

**STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION)**  
**COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 4 September 2018**

**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:**

Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	Alderman Gregory Jones QC
Oliver Sells QC (Deputy Chairman)	Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)
Randall Anderson	Deputy Alastair Moss
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Barbara Newman
Marianne Fredericks	Graham Packham
Alderman Alison Gowman (Ex-Officio Member)	

**Officers:**

Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Olumayowa Obisesan	- Chamberlain's Department
Karen McHugh	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department
Iain Simmons	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Alan Rickwood	- City of London Police
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Sam Lee	- Department of the Built Environment
Mark Lowman	- City Surveyor's Department
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark.

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

Alderman Alison Gowman declared an interest in Item 5 by virtue of living in the vicinity of Beech Street.

Graham Packham declared an interest in Item 6 by virtue of living in the vicinity of Tudor Street.

**3. MINUTES**

The Committee noted that Alderman Alison Gowman had given her apologies for the previous meeting and this was not recorded in the minutes.

**RESOLVED** – That, pending the above correction, the minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2018 be approved as a correct record.

4. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Committee received a list of outstanding references.

Swan Pier

The City Surveyor advised the Committee that work was on target for completion in February 2019.

Members queried whether the works related to the pier itself or the flood defence wall, and whether there would be any legal ramifications if the pier was taken out, even temporarily. The Chairman asked for officers to prepare a response to all Members of the sub-Committee as there was some confusion around the project.

22 Bishopsgate

The Director of the Built Environment advised the Committee that the negotiations over public realm improvements had been successful. It was hoped that a legal agreement with the developer would be in place by October 2018 and that work could start in late October or early November 2018.

The Sub-Committee noted that Dockless Bikes was on the agenda for the meeting, and that a report on ATTRO had been received by the Planning & Transportation Committee on 26 July 2018. Members asked that an annual report on ATTRO be submitted.

Members asked that two items be added to the list of Outstanding References:

Committee Structure

Members had previously discussed asking the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee to nominate a Member to the Sub-Committee, to ensure pollution issues were tied in with the Sub-Committee's discussions. Members agreed that the Planning & Transportation Committee should be asked to amend the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee to include one member of the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee, and to invite the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee to nominate one Member to the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.

Fann Street

The Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee that further work had been done to improve the street from U-turning traffic. An independent study had been undertaken which had resolved that it would not be unsafe to take away the current banned U-turn at the Aldersgate Street/Fann Street junction. Subject to the outcome of consultation with ward Members, the changes would be made in the next few weeks.

5. **BEECH STREET: TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning the Beech Street Transport and Public Realm Project. The report had been resubmitted following its original submission in July, with increased scope for the project, an increased emphasis on air quality, and more consideration given to the possibility of a City-wide traffic model which could be applied to the area.

This model could have several aspirational City schemes input into it to understand cumulative traffic impacts, more discussions are to follow between City officers and TfL as well as Islington Council who were working on a project for the Clerkenwell Road area. Officers had also undertaken structural investigation work and ground radar surveys were ongoing.

The Chairman noted that 2024 felt like a long timescale, and that if there were options to bring this forward they should be explored, including high-level political intervention if necessary. A Member suggested that this could be an opportunity to work closely and cooperate with TfL as a way forward. The Director of the Built Environment advised that officers had been working with TfL and had offered the City as a pilot for their model.

Members discussed the timescales of the project, noting that whilst 2024 was an unattractive target, in light of the scale and significance of the project it might be necessary and that it was comparable to other similarly complex projects such as Aldgate. The Chairman concurred but felt it was necessary to keep pressing on this project, politically and with TfL, and it was agreed that regular updates should be provided to the Committee as a standing item. It was important for the project to be done correctly and with minimal impact on neighbours. A Member suggested that it might be more efficient to simply ban polluting vehicles from the tunnel. Members asked about the timescales for the TfL model and detailed designs to be developed.

The Director of the Built Environment responded to questions from Members. The recommendations included a request to increase the scope of the project to explore the possibility of introducing Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle restrictions in Beech Street. Early indications were that it would take 12-18 months for the TfL model to be developed. The detailed design phase carried a timescale of 14 months as Beech Street was complicated structurally, and the project would need to tie in with other works. The timescales attached were a best guess and whilst there would be ways to speed things up such as overlapping works, these would often carry risks. Officers would work with Members to explore ways the project could be accelerated, and agreed to update officers on the project at each meeting.

A Member asked if the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicles restrictions could be implemented quickly. The Director of the Built Environment responded that officers would look at other Boroughs and report back.

**RESOLVED** – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

1. Note the vision for Beech Street as approved by the Policy and Resources Committee, which includes the reduction of traffic, improvements to the public realm, widening of footways and improvements in air quality;
2. Note the separation of the podium water-proofing, property redevelopment and transportation & public realm projects, to follow individual Gateway paths and reporting times;
3. Note the results of the traffic and public realm work done so far;
4. Note the key project risks, next steps & programme.
5. Approve further development of the feasibility of Option 1 (Beech Street closed to eastbound traffic) and Option 2 (Beech Street closed to westbound traffic);
6. Approve an increase in the scope of the project (requested by the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee) to investigate the feasibility of introducing Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle restrictions in Beech Street;
7. Approve the proposed procurement route for consultancy services utilising the City's Highways Term Contract;
8. Approve an increase in the estimated project budget of £1,526,435, to £1,745,362 to fund the project to Gateway 4, subject to the procurement of the relevant consultancy appointments;
9. Approve the allocation of Public Realm and Local Transport Improvement CIL funds to fund the development of the project to Gateway 4;
10. Delegate authority for any adjustments between elements of the budget to the Director of the Built Environment in conjunction with the Chamberlain's Head of Finance provided the total approved budget of £1,745,362 (subject to procurement) is not exceeded and the scope remains unchanged; and
11. Ask that officers explore ways to accelerate the project if appropriate, and that officers update Members on the project at each meeting of the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.

6. **TUDOR STREET/NEW BRIDGE STREET - UPDATE REPORT**

The Chairman proposed that the item be withdrawn, as the other planned activities in the area meant that funding for the project in its present guise was unlikely to be agreed. The timing was not right, and a number of issues including which projects would be deferred needed to be settled before the project could proceed.

A Member requested that a report or a presentation be brought to the Sub-Committee on the Temple Area Traffic Study, as it would inform future decisions. The Member was also concerned with the arrangements of using a third-party transport consultant to review the Embankment access. Another Member queried what the City was doing regarding a recent injury collision at the Tudor Street/New Bridge Street junction.

The Sub-Committee was advised that as part of the Temple Area Traffic Review project, a further report setting out the findings would be submitted to this committee soon. The arrangements to use a third party had previously been agreed by Members. The Sub-Committee was assured that any proposals would be scrutinised by Corporation officers who would undertake their own due diligence and provide advice on anything brought before Members. A copy of this agreed arrangement will be circulated. The Sub-Committee was advised that officers would continue to discuss the safety performance of the current junction with TfL to see what safety improvements they could make.

The Sub-Committee agreed to withdraw the item.

**7. BANK ON SAFETY: FURTHER DETAIL ON THE ADDITIONAL FUNDS SOUGHT**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment giving further detail on additional funds sought for the Bank on Safety scheme, subject to the outcome of the decisions of the Policy & Resources Committee and Court of Common Council on 6 September 2018 and 13 September 2018 respectively.

The Director of the Built Environment gave Members an overview of the small package of enhancement works planned in advance of the All Change at Bank project. Members noted the proposed timescale set out in the report, and that resources would be allocated to complete the works as quickly as possible.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

**8. ADOPTION OF THE CITY LIGHTING STRATEGY**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning adoption of the City Lighting Strategy. The strategy would introduce significant changes including upgrades to LED lights. The public consultation on the strategy had been well-received. There would be an emphasis on linking the strategy with the planning process as this had been a consistent feature in consultation feedback, and officers were looking at producing a guidance note for developers to this end.

Members praised the strategy and commended officers for their work, adding that the consultations had been very well-organised. Members of the Sub-Committee endorsed the recommendations that would be put to the Planning & Transportation Committee on 11 September 2018.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

## 9. **DOCKLESS CYCLE HIRE REVIEW**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning the City of London Corporation's dockless cycle hire policy. Officers had reviewed the policy and confirmed that the Corporation does not have the power to prevent dockless cycle operators from operating within the City, but has the power to remove cycles if they were deemed to be causing an obstruction, danger or nuisance.

The recommendation was that officers would investigate whether additional management measures could be applied pending the adoption of the City's new Transport Policy and in the meantime the Corporation could be more proactive in removing cycles in accordance with the Street Obstructions Policy. The Sub-Committee was advised that TfL was consulting on devising a London-wide byelaw which would enable the Corporation to licence dockless bike operators in coordination with other boroughs and TfL.

The Comptroller & City Solicitor drew the Sub-Committee's attention to the legal advice set out in the report. Whilst Members' frustrations were understandable, the matter had been looked at very carefully, and the general law does not permit the City to ban operators from operating in the City. Officers were continuing to work closely with the operators, and the Corporation retained the right to remove any dockless bikes that were an obstruction, nuisance or danger.

Members suggested that the opportunity be taken to undergo a wider review of the Corporation's Street Obstruction Policy to reconsider issues such as A-boards, road signs, and people congregating in large numbers to drink outside pubs. The current Street Obstructions Policy was agreed in 2014 and may need to be updated given the greater number of pedestrians in the City today. Members asked that a report be brought back on street obstructions generally.

A Member commented that the City had power to prosecute obstructions of the highway. A Member asked what was happening with regards to dockless cycles in other London Boroughs and cities elsewhere. The Director of the Built Environment responded that experience varied, but most London Boroughs had reported similar experiences to that of the City of London. TfL had a working group that was focussed on the issue in London. Mobike was withdrawing from Manchester because of operational issues and operators were now focussing more on London as they worked towards a profitable business model. Other countries had different experiences, affected by their relevant laws, China's had been well documented; some US cities had banned them, others had problems with electric scooters. Most cities were having to balance encouragement of cycling with the fact that it could be a challenge to manage.

A Member enquired about the fee of £82.58 charged for removing a cycle and how this figure was reached. The Director of the Built Environment responded that the figure was the same as that applied to individual (private) bikes and could be reviewed.

A Member expressed disappointment that the report did not address comments or provide information requested by Members, such as measures introduced in other countries who seemed to have stricter rules, like Singapore, who operated on a basis of licensing all dockless cycle operators, with a limited number of licences available. The Corporation had the power to deal with obstructions and needed to make more use of those powers. The report needed to provide further detail about removals such as its impact on officer resources. It was suggested that officers look at the Metropolitan Streets Act 1867 and Schedule 4 of the Environment Act 1990, which had for example enabled authorities to take stricter action against supermarket operators when the dumping of shopping trolleys had become a problem.

A Member argued that the City of London was not a suitable location for dockless cycles and the operators should be told that they were not allowed to use the City of London. The Member highlighted limited capacity on the City's streets and the Corporation's responsibility to account for the impact of street obstructions on disabled people, as the streets could be difficult to navigate for them. It should be suggested that dockless bikes could be ridden in the City - but could only be parked outside of the City.

A Member suggested that the service could be a real benefit if it was well-run, and a possible way forward might be to designate areas where the cycles could be left, such as car parks like Baynard House. A Member added that it was not clear how significant an issue the cycles were as obstructions, as the report stated that poorly-parked cycles had often been ridden away by a customer between the cycle being reported to officers and the operator reaching the location. It was noted that the City's SEO or City Police had only had to remove bikes on three occasions since November 2017.

A Member asked officers to clarify whether the City of London was a Participating Borough (for the purposes of TfL's Code of Practice (Dockless bike share)). The Director of the Built Environment responded that the Corporation had not entered into a Memo of Understanding with operators as officers had been advised that these did not carry weight. The City has formal arrangements with 2 operators. Designated parking areas had been suggested before and work on this proposal could be brought forward. Geofencing was raised and it was suggested that the Corporation could give preferred locations to operators. Officers commented that the GPS technology on the bikes was not sophisticated enough to trigger charges if the bikes were left in the wrong location, as it was only accurate to within 100 metres. However, different technology such as Bluetooth could be explored. Mobike has a surcharge system for bikes left outside their operating area (which currently includes the City).

The Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee that the current arrangements with operators could be revoked and the operators could be asked not to operate within the City, but legally the Corporation could not stop them from doing so. A Member responded that the main issue was with using public pavement space. The operators could hire car parking space or private land to station their bikes. Provision for private bikes was already

limited. The Corporation should take the proactive course of saying that dockless bikes could not be parked on public pavements to ensure the pavements were kept clear and safe, and if the operators wanted to so trade, they should follow the same rules as others. This would not be banning the bikes from the City but only from the public highway.

The Director of the Built Environment responded that officers needed time to assess the degree of obstruction being caused and to develop an understanding of the scale of any negative impacts that the bikes were causing. The upcoming Transport Strategy would also identify the level of public amenity provided by dockless cycle schemes, which could be set against the issue of obstructions. It was requested that officers be given time to gather more data and bring a further report back at a future meeting.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor advised the Sub-Committee that revoking the current arrangements with operators would not give the Corporation greater powers to act against them and would not make a difference to the City's current ability to remove the bikes where they are causing an obstruction danger or nuisance. The Sub-Committee was advised that the City had a better ability to manage the situation if it continued to work with operators under the current arrangements, and that the Corporation would be better off being part of a London-wide model. Members' suggestions on previous legislation could be fed back into the discussions taking place on the establishment of a London-wide byelaw.

A Member stressed the need for a measured and proportionate response. A co-ordinated approach with other boroughs should be the central means of working with operators so that there is regulation across Central London, but officers need to keep up the momentum so as to make progress with this. Members recognised the need for a proper enforceable legal agreement with operators.

#### **RESOLVED –**

a) That officers take the comments of the Sub-Committee into account and produce this note of the Sub-Committee's discussion, and previous reports, to the Planning & Transportation Committee ahead of consideration of the matter by the Planning & Transportation Committee; and

b) That officers be instructed to bring a report back to the Sub-Committee on the Corporation's Street Obstructions Policy for review.

#### **10. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

A Member asked about the current situation with Cadent, and what formal work was being done to address it. The Director of the Built Environment responded that central London as a whole was experiencing the same issues as the City due to the age of the gas main network in place. There had been 8 major gas main failures recently, and officers were pushing for the mains to be replaced rather than repaired. However, the Tideway project and potential closure to



Embankment could cause delay to this work. A report would be brought to the Planning & Transportation Committee on plans for 2019 when more details about Tideway were known.

A Member reported that on Saturday 11 August 2018 a mass cycling event organised via Facebook had come through the City and had resulted in a number of incidents including pedestrians being hit and intimidated, and asked what officers knew about the incident. The Director of the Built Environment responded that a large anti-knife crime event had been organised, and that a Metropolitan Police escort had been arranged to monitor the event. A Member advised officers that incidents had been reported and received crime numbers. Officers were asked to look into the matter and provide a written response to Members.

A Member requested that officers give an update to Members regarding the delay to the opening of Crossrail. The Director of the Built Environment responded that officers were disappointed about the delays, but it had become clear that although the Crossrail project at Farringdon East was on course to be completed by the original deadline, Liverpool Street/Moorgate was falling behind. In response to a query from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment responded that full funding for the public realm works had been received for Farringdon East and Moorfields, but not for Liverpool Street. The upcoming Transport Strategy would have more information on the impact on buses, as some routes were being taken out.

**11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was none.

**12. 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.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Exempt Paragraphs</b>
13 - 15	3
16 - 17	-

**13. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

**14. BANK ON SAFETY UNATTENDED ENFORCEMENT CAMERA CONTRACT EXTENSION**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment.

**15. NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX - TUDOR STREET/NEW BRIDGE STREET**

The item was withdrawn.

**16. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

There was a non-public question.

**17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no other business.

**The meeting closed at 12.27 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee**

**tel. no.: 020 7332 1480**

**Joseph.Anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk**