

<b>Committee(s):</b> Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee Projects Sub-Committee	<b>Date(s):</b> 11/12/2012 13/12/2012	
<b>Subject:</b> Road Danger reduction in the Shoe Lane area – Stonecutter Street & Little New Street	<b>Public</b>	
<b>Report of:</b> Director of the Department for the Built Environment	<b>For Decision</b>	

### Gateway 3-5 Report (Streamlined)

#### Summary

##### Dashboard

Project Status	Project Stage	Total Estimated Cost	Spend to Date	Overall project risk
<u>GREEN</u>	<u>Authority to start work – Gateway 5</u>	<u>£149,838 To complete the project</u>	<u>53,738 Staff Costs, Fees</u>	<u>GREEN</u>

##### Context

In July 2012 Members agreed a project to explore how road safety and the local environment (including air quality and noise) might be further improved in the Shoe Lane area. In particular, to consider what benefit might be derived from the formal closure of Stonecutter Street to through traffic. This followed an approach from Goldman Sachs who expressed concern about the safety of vulnerable road users (including their own staff based at their Shoe Lane campus) and agreed to fund the project. They have already provided £100,000 of advance funding for the evaluation and design phase of the project.

One of the ways to improve road safety in this area and the local environment would be to remove through vehicular traffic. Stonecutter Street currently accommodates competing and conflicting transport activities. The dominant use of Stonecutter Street is as a cut through route for traffic moving south-eastbound from Holborn Circus to Farringdon Street. This conflicts with the character of the road, the local activities, and the interests of pedestrians and cyclists.

Growth in pedestrian and cycle numbers is expected in the area as a result of local developments and national public transport enhancements (Crossrail) as well as modal shifts to more sustainable forms of transport.

Locally, Transport for London (TfL) has forecast that 140,000 passengers will use the new Farringdon Station each day once Thameslink and Crossrail are fully implemented in 2018 and 2019 respectively. A proportion of these passengers will

travel through the Stonecutter Street area, either on foot or by bicycle. Giving higher priority to pedestrians and cyclists on Stonecutter Street would help to accommodate these higher flows by improving both safety and the quality of the public realm in the area. Improving the priority given to vulnerable road users is entirely consistent with the nearby Holborn Circus Enhancement Scheme, which the City will implement in 2013.

These aims and objectives have been communicated to local Ward Members, residents, businesses, user groups and TfL via a public consultation which was held between 27<sup>th</sup> September and 26<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

#### Brief description of project

The City has now undertaken feasibility studies in the Stonecutter Street, Shoe Lane and New Street Square area to develop measures which would increase the priority given to vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists. This could be achieved partly by redirection of through traffic on to more appropriate streets whilst limiting impacts on journey times and distances for local residents and businesses.

Three options were developed and consulted upon. These were:

1. Option 1 (Recommended): Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles.
2. Option 2: Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles and also close Little New Street at its junction with Shoe Lane, to motorised vehicles.
3. Option 3: Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles whilst allowing for one-way traffic to travel eastbound from Little New Street onto Shoe Lane.

After an analysis of the consultation results it was noted that 50% of respondents were in favour of Option 1 and only 4% were in favour of Option 2. There was no support for Option 3. Results of the consultation show that there was negligible support for Options 2&3. This report focuses on the proposal to close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles (Option 1).

A full breakdown of replies is given in Appendix 1, with the results (after re-engagement in Table 4. Of the 22 Businesses/Key Stakeholders consulted, 11 were in favour of the scheme, 5 undecided and 6 were against.

Of those respondents that expressed support for the scheme, traffic speed reduction and reduction of rat-running traffic were commonly cited as key reasons for supporting the scheme. Of those that did not support the scheme, concerns regarding potential increases in vehicle journey times were generally expressed. Traffic analysis suggests that although there may be increases in travel time for certain journeys, these increases are minimal. Furthermore, discussions are progressing regarding linking the signal timings of the Holborn Circus and Charterhouse Street junctions to further minimise any potential impact.

## Recommended Option

1. **Option 1 (Recommended):** Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles as set out in Appendix 3 – drawing 22484901-109 - Sheet 1 - REV D.

## **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Members:

1. Approve the detailed design (Appendix 3) and closure of Stonecutter Street to motorised vehicles subject to:
  - i. The making of any necessary Traffic Management Orders which will be the subject of a separate statutory process, (including statutory consultation);
  - ii. The Comptroller and City Solicitor entering into an agreement (under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980) with Goldman Sachs; and
  - iii. That Goldman Sachs provide full funding for the project in accordance with the conditions of the S.278 and prior to the commencement of any works;
2. Members are also asked to approve revisions to the project budgets as detailed in Table 2.

## Resource requirements to complete the project

It is anticipated that the total costs to complete the project will come to £149,838. Goldman Sachs has committed to fund the costs of the entire project, and has already provided £100,000 advance funding for this purpose.

**Table 1: Total Estimated Project Costs – Option 1**

<b>Stonecutter St Evaluation</b>	<b>Option 1 Permanent Closure of Stonecutter Street</b>
	<b>£</b>
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>53,738</b>
Highways Works	32,100
TfL Signals Works	10,000
<b>Works Sub Total</b>	<b>42,100</b>
Fees	16,000
Staff Costs	18,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>34,000</b>
Sub Total before Tolerance	129,838
Tolerance (allowance for utilities)	20,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>149,838</b>
Total Funding Requirement	149,838
Advance funds received	(100,000)
Balance remaining*	49,838

\*Note: Additional funds required via S.278.

Plans for consultation prior to the next Gateway report

The following consultation processes are anticipated:

- Statutory consultation on the Traffic Management Order; and
- Stakeholder engagement with those properties that may be affected during the construction phase.

Tolerances

- Goldman Sachs will be required to underwrite the full costs of the project;
- The making of any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders, which will be the subject of a separate statutory process.

## Overview

### **1. Evidence of Need**

- Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street are designated as local access roads and are expected to cater only for local trips. If Stonecutter Street were to be closed to motorised vehicles this would enforce this designation and reassign through-traffic onto designated London distributor roads such as Farringdon Street, and onto City of London local distributor roads such as New Fetter Lane and Charterhouse Street.
- From investigations it can be demonstrated that there is justification for action based on the high numbers of vehicles using Stonecutter Street as a through route to Farringdon Street. Surveys indicate that 60% of traffic using Stonecutter Street is rat-running traffic.
- 1 fatal, 10 serious and 73 slight accidents have been recorded in the area over the last 36 months. A reduction in vehicular traffic will normally lead to a corresponding reduction in accident occurrence.
- In the morning peak hour alone, approximately 200 vehicles using Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street as a cut through have the potential for conflict with over 550 pedestrians that currently cross informally at the western end of Stonecutter Street and towards the southern end of Shoe Lane.
- With pedestrian and cycle growth predicted to rise in the future, accident rates are also predicted to increase should the local environment remain unchanged.

### **Cycling Environment**

- Although St. Bride Street is an attractive route for both pedestrians and cyclists, this does create conflicts within a designated shared area. By improving the facilities at Stonecutter Street for cyclists to enter / exit the Shoe Lane area, a reduction in the numbers of cyclists currently using St. Bride Street can be achieved without affecting journey times or cycle safety.
- A Barclays Cycle Hire station operated by Transport for London (TfL) is located on both sides of Stonecutter Street, adjacent to the junction with Farringdon Street. Approximate 46 docking stations are provided and generate frequent cycle trips.
- Development in this area is likely to be predominantly office based which will encourage a further increase

	<p>in cycle numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The closure of Stonecutter Street to motorised traffic would retain permeability for cyclists, improve safety, and the local environment to further encourage these sustainable travel options.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Success Criteria</b>	<p>The success criteria for this project will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in traffic volumes;</li> <li>Reduction in personal injury accidents on the local streets;</li> <li>Redirection of through traffic on to more appropriate streets with limited impacts on journey times or distances;</li> <li>Effective use of the local streets for local needs, without detrimental impact on the operation of the surrounding highway network;</li> <li>Enhanced pedestrian and cycle environment;</li> <li>Maintain the effectiveness of the 'Traffic and Environment Zone' in the west of the City; and</li> <li>The ability to accommodate higher pedestrian and cycle flows, particularly to local public transport hubs where services have recently been or will soon be enhanced.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Project Scope and Exclusions</b>	<p>There are no notable exclusions.</p>
<b>4. Link to Strategic Aims</b>	<p>This project seeks to deliver against the following Strategic Aim:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To support and promote 'The City' as the world leader in international finance and business services</li> </ul> <p>This will be delivered by ensuring that the needs of the local community are met fully.</p> <p>This project also supports delivery of the Statutory Local Implementation Plan. In particular, the plan includes an objective to reduce road traffic dangers and casualties.</p>
<b>5. Within which category does the project fit</b>	<p>(2) Statutory (a requirement under the RTA 1988 to reduce casualties) and (4) Reimbursable.</p>
<b>6. What is the priority of the project?</b>	<p>(B) advisable</p>

<p><b>7. Governance arrangements</b></p>	<p>Not required, a formal working group was set up with the external funder at Gateway 1-2.</p>																				
<p><b>8. Resources Expended To Date</b></p>	<p>To date the following resources have been expended on the evaluation of the Stonecutter Street Danger Reduction scheme:</p> <p><b>Table 2: Evaluation &amp; Design</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="587 495 1417 1043"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="587 495 844 674">Stonecutter St Evaluation</th> <th data-bbox="844 495 1046 674">Original Budget</th> <th data-bbox="1046 495 1228 674">Spend to date / (Revised Budget)</th> <th data-bbox="1228 495 1417 674">Remaining</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="844 674 1046 745">£</td> <td data-bbox="1046 674 1228 745">£</td> <td data-bbox="1228 674 1417 745">£</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="587 745 844 869">Fees</td> <td data-bbox="844 745 1046 869">31,000</td> <td data-bbox="1046 745 1228 869">2,556</td> <td data-bbox="1228 745 1417 869">(28,444)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="587 869 844 972">DBE Staff Costs</td> <td data-bbox="844 869 1046 972">69,000</td> <td data-bbox="1046 869 1228 972">51,182</td> <td data-bbox="1228 869 1417 972">(17,818)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="587 972 844 1043"><b>Grand Total</b></td> <td data-bbox="844 972 1046 1043"><b>100,000</b></td> <td data-bbox="1046 972 1228 1043"><b>53,738</b></td> <td data-bbox="1228 972 1417 1043"><b>(46,262)</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As is explained later in this report, the amount of time that needed to be spent on consultation and stakeholder engagement was much larger than initially envisaged. However, much less time was spent on design as a result, resulting in an underspend on staff costs overall.</p> <p>The remaining unspent evaluation funds (£46,262) are set aside for the implementation of the scheme; the progression of the scheme being subject to a S278 agreement with Goldman Sachs and all additional funding being received in advance of implementation.</p>	Stonecutter St Evaluation	Original Budget	Spend to date / (Revised Budget)	Remaining		£	£	£	Fees	31,000	2,556	(28,444)	DBE Staff Costs	69,000	51,182	(17,818)	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>53,738</b>	<b>(46,262)</b>
Stonecutter St Evaluation	Original Budget	Spend to date / (Revised Budget)	Remaining																		
	£	£	£																		
Fees	31,000	2,556	(28,444)																		
DBE Staff Costs	69,000	51,182	(17,818)																		
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>53,738</b>	<b>(46,262)</b>																		
<p><b>9. Results of stakeholder consultation to date</b></p>	<p>From September 27 to October 26 the City undertook a public consultation on three proposed options. A consultation leaflet seeking comments on the proposals was distributed to Ward Members, and 750 local businesses and residents in the vicinity of Shoe Lane, Stonecutter Street, and New Street Square, including statutory consultees, and TfL. The options were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1 (Recommended): Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles;</li> <li>• Option 2: Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its</li> </ul>																				

eastern end to motorised vehicles and also and close Little New Street at its junction with Shoe Lane, to motorised vehicles; and

- Option 3: Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles whilst allowing for one-way traffic to travel eastbound from Little New Street onto Shoe Lane.

In addition to the consultation leaflet, officers also attended meetings with major occupiers in the area and key stakeholders (Deloitte, Hines, City Temple, St Andrews Church, and Land Securities) who sought clarification on the proposals prior to submitting their responses.

As a result of this exercise the City received 22 responses of which 13 were from businesses and key stakeholders and 9 from local residents. This represents a response rate of 3% which is typical for this type of consultation.

The full breakdown of results received by the deadline date of 26 October and hard copies can be found in Appendix 1-2 of this report.

Analysis of the consultation responses and stakeholder feedback revealed that:

- residents were either strongly in favour or against Options 1-3; whereas
- business stakeholders and major occupiers in the City would only agree with the principles of the proposals, stating they were unable to decide given the information available to them.

**Table 3: Initial Consultation Responses**

<u>PROPOSAL</u>			
Options 1-3	For	Undecided	Against
Resident	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	5 (23%)
Business and Other Key Stakeholders	5 (23%)	7 (32%)	1 (4%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	7 (32%)	9 (41%)	6 (27%)

In total 41% of respondents were of the opinion that further research should be undertaken to better understand the

environment and local needs, and therefore could not agree to any of the proposed options by the consultation deadline date of 26 October.

In particular, there were concerns regarding how the proposals would work in the context of the programmed Holborn Circus Enhancement Scheme, part of which proposed to restrict movements at the junction of St Andrews Street / New Fetter Lane.

Because of the mixed response to the options, officers undertook further analysis into the impacts of the proposals in conjunction with TfL to further clarify the benefits and impacts of the proposals and in turn communicate these to stakeholders.

To this end, the City commissioned specialist transport consultants to produce an addendum technical report which could be sent to key stakeholders and major occupiers who sought further clarification. In addition, Officers discussed and agreed with TfL that the junction of St Andrews Street /New Fetter Lane could work as an all-movements junction without any effect upon either the Holborn Circus scheme nor the Stonecutter Street proposals.

Follow-up meetings were then held with Deloitte, TfL, St Andrews Church, City Temple and Land Securities.

A summary of the respondent's issues, and the technical addendum outlining the City's response to the issues raised are given in Appendix 4.

### **Current Position**

Subsequent to the second round of engagement, officers noted a shift in opinion from "Unable to decide at this time" to "In favour" based on the technical analysis/mitigation provided and supporting correspondence provided by TfL.

Of the major occupiers and key stakeholders the City re-engaged with, the following are now in favour of Option 1.

1. Deloitte ( approx. 10,000 employees)
2. The City Temple
3. St Andrews Church
4. Transport for London

Table 4 summarises the consultation responses following the second round of engagement.

**Table 4: Consultation results following re-engagement:**

<u>PROPOSAL</u>			
Option 1	For	Undecided	Against
Resident	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	5 (23%)
Business and Other Key Stakeholders	9 (41%)	3 (14%)	1 (4%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	11 (50%)	5 (23%)	6 (27%)

As a result of the re-engagement, 50% of respondents are now in favour of Option 1, with 23% still unable to decide, and 27% who are still against Option 1.

In addition to the changes noted above officers are of the opinion that with further re-engagement there may be an additional 3 businesses, and 2 residents who may change their views from “Unable to decide” to “In favour” of Option 1.

**10. Commentary on the options considered**

**Option 1 (Recommended):** Permanently close Stonecutter Street at its eastern end to motorised vehicles to reduce unnecessary through traffic in the area.

The City, in conjunction with TfL have identified that the closure of Stonecutter Street would have no adverse effects on Farringdon Street and the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). It would help in achieving the City’s aims to reduce accident rates, provide a quieter, safer route for pedestrians and cyclists, accommodate future growth in pedestrian and cycle flows, and improve local cycle access. This option will also increase the priority given to vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists; and redirect through traffic on to more appropriate roads whilst limiting impacts on journey times and travel distances for local residents and businesses.

It is envisaged that the physical closure of Stonecutter Street would be achieved via the installation of removable bollards, associated regulatory and advisory signage, lining works, and amendments to TfL signal aspects on Farringdon Street. Please refer to Appendix 3 – 22484901-109.dwg - Sheet 1 - REV D.

In order to ensure that the closure satisfies the Success Criteria set out in Section 2 of this report, and to further satisfy consultees concerns with regard to through traffic, monitoring will be undertaken. Modelling of the traffic impact of the proposed closure indicates a de-minimus impact in terms of through traffic using Little New Street. This will be

kept under review to enable further understanding of the impact on local environment and needs, and assess any requirement for further measures. If the closure is not adequately achieving the Success Criteria, particularly with regard to through traffic, additional measures will be considered. This could include further physical restriction or the use of Access Only Traffic Regulation Orders.

The cost implications of Option 1 are given in Table 5.

**Table 5: Option 1 S.278 Construction Estimate**

<b>Stonecutter St</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>£</b>
Highways Works	Riney's / Highways	32,100
TfL Signals Works	TfL Signals Works*	10,000
<b>Works Sub Total</b>		<b>42,100</b>
Fees	Surveys, Traffic Orders	16,000
T&PR Staff Costs	Project Management	15,000
Highways Staff Costs	Project Management	3,000
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>34,000</b>
<b>Sub Total before Tolerance</b>		<b>76,100</b>
Tolerance	Utility Diversions	20,000
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>96,100</b>

\* - TfL and utilities diversions estimates yet to be received. An estimate of £10k has been assumed for TfL works costs and a £20k tolerance for utilities diversions.

Should members choose not to close Stonecutter Street officers will close down the project and return any remaining funds to Goldman Sachs.

**11. Consequences if project not approved**

- Should Members not approve the recommendations within this report the project will be closed and an opportunity to improve the local environment at no cost to the City will be lost.
- There is a possible risk to corporate reputation with major City stakeholders if this project suffers undue delay.

<p><b>12. Key benefits of the proposal</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A genuine reduction in danger for all road users by identifying and controlling the principle sources of threat;</li> <li>• Reduction of road danger at source by promoting environmentally sustainable transport which will provide equity and accessibility for non-motorised road users;</li> <li>• Provide for expected cycle and pedestrian growth in the area due to new developments, the Crossrail and Thameslink improvements, in addition to projected changes in future modal share;</li> <li>• Redirection of through traffic on to more appropriate local distributor roads whilst limiting impacts on journey times and distances for local residents and businesses;</li> <li>• Increase the priority given to vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists;</li> <li>• Improve permeability for cyclists and pedestrians and improve the environment to further encourage sustainable travel options; and</li> <li>• Generation of opportunities for significant public realm improvements in the future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>13. Programme and key dates</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Stakeholder consultation: 27/09/2012 – 26/10/2012;</li> <li>• S&amp;W Sub Committee: 11/12/2012;</li> <li>• Projects Sub Committee: 13/12/2012;</li> <li>• Enter into S.278 agreement with Goldman Sachs: December 2012;</li> <li>• Obtain formal approvals from TfL: early 2013;</li> <li>• Advertise Section 6 traffic orders: early 2013; and</li> <li>• Implementation: early 2013</li> </ul>
<p><b>14. Constraints and assumptions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goldman Sachs to fully fund the delivery of this project via S.278 agreement;</li> <li>• Possible delay to implementation due to construction requirements of known or future developments and Crossrail.</li> </ul>

<p><b>15. Risk implications</b></p>	<p><b>MEDIUM RISK</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project will require formal approval from TfL on traffic and bus matters;</li> <li>• Objections to the statutory consultation of Section 6 traffic orders; and</li> <li>• There is a possible risk to corporate reputation, if delays occur during the project process or approval is not granted to proceed with the recommended option.</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. Stakeholders and consultees</b></p>	<p>External stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport for London (TfL);</li> <li>• Local business and community interests; and</li> <li>• The public and user groups.</li> </ul> <p>Internal Stakeholders:</p> <p>Dept of the Built Environment (DBE);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways</li> <li>• Access Team; and</li> <li>• Road Safety Team – Road Safety Audit;</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open Spaces Department; and</li> <li>• Ward Members – Castle Baynard</li> </ul> <p>Traffic Regulation Order :</p> <p>Statutory consultation</p>
<p><b>17. Legal implications</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be required;</li> <li>• In order to ensure that the City can continue to fulfil its statutory duties, the City retains full discretion to consider the introduction of alternative traffic arrangements (either temporary or permanent) on the affected roads should this be necessary in the future, in the event of changed circumstances such as altered traffic patterns;</li> <li>• S.278 agreement; and</li> <li>• In exercising its highway and traffic functions the City must have regard, inter alia, to its duty to assert and protect the rights of the public to use and enjoyment of the public (S.130 Highways Act 1980); its duty to secure the expeditious, safe and convenient</li> </ul>

	movement of traffic (having regard to effect on amenities) (S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984); its duty to secure the efficient use of the road network avoiding congestion and disruption (S.16 Traffic Management Act 2004), and the co-ordination of street works (S.91 New Roads and Street Works Act 1991).
<b>18.HR implications</b>	None
<b>19.Benchmarks or comparative data</b>	N/A
<b>20.Funding strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% external, from Goldman Sachs; and</li> <li>• S.278 agreement.</li> </ul>
<b>21.Affordability</b>	This project will be funded in full by Goldman Sachs.
<b>22.Procurement approach</b>	N/A

### **Options Appraisal Matrix**

See separate document.

### **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Initial and post consultation response breakdown
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Hard copies of initial consultation responses
<b>Appendix 3</b>	General arrangement drawing for Option 1
<b>Appendix 4</b>	Technical note addendum – Issues Resolution
<b>Appendix 5</b>	Stonecutter Street Consultation Document

### **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Aaron Banfield
<b>Email Address</b>	<a href="mailto:aaron.banfield@cityoflondon.gov.uk">aaron.banfield@cityoflondon.gov.uk</a>
<b>Telephone Number</b>	0207 332 1723