

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
<p>1. Brief description of option</p>	<p>Do Nothing</p>	<p>Intermittent surface treatment of the shared use spaces and improvements to the existing Q11 route, and other Quick Win measures.</p> <p>The three shared use areas on Queen Street will be amended to create intermittent areas of paving designed to convey the route cyclists should use. The crossing over Cannon Street would also be amended to fit the new layout. Elsewhere, along the Q11 route, the measures include, introducing restrictions and physical measures to prevent parking and loading including on King Street, Queen Street, Wood Street and Moor Lane, raising the carriageway at the southern end of Queen Street to reduce cycle speeds and signal timing amendments to two junctions to improve cycle priority.</p>	<p>Full segregation of shared use space and other improvement measures.</p> <p>This is largely the same as Option 2 but goes much further with full segregation between pedestrians and cyclists at the three shared areas on Queen Street. This will be achieved by installing a cycle lane through the spaces at a lower level with full or semi high kerbs. It will require some utility services to be lowered or diverted.</p> <p>Full segregation provides much improved clarity for using the space but as a direct consequence, is less flexible (i.e. for pedestrian to overspill at peak times) and is likely to lead to more aggressive behaviours with less tolerance towards other users.</p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

		<p>The Quick Win measures include raised carriageways/continuous footways on Mark Lane at its junctions with Fenchurch Street and Great Tower Street, and on Blackfriars Lane at its junction with Queen Victoria Street, and introducing advisory cycle lanes on Fetter Lane, New Fetter Lane and Aldersgate Street.</p>	
<p>2. Scope and exclusions</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>To introduce improvements to the cycle route running from Queen Street, King Street, Gresham Street, Wood Street, Fore Street and Moor Lane, and to introduce Quick Wins on Mark Lane, Blackfriars Lane, Fetter Lane, New Fetter Lane and Aldersgate Street.</p> <p>Only sections with known deficiencies or stakeholder feedback are included.</p> <p>The section of Moor Lane between Ropemaker Street and Chiswell Street is excluded. This is because the London Borough of Islington is investigating other measures which may require additional change.</p> <p>The Queen Street/Upper Thames Street junction is excluded as this is under the control of TfL and the opportunity for change is limited.</p>	

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Project Planning			
<p>3. Programme and key dates</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Delivery is expected to be completed by March 2020.</p> <p>Dec 19 Detailed Design complete / procure materials Jan 20 Construction Starts Mar 20 Construction Completed Mar 20 Signals work Dec 20 G6 Outcome Report</p>	<p>Delivery is expected to be completed by July 2020.</p> <p>Dec 19 Detailed Design complete / procure materials / funding strategy Dec 19 Utility Estimates Feb 20 Issues report (if required) Mar 20 Construction Starts July 20 Construction Completed Feb 21 G6 Outcome Report</p>
<p>4. Risk implications</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Overall project option risk: Low</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work cost estimates may change following completion of detailed design. However, if additional funding is required, it is likely that TfL will fund this but if they don't, design alterations could be made to reduce costs without affecting the overall outcome of the project. 2. Objections to the Traffic Order Consultation. Although this is 	<p>Overall project option risk: High</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work cost significantly exceeds available budget due to the high costs involved in achieving a difference in levels for the segregated cycleway. This high additional cost is unlikely to be agreed by TfL. 2. Lowering of the space to form the cycleway could lead to additional unknown conditions, potentially increasing costs and timescale to resolve. There is a

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

		<p>likely, the impacts, if necessary, can be managed through minor amendments or other options without affecting the overall project. It is therefore recommended that resolution of this is delegated to the Director of the Built Environment in consultation with the Chairman/Deputy Chairman of the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.</p> <p>3. The confirmed TfL funding is time restricted and therefore the allocation must be utilised within the financial year or funding may be lost.</p> <p>4. TfL’s ability to deliver the traffic signals work this financial year may slip due to other priorities or circumstances beyond the City’s control.</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 5).</p>	<p>high risk that this option would not be completed by 31 March 2020.</p> <p>3. Objections to the Traffic Order Consultation. Although this is likely, the impacts, if necessary, can be managed through minor amendments or other options without affecting the overall project. It is therefore recommended that resolution of this is delegated to the Director of the Built Environment in consultation with the Chairman/Deputy Chairman of the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.</p> <p>4. The confirmed TfL funding is time restricted and therefore the allocation must be utilised within the financial year or funding may be lost.</p> <p>5. TfL’s ability to deliver the traffic signals work may slip due to</p>
--	--	--	--

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

			other priorities or circumstances beyond the City's control.
5. Stakeholders and consultees	TfL	TfL Committee Local occupiers Statutory Consultees Highways Team Open Spaces Team City Public Realm The Barbican Estate Ward Members	Throughout the life of the project At Project Gateways Consultation Consultation Throughout the life of the project Consultation Consultation Consultation Consultation
6. Benefits of option		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved safety for cyclists, pedestrians and others along the route • Pedestrians will feel safer with a clearer route intended to cyclists • Design of shared spaces allows flexible use and encourages more considerate cycling • Raised carriageways are likely to reduce motor vehicle speeds and therefore the risk of a collision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved safety for cyclists, pedestrians and others along the route • Pedestrians will feel safer with clearly defined segregated areas for cyclists • Raised carriageways are likely to reduce motor vehicle speeds and therefore the risk of a collision • Reduces congestion and parking at inconsiderate locations • Improves air quality

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable with confirmed TfL funding • Reduces congestion and parking at inconsiderate locations • Improves air quality 	
<p>7. Disbenefits of option</p>		<p>Reduced areas for loading or servicing for local occupiers.</p>	<p>Reduced areas for loading or servicing for local occupiers.</p> <p>Fully segregated cycle ways provide less flexibility for use by others such as the ability for pedestrians to spill into the cycle lane.</p> <p>Cyclists are likely to travel faster on the segregated sections of cycle way.</p> <p>Some cyclists may be more aggressive to pedestrians who encroach onto the cycle way.</p> <p>TfL unlikely to fund the full costs and therefore an alternative funding source would be required.</p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

			Unlikely to be deliverable within this financial year therefore potentially losing out on the TfL funding grant.
Resource Implications			
8. Total estimated cost	0	Total estimated cost £680k	£1.2m
9. Funding strategy	N/A	Funding to deliver this option will be through the grant provided by TfL.	Funding to deliver this option will be through a grant provided by TfL and other sources (currently unidentified).
10. Investment appraisal	Not applicable		
11. Estimated capital value/return	Not applicable		
12. Ongoing revenue implications	None	Will be covered through business as usual activities such as routine maintenance of the highway.	
13. Affordability	N/A	This option is affordable. The grant of £880k from TfL is sufficient to deliver this option.	This option is unaffordable. TfL is unlikely to fund the significant additional cost (in the region of £600k) and therefore an alternative

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

			funding source will need to be identified and agreed.
14. Legal implications	None	Both options will require traffic orders to be made to introduce new loading restrictions on King Street, Queen Street, Wood Street, Moor Lane and Silk Street, and a new loading bay on Trump Street. Any objections arising from this require resolution.	
15. Corporate property implications	None.		
16. Traffic implications	None	<p>These options have minimal impact on traffic capacity. The loading/parking restrictions will reduce congestion/improve traffic movement.</p> <p>To deliver the measures, local road closures and diversion will be required but will be co-ordinated and managed to keep disruption to a minimal.</p>	
17. Sustainability and energy implications	Cycling is an environmentally friendly form of transport with huge health benefits. As such it contributes significantly to improving air quality.		
18. IS implications	None		

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

19. Equality Impact Assessment	N/A	Test of Relevance showed a full equality impact assessment was not necessary as there were no adverse impacts to protected characteristics.	
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	N/A		
21. Recommendation	Not recommended	Recommended	Not recommended