183 as the implementation budget for the Interim Scheme, funded from within the existing budget of £1,745,362;

4. Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to make any adjustments between elements of the approved budget, provided the total approved budget of £1,745,362 is not exceeded;
5. Agree to provide funding to Islington Council at an estimated cost of £80,000 funded from within the existing budget;
6. Delegate to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to vary the cost of the Islington contribution, subject to the total approved budget of £1,745,362 not being exceeded;
7. Note that GLA funding of £91,000 that has been secured for the project; and
8. Note work and findings to date as detailed in Appendix 4.

5. **CITY CLUSTER AND FENCHURCH STREET HEALTHY STREETS PLAN**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment presenting an options appraisal and seeking authority to start work on a Healthy Streets Plan for the City Cluster and Fenchurch Street. The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points.

Members then proceeded to discuss the proposals and options. The Sub-Committee noted that the scheme was to be funded through Liveable Neighbourhoods grant funding from TfL and match funded by s106 payments. In response to a question, the Chamberlain and the Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee on the funding available and confirmed that the project was outside the scope of the Fundamental Review.

Arising from the discussion, the recommendations were put to vote amongst eligible Members, who agreed the recommendations and voted in favour of Option 1.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

1. Approve the total estimated cost of the project of £282,433 (excluding risk) and release the additional budget of £269,033 to prepare and complete the Healthy Streets Plan;
2. Agree that there is a change of scope to the Healthy Streets Plan area boundary to that of the City Cluster area only;
3. Agree that the project name is changed to 'City Cluster Healthy Streets Plan';
4. Agree that delegated authority is given to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to make any adjustments between elements of the project budget;

5. Agree that Option 1, the plan for the City Cluster only, is approved; and
6. Agree authority to start work on the preparation of the Healthy Streets Plan.

6. **CULTURE MILE LOOK & FEEL EXPERIMENTS PHASE 4**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment presenting Phase 4 of the Culture Mile Look and Feel Experiments. The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and gave Members an overview of the proposals, before giving a presentation outlining work done so far, the current proposals and plans for 2020 in more detail.

The Sub-Committee then proceeded to discuss the proposals. Whilst Members were generally supportive, noting the praise and traction of the programme elsewhere, there was some concern that the overall project may not be demonstrating value for money, particularly within the context of the Fundamental Review. In response to a query, the Chamberlain confirmed that the Culture Mile programme was outside the scope of the Fundamental Review. However, Members asked that if approved, confirmation be sought that the budget allocated to the programme was intact and remained applicable.

The Sub-Committee continued to discuss the proposals. The Deputy Chairman advised that coloured road crossings sometimes caused difficulties and urged officers to undertake consultation with regards to accessibility before installing them. Members were also keen to ensure that the programme complimented the Legible London signage and wayfinding scheme rather than competing with it.

In response to points raised by Members, the Director of the Built Environment reassured the Sub-Committee on funding and that the programme was compatible with Legible London, and advised Members of the outcomes from the programme so far.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

- i. Approve the Look and Feel Experiments Phase 4 programme for a total cost of £685,000, funded from the £5 million budget previously allocated by the Policy & Resources Committee (subject to confirmation that this budget remains intact and allocated to the programme); and
- ii. Approve the revised budget for Phases 1-3 as set out in the report.

7. **20MPH SPEED LIMIT EXTENSION**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment proposing the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on the few remaining streets south of Upper and Lower Thames Street which are still subject to a 30mph limit, in order to complement TfL proposals.

RESOLVED – That the Street and Walkways Sub-Committee approve the making of a Traffic Management Order to extend the City’s 20mph speed limit to include the streets south of Lower Thames Street and Upper Thames Street, subject to TfL implementing a 20mph speed limit on those streets.

8. **QUEENHITHE AND VINTRY PROGRAMME UPDATE REPORT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning a number of public realm improvement projects in the Queenhithe and Vintry area.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

1. Note the updates provided on the individual projects contained in the programme;
2. Approve design option one of the Globe View Walkway project to be taken forward to the next Gateway; and
3. Delegate approval to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee to approve Globe View Gateway 4 report (Detailed Design).

9. **MAJOR HIGHWAY ACTIVITIES 2020**

The Sub-Committee received an annual report of the Director of the Built Environment, reflecting on major highway activities in 2019 and 2020. Members suggested publicising the positive impact and benefits of projects requiring road closures, such as the recent Cannon Street project, and also where projects had been notably successful, such as the recent Aldersgate Street road works, which had completed two weeks ahead of schedule.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

10. **CITY WAYFINDING - INTRODUCTION OF LEGIBLE LONDON**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the installation of new wayfinding maps and signage across the Square Mile. The Director of the Built Environment advised that the project was on time and within budget.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

11. **6-MONTH UPDATE ON THE ULTRA LOW EMISSION ZONE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment summarising the Greater London Authority’s (GLA) evaluation of the impacts of the central London Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) over the first six months of operation.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

12. **2019 CAR FREE DAY UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding outcomes from the Car Free Day held on 22 September 2019. The Chairman introduced the report and noted the event had been successful despite relatively short notice and bad weather conditions on the day, and added his ambition that more Car Free Days and related events be held going forward.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Sub-Committee received a list of outstanding references. The Sub-Committee noted that the Planning & Transportation Committee would be considering dockless bikes at its next meeting, and that officers were still engaged with consultants on road markings.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

14. **THE CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION'S DRAFT SPORT AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STRATEGY FOR 2020-25**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Head of Corporate Strategy and Performance presenting the City of London Corporation's draft Sport and Physical Activity Strategy for 2020-2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chairman invited Common Councillor John Edwards to address the Committee regarding a proposal for the installation of a soft-surface running track within the City of London. Mr. Edwards outlined the proposal and presented the benefits of such a scheme to the Sub-Committee before discussing the idea with Members.

Whilst Members were broadly supportive of the concept, there were several practical elements of such a scheme that would require serious consideration before it could be progressed, such as the route taken by the track, costing and funding, managing different road user groups, and highway maintenance, and the Sub-Committee discussed these points. However, Members commended the ambition of such a project and recognised the positive impact and benefits of such a facility. The Sub-Committee agreed that the idea had merit, and that if the practical challenges could be navigated, such a project could be considered by Members in the future. The Chairman thanked John Edwards for his attendance and presentation, adding that he hoped the feedback from Members would be useful.

The Chairman then advised Members of meeting dates for 2020 and advised that calendar invitations would be circulated by the Town Clerk.

16. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.
17

Exempt Paragraphs

-

17. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was one item of other business.

The meeting closed at 12.00 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee
tel. no.: 020 7332 1480
Joseph.Anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees: Streets & Walkways Sub Committee Projects Sub Committee	Dates: 25 February 2020 24 February 2020
Subject: 150 Bishopsgate (Heron Plaza) Unique Project Identifier: 10717	Gateway 5: Authority to start work Regular
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Na'amah Hagiladi	For Decision
<h2 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h2>	

1. Status Update	<p>Project Description</p> <p>The project was initially developed in 2011 as part of a Section 106 obligation relating to the development of 150 Bishopsgate, also known as Heron Plaza, with a Section 278 agreement being entered into. The original design purpose was 'to enable the Development to be carried out and to enable traffic management issues arising from the Development to be addressed' and also to deliver other improvements, including trees along the northern footway of Houndsditch (to mirror those on the southern footway) and raise the carriageway in granite setts. A separate scheme purely focussed on security for the development was deferred pending further design work. The main project was approved via a Gateway 3-4-5 report in December 2012.</p> <p>Subsequent to the approval the development was put on hold, with activity recommencing and a new planning application approved in 2015. A new Section 106 agreement was also completed.</p> <p>During the intervening period it has been identified that the presence of a pipe subway beneath Houndsditch has meant that the trees on the south side of Houndsditch have failed to thrive, and the plan to plant trees on the northern side needed to be revised.</p> <p>In April 2019 Members approved an issue report to allow a process of revision to the design agreed in 2012. This is now</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>concluded with a design which fits with these constraints (see section 4 and appendix 3 for more details).</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £1,273,528</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): Increase of £463,425 since last Gateway 5 report to Committee in 2012 (see section 3 below for more information).</p> <p>Spend to Date: £304,883</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: Not applicable</p> <p>Funding source: Fully funded through S278 agreement (outside the fundamental review)</p> <p>Slippage:</p> <p>As notified in the issue report in April 2019 the slippage occurred due to the delays to the development. The works are planned to start in April / May 2020.</p>
<p>2. Requested decisions</p>	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 6: Outcome Report</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>In order to minimise disruption, the programme follows the developer's works which consists of completion of the privately-owned public realm. Next steps therefore are to start the procurement process to ensure materials are on site by the end of April 2020, and the public highways works are complete by October 2020.</p> <p>This report presents detailed design information and costs for the project, including maintenance costs (see Appendix 6).</p> <p>The next steps will be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extend the current Section 8 agreement to support traffic changes to Houndsditch; update the existing safety audit and submit traffic orders to deliver changes to parking, waiting and loading restrictions in Houndsditch 2. Set up a communication strategy to accompany the construction phase; 3. Implement the works. <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authorise officers to update the existing Section 278 agreement via exchange of letters; 2. Approve the budget of £954,856 for implementation of the works, to be funded through a Section 278 agreement; 3. Approve the revised total estimated cost of the project at £1,273,528 (excluding risk);

	<p>4. Authorise the extension of the Section 8 agreement and the making of a Traffic Management Order to amend parking, waiting and loading restrictions, subject to addressing any objections</p>											
<p>3. Budget</p>	<p>The previous scheme was approved with a total budget of £810,103, to be fully funded through a Section 278 agreement. The total budget for the revised scheme is £1,273,528</p> <p>The additional works and costs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of the trees on the south side of Houndsditch. • A commuted sum for maintenance of the hard landscaping for 20 years, and the maintenance of the new trees for 5 years (which was not fully included in the previous scheme). • New lighting which has a longer design life. • Provision of a root barrier and waterproofing around the pipe subway. • Additional street furniture (i.e. benches and cycle racks); and additional paving on the south side of Houndsditch due to settlement. • Works are also due to be carried out in a greater number of smaller sections than originally envisaged thereby extending the programme, and general cost inflation is also taken into consideration. <p>It has been agreed that an exchange of letters between the City and the developer is sufficient to confirm the updated proposals and budget.</p> <p>Table 1: Implementation Budget</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="529 1328 810 1507">Item</th> <th data-bbox="810 1328 1018 1507">Reason</th> <th data-bbox="1018 1328 1230 1507">Cost (£)</th> <th data-bbox="1230 1328 1386 1507">Funds/ Source of Funding</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="529 1507 810 1798">Highways Staff Costs</td> <td data-bbox="810 1507 1018 1798">Supervision of works, liaising with utilities companies, coordinating onsite works</td> <td data-bbox="1018 1507 1230 1798">£78,194</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1507 1386 1798" rowspan="2">S278</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="529 1798 810 2033">City Transport & City Public realm Staff Costs</td> <td data-bbox="810 1798 1018 2033">Facilitate regular construction management meetings; liaison and</td> <td data-bbox="1018 1798 1230 2033">£60,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funds/ Source of Funding	Highways Staff Costs	Supervision of works, liaising with utilities companies, coordinating onsite works	£78,194	S278	City Transport & City Public realm Staff Costs	Facilitate regular construction management meetings; liaison and	£60,000
Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funds/ Source of Funding									
Highways Staff Costs	Supervision of works, liaising with utilities companies, coordinating onsite works	£78,194	S278									
City Transport & City Public realm Staff Costs	Facilitate regular construction management meetings; liaison and	£60,000										

		consultation with stakeholders; maintain project documentation		
	Open Spaces Staff Costs	Supervision of works	£2,922	
	Fees	Traffic Regulation Order process; utilities surveys	£24,233	
	Works	Highways works,	£562,295	
		landscaping works	£14,108	
	Utilities		£75,700*	
	Lighting		£57,200	
	Maintenance	To maintain soft and hard landscaping for 20 years	£80,204*	
	Implementation budget		£954,856	
	<p><i>* Officers are working with the developer in an attempt to achieve efficiencies that may reduce these cost items.</i></p> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: None (low risk)</p>			
4. Design summary	<p>The project's aim is to improve the public realm experience while accommodating the new building and its impact on growth of pedestrian flow. The project's objectives set up in 2011 remain the same, apart from the removal of the trees on the north side of Houndsditch due to the constraints of the pipe subway. The objectives are to:</p>			

- Ensure there is a sufficient space for vehicles to pass those dropping off and picking up passengers within close proximity to the entrance to the Heron Plaza hotel;
- Ensure pedestrian movement in the area is safe and convenient;
- Deliver the physical changes in time for the occupation of the development; and
- Deliver an improved Houndsditch by introducing a raised carriageway, improved lighting, and liveable trees at the southern part of the street.

The design will include the following works:

- Construction of the footway and carriageway of Houndsditch between Outwich Street and Bishopsgate, with an area for vehicles to drop off/pick up passengers outside the entrance to Heron Plaza. Footways to be constructed in Yorkstone and the carriageway in Granite Setts as per the City standard palette of materials. Carriageway to be raised to create a flush surface with the footways. Provision for new street furniture including new cycle stands and bollards.
- Existing street lighting to be upgraded along the southern side of Houndsditch
- Existing street lighting to be upgraded along Devonshire Row
- New Lighting Installation along Brabon Alley
- Construction of new footway along the eastern side of Bishopsgate. Existing paving to be replaced with new Yorkstone paving.
- Construction of new footway along the southern side of Devonshire Row. Existing paving to be replaced with new Yorkstone setts.
- Construction of new footway along Cavendish Court. Existing paving to be replaced with new Yorkstone paving. New drainage to be introduced to suit changes to levels.
- Existing trees on south side of Houndsditch to be replaced with seven new trees and irrigation
- All existing utility covers to be adjusted to suit new levels. Existing footway covers to be replaced with new inset covers.
- Revised traffic order to suit 2-way movement at the junction of Houndsditch/Outwich Street to accommodate vehicles leaving the service bay. New signage to be introduced to reflect the changes.

	The design is a revised version of the one agreed in 2015 under the Heron Tower S.278(2) agreement and subsequently the Heron Tower 278(2) variation agreement. These designs mitigated the impact of the Heron Tower development.
5. Delivery team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Management - City Public Realm team • Construction package, lighting and works supervision - City Highways team • Planting - City of London Open Spaces Department • Construction – JB Riney (under the City’s term contract), including sub-contractors for utilities works and any other specialist contractors or sub-contractors as required • Traffic signal changes – Transport for London, including their sub-contractors and works supervision by City Transportation.
6. Programme and key dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacing the trees in south part of Houndsditch: End April 2020 to end May 2020 • Repair works to pipe subway: March-May 2020 • Start main construction works: End May 2020 • End main construction works: End September 2020 • Gateway 6 report: January 2021
7. Risks	<p>1. <i>The developers programme delays the start of the public realm works</i> Officers are liaising closely with the developer to minimise and mitigate any potential delays.</p> <p>2. <i>Presence of sub-surface utilities impacts on the delivery of the scheme</i> Surveys and trial holes have been undertaken in order to reduce this risk as much as possible.</p> <p>3. <i>Movement within the pipe subway structure exceeds the agreed tolerance causing delays to the onsite works schedule</i> Trial holes have been undertaken to assess the depth of these systems, and officers have established that repair works will need to be completed on the pipe subway. This has been factored into the project programme.</p> <p>Further information is available in the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>
8. Success criteria	<p>The project will continue to implement the success criteria it set up in 2012, as it will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliver the highway works in time for the occupation of the buildings.

	<p>2. Deliver a highway that is designed and implemented to the City's standards.</p> <p>3. Deliver the above without financial impact on the City.</p>
9. Progress reporting	This will be via the regular Project Vision progress reports with issues requiring decision coming back as an Issue Report.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	General Plan
Appendix 4	Site works programme
Appendix 5	Finance tables

Contact

Report Author	Na'amah Hagiladi
Email Address	Na'amah.Hagiladi@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1134

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Streets and Walkways <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 04 February 2020 24 February 2020 25 February 2020
Subject: Issue / Progress Report Greening Cheapside: Sunken Garden (Phase 1B) St. Paul's Tube Station Area Improvements (Phase 1)	Public
Unique Project Identifier: 10991	
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Decision
Report Author: Stefania Pizzato	
<h1 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Greening Cheapside project aims to enhance the local environment and improve air quality particularly through new green spaces and tree planting and by supporting the objectives of the City's joint health and wellbeing strategy as well as pollution reduction initiatives.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green</p> <p>Previous RAG status: Green</p> <p>Risk Status: Low</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project: £580,154 (£380,154 Phase 1, £200,000 Phase 1b)</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project Increase of £200,000 (Phase 1b) since last report to Committee</p> <p>Spend to Date: £307,779 of £380,154</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: not applicable</p> <p>Slippage: The construction works of the Phase 1 are delayed by 4 months due to delays of the manufacturing of the planters and road closures prior to the Lord Mayor show.</p>
2. Requested decisions	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 6 (Phase 1) Gateway 3/4/5 (Phase 1b)</p>

	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That an additional budget of £200,000 is approved for delivering Phase 1b of which an initial sum of £55,000 is allocated to reach the next Gateway. The full amount is to be funded from C Hoare & Co through a voluntary S278 contribution; 2. Approve the revised total project budget of £580,154 (£380,154 allocated for Phase 1, and £200,000 allocated for Phase 1b) subject to receipt of funding; 3. Authorise completion of one or more agreements between the City and C Hoare & Co for the provision of funding by C Hoare & Co for enhancements to the Sunken Garden. 														
<p>3. Budget</p>	<p><u>Sunken Garden (Phase 1b)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The below table shows the proposed budget to progress the project to the next Gateway 3/4/5 as well as deliver the installation of the Blue Plaque on site by next Autumn. <table border="1" data-bbox="644 1003 1235 1267"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Amount £</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P+T Staff Costs</td> <td>25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Env Serv Works</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open Spaces Staff Cost</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Env Servs Staff Costs</td> <td>10,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P&T Fees</td> <td>10,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>55,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The budget will be subject to finalisation of legal agreements between the City and C Hoare & Co, and to receipt of funding. <p><u>St Pauls Tube station Area Improvement (Phase 1)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The project expenditure is included in Appendix 2. 	Description	Amount £	P+T Staff Costs	25,000	Env Serv Works	5,000	Open Spaces Staff Cost	5,000	Env Servs Staff Costs	10,000	P&T Fees	10,000	Total	55,000
Description	Amount £														
P+T Staff Costs	25,000														
Env Serv Works	5,000														
Open Spaces Staff Cost	5,000														
Env Servs Staff Costs	10,000														
P&T Fees	10,000														
Total	55,000														
<p>4. Issue / Progress description</p>	<p><u>Project background</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. In January and February 2019, Members approved the Greening Cheapside Gateway 4/5 report, which proposed to deliver the project in 2 phases (see location map in appendix 03): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase 1: St Pauls Tube station Area Improvements - Phase 1b: Sunken Garden <p>This report set out the detailed design and requested authorisation to start works on St. Paul's Tube Station Area</p>														

Improvements (Phase 1) and recommended to carry out a design competition for the Sunken Garden enhancements (Phase 1b) using an allocated budget of £20k.

7. Works for Phase 1 have progressed as per the programme and are due to be completed by the end of March 2020.
8. The design competition for Phase 1b was cancelled as the project didn't manage to secure the original source of funding. The budget of £20k assigned for the design competition have then been reallocated to Phase 1.
9. Since then further discussions with other stakeholders have taken place, and officers have secured some external funding to progress Phase 1b through a voluntary S278 contribution with C Hoare & Co .

Sunken Garden (Phase 1b)

10. The City has engaged with C Hoare & Co who were interested to work with the City to develop a new design for the site, that included historic interpretation of the founding building of the Bank, originally located in the site of the Sunken Garden.
11. The Bank will be celebrating its 350th anniversary in Summer 2022 and would like to commemorate this event with the unveiling of a blue plaque in memory of Sir Richard Hoare, who was the founder of C. Hoare & Co.
12. Following very positive conversations with City of London officers, C Hoare & Co has agreed in principle to donate £200k to deliver public realm enhancements works to the Sunken Garden. These include:
 - Re-design the area to enhance the garden and encourage community interactions, through reviewing the existing seating and planters, whilst tackling anti-social behaviour;
 - Include potential innovative biodiversity measures, including sustainable urban drainage and low maintenance, sustainable planting, that can be used as a pilot for future projects in the City;
 - Deliver some historic interpretation of the original Bank site including the installation of a Blue Plaque in memory of Sir Richard Hoare.
13. It has been agreed that the bank will be donating the funding in two stages, each one accompanied by a separate legal agreement as follows:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £100k to initiate a design appraisal for the area, engage with local stakeholders, fabricate and install a blue plaque to be on site by Summer 2022; - a second contribution of £100k to finalise the Sunken Garden new design and implement works on site for the Bank Anniversary. <p style="text-align: center;"><u>St Pauls Tube station Area Improvement (Phase 1) update</u></p> <p>14. The works began on site in November 2019 and includes the installation of new planters, trees and a refill water fountain. Implementation will be completed by mid-February 2020, and snagging works by March 2020.</p>
5. Next Steps	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Sunken Garden (Phase 1b)</u></p> <p>15. Finalise legal agreements with C Hoare & Co and arrange for funding to be received</p> <p>16. Initiate engagement with local stakeholder to understand issues and objectives for the site</p> <p>17. Appoint an external consultant in innovative green sustainable measures to develop a proposal for the area</p> <p>18. Liaise with Historic Environment and City surveyors to deliver the installation of the blue plaque by Autumn 2020</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>St Pauls Tube station Area Improvement (Phase 1)</u></p> <p>19. Submit Gateway 6 report to the relevant Committees to update on the completion of the Phase 1 works. This will be at the next combined outcome reports in Autumn 2020 committees.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Cover Sheet
Appendix 2	Phase 1 Finance table
Appendix 3	Location plan
Appendix 4	Phase 1b Risk Register

Contact

Report Author	Stefania Pizzato
Email Address	Stefania.pizzato@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3903

Agenda Item 6

Committees: Streets and Walkways <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 25 February 2020 24 February 2020
Subject: Bernard Morgan House Public Realm Unique Project Identifier: 12056	Gateway 3/4: Options Appraisal (Regular) Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Sarah Jane Enson	For Decision

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Deliver public realm enhancements in the area surrounding the new development at Bernard Morgan House.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (unchanged from last Gateway)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (unchanged from last Gateway)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): up to £725,505 (inc. spend to date).</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): Within range provided in Gateway 2 report (£250,000 - £800,000)</p> <p>Spend to Date: £14,144</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: None to date</p> <p>Funding Source: The project is fully funded via a Section 278 agreement and is not impacted by the Fundamental Review.</p> <p>Slippage: Programme slippage of six months - negotiations with the developer regarding scope of works took longer than anticipated to complete; personnel changes within the developer team has led to delays in progressing the project.</p> <p>Additionally, the site is not fully accessible due to the developers hoarding blocking access, preventing the completion of required surveys and therefore limiting the extent of work that can be undertaken on the detailed design. This is likely to delay completion of detailed designs and start of works.</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 5: Authority to Start Work</p> <p>Next Steps: Officers will continue to progress the detailed design as far as possible until the site is fully accessible in May 2020. The following steps will be completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertaking radar surveys and completion of the detailed design.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison with local stakeholders and residents on the final design. • Finalising and approving the construction package with the City’s Highway Term Contractor to prepare for a start on site in early Autumn 2020. • Finalising the S278 agreement with the developer to receive the additional funding to proceed with the scheme. • Submitting a Gateway 5 report to obtain authority to start works in Summer 2020. <p>Requested decisions: It is recommended that Members of Streets & Walkways Sub Committee and Projects Sub Committee:</p> <p>i) Authorise officers to invoice the developer for £85,361 to undertake work to progress to Gateway 5 (see section 3 table 1 below), in advance of the full S278 payment to avoid delays to the programme. The amount would be deducted from the full S278 payment.</p> <p>ii) Approve Option 1 at a cost of up to £725,505, fully funded by a Section 278 agreement with Taylor Wimpy, the developer of Bernard Morgan House.</p> <p>iii) Authorise officers to publish proposals in relation to any necessary traffic orders or other consents to implement the project as described in this report.</p>
<p>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</p>	<p>Expenditure to date is £14,144. Activities completed include local stakeholder consultation sessions and communication, development of detailed designs based on stakeholder feedback, negotiations with the developer regarding design options, liaison with officers in Open Spaces, Legal and Transportation regarding details of the design and their wider impact. There has been some underspend due to the inability to progress the detailed designs due to the lack of radar surveys.</p> <p>Table 1 outlines the revised budget to reach the next Gateway (5) and includes the sum requested in this report (£85,361) and the spend to date (£14,144). Implementation of Gateway 3-4 will require staff time from DBE alongside work from colleagues across the Corporation as appropriate. These Highways and P&T staff costs will cover project management, detailed design and construction package completion, local stakeholder liaison, developer negotiation and report writing.</p> <div style="background-color: #cccccc; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <p>Table 1: Revised Budget to reach next Gateway - Bernard Morgan House S278</p> </div>

Description	Approved Budget (£)	Resources required to reach next Gateway (£)	Revised Budget to next Gateway (£)
Fees	14,430	6,500	20,930
Highways Staff Costs	2,570	32,361	34,931
P&T Staff Costs	18,000	40,000	58,000
Surveys	0	6500	6500
TOTAL	35,000	85,361	120,361

Table 2: Funding Source	
Funding Source	Amount (£)
S278	120,361
TOTAL	120,361

Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £0

4. Overview of project options

Progress to date:

In February 2019, Members approved a Gateway 2 report for the progress of Bernard Morgan House public realm project to progress to detailed options appraisal.

The following activities have taken place:

- i) Stakeholder consultation sessions with local residents, neighbours, schools and businesses.
- ii) Evaluation of stakeholder consultation and development of two options for concept designs for the area which respond to stakeholder feedback.
- iii) Negotiations with the developer and agreement on Option 1 as the preferred option for the area.
- iv) Topographical surveys of the site.
- v) Drafting of the S278 agreement which will be finalised subject to option approval by this Committee.

Project options developed:

Following public consultations with local residents, businesses and occupiers, two design options were developed and negotiated with the developer (see appendix 3a and 3b).

Option 1 reflects the scope outlined in the S106 agreement. It proposes the installation of new Yorkstone paving around the development, work to the Golden Lane zebra crossing and footway which will need to be realigned, and granite setts to the vehicle access dropped kerb on Brackley Street. It also includes raising the TfL bike rack so that it stands on the pavement rather

	<p>than its current position in the highway in accordance with City design standards.</p> <p>Option 2 was wider in scope and reflected many of the comments raised during stakeholder consultation. This design included the changes outlined in option 1, in addition to further repaving and changes to the existing Fann Street vehicle gate which residents raised as an issue in the consultation sessions. The two option designs are detailed in the appraisal matrix.</p> <p>Local Ward Members expressed a desire that measures to improve Fortune Street Park be included as part of the project given the proximity of the development. However, as the park is located in the London Borough of Islington it is therefore outside of the scope of this project.</p> <p>Officers presented the developer with the feedback from the stakeholder consultation in addition to the two options designs and their cost estimates. Following a number of negotiation meetings and consideration of all options, the developer confirmed that they are not in a position to invest in the site beyond the scope outlined in the S106 agreement. The developer agreed the designs for option 1 which is compliant with the S106 agreement.</p> <p><u>Proposed way forward:</u> The developer anticipates completion of the building in May 2020 and plans to open the building in late Summer 2020. The developer considers the public realm improvements as integral to the building completion as all entrances to the building will be impacted.</p> <p>It is proposed that the implementation of works begin as soon as possible in early Autumn 2020 to ensure completion after the opening of the new development.</p>
<p>5. Recommended option</p>	<p>Following public consultation and negotiation with the developer, officers recommend that Members approve option 1, as the developer has been clear that they are not in a position to fund option 2 which has a larger scope of cost.</p> <p>Officers have consulted with local stakeholders, residents and Ward Members, and their concerns and comments have been considered, however this option reflects the scope outlined in the S106 agreement.</p>
<p>6. Risk</p>	<p><i>1. Delays in completing detailed designs and construction package</i> Risk response: Accept Topographical and radar surveys were not completed prior to the developer occupying the site in 2017. Topographical surveys were completed in December 2019 by working with the</p>

developer to move some hoarding on site and allow access to surveyors. However, radar surveys cannot be completed until the site is cleared by the developer in April/May 2020. This will delay the completion of the detailed design, construction package and programme for public realm works commencing. Officers will work to complete the construction package as far as possible so that this delay can be minimised.

2. Sub-surface utilities / structures or other archaeological remains cause issues during constructions

Risk response: Reduce

Surveys have been undertaken to determine the extent of sub-surface elements as far as possible. Detailed designs will be developed to take into account the utility information provided by the surveys. Further investigations will be carried out to determine the extent of underground structures and basements. This risk will be closely monitored during the implementation phase and avoided where possible. Any costs reasonably incurred over and above the estimate due to sub-surface issues will be recoverable from the developer under the S278 agreement.

3. Stakeholder concern that the scope of the scheme does not include Fortune Street Park

Risk response: Accept

This development is situated on the boundary of the City and neighbours Fortune Street Park which lies within the boundary of LB Islington. Local stakeholders have raised concerns about the impact the development will have within the park in terms of higher footfall, however it is not within the City boundary or identified within the scope outlined within the S106 agreement, and therefore is not part of the scope of this project. LB Islington is considering changes to Fann Street (i.e. closing the road to through traffic except resident vehicles and school buses) to create a more attractive pedestrian experience which would in turn reduce pedestrian footfall through the park.

4. The scope of the scheme does not respond to all feedback raised during consultations

Risk response: Accept

The scope of option 1 does not address all of the concerns raised by local residents and stakeholders during public consultation regarding neighbouring pavement quality, air quality or driver behaviour. Officers have negotiated with the developer as far as possible to highlight what could be achieved with further investment and the risk of stakeholder disappointment with option 1. Within the vicinity of this project, air quality is being addressed by officers through the Beech Street project which is predicted to reduce vehicle traffic in the area and streets within the scope of this project. Driver behaviour is similarly being considered by officers in a neighbouring project looking at the corner of Fann Street and

	Aldersgate Street. Officers are working collaboratively to address local stakeholder concerns in nearby projects wherever possible.
7. Procurement approach	It is proposed that the works will be delivered by the City of London's Highways Term Contractor and any nominated sub-contractor or utilities provider as necessary, under the supervision of the Department of the Built Environment.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Risk Register (for recommended option)
Appendix 3	Design options
Appendix 4	Finance tables

Contact

Report Author	Sarah Jane Enson
Email Address	sarahjane.enson@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1688

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2
<p>1. Brief description of option</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reparations as outlined in S278, including repaving of footways adjacent to the development in Yorkstone paving, kerb realignment on Golden Lane, removal of redundant traffic signs and columns. • Works to Golden Lane zebra crossing to improve accessibility. 	<p>Option 1 plus the following additional works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repaving additional footways at Golden Lane, Fann Street, Brackley Street, Viscount Street. • Improvements to emergency access gate in Fann Street to improve pedestrian and cycle safety.
<p>2. Scope and exclusions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to the pedestrian highway in the immediate vicinity of the development and to Golden Lane zebra crossing. • The pedestrian highway opposite the development island is excluded. • The following stakeholder consultation issues would not be directly addressed: poor air quality, lack of greening, issues with the Fann Street vehicle gate, issues with the paving on the opposite side of the highway from the development island. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to the pedestrian highway in the immediate vicinity of the development and to Golden Lane zebra crossing. • Improvements to the footways opposite the development and to the Fann Street vehicle gate. • The following stakeholder consultation issues would not be fully addressed: poor air quality, lack of greening.
<p>Project Planning</p>		

3. Programme and key dates	<p>Overall project: Autumn 2020</p> <p>Key dates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalise S278 Agreement – Feb 2020 2. Site surveys – May 2020 3. Draft construction package – May-July 2020 4. Gateway 5 report – Jun 2020 5. Issue Construction package – July 2020 6. Pre-construction planning – July-Sept 2020 7. Project construction – Sept-Dec 2020 	
4. Risk implications	<p>Overall project option risk: Low</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delays in completing detailed designs and construction package 2. Sub-surface utilities / structures or other archaeological remains cause issues during constructions 3. Stakeholder concern that the scope of the scheme does not include Fortune Street Park 4. The scope of the scheme does not respond to all feedback raised during consultations <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>	
5. Stakeholders and consultees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer of Bernard Morgan House 2. Local Ward Members 3. London Borough of Islington 4. Owners/occupiers of adjacent buildings, including local residents 	
6. Benefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality public realm within the immediate vicinity of the development will be achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality public realm in the wider vicinity of the development will be achieved. • Stakeholder concerns regarding uneven

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of option has been agreed by the developer. 	footway, and driver behaviour at Fann Street Gate will be addressed.
7. Disbenefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design does not address all of the issues raised during stakeholder consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design does not address all of the issues raised during stakeholder consultation • Scope of option has not been agreed by developer.
Resource Implications		
8. Total estimated cost	Total estimated cost (excluding risk) up to: £725,505 (inc. spend to date).	Total estimated cost (excluding risk) up to: £966,375 (inc. spend to date).
9. Funding strategy	Fully funded by a Section 278 with the developer. Please see Appendix 4 for finance tables.	
10. Investment appraisal	None – scheme is fully funded by Section 278 with the developer.	
11. Estimated capital value/return	N/A	
12. Ongoing revenue implications	The cost of the scheme includes the commuted sum which accounts for the anticipated replacement of the materials and street furniture for 20 years.	
13. Affordability	This scheme offers good value for money which has been deemed affordable by the developer.	This scheme offers good value for money but has been deemed unaffordable by the developer.
14. Legal implications	A Section 278 agreement will be entered into with the developer to secure payment for the works and comply with an obligation of the Section 106 agreement.	

15. Corporate property implications	None	
16. Traffic implications	None	
17. Sustainability and energy implications	None	
18. IS implications	N/A	
19. Equality Impact Assessment	The impact assessment concluded that there is a no impact on equality criteria as a result of this project. The proposal aims to improve accessibility for pedestrians by improving the footway quality.	
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	N/A	
21. Recommendation	Recommended	Not recommended

Committees: Streets & Walkways Sub Committee Projects Sub Committee	Dates: 25 February 2020 24 February 2020
Subject: 55 Moorgate Section 278 Public Realm and Highway Improvements Unique Project Identifier: 12028	Gateway 5: Light Authority to start work
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Emmanuel Ojugo	For Decision

PUBLIC

1. Status Update	<p>Project Description: To deliver public realm enhancements to Nun Court and the surrounding footway of the development 55 Moorgate. The enhancements will include the creation of a new pedestrian link between Moorgate and Coleman Street, greening measures, such as tree planting, subject to site conditions, as well as a widening of the footway on Coleman Street outside the development. Please see Appendix 3 for an indicative artistic impression of proposed Improvements on Coleman Street.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Project initiated at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Project initiated at last report to committee)</p> <p>*Funding Source: A Section 278 voluntary contribution provision from the developer of 55 Moorgate.</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project: £322,634 (inclusive of £27,500 spend-to-date and £276,136 for implementation and £23,249 for commuted maintenance sum).</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): Increase of £122,634 against higher estimated capital cost since last report to Committee, however this considers a design specification revision and commuted sums for related maintenance agreed with the developer to be specified in the final Section 278 agreement currently being finalised with the developer.</p> <p>Spend to Date: £27,500</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: Not applicable;</p> <p>Slippage: The first phase of the project was expected to start on site in Q4 of 2019, however due to delays in the developer’s programme and the impact of other adjacent development activity at 51 Moorgate and 74 Coleman Street affecting common work areas; it was subsequently agreed that the public realm enhancement works would be phased accordingly to coincide with the site being made available to the City.</p> <p>The common work area concerns Nun Court as activity from the developer of 55 Moorgate as well as adjacent developments at 51</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Moorgate and 74 Coleman Street, that also require Nun Court access to complete their building works; and agree access to a utility service plant on private land that services all concerned.</p> <p>In order to accommodate developer requirements, enhancement works are now expected to be carried out in two phases and are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Phase 1: Resurfacing works to Coleman Street and Moorgate footways inclusive of tree planting are to be initiated in June 2020.</p> <p>Phase 2: Resurfacing works to Nun Court are expected to begin in September 2020 to coincide with building works to adjacent developments.</p> <p>*The funding provision for this project is not to be considered part of the Fundamental Review of projects. The project funding is a voluntary provision that is site specific and therefore, ring fenced, a direct result of the developer's desire to improve the area adjacent to their development at 55 Moorgate that is currently under construction.</p>
<p>2. Requested decisions</p>	<p>Next Gateway: <i>Gateway 6: Outcome Report</i></p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction package to be completed and the materials ordered upon the signing of the Section 278 agreement and receipt of funding. • The project will be implemented on site in June 2020 following the development's practical completion in March/April 2020. It is envisaged that the works will take 12-14 weeks to complete and will be phased to coincide with the developers' programmes. • The necessary Traffic Orders will be made to relocate the parking bays on Coleman Street. <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That additional budget totalling £299,385 is approved to progress with the implementation of the project, funded by a Section 278 Agreement with the developer and to reach the next Gateway. This is inclusive of any underspends from the previous gateway. 2. Authority to start work be granted subject to completion of the Section 278 Agreement and receipt of full funding from the developer; 3. Approval is given for City officers to publish proposals in relation to any necessary traffic orders or other consents to implement the project as described in this report. (Traffic orders will be necessary to relocate parking bays outside the development on Coleman Street); 4. Delegated authority be given to the Director of Transportation and Public Realm to consider any objections to the traffic orders detailed in this report given the minor infraction of relocating existing traffic bays a few metres south of their current location;

	<p>5. Delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of City Public Realm and Head of Finance to adjust the project budget between staff costs, fees and works providing the overall budget is not exceeded beyond standard tolerances in accordance with the Section 278 agreement.</p>																																		
<p>3. Budget</p>	<p>Budget Increase from previous Gateway The total estimated cost of the project at project initiation (Gateway 1&2) was a broad range of between £100k and £200k. This estimated cost has now been refined as the scheme has developed, to £322,634 less the £27,500 (pre-evaluation stage) spent to reach Gateway 5. Therefore, £299,385 is available for implementation and maintenance now the project detailed design has been developed to an advanced stage and the necessary maintenance considerations have been accounted for. A detailed breakdown of the budget required to implement the scheme is contained in Table 1 below.</p> <p>Implementation Budget and Expected Spend It is expected that most of the funds will be spent in the second quarter of 2020 (subject to the development’s practical completion) and construction is planned to take 12-14 weeks. There will also be some expenditure in the third quarter of 2020 to cover the remaining weeks of implementation in Nun Court, inclusive of staff time needed for supervision, snagging, report writing and monitoring post-implementation.</p> <p>The budget has increased from the initial estimate due to the higher scope option agreed with the developer of 55 Moorgate and the decision to better define greening measures as “street trees” on Coleman Street subject to ground conditions. The project scope is unaltered in accordance the previous Gateway 1&2 and is to be fully funded by the developer of 55 Moorgate through a Section 278 Agreement.</p> <p>Table 1: Estimated Implementation costs</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 1429 1474 2018"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Staff Time</td> <td>P&T Staff Costs – Project Management</td> <td>18,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P&T Staff Costs – Transportation statutory functions to alter the status of public highway</td> <td>3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highways Staff Costs</td> <td>26,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open Spaces Staff Costs</td> <td>2,039</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fees</td> <td>Surveys and Traffic Orders</td> <td>5,350</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works</td> <td>Implementation on Site</td> <td>186,247</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Utilities</td> <td>35,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sub-total Implementation</td> <td></td> <td>276,136</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Committed / Maintenance Sum</td> <td>Highways</td> <td>11,652</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open Spaces</td> <td>11,597</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sub-total</td> <td></td> <td>23,249</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>For Implementation Phase & Maintenance</td> <td>299,385*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Description	Cost (£)	Staff Time	P&T Staff Costs – Project Management	18,000	P&T Staff Costs – Transportation statutory functions to alter the status of public highway	3,000	Highways Staff Costs	26,500	Open Spaces Staff Costs	2,039	Fees	Surveys and Traffic Orders	5,350	Works	Implementation on Site	186,247	Utilities	35,000	Sub-total Implementation		276,136	Committed / Maintenance Sum	Highways	11,652	Open Spaces	11,597	Sub-total		23,249	TOTAL	For Implementation Phase & Maintenance	299,385*
Item	Description	Cost (£)																																	
Staff Time	P&T Staff Costs – Project Management	18,000																																	
	P&T Staff Costs – Transportation statutory functions to alter the status of public highway	3,000																																	
	Highways Staff Costs	26,500																																	
	Open Spaces Staff Costs	2,039																																	
Fees	Surveys and Traffic Orders	5,350																																	
Works	Implementation on Site	186,247																																	
	Utilities	35,000																																	
Sub-total Implementation		276,136																																	
Committed / Maintenance Sum	Highways	11,652																																	
	Open Spaces	11,597																																	
Sub-total		23,249																																	
TOTAL	For Implementation Phase & Maintenance	299,385*																																	

	<p>* Any unspent funds from the previous gateway will be transferred to the implementation budget.</p> <p>* Following completion of the project any unspent funds will be returned to the developer in accordance with the terms of the Section 278 agreement.</p>
<p>4. Design summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project scope includes enhancements to Nun Court to enable an attractive new pedestrian link between Coleman Street and Moorgate, as well as enhancements to Coleman Street outside the development's new entrance. Additionally, the reconstruction of the footways outside the development on Moorgate in high-quality York stone paving to the City's specification. Please see appendix 2 for the project scope. • Nun Court will be paved in small module York setts to create a continuous pedestrian surface from Coleman Street through to the new passageway created by the 55 Moorgate development. The design will be consistent in material through to the private section of the new walkway. • The footway outside the development on Coleman Street will be widened by relocating two parking bays and using the available width. The widened footway will be paved in York stone. • The paving outside the development on Moorgate will be repaved in York stone. • Traffic orders will be necessary as there are two parking bays which require relocation. One of the parking bays is a disabled bay which will be relocated just south of Nun Court by replacing a pay & display bay to maintain its proximity to the area. The resulting two pay & display parking bays needing relocation will be relocated to Basinghall Street. • Two street trees will be planted in the widened footway area on Coleman Street adjacent to the development's main entrance to provide some greening to the scheme. Tree planting is subject to final confirmation of feasibility which will be ascertained through standard site condition appraisals. • Lighting improvements to Nun Court and the frontage of the developments on Coleman Street and Moorgate are a planning condition. The lighting levels will align with the City Lighting Strategy SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) and be adjustable as they will form part of the City's connected lighting system. • Coleman Street is being explored as a Pedestrian Priority Street as part of the delivery of the City of London Transport Strategy (published in May 2019). Although this proposal supports the pedestrian priority aspiration, changes to the layout may be required in the future.

5. Delivery team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project owner/Project Management: CoL City Public Realm team • Detailed design: CoL Highways, City Transportation • Construction Management: CoL Highways • CoL's Highways term contractor: JB Riney • Principal Designer: CoL Highways • Principal Contractor: JB Riney
6. Programme and key dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete Section 278 agreement: February 2020 • Committee Approval – February 2020 • Order Materials: March 2020 • Construction pack: March 2020 • Development's practical completion: March/April 2020 • Implementation (phased/staggered 12-14 week programme) *. <u>Phase 1</u>: June 2020 – August 2020. <u>Phase 2</u>: September – December 2020 • Monitoring: January 2021 – February 2021 • Gateway 6: March 2021 <p>*Please note the implementation programme is subject to the development's practical completion in March/April 2020 and receipt of funding. Also, subject to site conditions, trees will likely be planted in the final quarter of 2020 to coincide with the Open Spaces planting season.</p>
7. Risks	<p>Overall project risk: Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project not delivered to programme <i>Risk response: reduce</i> <p>The developer requires the public realm works to be completed as soon as possible following the development's practical completion. Therefore, the works are programmed to be implemented accordingly. Officers are coordinating with the developer's contractor on a frequent basis to ensure their works are to programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees cannot be planted due to the lack of underground space <i>Risk response: fallback</i> <p>Trial holes will be carried out to confirm the feasibility of trees once the hoarding of the development has been removed. If there is not enough space for the trees due to utilities underground, the same scheme can be delivered without the trees. However, alternative greening measures will be considered in consultation with the developer and Department of Open Spaces. Relocating the trees is possible, whilst providing planters, though less desirable in this location, may be a viable alternative which require less depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays to works adjacent to the site mean that implementation must be done in separate phases, incurring costs and timescale increases <i>Risk response: reduce</i> <p>The developer's work programme and the programme of adjacent developments will be coordinated through ongoing communication. The works will not start until after the practical completion of the 55</p>

	Moorgate development, and the requirements of 74 Coleman Street will be ascertained early so the Section 278 works are phased to minimise the risk of having to postpone implementation phases.
8. Success criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The creation of a new pedestrian walkway which enables improved pedestrian movement in the City. 2) Improved lighting and high-quality materials which increases public perceptions of safety when using the new passageway. 3) The meeting of the developer's aspirations and requirements by ensuring the surrounding highways work is completed in accordance with the agreed revised public realm enhancement specification. 4) The meeting of the developer's aspirations and requirements by ensuring the surrounding highway work is completed prior to occupation of the development.
9. Progress reporting	Progress will be reported through Project Vision on a monthly basis. Should an issue arise that requires a decision this will be communicated with an Issue Report.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Location Plan
Appendix 2	General Arrangement Plan
Appendix 3	Indicative Artistic Impression of Proposed Improvements on Coleman Street
Appendix 4	Project Cover Sheet
Appendix 5	Risk Register

Contact

Report Author	Emmanuel Ojugo
Email Address	emmanuel.ojugo@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1158

Committees: Streets and Walkways Committee <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 25 February 2020 24 February 2020
Subject: St Mary Axe Experimental Timed Closure (within City Cluster Vision Phase 1 – Activation, Greening and Experiments programme)	Gateway 3/4: Options Appraisal (Regular)
Unique Project Identifier: 12072	
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Averil Pittaway	For Decision
<h1 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Descriptions:</p> <p><u>City Cluster Vision – Phase 1</u></p> <p>The activation, greening and experiments programme is Phase 1 of the implementation of the City Cluster Vision. It includes a series of temporary and permanent installations and experiments that aim to enhance and activate the streets and public realm of the City Cluster as well as trialling changes ahead of long-term transformation. As part of this programme of work, a workstream on St Mary Axe to deliver pedestrian priority through a peak time experimental road closure is proposed. This report focuses on this particular strand of the delivery programme.</p> <p>This report is submitted ahead of a programme update report for other elements of the Phase 1 programme, which will follow in April 2020. This is to accelerate the pace of delivery for the experimental closure on St Mary Axe so that it could be in place this summer, delivering meaningful improvements in safety and comfort for local workers and visitors.</p> <p>Within the April 2020 report on the Phase 1 programme, the other proposed prioritised measures will be discussed with estimated costs for delivering the remaining elements of the programme, as well as an update on what has already been delivered. By this time the detailed costings for the proposed St Mary Axe project will also be identified giving a full picture of proposed cost for the delivery of the Phase 1 programme.</p> <p>RAG Status: Amber (Phase 1 Programme was Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Medium (Phase 1 Programme was Low at last report to Committee)</p>
-------------------------	--

Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £250,000 - £750,000

Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): No change since last report to Committee

Spend to Date: £95,000 (forecast to April 2020)

Funding Source: Ringfenced external funding (outside of Fundamental Review)

Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A

Slippage: the next report on the programme has slipped from January to April 2020.

Next Gateway: Gateway 3/4/5: Authority to Start Work

The below proposal forms part of the above delivery programme and sits within the above total estimated cost of the City Cluster Phase 1 programme.

St Mary Axe experimental timed closure:

An experimental timed closure of St Mary Axe to motor vehicles during peak times has been identified as a suitable short-term intervention within the City cluster Phase 1 programme.

St Mary Axe is a key pedestrian route into the City Cluster from Liverpool Street and Fenchurch Street stations and at peak times has a very high pedestrian density. Nearly 80% of people supported timed closures of St Mary Axe through the City Cluster Vision Consultation in 2018.

This experimental measure can be implemented quickly as there will be minimal impacts on the rest of the highway network. It will allow immediate improvements to be made to the comfort and safety of people walking on St Mary Axe ahead of any longer-term streetscape change or permanent timed closure being investigated. A complementary programme of lunchtime street closures over the summer may also be progressed on St Mary Axe, and this will be part of a separate report.

To note, this report only covers the cost for this one element of the Phase 1 programme and is requested to be set up as a subset of the overall Phase 1 programme funding.

RAG Status: Green

Risk Status: Medium

Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £270,000 (max)

Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): N/A

Spend to Date: £5,000

Funding Source: Ringfenced external funding (outside of Fundamental Review)

Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A

Slippage: N/A

	<p>The estimated cost of this experiment at this time has been based on the worst case scenario of having to have two gates as part of the design and for the experiment to be in place for the full 18 months which would extend the monitoring and engagement phases of the project.</p> <p>The £270k is an estimated maximum cost to deliver the St Mary's Axe experiment as part of the overall Phase 1 programme. It is envisaged that once the design is fixed and some further stakeholder engagement undertaken ahead of the Gateway 5 report, that this maximum amount will not be required.</p>
<p>2. Next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 5: Authority to Start Work (For St Mary Axe)</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue engagement with building occupiers and other stakeholders (e.g. taxi trade, emergency services etc.). • Detailed design to be undertaken by DBE staff • Submit for any relevant approvals for the experiment from Transport for London • A delegated Gateway 5 approval targeted in April 2020 – subject to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairman, deciding to proceed with the Experimental Traffic Order after considering any equality implications, the Director shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notify statutory parties of the intention to make the experimental traffic order. (if any responses to this raise significant or unexpected concerns, the matter will be referred back to Members for decision.) ○ Make the ETO ○ A six-month statutory public consultation period begins when the ETO comes into force ○ Construct the minor works ○ Monitor the scheme impacts <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree that St Mary Axe experimental timed closure project be established as part of the City Cluster phase 1 programme; 2. That an additional budget of £41,699 is approved to reach the next Gateway (G5) giving a total budget of £46,699 for the St Mary Axe experimental timed closure project, and to be set up using a separate cost code to the main Phase 1 project code; 3. Agree the total estimated maximum cost of the St Mary Axe experimental timed closure project is £270,000 (excluding risk); 4. That Option 2, trial the closure of St Mary Axe to motor traffic at peak periods through an Experimental Traffic Order and maintain the existing motorcycle bays, is approved to proceed into detailed design; 5. Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment to approve budget adjustments, above the existing authority within the project procedures and in consultation with Chamberlains, between budget lines if this is within the approved total project budget amount; and

	<p>6. That the next Gateway report proceeds under delegation to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairman, subject to:</p> <p>a) project cost not exceeding the maximum of £270,000 and the Director of the Built Environment and Chairman being satisfied with the equality implications after considering the review currently being prepared.</p>																				
<p>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</p>	<p>For recommended Option 2:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="464 555 1326 1200"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P&T Staff costs</td> <td>Project management and business engagement</td> <td>S106</td> <td>£17,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highways Staff costs</td> <td>Detailed design</td> <td>S106</td> <td>£12,349</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fees</td> <td>Design surveys and trial holes</td> <td>S106</td> <td>£11,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>£41,699</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: N/A</p> <p>P&T staff costs includes 176 hours of Project Manager and Principal Project Manager time to undertake engagement with impacted businesses and project management tasks. Highways staff costs includes up to 165 hours of engineer staff time depending upon the preferred design for the barrier or barriers. Fees cover (but are not limited to) costs for surveys and trial holes for the location of the barriers and signage.</p> <p>Finance tables can be found in Appendix 4.</p>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	P&T Staff costs	Project management and business engagement	S106	£17,600	Highways Staff costs	Detailed design	S106	£12,349	Fees	Design surveys and trial holes	S106	£11,750	Total			£41,699
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)																		
P&T Staff costs	Project management and business engagement	S106	£17,600																		
Highways Staff costs	Detailed design	S106	£12,349																		
Fees	Design surveys and trial holes	S106	£11,750																		
Total			£41,699																		
<p>4. Overview of project options</p>	<p>The core of the experiment is to trial the closure of St Mary Axe to motor vehicles during the morning (08:00 – 09:30) and evening (16:30 – 18:30) peak periods on weekdays. These times have been chosen as they are the times when pedestrian numbers are at their highest, and to minimise disruption to businesses who require vehicle access from St Mary Axe.</p> <p>St Mary Axe is one of the busiest pedestrian streets in the Cluster with narrow and overcrowded footways, where there are over 5,000 people on the street during each peak period. The City Cluster Vision proposes to implement a timed closure on St Mary Axe, along with a raised and</p>																				

narrowed carriageway and wider footways. This will provide a pedestrian priority axis connecting Houndsditch to Fenchurch Street (via Lime Street, which has an existing timed closure) during the daytime. A timed closure can also help facilitate outdoor events and activities to animate the streets, such as Lunchtime Streets during the summer months. This experiment looks to provide the functionality of the overall vision in advance of delivering a higher quality public realm design for the space as a key pedestrian corridor in the cluster.

The proposed experiment will allow the City to 'live trial' the timed closure element of the proposal, to monitor the impact on vehicle access to businesses and other access needs, as well as benefits such as any increases in pedestrian and cycle flows and improvements to air quality.

Measures of success for the experiment are proposed to include;

- Whether businesses can still meet the delivery and access needs;
- Journey times are not significantly impacted on surrounding streets; and
- Perceptions of pedestrian and cycle comfort on St Mary Axe improve

Improvement in air quality is also expected during the timed closure periods, and it is planned to be monitored throughout the trial to establish the benefits of timed closures in this location.

The experiment can be amended if necessary, while providing an immediate improvement to the comfort and safety of people walking and cycling. This can be done within the overall 18-month time limit of an experimental order.

If the experiment is deemed successful in terms of public response and monitoring information, Members may decide to make it permanent. The experiment can help inform designs for the future streetscape proposals based on how people walking, and cycling use the street when motor traffic is removed. It could also be the start of a number of trials and experiments in the City Cluster, to test proposals ahead of permanent changes being developed.

The experimental timed closure of St Mary Axe aligns with;

- the **Activation and Greening Programme's** objectives by improving pedestrian comfort and experience; the **City Cluster Vision** objectives of enabling positive growth through enhanced routes for pedestrians and prioritising pedestrians over vehicles;
- the **City's Transport Strategy** by delivering pedestrian priority streets (Proposal 2) and using timed and temporary street closures to help make streets safer and more attractive places to walk, cycle and spend time (Proposal 13); and
- the objectives of the **TfL's Liveable Neighbourhood** aspirations, of which St Mary Axe is located within, by promoting walking and cycling, reducing the fear of road danger, reducing motor traffic

dominance, increasing the active use of streets as public space and improving air quality.

A variety of data has been collected for St Mary Axe to provide context on how the street is currently used, including pedestrian, cycle and motor traffic volumes, kerbside activity (loading/unloading and passenger drop off and pick up) and Healthy Streets Checks and Healthy Streets Mystery Shopper surveys. This data will be collected again once the experiment is live so that it can be monitored.

Engagement is also being undertaken with occupiers and businesses who are either located on St Mary Axe, or who have vehicle access requirements from there. This engagement will be continued during the experiment along with formal public consultation as required by the experimental traffic order process.

Both options propose to;

- Trial the closure of St Mary Axe to motor vehicles during the morning (08:00 – 09:30) and evening (16:30 – 18:30) peak periods on weekdays;
- Install a traffic gate at the southern end of the street that will be closed during the restricted hours (see Appendix 5 for preliminary design);
- Close the street to all motor traffic during the restricted hours (any vehicles located past the gate during the closure will still be able to leave the street);
- Reduce the operational hours of the taxi rank to reflect the hours of the timed closures; and
- Allow pedal cycles to continue to use the street in both directions.

Option 1 proposes to also remove the on-street motorcycle bay at the southern end of the street.

Option 2 proposes to keep the motorcycle bay, which can be accessed outside of the timed closure periods.

Option 3 is a 'Do Nothing' option; with no experiment undertaken ahead of any proposed permanent change.

The City is under a duty to “*secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians)*” so far as practicable (S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984). The ETO would represent a restriction on the movement of vehicular traffic at certain times. However, this is considered to be a justified and practicable restriction having regard to the following:

- This duty also relates to pedestrians and it is expected that the ETO will improve pedestrian movement and amenity during peak periods;
- The positive contribution that is expected to be made to air quality for pedestrians on St Mary Axe during peak periods; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The traffic order is experimental, so will be for a temporary period only to enable the balance of benefit/disbenefit to be more accurately assessed before any permanent measures are introduced.
5. Recommended option	<p>Option 2 is the recommended option.</p> <p>The motorcycle bay is highly used during the week. While the motorcycle bay cannot be accessed during the timed closure periods, the vast majority of motorcycles arrive at the bay before 08:00 and park all day. Those who arrive before 08:00 will not be impacted and will be able to depart the bay even during the closure periods. By leaving the bay in for the experimental period it minimises the impact on the local users whilst not detracting from the objectives of the experiment itself.</p>
6. Risk	<p>Overall project risk: Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial feedback from building managers has indicated that while there is support for the scheme's aspirations, there is a requirement for constant vehicle access to premises for deliveries and servicing, private vehicles and contractors desired. an agreement needs to be in place for when the experiment begins for a local stakeholder to manage the opening and closing of the traffic gate at the start and end of the timed restrictions. there is a risk that if the scheme fails the experimental scheme may have to be abandoned. <p>Further information is available in the Risk Register (Appendix 3) and Options Appraisal.</p>
7. Procurement approach	Procurement for infrastructure will be through the design services in the highways team contract.

Background Papers

Activation and Greening Programme Gateway 2 Report (July 2019)

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Programme Structure
Appendix 3	Risk Register (for recommended option)
Appendix 4	Finance tables
Appendix 5	Preliminary Design

Contact

Report Author	Averil Pittaway
Email Address	Averil.Pittaway@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3894

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3												
1. Brief description of option	Trial the closure of St Mary Axe to motor traffic at morning and evening peak periods through an Experimental Traffic Order. The peak periods for pedestrian movement being considered are 08:00 – 09:30, 12:00 – 14:00 and 16:30 – 18:30.		Do Nothing. No experimental timed closure to be undertaken ahead of permanent change.												
2. Scope and exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of St Mary Axe during the morning and evening peak periods • Install a traffic gate at southern end of St Mary Axe • Reduce the operational hours of St Mary Axe taxi rank • Suspend St Mary Axe motorcycle parking bays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of St Mary Axe during the morning and evening peak periods • Install a traffic gate at southern end of St Mary Axe • Reduce the operational hours of St Mary Axe taxi rank • Retain St Mary Axe motorcycle bays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Mary Axe remains open at all times to motor traffic • No change to taxi rank operational hours • No change to motorcycle bay 												
Project Planning															
3. Programme and key dates	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gateway 5 approval</td> <td>April 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Procure infrastructure</td> <td>May/June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Advertise Experimental Traffic Order</td> <td>May/June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Promotion of closure</td> <td>May - June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Install gate and signage</td> <td>June 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Experiment</td> <td>July 2020 – Up to December 2021</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Gateway 5 approval	April 2020	Procure infrastructure	May/June 2020	Advertise Experimental Traffic Order	May/June 2020	Promotion of closure	May - June 2020	Install gate and signage	June 2020	Experiment	July 2020 – Up to December 2021	N/A
Gateway 5 approval	April 2020														
Procure infrastructure	May/June 2020														
Advertise Experimental Traffic Order	May/June 2020														
Promotion of closure	May - June 2020														
Install gate and signage	June 2020														
Experiment	July 2020 – Up to December 2021														

4. Risk implications	<p>Overall project option risk: Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders and/or consultees do not support the experiment • Impacted businesses/occupiers cannot or are unwilling to change their vehicle access timings • A stakeholder has not yet been identified to manage the opening and closure of the gate • Transport for London do not support the experiment based on traffic implications 	<p>Overall project option risk: Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay to providing improvements to people walking and cycling • Reputational risk for not accelerating the pace of delivery which was a key response to the City Transport Strategy and City Cluster Vision consultations
5. Stakeholders and consultees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business occupiers on St Mary Axe/who use St Mary Axe for vehicle access • Other business occupiers in the immediate area • City of London Police • Transport for London • Local workers and residents • Ward members • City of London Access Group • City of London Internal departments <p>Significant stakeholder engagement has been undertaken with workers, businesses and occupiers in the City Cluster as part of the development of the City Cluster Vision and to deliver the Lunchtime Streets event in August 2019. Nearly 80% of Vision consultees supported a timed closure on St Mary Axe, and 90% of those surveyed at the Lunchtime Streets event supported a lunchtime closure.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	Engagement has already begun with the largest occupiers who have vehicle access requirements from St Mary Axe, to understand their access needs. All occupiers that were spoken to were supportive of the scheme, with only one occupier raising concerns with regards to not having 24hour vehicle access to their premises. Engagement will continue with other occupiers on St Mary Axe and Undershaft ahead of Gateway 5 approval.		
6. Benefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivering Transport Strategy proposals of prioritising people walking (Proposal 2) and reallocating on-street parking bays (Proposal 14) Maximum space provided for people walking and cycling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact on local users is minimised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Businesses and occupiers can continue to access their premises at all times
7. Disbenefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential opposition from motorcycle users/ action groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorcycles may try to contravene the closure to access the motorcycle bay during the restricted hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No interim improvements for people walking and cycling ahead of permanent change The street continues to be a vehicle dominated street until the permanent scheme can be implemented Timed closure will not be trialled ahead of a permanent closure and therefore any issues and concerns cannot be addressed as part of the experiment

Resource Implications			
8. Total estimated cost	Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £270,000 (to be reviewed as part of a future G5 report)		No cost
	Total estimated cost (including risk): Not applicable		
9. Funding strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S106 • TfL Liveable Neighbourhoods Grant 		N/A
10. Investment appraisal		N/A	
11. Estimated capital value/return		N/A	
12. Ongoing revenue implications		N/A	
13. Affordability	The project is fully funded through s106 payments and TfL funding.		N/A
14. Legal implications	The street closure will be implemented through an experimental traffic order made under s9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Regulations made under this Act set out the process to be followed before and after the order is made and set out a requirement for the City to consult with Statutory Parties. Prior to the implementation of the timed closures, full and proper account of any comments made by the Statutory Parties will need to be considered before deciding whether to proceed with the final experimental order.		N/A

	The project team have taken legal advice from the Comptroller and City Solicitor team regarding the City's powers as Traffic Authority to make the ETO. The advice is that the City is acting within its authority under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities' Traffic orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.		
15. Corporate property implications	None		
16. Traffic implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motor traffic with a destination on St Mary Axe (or Undershaft) will need to retime to out of peak hours or use nearby streets (Bury Street, Leadenhall Street or Bevis Marks) • Motor traffic that uses St Mary Axe as a through route will need to use an alternative route such as Bury Court or Bishopsgate • Motorcycles that park on St Mary Axe motorcycle bay will be required to park elsewhere • St Mary Axe taxi rank operational hours to be reduced (alternative taxi rank on Leadenhall Street can be used during timed closures) • There will be no implications for pedal cycles; will be able to continue to travel in both directions on St Mary Axe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motor traffic with a destination on St Mary Axe (or Undershaft) will need to retime to out of peak hours or use nearby streets (Bury Street, Leadenhall Street or Bevis Marks) • Motor traffic that uses St Mary Axe as a through route will need to use an alternative route such as Bury Court or Bishopsgate • St Mary Axe taxi rank operational hours to be reduced (alternative taxi rank on Leadenhall Street can be used during timed closures) • Motorcycles will not be able to access the St Mary Axe on-street bay during timed closure • There will be no implications for pedal cycles; will be able to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motor traffic will continue to use the streets as they do at present

		continue to travel in both directions on St Mary Axe	
17. Sustainability and energy implications	It is expected to see an improvement in air quality on St Mary Axe during the experimental closure times.		None
18. IS implications	None		
19. Equality Impact Assessment	<p>When making decisions, the City Corporation must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not (the public sector equality duty). A proportionate level of equality analysis is required to discharge the duty. It is recognised that there could be both positive and negative equality impacts flowing from the proposals.</p> <p>An initial review of a timed closure on St Mary Axe is currently being considered by external equalities consultants. The review will help inform the final proposal for the timed closure, taking into consideration the impacts on equalities and will form part of the Gateway 5 report.</p>		None
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	None		
21. Recommendation	Not recommended	Recommended	Not recommended

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Streets & Walkways Sub Committee – For Decision Planning & Transportation Committee – For Information	25 February 2020 6 March 2020
Subject: City Lighting Programme Update	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Decision / For Information
Report Author: Ian Hughes, Assistant Director (Highways) Clarisse Tavin, Group Manager (Public Realm)	

Summary

This report provides Members with an update on the implementation of the City’s innovative Lighting Strategy approved by the Court of Common Council in October 2018. The aim of the strategy is to deliver a holistic and co-ordinated approach to lighting the Square Mile, and was initially driven by the project to upgrade our street lighting to energy efficient LED units and to implement a new smart control system.

These interlinked workstreams have been highly successful, creating opportunities to use the technology to deliver wider benefits, in establishing new cross-departmental governance and challenging conventional thinking behind how lighting affects the public realm. Our holistic approach has generated significant interest from a series of high profile external stakeholders such as the Centre for London, Historic England, the London School of Economics and the Greater London Authority, with the City of London now a member of Lighting Urban Community International (LUCI).

Further initiatives planned for the coming year include:

- Completion of the LED upgrade project;
- Trials of Smart sensors using the same mesh technology platform;
- Trials into how dynamic lighting can influence anti-social behaviour and crime & disorder;
- Social & economic studies into people’s perceptions of lighting and its impact on the public realm;
- The drafting of Planning guidance to establish best practice for developers in relation to lighting their buildings;
- Ensuring that lighting is seen as a focus for planning the future Culture Mile;
- Working with the Illuminated River to relight Blackfriars Road Bridge;
- Further stakeholder engagement and event planning to promote the City’s approach at a London, national & international level.

Recommendation(s)

Members are recommended to:

- Note the progress & next steps towards delivering the Lighting Strategy outlined in this report;
- Agree in principle for the City to host the 2021 LUCI event subject to an appropriate business case.

Main Report

Background

1. At a previous Streets & Walkways Committee, Members asked for an update on street lighting in the context of the on-going rollout of LED lighting, the various initiatives connected to the City's new lighting strategy and a series of informative night walks to illustrate the progress being made in this area.
2. This report provides that general update, including an overview of the various projects and activities planned for 2020/21 to deliver the wider City Lighting Programme. A specific Gateway 6 (project close out) report for the LED upgrade will come to Streets & Walkways Committee and Project Sub Committee later in the year.
3. In terms of background, Members may recall from previous reports that prior to 2017, the City's street lighting inventory was subject to a series of pre-existing issues common to many highway authorities, including a large & aging inventory of equipment, installed over several decades using equipment from numerous different suppliers and costing more each year to maintain.
4. In parallel, energy costs were rising with carbon taxes added to our energy bills by central government, but without significant capital investment, we could not take advantage of the new energy efficient lighting products starting to appear on the market.
5. In building the business case to seek those funds, two key opportunities were identified. Firstly, new technology could allow us to establish a mesh system that would enable dynamic real time control of each individual street light, as well as creating the potential to implement wider smart technology applications in the longer term.
6. Secondly, in the absence of a pre-existing lighting strategy, the investment in new equipment and control systems would enable us to establish the City's very first Lighting Strategy for the public realm, with the fundamental aim of ensuring the right type of lighting would be used in the right place at the right time whilst recognising the wider societal and environmental benefits of efficient and appropriate public realm lighting.
7. Members approved that business case on a spend to save basis, agreeing a £4m investment in new LED lighting technology funded from the On-Street Parking Account, and in parallel, a new Lighting Strategy was also approved after a wide ranging and informative public consultation

Current Position – Lighting Strategy

8. The Strategy focused on three general themes, namely:

- The Functional requirements focusing on public realm look & feel, safety, security & accessibility;
- An Environmental focus covering sustainability, culture & building development;
- The Technical needs ie system management, control & other advances in new technology.

Function

9. Between the Lighting Strategy and LED rollout, the intention was to find a way to rebalance our lighting away from a traffic dominated and overly lit environment, establishing a more human & less traffic dominated scale aligned to our Transport Strategy & Public Realm objectives.

10. With our new ability to set lighting timings (when individual lights come on and off), lighting levels (high to low) and lighting temperature (warm to cold) tailored to every area, street & alleyway in the City, we are now starting to implement that vision.

11. As part of the LED project, we have identified a number of locations where we can explore opportunities to deliver fundamental change to the look & feel of a location. One of those has been Peters Hill between Carter Lane and Queen Victoria St, where we have reduced the scale of the lighting and the overall number of fittings, introducing lighting at ground level in handrails and generally introducing warmer, lower lighting levels. This has served to create a calmer and more welcoming space more in keeping with a key pedestrian route connecting the riverside & Millennium Bridge to St Paul's Cathedral, at the same time as achieving a consistency of approach with the adjacent Illuminated River project.

12. At a governance level, one of the key outcomes of developing the Lighting Strategy was the realisation of the need for a cross-departmental Lighting Board to recognise the wider impacts of lighting, rather than just decisions being left to the technical engineers.

13. As such, a Public Realm Lighting Board now meets quarterly to review issues and opportunities across the board and includes representation from:

- DBE's Transportation & Public Realm team, including street lighting, road safety and public realm remits;
- the City Police, who consider how lighting can assist in addressing anti-social behaviour and crime & disorder;
- Licensing & Environmental Health covering licensing issues, light spillage and statutory nuisance concerns;
- DBE's Planning officers in relation to building development;
- Open Spaces re lighting the Square Mile's garden spaces;
- the City's Energy Management team;

- Community & Children’s Services for the City’s estates and residential concerns.
14. From this Board, one of the first outcomes has been to instigate a series of trial initiatives to see whether lighting changes can support the efforts of the City Police and Consumer Protection’s Licensing Team in dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime & disorder. So far, the results of those trials have been positive, where (as part of a package of measures) bespoke lighting timings have helped address localised issues such as noise associated with late night bars at closing time.
15. Moving forward, we will use the new control system to:
- set individual lighting profiles to mirror the times of nightclubs closing or activity at a transport hub
 - deliver much higher levels of light to help discourage anti-social behaviour in regular hot spot locations
 - provide direct access for the police to trigger much higher levels of street lighting in response to a night-time incident.

Environment & Culture

16. The challenge of moving towards a carbon neutral City will require a response from developers in how they light their buildings, both in terms of architectural external lighting but more fundamentally in terms of their approach to lighting their buildings internally.
17. Flowing from the Lighting Strategy, the City’s Planning team will be bringing forward new Planning guidance that looks to set out best practice in this area, challenging new and existing developments to deliver environmentally sustainable building lighting that complements the public realm rather than clashes with it.
18. In terms of the potential for delivering cultural impacts from lighting, not surprisingly the key area going forward will be the Culture Mile quarter, where the ambition of creating a distinct look & feel for that geographical area will include a night time focus embedded in the project from the outset.
19. Some of the temporary Culture Mile installations have already included a lighting element, such as the Beech St art and sound installation in 2018, but as an indication of how light can be used as an artistic and cultural medium, the Illuminated River project to light the Thames bridges and create a new backdrop to the riverside is now the benchmark for London as a whole.
20. Following its launch in June last year, reaction to the Illuminated River has been universally positive, with three of the City’s Bridge House Estate’s five bridges forming the core of the first phase. City officers worked closely with the Illuminated River Foundation and artist Leo Villareal to ensure the scheme enhanced the bridge structures, was sensitive to the surrounding environment

and was delivered with the most energy efficient lighting equipment possible to deliver a sustainable and popular long-term project.

21. The Illuminated River installation on Southwark, London and Cannon Rail Bridges also formed part of the Lord Mayor's Show celebrations in 2019 as a unique lighting scheme was implemented by lighting designers Speirs & Major to commemorate the Show and honour the incoming Lord Mayor.

Technology

22. The LED upgrade project is currently due to complete on schedule this Spring, with officers within Highways working closely with our highways term contractor (JB Riney) and key suppliers DW Windsor (lighting units) and iTron (control system) to roll this out across the City's footways and alleys. Once complete, every street light in the City will contain an LED fitting connected to the mesh system.
23. As expected, the project has required a considerable degree of work to replace old and worn out brackets and wiring, but with 70% of the work now complete, both energy and maintenance savings are starting to be realised. In particular, the reporting system means we no-longer require 'night scouting' to spot street lights that aren't working, and the energy savings so far achieved have helped offset further significant increases in energy prices that would otherwise have doubled our costs.
24. The mesh control system used to monitor the street lights and change the lighting levels in real time also has the capacity to carry data beyond street lighting. With the system now in place across the Square Mile, officers are looking at proof of concept trials to see whether this technology can also be used to facilitate smart sensors and create a new data platform of benefit to the City's wider transport objectives.

Wider Interest & Opportunities

25. Feedback from City stakeholders to these initiatives has been universally positive, including residents of the Barbican where a series of changes on the highwalk to refresh the night-time look and feel has been welcomed.
26. A somewhat unexpected outcome has been the degree of interest from outside the City regarding this area of work. Not only is the development of the City's mesh control system seen to be highly innovative and cutting edge, but the establishment of a holistic strategy for lighting the Square Mile has been recognised as one of the first of its kind and potentially ground-breaking.
27. Interest in how the City went about building this strategy and the opportunities it creates has been wide ranging, with Cross River Partnership, Historic England and the Greater London Authority recognising and promoting the City's approach as best practice.

28. From this feedback, both the Centre for London and the London School of Economics have expressed interest in working with City officers to better understand how public realm lighting can positively impact the lives of those who live and work in the City, and assess future opportunities around policy, culture and technical advances.

Proposals

29. There has been international interest in the City's approach through the Lighting Urban Community International (LUCI) association, with LUCI asking the City to consider hosting their 2021 conference, provisionally titled 'City under the Microscope'. LUCI is a network of over 70 towns & cities that share information and work together to promote light as a tool for social, cultural and economic development, and with support from Members, hosting their annual event would be a prestigious and high calibre undertaking.

30. It is acknowledged that such an event is likely to require funding of between £50k to £100k for the City to host, but this could potentially be met through the use of sponsors or other funding streams, so it is proposed to build an initial business case first for the consideration of your Chairman & Deputy Chairman before proceeding.

Next Steps

31. There are continuing opportunities for the City Corporation to be seen to lead on this exciting & developing area of work, with the following activities planned for the coming year:

- As part of the move away from a 'one size fits all' approach to lighting our streets, a series of core timing profiles will be developed to better fit the needs of the City's transport hubs, residential areas, night-time economy hotspots and our riverside & open spaces;
- Planning Guidance for the control of lighting within buildings will be brought forward;
- The LED rollout project will be completed, with a Gateway 6 report being brought forward to summarise the project's outcomes;
- More work will be done to better understand the role dynamic lighting can play in creating enjoyable spaces (eg Culture Mile) & in dealing with anti-social behaviour;
- The City's approach will form the basis of studies being undertaken by the London School of Economics (on the social impacts of lighting) and Centre for London (on establishing best practice);

- Smart City sensors will be considered using the opportunity created by the underlying mesh technology;
- The Department of Children & Community Services has suggested including their Youth Parliament in broadening out awareness and involvement of this area of work;
- The Illuminated River project will be extended to include Blackfriars Road Bridge as part of its second phase, and discussions will begin about when Tower Bridge could be similarly relit;
- Sheriff Christopher Hayward has been invited to address the Middle East Smart Landscape Summit, setting out the City's lighting vision;
- Further night walks with Members are planned to help illustrate the achievements so far and the issues and challenges going forward;
- External sponsorship and a potential application for CIL Neighbourhood funding will be considered to help fund a refreshed external lighting scheme for St Paul's Cathedral;
- Officers will build the business case for the City of London to host the LUCI international lighting conference in spring 2021.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

32. The City Lighting Strategy meets a series of key objectives contained within the Corporate Plan. These include:

- We will ensure people are safe & feel safe by tackling anti-social behaviour & protecting our streets & open spaces
- We will ensure people enjoy good health & wellbeing by better service design & delivery
- We will develop & trial smart innovations and improve the experience of moving through our spaces
- We will curate a vibrant, attractive & complementary blend of uses of space
- We will create & transform streets & public spaces for people to admire & enjoy
- We will champion a distinctive & high-quality residential, worker, student & visitor offer
- We will drive down the negative effects of our own activities
- We will provide environmental stewardship in use of resources
- We will influence UK and global policy to protect the environment
- We will maintain our streets & public spaces to high standards

33. In terms of funding, the above actions have largely been delivered within business as usual activities, with the capital investment in the LED upgrade

(funded from the On-Street Parking Account) the only major cost. Through better governance, guidance and policy direction, the intention remains to deliver the ambition of the Lighting Strategy by embedding more efficient, effective and appropriate use of lighting in the next wave of building development and cultural activities, as well as the City's own public realms schemes and maintenance works.

34. Funding for staff costs and consultancy fees may need to be identified from within existing budgets or external sources to help deliver the LUCI event and the Planning guidance respectively, but the overall impact of the reduction in maintenance costs and energy savings is expected to offset the recent increase in energy prices.

Conclusion

35. The City's Lighting Strategy represents a genuinely innovative opportunity to create a joined up and holistic approach to managing the look & feel of the Square Mile at night. The Strategy has created the framework, and the LED project the mechanism, to deliver a step change in approach, with benefits in terms of sustainability, cultural opportunity and public realm safety.
36. The recognition of the work done so far suggests the City Corporation is leading the way in this field, and that the lessons to learn from our approach can be used to inform the development of policies and best practice across London & beyond.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Lighting Programme & Milestones

Ian Hughes
Assistant Director (Highways)
Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 1977
E: ian.hughes@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Clarisse Tavin
Group Manager (Major Projects & Programmes), City Public Realm
Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 3634
E: clarisse.tavin@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s)	Dated:
Streets & Walkways Sub Committee Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee	25 February 2020 23 March 2020
Subject: Special Events on the Highway	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Decision
Report Author: Ian Hughes, Assistant Director (Highways)	

Summary

This report outlines the major special events planned for 2020 and provides Members with an opportunity to consider & comment on the appropriateness of those events, taking into account their nature, scale, impact and benefits.

In summary, there continues to be a relative stable core of 13 regular sporting, ceremonial or celebratory events likely to take place on the City's streets in 2020. These core events are highly professional and extremely well-run, generating a range of charitable, reputational & promotional benefits to the City and delivered with the minimum of fuss or complaint.

Around that core programme is an increasing variety of one-off events that aim to support the City's Cultural and Visitor agendas, its Transport Strategy and / or the aims & objectives of key City partner organisations and community groups.

For 2020, the likely programme of additional activities includes a series of events to promote the City's cultural ambitions, a likely repeat of last year's Car Free Day and further Lunchtime Street events to help promote Road Danger Reduction as part of the City's evolving Transport Strategy.

In parallel, this report also notes the increase in authorised filming activity taking place on City streets, with the Square Mile's iconic backdrop attracting a series of major production companies using relatively new powers to request road closures.

Finally, this report also notes for Streets & Walkways Sub Committee the event-related 'benefits in kind' granted to charitable & other organisations in 2019.

Recommendation(s)

Members are recommended to:

- Agree to support the regular core events programme listed in paragraph 5 and detailed in Appendix 1.
- Agree to support the additional Cultural, Community & Transport Strategy events outlined in paragraphs 21-30, subject to the appropriate degree of due

diligence regarding safety, licencing approval, traffic orders (where required) and impact on local stakeholders.

Members of Streets & Walkways Sub Committee are recommended to:

- Note the Benefits in Kind listed in Appendix 4.

Main Report

Background

1. This report provides an update to Members on the programme of on-street special events currently planned to take place in 2020. Although some events are more commercial than others, most are organised with the intention of raising money for charitable causes or promoting specific City strategies and Mayoral initiatives. Each event aims to deliver some form of social, financial or community benefit, but the City's long-term approach has been to ensure that the impact on residents, businesses and traffic must not be disproportionate.
2. Planning for each major event takes place well in advance in order to minimise their impact on others and to co-ordinate them into the wider programme of works taking place on the City's streets. Officers from the Department of the Built Environment lead this process with the assistance of a variety of departments, including Town Clerks, Markets & Consumer Protection, Remembrancers and the City Police.
3. The Director of the Built Environment has delegated authority to write traffic orders for roads to be closed for special events, so Member approval for each major event is not required. However, there are established guidelines for officers to follow in determining the suitability of events (including the process for appropriate political oversight), enabling the provision of advice for organisers and setting out the procedure for consents & approvals.
4. Key to the process for supporting large scale events remains the Safety Advisory Group (SAG), which examines event proposals from the organiser to seek assurance that the event will be safely managed. The City's SAG is chaired by the City's Strategic Security Director, and comprises various City divisions including Highways, Environmental Health and Contingency Planning, as well as the emergency services, Transport for London and other interested parties.

Events Calendar 2020

5. The City's on-street event programme has developed a consistent rhythm, with a core programme of 13 substantial, well-run and popular events becoming established over time. Full details behind each of these events can be found in Appendix 1, but they can be separated into three distinct categories:

Sporting

- Winter Run – Sunday 9 February
- London Landmarks Half Marathon (Tommy's) – Sunday 29 March
- Adidas City Run – Sunday 5 April
- London Marathon – Sunday 26 April
- Vitality 10k Race – Bank Holiday Monday 25 May
- Great City Race – Tuesday 21 July
- London Triathlon – Sunday 9 August
- Ride London Cycling – Sat 15 & Sun 16 August
- Bloomberg Square Mile Run – Thursday 24 September
- Royal Parks Half Marathon – Sunday 11 October

Ceremonial

- Cart Marking – Mid-July (TBC)
- Lord Mayor's Show – Saturday 14 November

Celebratory

- New Year's Eve – 31 December

6. This core group of events is organised by experienced and professional event management companies with well-established routes, detailed communications plans and effective working relationships built up over time with the three key highway authorities for Central London, namely the City of London, Transport for London and Westminster City Council.
7. This core list of events has remained relatively stable for several years, with the only recent change being the end of the Nocture cycling event due to their own internal challenges in delivering a viable event, and it remains unlikely to return to the City in the foreseeable future.
8. As a group, these events generally remain popular with the public & participants, they are safely managed, and they provide the City with a range of secondary benefits, including publicity & footfall, visibility on the international stage, connections to the charitable sector and (in some cases) funding for the City's own events and programmes.
February
9. To be clear, event organisers are aware that they do not have a permanent agreement to hold their events on our streets, but permissions are typically granted on three-year cycles to allow event managers to plan ahead for publicity and commercial reasons. However, as can be seen in Appendix 3 (which sets out the established events assessment matrix), these events are typically considered 'Green' in terms of delivering a positive balance between the benefits they bring against the impact they cause.
10. In terms of the core 13 events, the key points to note for 2020 are:

- Regrettably, this year's Winter Run had to be cancelled at short notice due to the safety risk from Storm Ciara. All major events have plans to cope with a cancellation at short notice, focusing on fast-time communications with participants, support teams and the general public. This plan was triggered on the Friday beforehand once the decision was made to cancel; a decision supported by all parties involved and was proved to be correct given subsequent events;
- Keeping the Great City Race on a Tuesday (rather than a Thursday) evening continues to reduce the overall impact of the event, plus the change in route to avoid 'landlocking' Guildhall minimises complaints;
- This year's London Landmarks Half Marathon will look to add an additional 10k event using the same route and road closures but starting at roughly half distance. This is expected to enable them to increase the number of participants by including places for those who do not want to attempt the longer distance but without increasing the impact on the local community. They are also including a specific wheelchair event for the first time;
- The Saturday of August's Ride London event will include the addition of a women's international professional cycling event, which was previously confined to Westminster but will now extend slightly into the City. Although this may mean later reopening times for some roads, this high-profile event provides alternative exposure for the City in this sport, offsetting the loss of the stand-alone Nocturne event but with much less disruption.

Cart Marking

11. Members of the Committee(s) may be aware of the concerns raised in some quarters about the Cart Marking event last July. As with any major event taking place during the week, there are consequences for the streets surrounding Guildhall when the roads are closed, albeit from a wider network management perspective, the impacts are manageable as officers of DBE have worked hard with the organisers to minimise any disruption.
12. Nevertheless, following the concerns that were raised, the Carmen have been asked whether they would consider moving their event to a weekend to reduce this impact. In response, they have indicated such a move would significantly reduce the visibility and likely participation in the event, reducing the overall benefit and potentially making it unviable.
13. Your respective Committees are not required to make a formal decision on this matter as yet but I understand the Chief Commoner is reviewing the overall format of the event and I will ensure Members are kept informed as discussions progress.

Mass Participation Event Proposals

14. The success of events such as the London Marathon, the Great City Race and the London Landmarks Half-Marathon mean that the City remains an attractive location for mass participation charitable 'fun run' type events.
15. However, with eight such events now on the City calendar, adding further events could cause other issues:
- there is inevitably a degree of diminishing returns from adding similar events;
 - there can be 'event fatigue' from residential groups given the same streets are often used for more than one event;
 - there are limited officer resources to help deliver these events;
 - there is a need to retain a priority towards business as usual activity at weekends such as utility street works, resurfacing and crane operations that can't otherwise take place during the week.
16. In the past few months, officers have received two new proposals for additional mass participation events, one from the charity Scope focusing on a fully accessible 10k run, and another from the charity Crisis for a 12k event near Christmas. Although both proposals have merit, in the context of 2020 with the major works by Cadent Gas in Cheapside, both organisers have been told the City's road network does not have the capacity to accommodate them.
17. However, should they wish to propose events for 2021, Members may wish to consider whether we should prioritise our resources towards activities that more closely align with the City's corporate objectives and Transport Strategy, such as the Lunchtime Streets initiative and Car Free Day, rather than adding more mass participation charity runs into the weekend diary.

Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order

18. Before moving onto cultural, community and other events, it should be noted that the use of the City's Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) in relation to special events will be covered in more detail by a separate report to Streets & Walkways Committee. Nevertheless, it can be noted here that only one event required its use in 2019, namely the New Year's Eve celebrations as part of the wider policing operation led by the Metropolitan Police.

One-Off Events in 2020

19. Away from the core event programme outlined above, there has been a considerable degree of year-on-year fluctuation in terms of the number and extent of major one-off special events. Despite the benefits they bring, these events typically require a disproportionate resource commitment, bringing with them the potential to cause significant disruption to the lives of residents and 'business as usual' activity in the City without the benefit of previous experience or a well-structured learning curve.

20. In previous years, these sorts of events have included:

- the Tour de France (2014)
- the Royal Marines Regimental parade (2014)
- the Afghanistan Commemoration at St Paul's Cathedral (2015)
- the Great Fire of London events (2016)
- the International Association of Athletics Federations marathon (2017)
- Culture Mile light & sound installation at Beech St (2018)
- Smithfield 150 celebrations (2018)
- Commonwealth Heads of Government Visit (2018)

Transport Strategy & Air Quality Events

21. The most significant addition to last year's calendar was Car Free Day which was delivered in conjunction with the Greater London Authority and Transport for London. The event sought to promote air quality and celebrate walking & cycling, and although the logistical effort required to mobilise the event as short notice was considerable, the event itself proved popular and may well return this year. Two dates are currently being considered (either 20 or 27 September), but a final decision on the nature & scale of the event is likely to depend on funding being confirmed after the London Mayoral election in May.

22. Last year's smaller scale Lunchtime Streets initiative proved highly popular, with St Mary Axe and Chancery Lane closed to provide a traffic free environment and help promote air quality and road safety improvements. Deliveries to adjacent premises were successfully retimed to enable the event to take place, and although the 2020 programme is currently being scoped, the aim is to deliver at least three Lunchtime Streets, with Carter Lane being explored in addition to the previous two locations.

Cultural & Community Events

23. The City's aspiration to draw its cultural offer out onto the streets of the Square Mile means that its public streets and spaces will again be utilised to host a number of cultural activities. Officers continue to seek a balance between cultural benefit and the need to minimise the impact to traffic and the local community, with this year's focus remaining the Culture Mile quarter, our key iconic locations and the Aldgate Square public space. At the time of writing, these activities are likely to include:

Mela in the City (19 April, Aldgate Square)

24. Celebrating the Bengali New Year in Aldgate Square, Mela will bring to life the rich cultural diversity of the Aldgate area and showcase local, national and international Bengali arts, music and culture. Following on from the City's first Bengali New Year Mela in 2019, *Mela in the City* aims to bring different communities together for an inclusive celebration and open up the City's public spaces to its local and Greater London Bengali communities, welcoming audiences into the Square Mile.

Color of Time (13 June (TBC), Gresham St & Guildhall Yard)

25. Cie Artonik presents a stunning reinvention of the Indian traditional Holi festival with this contemporary dance-theatre event. Community participants and audience members are invited to join in the performance in a mass participatory choreography, painting the sky with coloured paint. (This event is likely to require some form of road closure.)

Euro 2020 'Spectacular' Event (14 June, Tower Bridge)

26. This global art project co-commission with the GLA for Euro 2020 will be the GLA's Euro 'Spectacular' event, taking place on Tower Bridge. A large-scale photography exhibition will be installed onto the road bridge which Londoners will be invited to participate in and view during the day. The installation celebrates diverse communities in London. (This event is likely to require a road closure authorised by Transport for London.)

London International Festival of Theatre Co-commission (17 & 18 June, Carter Lane Gardens & Aldgate Square)

27. This co-commission with London International Festival of Theatre involves a one women street theatre show exploring ideas and challenges around race and identity.

Nocturnal Creatures (17 & 18 July, Aldgate Square)

28. This is a new commission by Whitechapel Gallery inspired by the Mayflower and will involve an outdoor installation and animation of Aldgate Square as part of the Nocturnal Creatures festival.

Trois Éléphants passent (26 September, Location TBC)

29. The headline event for this year's cultural programme will involve a largescale parade with three giant mechanical iron elephants and a squadron of metal phoenixes that make their way through the City, accompanied by the sound of bagpipes, drums and bombards played tin soldiers. Costumes, musicians and torches all add to the mix to deliver a multi-site show that explores themes of migration and identity. This event will require road closures and coordination with both the Cadent gas works (by then in Newgate Street) and the likely Car Free Day activities that may take place on the same weekend.

VE Day (8-10 May)

30. At the time of writing, we are not aware of any major events in the City linked to VE Day in May, but we have received a small number of expressions of interest in holding street parties linked to the change in the Bank Holiday. For similar national celebrations in the past, the Government has asked Highway Authorities to treat such requests proportionately (including the waiving of fees & charges as a 'benefit in kind'), but if these become firm applications we would still look to

ensure their network impact is contained to the local community and that appropriate management procedures are in place.

Road Closure Volumes (Filming & Events)

31. The table below notes the increasing number of road closure applications received from different sources over recent years. The predominance of activity to support building development and utility work in the Square Mile has been covered in the recent report to the Planning & Transportation and Streets & Walkways Committees, but as reported last year, the number of applications for filming has continued to rise.

Road Closure Application Volumes

Type / Year	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Developments	101	155	231	175	214	190
Utilities	62	67	89	95	91	125
Emergencies	26	57	68	38	35	76
CoL	40	85	89	78	93	98
Filming	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	59	76
Other	3	18	17	51	29	43
Total	232	382	494	437	521	608

32. In addition to the trend for more cultural activity on-street, legislative changes in 2016 made it possible for roads to be closed for filming, allowing some of the largest Hollywood and UK production companies to use the City's iconic sights and 'quiet' weekends as backdrops. This has generated a significant uplift in road closure applications which need to be co-ordinated with other activity on the network and managed in terms of minimising their impact on local residents and businesses.

33. It would appear that the City has not yet started to suffer from filming 'saturation' in the same way that some residents (such as those on Upper Thames St) can suffer event 'fatigue'. However, regular use of the same streets around iconic locations does have the potential to reduce the tolerance of residents, local stakeholders and key partners such as Transport for London.

34. Nevertheless, the benefits to the City's Cultural Strategy of retaining the Square Mile as a primary film location mean that well-managed, well-communicated filming can be a key promotional tool for the City Corporation for the foreseeable future, connecting the Square Mile to the very heart of this world-renown creative industry.

Benefits in Kind

35. The City Corporation gives around £55m pa to charities either directly or through its trusteeship, but in addition, the City also gives significant benefits in kind, defined (for this purpose) as:

- Abatement of a full commercial rent;
- Abatement of a fee or charge for services provided; or
- Provision of goods or materials free of charge, or at a reduced charge.

36. The Director of the Built Environment has delegated authority to waive fees and charges on a case by case basis in accordance with the Member-approved guidance that sets out the likely circumstances where this can be done.

37. In particular, the need to ensure appropriate cost recovery to offset wider budget constraints has ensured a significant degree of challenge is applied to requests to waive fees, whilst officers are also aware they must seek to ensure parity and even-handedness in providing benefits in kind to similar types of events.

38. For some time, DBE has summarised this information for the Finance Grants & Oversight Committee, but to improve transparency of the decision making behind this process, that Committee now recommends that all current benefits in kind with no identifiable end date should be reviewed by the relevant department or Committee, and a recommendation made as to the on-going provision of each benefit.

39. Therefore, for the purposes of transparency, Members of Streets & Walkways Sub Committee (as the spending Committee for special event management) are asked to note the Benefits in Kind provided under this protocol and set out in Appendix 4. This year's total figure is somewhat distorted by the inclusion of £37k in waived parking suspension fees & charges for the City / GLA Car Free Day event, but otherwise further details on any particular benefit can be provided on request.

Conclusion

40. This report summarises the major events planned for 2020, including a series of on-street cultural and transport-strategy related activities to supplement the core established major events. The vast majority of events continue to be delivered successfully and safely, whilst City officers work with organisers to ensure the disruption they cause is minimised wherever possible.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Core Event Programme for 2020
- Appendix 2 – Core Event Timeline for 2020
- Appendix 3 – Summary Event Assessment for 2020
- Appendix 4 – Benefits in Kind for 2019

Ian Hughes
 Assistant Director (Highways)
 Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 1977

E: ian.hughes@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Streets & Walkways Sub Committee (For Decision) Police Authority Board (For Information) Policy & Resources Committee (For Decision)	25 February 2020 27 February 2020 19 March 2020
Subject: Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Information / For Decision
Report Author: Ian Hughes, Assistant Director (Highways)	

Summary

This report reviews the use of the City’s permanent Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) in 2019, as well as whether it should be retained more generally going forward.

The ATTRO authorises the City Police to potentially control the movement of pedestrians and vehicles on City streets for counter terrorism purposes and was originally requested as part of a package of measures aimed at both improving the security of people in crowded places & preventing damage to buildings from a potential terrorist attack.

Members approved the ATTRO in 2016 on the basis that the City Corporation’s area was particularly vulnerable to terrorism due to its highly dense nature and the concentration of high profile, historic, prestigious and financial targets that can be found throughout the Square Mile.

Matters since would suggest this assessment has not changed, albeit the use of the ATTRO has been limited to a small number of high-profile special events. In 2019, it was only used for the New Year’s Eve celebrations as part of the wider Metropolitan Police-led operation, but from a City Police perspective, retaining the permanent ATTRO remains important because it affords them the ability to react quickly, if the intelligence necessitates it, to protect the public.

When the ATTRO was written, it did not have a specific end or review date, but in response to the last annual summary report in January 2019, Members requested that this year’s report decide upon the continuing need for the ATTRO to remain in place. As a result, this year’s report is For Decision by the Streets & Walkways and Policy & Resources Committees.

Recommendation(s)

Members are recommended to approve the continued use of the ATTRO subject to a further review in three years’ time.

Main Report

Background

1. In September and October 2016, the Planning & Transportation Committee (for decision), the Police Committee (for information) and the Policy & Resources Committee (for decision) discussed and agreed to the creation of an Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) in the City Corporation area.
2. This was in response to a request from the Commissioner of the City Police in July 2015 to introduce such an order and followed a statutory public consultation.
3. The Commissioner's request was informed by advice received from his counter-terrorism security advisors, including the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI). The advice related to the whole administrative area of the City and was in the context of the potential impact of terrorism due to the City's intensely crowded nature and its role as a high-profile world centre of economic activity.
4. The ATTRO is a counter terrorism measure pursuant to the provisions of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, which allows traffic orders to be written by the Traffic Authority under s6, s22C and s22D of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. These orders can only be made on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police, and are for the purposes of:
 - Avoiding or reducing the likelihood of, or danger connected with, terrorism, or;
 - Preventing or reducing damage connected with terrorism.
5. On the basis of a security assessment or an intelligence threat, the ATTRO gives a City Police Inspector or above the discretion to restrict traffic and / or pedestrians to all or part of any street in the City. That discretion must be exercised in accordance with an agreed protocol so that any interference is proportionate and that such restrictions are in place for the minimum extent and time necessary.
6. The Commissioner requested the ATTRO be put in place on a permanent basis, but that its use be contingent on it only being used as a proportional counter terrorism response to the needs of an event, incident or item of intelligence. Transport for London also agreed to allow the City Corporation to include their streets within the Square Mile as part of the ATTRO area.
7. The permanent ATTRO allows the controls to be activated at any time, albeit in accordance with an agreed protocol that reflects the statutory requirements for making such an order. Nevertheless, its permanent nature enables speedier activation of security measures to meet operational requirements given the unpredictability of the current terrorist threat.

8. Members agreed to making the ATTRO on two key conditions, namely that an annual review be presented to Members, and as part of that review, there should be confirmation that the ATTRO had been used in a proportionate way.

Current Position

9. The protocol established for using the ATTRO allowed for two main types of scenario, namely for intelligence-based Police led urgent situations and for pre-planned special events. In terms of the former scenario, the permanent City ATTRO has yet to be used to implement controls as a result of advance intelligence.
10. In terms of special events, it was agreed that the ATTRO could be used to supplement the City Corporation and TfL's existing event planning process. This process would typically include a separate pre-advertised temporary traffic regulation order (TTRO) granted to the organiser to close roads just to facilitate the event. In such circumstances, the ATTRO could be used to authorise additional protective security measures, such as the control of pedestrian movements which would not typically form part of the standard event TTRO, and / or additional road closures that might be deemed appropriate nearer the event.
11. Since its introduction in 2016, the City Police Commissioner has only requested that the ATTRO be used on eight separate occasions, all in relation to a particular special event. Four of those requests involved the annual New Year's Eve celebrations as part of the Metropolitan Police-led operation across Central London. The other four were all in 2017 and related to:
 - The funeral of PC Keith Palmer at Southwark Cathedral
 - The IAAF Marathon
 - The Lord Mayor's Show & Fireworks
 - The Grenfell Tower Memorial Service at St Paul's Cathedral
12. Post-event feedback would suggest the additional powers contained in the ATTRO were used sparingly and there was no noticeable or negative impact on the general public. In accordance with the agreed protocol, none of the uses of the ATTRO exceeded 48 hours, which would otherwise have triggered a review by the Town Clerk & Commissioner.

Proposal

13. Given the ATTRO has only been used for New Year's Eve in the last two years and had limited consequential impact both times, it would appear the ATTRO powers continue to be used proportionately and that a fair balance is being struck between the public interest and an individual's rights.
14. Nevertheless, despite its infrequent use, the City Police and City Corporation believe the ATTRO should be retained as it gives the City of London Police the ability to respond quickly to an emerging terrorist threat, providing enhanced protection (if needed) and reassurance to the public.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

15. Counter Terrorism is graded as a tier one threat against our country as per the National Strategic Policing Requirements set by the Home Office. Nationally and locally, there is an appropriately strong expectation that the threat of terrorism is met by an equally appropriate and proportionate response by the police and our partners.
16. The Government's Contest Strategy aims to reduce the risk to the UK and its interests overseas from terrorism, so people can go about their daily lives freely and with confidence. The City of London Police, part of the London counter terrorism region, supports the Contest Strategy through the four P's approach of Pursue, Prevent, Protect and Prepare. Protective Security as a theme, and therefore the ATTRO, fits firmly under Protect element of the Government's Contest Strategy.
17. The number one ambition of the City of London Police's Corporate Plan is 'to make the City of London the safest place in the world'. This includes having all the tools available to rapidly mitigate risk and to protect the public.
18. The City of London's historical, cultural and economic importance means it will always be an attractive target for those who are intent on causing high profile disruption. By continuing to protect the City of London from terrorism we will continue to protect the UK's interests as a whole. In terms of prevention, the City of London Police plan states 'we will continue to develop different ways to engage and work with partners in a coordinated way to deter, detect and disrupt terrorist activity'.
19. The City of London Local Plan 2015 aims to ensure that the City remains a safe place to live, work and visit. Core Strategic Policy CS3 makes specific provision for implementing measures to enhance the collective security of the City against terrorist threats, applying measures to broad areas, including the City as a whole. The Policy also encourages the development of area-based approaches to implementing security measures.
20. The risk of terrorist attack remains at the top of the current Corporate Strategic Risk Register because of the City's concentration of high profile, historic, prestigious and financial targets. In addition, the City's Corporate Plan 2018-2023 reiterates the key aims of ensuring people are safe & feel safe and that we protect the users of our buildings, streets & public spaces.
21. Otherwise, the legal implications on the use of the ATTRO remain unchanged from the original 2016 report and are repeated in Appendix 1 for reference.

Conclusion

22. Given the limited number of occasions on which the ATTRO has been used since 2016 and the limited impact on the general public's freedom of movement on each occasion, the evidence would suggest the ATTRO powers have been used

proportionately and to the minimum extent necessary in accordance with both the statutory requirements and Members' wishes.

23. However, due to the exceptional environment of the Square Mile, the City of London remains particularly vulnerable to terrorist attack, and as a result, the City's permanent ATTRO should be retained as an appropriate measure to enable the Commissioner of Police to more readily and better protect the City community.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – ATTRO Legal Considerations Appendix 2 – ATTRO Uses in 2019

Ian Hughes
Assistant Director (Highways)
Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 1977

E: ian.hughes@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date:
Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee – For decision	25 February 2020
Subject: Fann Street – Traffic Increase	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Decision
Report author: Min Yee Cheung - Department of the Built Environment	

Summary

Long term temporary changes, including the intermittent closure of Long Lane eastbound, were made to streets around the Farringdon Crossrail site between July 2017 to August 2019. Residents had concerns that increased traffic was using Fann Street to turn around, particularly by the entrance to Bunyan Court. These concerns mainly included the perceived increase in road safety risks and air and noise pollution.

To address this problem, the banned ‘U-turn’ on Aldersgate Street/Goswell Road at its junction with Fann Street was removed on an experimental basis. The experiment, allowed the permitting of motorists to ‘U-turn’ on Aldersgate Street/Goswell Road instead of using Fann Street, to be tested, before making a final decision. It included a period of public consultation.

To assess the experiment, officers analysed a range of data including site observations, traffic counts, collision data and public feedback. This showed that the experiment delivered limited benefits. Long Lane was re-opened in August 2019, and since then traffic using Fann Street has dropped substantially. The need to make the experiment permanent is therefore not required.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

Approve the reinstatement of the banned ‘U turn’ on Aldersgate Street/Goswell Road at its junction with Fann Street.

Main Report

Background

1. To facilitate construction of the Farringdon Crossrail Station, various temporary measures, including the long-term closure of Long Lane, were put in place.
2. Despite diversionary signage, some motorists chose to use Fann Street, particularly at the entrance to Bunyan Court, to turnaround instead. This increase in traffic led nearby residents to raise their concerns to the Corporation about the increased safety risks as well as air and noise pollution.
3. Fann Street is a two-way side street serving predominately as an access street into housing estates as well as providing some on-street parking facilities. At the Aldersgate Street/Goswell Road and Fann Street junction, there is a banned 'U-turn'. See Appendix 1 for a location plan.
4. To address residents' concerns, officers explored various options. An experimental proposal to suspend the banned 'U-turn' on Aldersgate Street/Goswell Road was considered to be the most appropriate approach. This would allow motorists to turn at the junction and therefore reduce the amount of traffic needing to use Fann Street.
5. On 1 October 2018, the experiment was implemented using an experimental Traffic Management Order. This allowed the new arrangement to be tested including to ensure that the change was safe, as well to allow public consultation. The Order is valid for up to 18 months and will therefore expire at the end of March 2020.
6. During the experiment, the closure of Long Lane was no longer required and was re-opened to traffic on 23 August 2019.

Current Position

7. To assess the experiment, officers have carried out regular site observations, counted traffic flows, analysed collision data and reviewed public feedback.
8. Before the experiment
The traffic counts which were taken before the experiment had started, showed a significant number of vehicles using Fann Street to switch directions. However, some motorists chose to perform an illegal 'U-turn' on Aldersgate Street/Goswell Road junction.
9. During the experiment
The traffic counts taken during the experiment indicated the overall number of vehicles switching directions had fallen. Although there is a significant drop in motorists using Fann Street, there is also a drop in vehicles U-turning at the main

junction. This indicates that motorists have become used to the Long Lane closure and are using other routes instead.

10. When Long Lane was re-opened

Traffic counts were taken after Long Lane was re-opened to traffic in August 2019. The data showed overall traffic switching direction has declined even further and traffic using Fann Street has substantially dropped. Appendix 2 provides a comparison of the traffic flows.

11. The experiment attracted a very low level of public interest, with only one resident opposing the removal of the banned U-turn as they felt that the change increased air pollution and made crossing the street more dangerous. The count data in fact showed a small reduction in turning traffic. Analysis of the collision data supplied by City Police did not identify any injury collisions relating to the removal of the banned 'U-turn'.

12. Ward members were updated on the proposal to re-instate the U-turn ban. As part of this, Alderman Graves is concerned with the proposal to reinstate the ban as this will increase traffic using Fann Street.

Way Forward

13. The experimental removal of the banned U-turn had limited effect and the closure of Long Lane is no longer in place. The number of drivers using Fann Street to turn around is now very low. It is therefore recommended that the banned U-turn is re-instated. This can be reviewed should there be a need to close Long Lane to facilitate works in the future.

14. It should also be further noted that 'U-turn' manoeuvres are one of the most hazardous movements a driver can undertake. This is because other road users are not generally expecting such manoeuvres and that a greater level of awareness is required by the driver to do this safely. Furthermore, the Highway code advises drivers to avoid turning around at busy roads but to use quieter side roads instead. Although the experiment did not identify any safety issues, the long-term impacts are unknown. The re-instatement of the ban would therefore reduce this risk.

15. This proposal has no impact on any of the projects in the area including the Beech Street Zero Emission Street and the Public Realm Scheme associated with the development of Bernard Morgan House.

Conclusion

16. The main reason for the extra traffic using Fann Street was associated with the long-term temporary closure of Long Lane for Crossrail works. However, with Long Lane re-opened in August 2019, the problems caused by the extra traffic turning in Fann Street or at the junction has largely dissipated. If Long Lane is to

be temporary closed in the future, consideration will be given to suspending the banned U-turn.

Background Papers

Min Yee Cheung
Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 1208

Appendix 1 Location plan
Appendix 2 Traffic counts data

Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Streets & Walkways Sub <i>[for decision]</i>		Dates: 4 February 2020 24 February 2020 25 February 2020
Subject: 72 Fore Street Unique Project Identifier: 10955	Gateway 6: Consolidated Outcome Report Regular	
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Tom Noble		For Decision
<h2 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h2>		

Summary

1. Status Update	<p>Project Description: The project sought to deliver enhancements in the vicinity of the 72 Fore Street development (also known as Moorgate Exchange), across two phases. These enhancements were to include widened and repaved footways around the site and across a wider area including Fore Street, Moor Lane and Wood Street.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green</p> <p>Risk Status: Low</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £84,610</p> <p>Slippage: None</p> <p>Works completed are: Phase 1 involved repaving of the footways immediately surrounding the development in Yorkstone, the introduction of dropped kerbs and vehicle crossovers, and the installation of bollards in certain areas.</p> <p>Phase 2 was intended to deliver changes across a wider area incorporating Fore Street, Moor Lane and Wood Street. However, these works were deferred owing to extensive construction works in the area; subsequent to this deferral, the London Wall Place scheme was advanced which delivered many of the enhancements that had previously been proposed.</p>
2. Next steps and Requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authorise closure of the project;

	2. Note the reallocation of £16,390 project underspend to the Moorgate Crossrail Station Links project as previously approved in the DBE prioritisation report.
--	---

3. Budget	<i>Estimated Total Project Cost G2</i> <i>Estimated cost: £950,000 - £1.1m</i>	
	At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost (G6)
	<i>Pre-evaluation</i>	<i>£13,058</i>
	<i>Fees</i>	<i>£1,583</i>
	<i>Staff Costs</i>	<i>£26,650</i>
	<i>Works</i>	<i>£43,319</i>
	<i>Contingency</i>	<i>£0</i>
	Total	£84,610
<p>The Final Account for this project has been verified.</p> <p>The final outturn cost of £84,610 is significantly less than the estimated total cost for both phases provided at Gateway 2. This variance is due Phase 2 of the project not being implemented, as explained above and in the Gateway 5 report.</p>		

4. Programme	Activity	Authority to Start work (G5) Programme	Final (G6) Programme
	Start of Phase 1	January 2014	January 2014
	Completion of Phase 1	April 2014	April 2014
	Start of Phase 2	Not defined	N/A
	Completion of Phase 2	Not defined	N/A

5. Key Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 of the project delivered localised enhancements around the 72 Fore Street development, enabling the building to open on time; Officers worked closely with the developer to ensure that the design was unified between public and private areas, and that the programme was adhered to; Phase 2 of the project was originally intended to deliver improvements across a wider area, however these works were eventually superseded and were largely delivered via the London Wall Place development.
---------------------------	--

Contact

Report Author	Tom Noble
Email Address	tom.noble@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1057

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Streets and Walkways Committee For Information	25 February 2020
Subject: JB Riney's Highways Term Maintenance Contract	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Information
<p>Summary</p> <p>The City's highways term maintenance contractor is JB Riney, who deliver highway maintenance, resurfacing, drainage, street lighting, public realm enhancements, road marking and highway changes for the Department of the Built Environment, as well as similar services for other departments.</p> <p>In June 2019, Riney completed year seven of a ten-year contract (five years + five year extension). During that time, Riney have maintained a very high level of performance, both in terms of their contract delivery (as measured through their KPIs), their quality of work and their cost control.</p> <p>Riney have fully adopted the partnership approach envisaged by the contract, continually adjusting programmes, designs and resources to meet the City's needs without making any formal compensation claims. Projects are typically delivered to a very high standard, on time & budget, and with the minimum of fuss and disruption to the public.</p> <p>Although there are alternatives to using a term contract for these services, including the London Highway Alliance Contract (LOHAC), none of these options deliver Best Value in terms of cost, quality of service, performance, flexibility, safety, innovation, early contractor involvement and continuity. The combination of all these factors can be demonstrated by the annual Contract Board report contained in the appendix to this report.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendation</p> <p>Members are recommended to receive this report.</p>	

Main Report

Background

1. The City Corporation is the Highway Authority for all the public highway and City walkway areas in the Square Mile, except those streets that fall within the Transport for London Road Network.
2. As such, the Department of the Built Environment (DBE) is responsible for maintaining those streets, footpaths and walkways, including inspecting them for defects, undertaking repairs and resurfacing, maintaining signs, road markings, bollards, street nameplates and drainage, and looking after all the powered & illuminated street furniture in the City, from road signs to street lights.
3. In addition, DBE are responsible for the highway construction aspect involved in making alterations to streets to satisfy road safety or transportation requirements, as well as delivering projects to enhance the public realm and undertaking reparations and highway changes around new building developments.
4. DBE delivers all these functions using a term contract, with the current incumbents being JB Riney. They were awarded the contract in early 2012 following a standard EU procurement process, and over the seven years of the contract so far, Riney have on average delivered around £10m worth of work each year.
5. This value primarily depends on the volume of internally and externally funded work needed from DBE, as well as a much smaller amount of work of a similar nature delivered on behalf of Open Spaces and the City Surveyors. In fact, in the last contract year to July 2019, a record £16.78m was spent through the contract, including public realm works for Crossrail and the City's Street Lighting LED rollout.

Current Position

Riney's Performance

6. During that time, Riney have maintained a very high level of performance, both in terms of their contract delivery (as measured through their KPIs) and their quality of work. Projects are delivered to a very high standard, on time & budget, and with the minimum of fuss and disruption to the public.
7. In addition, Riney have fully adopted the partnership approach envisaged by the contract, continually adjusting programmes, designs and resources to meet the City's needs. Excellent examples of this flexibility can be found in their delivery of the landmark Aldgate, Bank and Beech Street schemes, as well the public realm works around the Crossrail stations, where there have been numerous programme, design and construction changes during the life of that project. In each of these instances, Riney have had to alter their plans at very

short notice, move gangs on, off and around the site to meet the needs of TfL, the utilities and numerous local stakeholders, all to enable the various projects to stay on track.

8. It is not an exaggeration to say that without Riney's flexibility and support from as early as 12 months before the start of construction, the highways elements of the many strategic projects would not have been completed on time and within budget. Crucially, all this has been done so far without a single contract claim.
9. Riney's excellent performance can be seen in several ways, including:
 - a. Their success in delivering schemes on time and to budget gives the City the confidence to require all developers to use the City's term contract to deliver the public realm changes or highway reinstatements around their buildings;
 - b. The City has a high success rate in defending accident claims for trips and falls due to Riney's robust inspection regime and record keeping, and the number of claims itself is recognised to be extremely low;
 - c. Riney's commitment and professionalism has meant they have failed very few monthly Key Performance Indicators in their seven years;
 - d. Riney's formal Health & Safety procedures have recently passed formal Audit inspection, and they have seamlessly adapted to the new requirements for the Construction, Design and Management (CDM) Regulations;
 - e. Riney have an extremely low accident rate despite the inherent difficulties of working with so many utilities just below the surface of the City's streets;
 - f. The City Procurement team have acknowledged that Riney's delivery under the term contract should be the benchmark for City Corporation contractors in terms of sustainability and responsible sourcing of materials;
 - g. Riney's have consistently managed to come within 2% of their annual budget allocation for repairs & maintenance, which is a major challenge due to the irregularity of reactive repairs and outside factors such as utility excavations, inclement weather, significant HGV movements for developments and reduced resurfacing funds.

Commitment & Partnership

10. From the start of the contract, Riney have delivered their contractual requirements with a significant level of commitment to meeting the City's exacting standards and partnership approach. That commitment began with owner Brendan Riney (sadly now passed away) through more recent Contract

Directors, Contract Managers and Works Supervisors, down to the gangs themselves.

11. The direction and culture of the contract delivery has been aligned to meet the City's requirements, with Riney even replacing their first Contract Manager early on because they recognised the City's needs were even more exacting than they had anticipated. Riney have delivered on their contractual commitment to maintain an embedded resource at Guildhall dedicated to working with the City to improve and maintain communications with those affected by works.
12. Riney's approach has been one of flexibility without sacrificing quality and their early contractual involvement on schemes has had numerous design, safety and cost benefits. Some examples of this joined up approach with the City (at no additional cost) have included:
 - a. The use of mobile tablets to capture highway defects and facilitate an improved works ordering process;
 - b. The development of a new approach to asset management, including the valuation of identified highway defects and the tracking of repairs;
 - c. Long term forward profiling of contract spends and gang deployment;
 - d. The training of several site apprentices, as well as personal development opportunities for junior management;
 - e. Value engineering on proposed schemes through early contractor involvement;
 - f. The development & trialling of new vehicles with high visibility cabs to reduce road danger;
 - g. Improved energy efficient on-site equipment.

Financial comparison

13. Riney's contract rates were obviously assessed as part of the tender exercise in 2012 and deemed to be highly competitive at that point. However, in 2013, and again at the end of 2015, Riney's rates were also benchmarked against those of the London Highway Alliance Contract (LoHAC) - the TfL framework contract that the City could also use for highway maintenance, delivered in the Central London by the consortium CVU. On both occasions, Riney's rates were cheaper.
14. Equally, in terms of the delivery of work to construct numerous highway schemes over the last four years, through early contractor involvement as well as careful planning, estimation and budget management, Riney have consistently delivered their elements of these schemes within the budgets set for those individual projects.

The Annual Contract Board

15. The annual Contract Board took place in October 2019 between senior officers from JB Riney and the City of London to review activities in the last year and to

discuss new initiatives moving forward. The Contract Board report was well received, highlighting a series of successful projects & outcomes as part of the highest year of spend so far.

16. Some of these great successes include the implementation of the award-winning street lighting upgrade, Goldman Sachs' public realm project, the City's security programme, Bank on Safety, the gibbit wi-fi programme, tackling a 'fatberg' under Foster Lane and the Bartholomew Close regeneration project, to name a few. Further details of these and other projects can be found in Appendix 1.

Contract Challenges

17. As well as the successes and opportunities that have been implemented through the contract, there remain a number of challenges to be faced between the City and Riney over the final two and a half years of the contract.
 - a. The transition with Tarmac becoming the parent company to Riney has been relatively smooth and has allowed Riney to improve their processes and technology. However, there remains a risk that the 'family business' ethos of Riney may be lost in the wider Tarmac group, which could result in claims in the future as processes become more 'contractual' rather than 'partnership' working.
 - b. From experience, contracts often become harder to manage as they reach the end of their natural term. Contractors can often lose focus whilst we turn our attention towards the new contract and its specification, with transitional arrangements for long-term projects and TUPE rules for staff to be discussed.
 - c. As we move towards the final two years of the contract, we are now experiencing increases in cost indices, and the affordability of our high standards of maintenance will need to be reviewed. In particular, after a period when the material indices lagged behind the contract indexation uplift, those material indices are now accelerating, meaning that budget pressures to deliver a 'steady state' highway are becoming more acute.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

The Principle of a Term Contract

18. In this wider context, it is worth noting why a term contract is preferred in the first place. In terms of the delivery of these services through Riney, the justification for using a term contract includes:
 - a. It allows the provision of flexible, joined-up services, having one contractor to build, inspect and maintain all aspects of the highway;
 - b. It allows resources to be swapped seamlessly between highway maintenance and major schemes, minimising the risk of claims for downtime whilst ensuring maximum flexibility of resource
 - c. It delivers economies of scale in terms of management resource, material procurement and manpower;

- d. It facilitates a corporate resource available to other departments to deliver work of a similar nature;
 - e. It removes the delay and cost to individual projects of tendering these services each time, creating a 'fast track' to facilitate early contractor involvement, both in terms of time and expertise;
 - f. It minimises the impact of these works on the public by ensuring that gangs, supervisors and managers all understand the requirements necessary to work in the Square Mile.
19. In addition to the above, the next generation of LOHAC contract is being drafted by Transport for London, but for the moment we intend to remain with our term contract and its approach for the reasons stated within this report. However, access to LOHAC could still be useful for benchmarking opportunities and contingency planning purposes.

Conclusion

20. In order to maintain the City's requisite high quality of service, the term contract remains the most appropriate way for the City to deliver such workstreams in partnership with a contractor such as Riney.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Contract Board Paper

Background Papers: Annual Contract Board Report 2018/19

Giles Radford

Highways Manager, Dept of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 3924

E: Giles.radford@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s):	Dates(s):
Finance	21 st January 2020
Planning & Transportation	28 th January 2020
Streets and Walkways Sub	25 th February 2020
Court of Common Council	5 th March 2020
Subject: Annual On-Street Parking Accounts 2018/19 and Related Funding of Highway Improvements and Schemes	Public
Report of: Chamberlain	For Information
Report author: Simon Owen, Chamberlain's Department	

Summary

The City of London in common with other London authorities is required to report to the Mayor for London on action taken in respect of any deficit or surplus in its On-Street Parking Account for a particular financial year.

The purpose of this report is to inform Members that:

- the surplus arising from on-street parking activities in 2018/19 was £13.681m;
- a total of £6.833m, was applied in 2018/19 to fund approved projects; and
- the surplus remaining on the On-Street Parking Reserve at 31st March 2019 was £36.828m, which will be wholly allocated towards the funding of various highway improvements and other projects over the medium term.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the contents of this report for their information before submission to the Mayor for London.

Main Report

Background

1. Section 55(3A) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended), requires the City of London in common with other London authorities (i.e. other London Borough Councils and Transport for London), to report to the Mayor for London on action taken in respect of any deficit or surplus in their On-Street Parking Account for a particular financial year.

2. Legislation provides that any surplus not applied in the financial year may be carried forward. If it is not to be carried forward, it may be applied by the City for one or more of the following purposes:
- a) making good to the City Fund any deficit charged to that Fund in the 4 years immediately preceding the financial year in question;
 - b) meeting all or any part of the cost of the provision and maintenance by the City of off-street parking accommodation whether in the open or under cover;
 - c) the making to other local authorities, or to other persons, of contributions towards the cost of the provision and maintenance by them, in the area of the local authority or elsewhere, of off-street parking accommodation whether in the open or under cover;
 - d) if it appears to the City that the provision in the City of further off-street parking accommodation is for the time being unnecessary or undesirable, for the following purposes, namely:
 - meeting costs incurred, whether by the City or by some other person, in the provision or operation of, or of facilities for, public passenger transport services;
 - the purposes of a highway or road improvement project in the City;
 - meeting the costs incurred by the City in respect of the maintenance of roads at the public expense; and
 - for an “environmental improvement” in the City.
 - e) meeting all or any part of the cost of the doing by the City in its area of anything which facilitates the implementation of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, being specified in that strategy as a purpose for which a surplus can be applied; and
 - f) making contributions to other authorities, i.e. the other London Borough Councils and Transport for London, towards the cost of their doing things upon which the City in its area could incur expenditure upon under (a)-(e) above.
3. In the various tables of this report, figures in brackets indicate expenditure, reductions in income or increased expenditure.

2018/19 Outturn

4. The overall financial position for the On-Street Parking Reserve in 2018/19 is summarised below:

	£m
Surplus Balance brought forward at 1st April 2018	29.980
Surplus arising during 2018/19	13.681
Expenditure financed during the year	(6.833)
Funds remaining at 31st March 2019, wholly allocated towards funding future projects	36.828

5. Total expenditure of £6.833m in 2018/19 was financed from the On-Street Parking Reserve, covering the following approved projects:

Revenue/SRP Expenditure:	£000
Highway resurfacing, maintenance & enhancements	(2,242)
Concessionary fares & taxi card scheme	(517)
Thames Court footbridge	(376)
Ring of steel compliance & stabilisation	(175)
Holborn Viaduct & Snow Hill pipe-subways	(137)
Minorities car park structural building report	(118)
Temple Area traffic review	(113)
Special needs transport	(91)
HVM security team	(81)
Bank Junction experimental safety scheme	(56)
City Wayfinding Signage/Legible London	(29)
Cleansing / planting maintenance / Aldgate / other	(20)
Off-Street car parking contribution to reserves	116
Total Revenue/SRP Expenditure	(3,839)
Capital Expenditure:	
Street lighting project	(2,368)
City Wayfinding Signage/Legible London	(227)
HVM security bollards	(160)
Bank Junction experimental safety scheme	(141)
Beech Gardens Barbican Podium waterproofing	(98)
Total Capital Expenditure	(2,994)
Total Expenditure Funded in 2018/19	(6,833)

6. The surplus on the On-Street Parking Reserve brought forward from 2017/18 was £29.980m. After expenditure of £6.833m funded in 2018/19, a surplus balance of £6.848m was carried forward to future years to give a closing balance at 31st March 2019 of £36.828m.
7. Currently total expenditure of some £110.9m is planned over the medium term from 2019/20 until 2023/24 (as detailed in Table 1), by which time it is anticipated that the existing surplus plus those estimated for future years will be fully utilised.
8. The total programme covers numerous major capital schemes including funding towards the Street lighting project; repairs to Holborn Viaduct & Snow Hill pipe-subways; City Wayfinding Signage/Legible London; HVM security; Bank Junction experimental safety and permanent scheme; Thames Court footbridge; Minorities car park structural building report; Barbican Podium waterproofing & Highwalk remedial works; Dominant House footbridge repairs; Temple Area traffic review; London Wall car park waterproofing, joint replacement & concrete repairs; Museum of London public realm; St Pauls gyratory; Fire Safety at the car parks; Lindsey Street Bridge strengthening; Beech Street; and transport & public realm around Combined Courts/Police Development.
9. The programme also covers ongoing funding of future revenue projects, the main ones being highway resurfacing, enhancements & road maintenance

projects; concessionary fares & taxi cards; contributions to the costs of Off-Street car parks; and special needs transport. The progression of each individual scheme is, of course, subject to the City's normal evaluation criteria and Standing Orders.

10. A forecast summary of income and expenditure arising on the On-Street Parking Account and the corresponding contribution from or to the On-Street Parking surplus, over the medium-term financial planning period, is shown below:

Table 1 On-Street Parking Account Reserve Projections 2018/19 to 2023/24	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
	Actual £m	Forecast £m	Forecast £m	Forecast £m	Forecast £m	Forecast £m	£m
Income	20.3	15.4	23.8	22.7	19.7	16.9	118.8
Expenditure (<i>Note 1</i>)	(6.6)	(4.8)	(6.4)	(4.7)	(4.3)	(4.2)	(31.0)
Net Surplus arising in year	13.7	10.6	17.4	18.0	15.4	12.7	87.8
Capital, SRP and Revenue Commitments	(6.8)	(7.0)	(15.4)	(25.3)	(34.1)	(29.1)	(117.7)
Net in year contribution (from)/ to surplus	6.9	3.6	2.0	(7.3)	(18.7)	(16.4)	(29.9)
(Deficit) / Surplus cfwd at 1 st April	29.9	36.8	40.4	42.4	35.1	16.4	
(Deficit) / Surplus cfwd at 31st March	36.8	40.4	42.4	35.1	16.4	0.0	

Note 1: On-Street operating expenditure relates to direct staffing costs, repair & maintenance of pay & display machines, Saba enforcement contractor costs, fees & services (covering cash collection, pay by phone, postage & legal), IT software costs for enforcement systems, provision for bad debts for on-street income and central support recharges.

11. A noticeable increase in income is forecast from 2020/21 relating to traffic restriction enforcement through improved camera technology, including Beech Street zero emission zone, to be introduced as part of the fundamental review proposals. Depending upon future motorist's compliance, these forecast future income streams may need refining.

Conclusion

12. So that we can meet our requirements under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended), we ask that the Court of Common Council notes the contents of this report, which would then be submitted to the Mayor of London.

Background Papers

13. Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984; Road Traffic Act 1991; GLA Act 1999 sect 282.
14. Final Accounts 2018/19.

Simon Owen

Chamberlain's Department

T: 020 7332 1358

E: simon.owen@cityoflondon.gov.uk

TO: STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE 25 February 2020

FROM: RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB COMMITTEE 17 October 2019

Extract from Item 11 of the public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 October 2019

11. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There was one question: -

Dropped Kerbs and Accessibility

A Member urged that, when projects involving improvements to highways were being considered, it be made a condition of approval that measures be taken to ensure there were sufficient dropped kerbs and of appropriate quality to enable better disabled access. It was agreed that this question should be referred to the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee for further consideration.

This page is intentionally left blank

Date	Action	Officer responsible	To be completed/ progressed to next stage	Notes/Progress to date
4 September 2018 23 October 2018 4 December 2018 22 January 2019 26 February 2019 17 April 2019 22 July 2019 15 October 2019 3 December 2019	<u>Dockless Bikes</u> In response to a question concerning the dumping of yellow bikes in the City, officers reported that as a dockless cycle hire scheme could operate with no on-street infrastructure, companies were able to operate their schemes without the express consent of the Highway Authorities although bikes deemed to be causing an obstruction or nuisance could be removed. Officers agreed to speak to the relevant operators and report back to a future meeting.	Director of the Built Environment	31 March 2020	At its meeting on 10 September 2019, the Planning & Transportation Committee was advised that the prospective London-wide byelaw would cover 'dockless vehicles' to mitigate against legalisation of e-scooters. It was hoped the byelaw would be finalised by Spring 2020. At its meeting on 12 December 2019, the P&T Committee considered options and agreed to continue the parking arrangements as trialled, also approving additional operators, and agreed to extend the current trial until 31 March 2020.
3 December 2019	<u>Beech Street Transport and Public Realm Improvements</u> The project will address air quality issues by reducing traffic that pass through the tunnel. At the same time, it aims to deliver a vibrant street with a high-quality public realm at the centre of the Culture Mile, which will also provide the opportunity to realise property outcomes.	Director of the Built Environment	Ongoing January 2020 Feb 2020 March 2020	Engagement and public information with residents and businesses in the scheme area. Comprising on-street signing, leaflets, drop-in sessions, print and social media. TfL approved the Experimental scheme in early January with support of Islington and Camden. Minor civils construction works began on the 10 th February. Scheme due to be implemented in mid-March with launch event. 6 month long public consultation begins once the scheme launches, along with monitoring of project impacts.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee	Date: 25 February 2020
Subject: Report of Action Taken	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Joseph Anstee, Town Clerk's Department	

Summary

This report advises Members of action taken by the Town Clerk since the last meeting of the Committee, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b). This action related to:

60 LONDON WALL S278 HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

Main report

1. On 27 April 2017 conditional planning permission (16/00776/FULMAJ) was granted for partial demolition and redevelopment of 60 London Wall to provide retail and/or restaurant floor space at ground level and offices above on the land fronting London Wall and Cophall Avenue. Highway enabling works were required to integrate the development with the surrounding public highway and the City entered into a Section 278 agreement with the developer to deliver these works.
2. Through the detailed design process, it became apparent that more significant changes to the highway were required to accommodate threshold levels within the development and integrate the development into the surrounding highway. This included additional drainage work.
3. The increase in costs took the project from the light to general stream of the projects procedure. The design for the section 278 works was developed in partnership with the developer. Arising from this, approval for a change in the total estimated cost of the project of an increase of approximately £150,000 was requested in a report of the Director of the Built Environment to the Projects Sub Committee and the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee. The Projects Sub Committee approved the recommendations at its meeting on 27 January 2020.
4. Urgency was requested for Streets and Walkways Committee in order to ensure the necessary licences were in place and materials were procured in order to commence works in line with the developer's program. To line up with the practical completion of the development, works needed to start on 24 February.

If the report must wait until Committee on 25 February then it is likely that works will not start until late March/ early April, due to material lead in times, time taken for finance set-ups and works mobilisation periods.

Action Taken

That the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, agreed:

1. The total construction budget (Gateway 5) of £365,797 is approved for 60 London Wall Section 278;
2. Note the revised total estimated cost of the project of £405,797;
3. Delegate authority for any adjustments between elements of the approved budget to the Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain's Head of Finance;
4. Delegate authority for any budget increases to the Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain and Town Clerk, provided there is no change to the approved scope of works and the City receives upfront funding from the developer.

Contact:

Joseph Anstee
Committee and Services Officer, Town Clerk's Department
020 7332 1480

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank