

<b>Committee(s):</b>	<b>Date(s):</b>	<b>Item no.</b>
<b>Streets &amp; Walkways Projects Sub</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup>September 2013 25<sup>th</sup>September 2013</b>	
<b>Subject:</b> Outline Options Appraisal (Gateway 3) – Fleet Building & Plumtree Court Public Realm and Security Improvements		<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of the Built Environment		<b>For Decision</b>

### Summary

#### Dashboard

**Project Status:** Green  
**Timeline:** Outline Options Appraisal  
**Total Estimated Cost:** £8.7 million  
**Spend to Date:** £49,323  
**Overall Project Risk:** Low

#### Context

The developer of the Fleet Building & Plumtree Court (Farringdon Street Partners Limited) has asked the City for outline option approvals for the public realm and security elements presented within this report. The Section 106 (Highways & Public Realm) and Section 278 (Security & Public Realm) will provide the funding mechanism for the project which relate to security, public realm, and highways improvements in the vicinity of the development, which is bounded by Shoe Lane, Plumtree Court, Stonecutter Street, and Farringdon Street. The Section 106 and Section 278 funding and works boundaries as approved at the planning stage can be found in Appendix 1 (application number 12/01225/FULEIA).

Member approvals for the security and public realm elements will enable the developer and the City to enter into Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements, with the confidence that the Security standoff and proposed kerb line locations for the project have been approved, prior to the progression of both the development and project. This will ensure that no costly abortive work is carried out.

This Gateway 3 report seeks approval for the design development that has taken place in relation to the security and public realm enhancement proposals, presented to Members at Gateway 2 (February 2013). The report has combined the highways, public realm and security elements. It can be demonstrated from previous projects in Cannon Street and St. Swithins Lane that this is the most effective method of delivery.

The proposed public realm enhancement aspects of the scheme are in line with the City's strategies for creating safe sustainable streets and increasing the biodiversity of the City, climate change mitigation and air quality improvements. Meetings have been had with key local stakeholders, with the scheme being well received by all concerned. The design proposals are attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

The future highways design elements will be presented to Members at Gateway 4 and will also

further assist the delivery of the City's Road Danger Reduction Plan. Road Danger has already been reduced through the closure of Stonecutter Street to vehicular traffic, at its junction with Farringdon Street.

#### Brief description of project

The primary aim of the project is to deliver public realm improvements around the perimeter of the development, which integrates a British Standard PAS 68/69 rated security scheme. The security and associated public realm improvements are to be delivered via a Section 278 agreement, whereby the developer is to fund all evaluation, design, and implementation costs at no financial risk to the City. The proposed security scheme will provide a secure perimeter around the Fleet Building & Plumtree Court development on all frontages thus enabling protection from vehicle borne improvised explosive devices. To meet the developer's security requirements, certain benches, planters and bollards that form the protective perimeter are to be specified as security rated and to the appropriate British Standard. This will provide a 'stand-off' perimeter around the building that will withstand the impact of, and restrain vehicles impacting at speed. This design will also need to be submitted for approval under conditions 16a, 20, and 23 of the draft planning permission for the development.

The security and public realm enhancement proposals also include the management of 'Access Only' streets in Stonecutter Street and Plumtree Court. Traffic Management Orders (TMO's) have already been made, which restrict vehicular access to only those requiring access. The current intention for managing access is for rising bollards to be placed at the western end of Stonecutter Street and Plumtree Court. Bollards in Stonecutter Street are to generally remain in the "down" position, being raised under circumstance defined by the City Police, with the proposed bollards in Plumtree Court being maintained in the "up" position. This will meet the developer's requirement for a secure perimeter around the development and assist with the safe management of vehicles servicing adjacent properties on Plumtree Court. It is proposed that access would be managed by a designated agent on behalf of the City as Highway Authority. The full costs of the installation of the bollards and access management is to be met by the developer under the conditions of the Section 278 agreement. Similar contractual arrangements are already in place in Shoe Lane and St Swithins Lane, for the management of access on behalf of the City as Highway Authority.

A secondary aim linked to this project (to be funded via a Section 106 agreement) is to deliver a revised highway layout on Shoe Lane, Stonecutter Street, St. Andrews Street and Plumtree Court. The revised layout will involve taking excess carriageway space to create widened footways, tree and other planting, repaving with York Stone, replacing and possibly raising the carriageway surface and providing seating on specially designed sculptural and accessible benches including general seating around the development. All proposals will ensure that the street environment is improved and that designs will cater for the predicted growth in cycling and pedestrians, and make effective use of the local streets for local needs, without detrimental impact on the operation or safety of the surrounding highway network. It is proposed that options regarding the layout and design of the highways around the development would continue to be developed through local stakeholder working group meetings and be presented to Members at Gateway 4.

## Options

Only one scheme option for the area covered by the Section 278 is being presented, as this option is the one being put forward by the developer and is the one that they are prepared to fund. This scheme is illustrated in Appendix 2 of this report. Three options for the wider highway improvements within the Section 106 area are

1. Raised carriageways surrounding the development with inset parking bays with the potential creation of a shared space at the junction of Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street;
2. Carriageways at existing levels with inset parking bays; and
3. Carriageways and parking bays to remain at existing levels, without inset parking

The funding is summarised in the table below:

	<b>Security &amp; Public Realm Improvements £</b>	<b>Highways Improvements £</b>
Total Estimated Cost	*£5 to £7 million	*£1,636,476 - Options estimates to be provided at Gateway 4
Likely Funding Strategy	To be fully funded by the developer via a S278 agreement related to the Fleet Building & Plumtree Court development	S106 agreement related to the Fleet Building & Plumtree Court development

Note: Full details of all of the funding boundaries are available in Appendix 1 of this report.

\*Detailed utilities diversion costs have not been included in the total estimated Section 106 and Section 278 scheme costs. Costs will be established in relation to the final scheme and building design(s) and associated utility relocation estimates provided by Utility companies (Gateway 5) prior to implementation 2018-2020.

## **Recommendations**

Option(s) recommended to develop to next Gateway

It is recommended that Members approve:

1. The proposed security and public realm design contained within this report (Appendix 2) and progression to the detailed design stage (Gateway 4) (implementation to be subject to the making of any necessary Traffic Management Orders);
2. The development of highways options for Shoe Lane, Stonecutter Street, St Andrews Street, and Plumtree Court; and

3. The Comptroller and City Solicitor entering into legal agreements, under Section 106 & 278 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1980, with Farringdon Street Partners Limited.

### Next Steps

Should the recommendations within this report be approved, the City and the developer will enter into a combined Section 106 and 278 agreement. Upon signing of the combined Section 106 and 278 agreements the City will progress to the detailed design stage for the recommended security and public realm design, with highways design options being developed and presented to Members at the next Gateway;

Consultation on highways design options is to be carried out in conjunction with the already established local stakeholder working group, prior to reporting back to Members at Gateway 4 with the detailed design for the security and public realm improvements and options, as agreed by the stakeholder working group relating to highways design and improvements.

### Resource requirements to reach next Gateway and source of funding

The current total approved budget is £100,000 (fully funded by Farringdon Street Partners Limited) with an estimated expenditure of £49,323 as of 27 August 2013, as per the breakdown in the table below. This has included the appointment of independent transportation consultant to act on behalf of the City, and Project Officer and Assistant Director time to lead and manage the project.

Project Name	Budgets	Spend to Date	Remaining
Fleet & Plumtree Court Public Realm & Security			
Project Number - 16800075			
PreEv P&T Staff Costs	£40,000	£19,749	£20,251
PreEv Highways Staff Costs	£5,000	£1,169	£3,831
PreEv Open Spaces Staff Costs	£5,000	£455	£4,545
PreEv P&T Fees	£50,000	£27,950	£22,050
<b>Total</b>	<b>£100,000</b>	<b>£49,323</b>	<b>£50,677</b>

Taking into account the transfer of the estimated underspend on the approved budget (detailed in the table above) to the Section 278 and detailed design stage, the additional budgetary requirement to reach the next Gateway is a total of £116,000. This is set out in the table below. This requirement will be fully met through the Section 278 (£5 to 7 million) agreements, related to the Fleet Building & Plumtree Court development. This will allow for expenditure of fees on appointed Landscaping and Transportation consultants, Project Officer time to manage and lead the design process, Highways Officer time to manage the detailed design elements, and Assistant Director involvement in his role as Senior Responsible Officer.

Fleet & Plumtree Court Public Realm & Security	Budgets
PreEv P&T Staff Costs	£50,000
PreEv Highways Staff Costs	£5,000
PreEv Open Spaces Staff Costs	£5,000
PreEv P&T Fees	£56,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£116,000</b>

### Plans for consultation prior to the next Gateway report

It is proposed to continue with the local stakeholder working group which was established at Gateway 2. This will enable highways design options to be developed in the best interests of the Shoe Lane area as a whole and for the detailed design of the security and public realm to be completed. This is expected to consist of meetings to outline proposals, taking into account any concerns or issues raised. Any comments or feedback will be considered for inclusion in the detailed design process and will be reported at the next Gateway.

### Tolerances

All costs are to be funded by the developer including any excess of the Section 278 estimate should they be necessary. The Section 106 funded highway improvements are within a set budget. More detail will be set out on the tolerances and risk management relating to those tolerances in the Gateway 4 report.

## **Main Report**

### **Overview**

<p><b>1. Evidence of Need</b></p>	<p>This project is being delivered in order to:</p> <p>Provide security measures along the perimeter of the development at the developer's request and in line with the scheme shown when the development was approved by Committee</p> <p>The project will accommodate the forecast increase in pedestrian and cycle flows through the area. Coupled with the reduction of through traffic achieved by the recent the closure of Stonecutter Street, it will deliver a reduction in road danger for the area whilst also enhancing the quality of the streetscape.</p> <p>By securing Member approvals for the security and public realm elements at this Gateway, it will enable both the developer and the City to enter into Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements with the</p>
-----------------------------------	--

	<p>confidence that no costly abortive design works will take place. Key risks (i.e. Security standoff, Kerb line locations) of the project will also have been accounted for prior to the progression of both the development the project as a whole.</p> <p>The Section 106 and 278s agreement between the developer and the City is currently in draft format and is to be refined and finalised should this report be approved.</p> <p>As shown in the funding boundaries plan (Appendix 1) the legal agreements will state that the Section 106 contributions (Shown in Appendix 1 via the red line – boundary - Costs to be reported at Gateway 4) will be directed towards highways and public realm enhancement works on Shoe Lane, Stonecutter Street, St.Andrews Street, Plumtree Court with the required security and public realm improvements being funded via the Section 278 agreement (Shown in Appendix 1 via the blue line – boundary) and being focused around the perimeter of the development (estimated to be in the region of £5 to £7 million).</p> <p>Note: Section 106 and 278 funding for works to Farringdon Street fall outside of the scope of this project and are to be negotiated separately between TfL and the developer.</p>
<p><b>2. Success Criteria</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver a British Standard PAS 68/69-rated security scheme around the perimeter of the development;</li> <li>• Deliver a revised highway layout that integrates security measures and public realm improvements, as well as catering for all users of the public highway;</li> <li>• Ensure that the security and highway changes are incorporated into a wider environmental enhancement design that improves the appearance and function of the area as a whole;</li> <li>• Accommodate the safe and efficient movement of all road users;</li> <li>• Reducing road danger;</li> <li>• Tree planting as climate change mitigation;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved street environment (above the neutral impact benchmark set for schemes that install security infrastructure on street;</li> <li>• Securing Farringdon Street Partners Limited commitment to this City location.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Project Scope and Exclusions</b>	<p>The project area is split along a boundary with Transport for London (TfL). The current demarcation point is the eastern end of Stonecutter Street and Plumtree court at their junction with Farringdon Street.</p> <p>All elements on Farringdon Street fall outside the scope of this project.</p> <p>The project will deliver a security scheme for all City frontages except Farringdon Street for which TfL are the highway authority. Highway, security and public realm improvements on Farringdon Street are however subject to separate negotiations between TfL and the developer, with the City being a key stakeholder and forming part of the consultation and approvals process for all proposed measures.</p>
<b>4. Link to Strategic Aims</b>	<p><i>Aim 1: To support and promote ‘The City’ as the world leader in international finance and business services</i></p> <p>The project will improve the public realm in the vicinity of the Fleet Building &amp; Plumtree Court development in one of the City’s primary business clusters.</p> <p><i>Aim 2: To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes</i></p> <p>The City’s working population is expected to grow by 89,000 from 2007 to 2026. The improvements will provide more accessible routes between offices and public transport interchanges (including Crossrail), destinations for workers at lunchtime and cultural and leisure facilities.</p>
<b>5. Within which category does the project fit</b>	Fully reimbursable.
<b>6. What is the priority of the project?</b>	Desirable
<b>7. Governance</b>	Following Committee approval at Gateway 1-2 a project

<p><b>arrangements</b></p>	<p>working group was set up to provide high level direction and governance for the project. The project working group is made up of representatives from the City, Farringdon Street Partners Limited, and Transport for London. This allows a far higher degree of transparency for security, public realm, and highways designs and their development than would otherwise be possible.</p> <p>Subsequent to the establishment of the project working group with the developer, a local stakeholder working group was established to act as an active consultation body for area wide improvements. This group is led by the City of London and includes representatives from TfL, the developer, Deloitte LLP, St Andrews Church, Knight Frank (Representing River Court Properties Ltd), City Temple, Land Securities, Hines, and Morley House. The stakeholder working group will be maintained under the conditions of the Section 278 agreement for the purpose of establishing and ensuring the needs of local businesses, residents and key stakeholders are met.</p>
<p><b>8. Resources Expended To Date</b></p>	<p>Fees - £27,950  Staff costs - £21,373  <b>Total - £49,323</b></p> <p>All costs so far have been met entirely by the developer.</p> <p>The fees costs incurred to date are in relation to consultants being appointed to develop the highways and transportation elements of the project.</p> <p>The staff costs incurred to date primarily relates to design input for the security and public realm proposals and preliminary consultation meetings with local stakeholders and businesses and progressing with the various aspects of the transport assessments and highways designs.</p> <p>A breakdown of the resources expended to date is shown above.</p>
<p><b>9. Results of stakeholder consultation to date</b></p>	<p>In order to ensure local stakeholders and businesses were engaged from the inception of the project the City made initial contact and arranged meetings to discuss the current position, decision making process, and overall aims and objects for the project. Subsequent to the initial stakeholder meetings, the developer, at their own risk, undertook a design review of the security and public realm designs in conjunction with City officers. Changes were made to those presented at Gateway 2</p>



and the planning stage with a view to making significant improvements for the benefit of the local community and the development . Following the design development undertaken by the developer, two working group meetings were arranged in early August to present revised designs based on stakeholder comments and to seek in principal approvals for the revised designs presented in this report.

The information presented at the inception meetings was well received by all parties who commented that they could see the major benefits that the project will bring to the area in terms of public realm and highways improvements, and were happy that they would have a continued involvement in the design development and decision making process. One of the main points that was communicated and noted by the City was that businesses and stakeholders would like to see a continued and coordinated approach to improvements, not only in the vicinity of the development but to the wider area.

Businesses and Stakeholders that constitute the Stakeholder Working Group:

- Transport for London
- Farringdon Street Partners Limited (developer)
- Deloitte LLP
- St Andrews Church
- Knight Frank (Representing River Court Properties Ltd)
- City Temple
- Land Securities
- Hines
- Morley House
- Highways Team (DBE)

Conclusions from the Stakeholder Working Group Meetings:

In principle agreements for the following (Subject to detailed design):

- Security elements i.e. standoff, bollard type (CoL Spec), planters;
- Proposed public realm improvements around the development (Section 278);
- Rising bollard and access protocols; and
- Proposed improvements to road safety, parking, and cycle hire parking locations.

	<p>Conditions set by the working group that will require further information to be provided prior to Gateway 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area wide parking review to demonstrate net gain/loss of parking for weekday and weekend scenarios;</li> <li>• Investigations and recommendations for appropriate methods to reduce road danger on Shoe Lane i.e. raised carriageways, inset parking bays, carriageway material and colour variations; and</li> <li>• Presentation of findings and options to the working group prior to seeking Member authority for proposed highway improvement options.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Consequences if project not approved</b></p>	<p>Should the recommendations within this report not be approved there is the possibility that the developer would review their City accommodation strategy, risking their long term presence in the City. The environmental improvements and investment provided by the developer in improved streets around their building would also be lost.</p>

**Outline Options Appraisal**

<p><b>11. Commentary on the options considered</b></p>	<p>This section sets out and explains the design development that has taken place for the Section 278 area and the on-going options development for the Section 106 area. Proposals for both the Section 106 &amp; 278 have developed through stakeholder consultation and assessments of the impact they will have on the local area. This process will continue through to detailed design</p> <p>The design process for the security and public realm improvements has been fully funded by the developer and can be seen as a significant improvement from the proposals presented to Members at Gateway 2 (Appendix 1).</p> <p>All security, public realm, and highways improvement proposals have placed a priority on enhancing the pedestrian environment, whilst maintaining or improving the existing functionality of the streets. This includes the retention of current levels of taxi and pay &amp; display parking. All proposals include the provision of new street trees on Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street. However, trees are not proposed on Plumtree Court due to the narrow nature of the street where it would</p>
--	---

prove impractical to propose such features.

The design to date has been led by security, landscape architecture and highway consultancies instructed and paid for by the developer. The City engaged its own transport consultant to ensure that the proposals meet the needs of the City, both aesthetically and practically. The security scheme consists of bollards and planters, both of which are required to comply with British Standard PAS68 (Impact test specifications for vehicle security barriers) and British Standard PAS 69 (Guidelines for the specification and installation of vehicle security barriers).

The bollards follow the kerb line and form of the building around the perimeter of the development. PAS68 security rated planters are proposed to be interspersed with the bollards and will contain planting in order to provide a balance between function and place. Following the development of an appropriate security scheme it was necessary to identify a new carriageway alignment based on the required stand-off distance between the security elements and the building; this distance was identified following the developers consultation with the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure and the City of London Police. The maintenance of all security infrastructure and associated planting (including a full irrigation system) will be paid for by the developer through provisions in the S.278 agreement.

The highways improvement scheme will form the basis for the development of options to enhance the environment around the development and in the wider area. The highways design will be developed in relation to the proposed security standoff and public realm features and in line with recommendations from the stakeholder working group. The area with the greatest change taking place will be Stonecutter Street, where the design will focus on pedestrian and cycle use, with only vehicles that have legitimate access purposes being accommodated. Changes to Stonecutter Street can be seen in Appendix 2.

The highways improvement scheme will be led by City with specialist input from an independent transport consultancy instructed by the City. Highways design options are to be presented in detail to Members at Gateway 4. To date extensive pedestrian, cycle, and traffic surveys have been undertaken which will enable the City to develop and successfully integrate all elements of the project.

	<p>Note: Surveys were taken prior to the closure of Stonecutter Street, post Stonecutter Street closure, and pre Holborn Circus works. Surveys included classified traffic counts (including cyclists), pedestrian counts and desire lines, speed surveys and kerbside activity.</p> <p>As a result of preliminary investigations and consultations, three clear options have come to the fore that will be investigated in conjunction with an area wide parking survey and presented in detail to Members at Getaway 4. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raised carriageways surrounding the development with inset parking bays with the potential creation of a shared space at the junction of Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street;</li> <li>2. Carriageways at existing levels with inset parking bays; and</li> <li>3. Carriageways and parking bays to remain at existing levels, without inset parking.</li> </ol> <p>Evaluation of the options will also include quality aspects of the scheme and the choices of materials that are deliverable within the budget and appropriate to the area.</p> <p>Detailed design development will take in to account the access issues presented by the slopes and steps and street furniture etc. This will be undertaken to ensure an accessible design is presented at Gateway 4.</p> <p>Note: Improvements to parking in the wider area and the pedestrianisation of Stonecutter Street (except for cycles and other vehicles which have legitimate access purposes) are common to all options. Each option will be considered within the context of an area parking survey.</p> <p>Future decisions relating to above options, road safety improvements and material types on Shoe Lane, Plumtree Court, and Stonecutter Street will be as a result of robust assessments of pedestrian flows, desire lines, and the traffic and speed calming effect this will have on both cyclists and vehicles in the area.</p>
--	---

**Information Common to All Options**

<p><b>12. Key benefits</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A revised kerb layout that facilitates the inclusion of security measures (i.e., bollards and planters) along the perimeter of the development;</li> <li>• Improved carriageways on Shoe Lane, Plumtree Court, and Stonecutter Street which meets current cycle and pedestrian desire lines and</li> </ul>
--------------------------------	---

	<p>future pedestrian/cycle forecasts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved carriageways on Shoe Lane, Plumtree Court, and Stonecutter Street;</li> <li>• Improved traffic calming traffic</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian crossing points to improve safety and accessibility;</li> <li>• The introduction of new street trees on Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street;</li> <li>• A consistent street scene throughout the area using high quality materials, and</li> <li>• An accessible environment for all users.</li> </ul>
<p><b>13. Estimated programme and key dates</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2013: Approval at Gateway 3 for Security &amp; Public Realm (S106 and 278) proposals;</li> <li>• 2013-Early2014: Working in conjunction with the Working Group - Development of Highways options and detailed design of S278 proposals;</li> <li>• Mid 2014: Gateway 4 Report seeking approvals for Highways proposals;</li> <li>• Late 2014-2018: Development of the Security, Public Realm, and Highways construction packages</li> <li>• Implementation: 2018-2020</li> </ul>
<p><b>14. Potential risk implications</b></p>	<p><i>Should Members not approve the recommendations within this report there is a possible risk to corporate reputation:</i></p> <p>The developer would review their City accommodation strategy, risking their long term presence in the City. The environmental improvements and investment by Farringdon Street Partners for improved streets around their building would be lost.</p> <p><i>The design does not meet the needs of all stakeholders:</i></p> <p>Continued local stakeholder engagement through a formal Working Group will take place following approval of the preferred option(s) and will be maintained until the estimated completion of the project in 2018. It is envisaged that by undertaking this process the City will be able to provide a design that meets the needs of local businesses, stakeholders and users.</p> <p><i>Utilities relocation costs may exceed the allocation secured under Section S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act:</i></p> <p>Existing utility installations below highway are likely to</p>

	<p>conflict with locations needed for foundations for preferred tree planting positions. The design will be amended where possible to avoid/minimise utility diversions. However extensive relocation costs may lead to S106 design elements preferred by the City not being implemented.</p> <p><i>Highways Improvement costs may exceed the allocation secured under Section S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act:</i></p> <p>Costs may lead to S106 design elements preferred by the City not being implemented. The City will utilise S106 funds from local developments to ensure that the area as a whole receives a coordinated approach to the implementation of a high quality public realm.</p> <p><i>Bespoke Security planters do not conform to PAS 68/69 standards:</i></p> <p>The special security rated planters and benches being proposed will need to pass crash rating tests and be certified to BS PAS 68 before installation. Failure will require a redesign of the proposal to specify rated infrastructure.</p> <p><i>Implementation is subject to Traffic Management Orders:</i></p> <p>TMO's are subject to a separate statutory process including consultation, the outcome of which cannot be prejudged.</p> <p><i>Highway structures protection needs to be maintained.</i></p> <p>The layout of the Plumtree Court/ Farringdon Street Junction will to reflect the new layout of the Farringdon Street Bridge protection installed recently.</p> <p>The security bollards and planters in shoe lane will need to be designed to avoid the Pipe Subway and lateral connections to the development.</p> <p>Tree planting will require root barriers and also need to avoid the laterals to the Pipe Subway.</p>
<p><b>15. Anticipated stakeholders and consultees</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport for London</li> <li>• Farringdon Street Partners Ltd (developer)</li> <li>• Deloitte LLP</li> <li>• St Andrews Church</li> <li>• Knight Frank (Representing River Court Properties Ltd)</li> <li>• City Temple</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land Securities</li> <li>• Hines</li> <li>• Morley House</li> <li>• Chamberlain</li> <li>• Access Team</li> <li>• Local businesses</li> <li>• Cyclist groups</li> </ul>
<p><b>16. Legal implications</b></p>	<p>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 public highway should this be necessary in the future, in the event of changed circumstances, giving rise to the need for it to properly exercise its relevant functions as the traffic and highway authority.;</p> <p>In exercising its highway and traffic functions the City must have regard, inter alia, to its duty to assert and protect the rights of public use and enjoyment of public highway (S.130 Highways Act 1980); its duty to secure the expeditious, safe and convenient 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).</p> <p>The design for the security measures will also need to be submitted for approval under conditions 16a, 20, and 23 of the draft planning permission for the development.</p> <p>All other legal implications are included in the body of the report</p>
<p><b>17. HR implications</b></p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b>18. Anticipated source(s) of funding – capital and revenue</b></p>	<p>The proposals are to be fully funded through the Section 106 and Section 278 agreements associated with the development. The funding of the project is split between the two agreements.</p> <p>The aspects which are proposed to be funded through the Section 106 agreement (indicatively shown in Appendix 1 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widened footways and raised carriageways on Plumtree Court, Shoe Lane, St. Andrews Street and Stonecutter Street;</li> <li>• Trees, planting and associated material within planters.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carriageway and road safety improvements and resurfacing on Stonecutter Street, Shoe Lane, and Plumtree Court;</li> <li>• Major public realm improvements on Stonecutter Street;</li> <li>• Additional paving and lighting in the above locations; and</li> </ul> <p>The aspects of the project that are proposed to be funded through the Section 278 agreement are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAS 68 security bollards and planters around the perimeter of the development;</li> <li>• Trees, planting and associated material within the planters;</li> <li>• Creation of an access only area in Plumtree Court and minor footway realignment ;</li> <li>• Creation of an access only area in Stonecutter Street;</li> <li>• Widened footways (including security bollards) on Stonecutter Street; and</li> <li>• Additional paving and lighting in the above locations.</li> <li>• Adjustments to the security checkpoint in St.Andrews Street</li> </ul> <p>To ensure a coordinated approach is taken to area wide improvements the project would be coordinated closely with the environmental improvements envisaged around the Land Securities development at 75-76 Shoe Lane, funded from the associated Section 106. A full cost breakdown will need to be agreed with the developer and will form part of the Gateway 4 report</p>
<p><b>19.Affordability</b></p>	<p>Section 278 - The security and public realm improvements costs outlined in this report are to be met in full by the developer at no risk to the City.</p> <p>Section 106 – Costs and risks to be reported at the next Gateway. Officers are also considering how this coordinates with other developments and associated Section 106 &amp; 278 agreements in the area.</p>
<p><b>20.Next steps</b></p>	<p>Should the recommendations within this report be approved the City and the developer will enter into a combined Section 106 and 278 agreement with the City;</p> <p>Upon signing of the combined Section 106 and 278 the City will progress to the detailed design stage of the recommended security and public realm design with highways design options being presented to Members at the next Gateway;</p>



	<p>Consultation on highways design options is to be carried out with the Working Group concurrent with the early stages of the detailed design for the approved security and public realm enhancement proposals; and</p> <p>Report back to Members at Gateway 4 with the detailed design for the security and public realm improvements and options, as agreed with the Working Group relating to the highways design.</p>
--	--

### **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Section 106 and Section 278 Initial Design Inclusive of Funding/Works Boundaries
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Improved Security & Public Realm Proposals

### **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