

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Streets and Walkways Sub Committee (For Decision)	10 th March 2014
Finance Committee (For Decision)	25 th March 2014
Projects Sub Committee (For Decision)	2 nd April 2014
Subject: Queen Street Pilot Project Gateway 7 (Outcome Report)	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Decision

Summary

Dashboard

Project Status	Green
Timeline	Project Closedown - Gateway 7
Total Estimated Cost and source of funding	TOTAL = £4.28m (£2.5m - City of London, £1.75m - Transport for London, £30K - Arts Council England)
Spend to Date	Current Spend = £4.164m Upcoming Spend = £29K (see Section 14: Outstanding Actions)
Overall project risk	Green

Brief description of project

The Lord Mayor launched the Queen Street Pilot Project in June 2000 as part of the then Street Scene Challenge Initiative. The Pilot was a strategy for a series of phased improvements in the Queen Street area. The project area principally between the Guildhall and Southwark Bridge was chosen to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the closure of sections of Queen Street as part of the City traffic and environment zone (CTZ) cordon. It was intended that the approach taken in improving the street scene of the Queen Street area be adopted in other appropriate parts of the City. In February 2003 following an extensive public consultation exercise, the Queen Street Pilot Project was approved by Planning and Transportation Committee.

The improvements were implemented in a phased manner over a 10 year period and delivered new public spaces which include: a shared space between Queen Victoria Street and College Street, enhanced greenery at St Pancras Church Garden (Pancras Lane), widened footways, public art installations and associated lighting improvements.

This project has pioneered opportunities to improve the City's streetscape for what is an historically important route between the Guildhall and Southwark Bridge. It also facilitated opportunities to test a suite of ideas, solutions and techniques which have been utilised in subsequent and on-going environmental enhancement projects; as part of a programme of public realm improvements.

In total, eighteen schemes have been completed as part of the Queen Street Pilot Project and the details of these are set out in Appendix A table 2, Appendix B Indicative Site Location Plans and summarised in the report.

Summary of funding sources

The total approved funding for the Queen Street Pilot Project is £4.28m. This consists of £2.5m from the City of London On Street Parking Reserve, £1.75m from Transport for London and £30K from Arts Council England.

Awards

The success of the project has been recognised through the achievement of 3 awards:

- Winner of the Urban Transport Design Award 2007 for: Queen Street central plazas project, awarded by Transport Practitioners
- Highly commended for: Queen Street Central Plaza, London Planning Awards 2007
- Highly commended for: the Institution of Highways and Transportation national award for urban design 2007 for the Queen Street Pilot Project street scene scheme.

Recommendations

Outcome Report recommendation

- i) The outcome report is received and actions noted, and the Queen Street Pilot project inclusive of all project elements is formally closed down.
- ii) £29,000 of the remaining funds from the Queen Street Pilot project (On-Street Parking Reserve) is utilised to complete some minor outstanding actions (which include signage and paving alterations) that have yet to be implemented as part of the original St Pancras Church Garden project scope.

Overview

1. Evidence of Need	<p>The closure to sections of Queen Street as part of the City Traffic and Environmental Zone (CTZ) presented pedestrian enhancement opportunities following a significant reduction in local vehicular traffic in the area. This traffic reduction and the increasing numbers of City workers in the area, meant that improvements to the local environment and pedestrian movement could be brought forwards to address identified deficiencies.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor's processional route runs through the heart of the area and the route between the Guildhall and Southwark Bridge is also of historic significance. This project offered the opportunity to enhance these routes to create streets and spaces of a quality that is in keeping with the status of the area.</p> <p>The Queen Street Pilot Project heralded a modal shift in the City's approach to public realm enhancement and the importance of pedestrian movement.</p>
2. Project Scope and Exclusions	<p>The February 2003 Committee approval highlighted a number of streets that would be part of the Queen Street Pilot Project and these are listed in the table below:</p>

To enable the project to be delivered in such a complex and busy area, Members agreed that the project would be broken down into manageable phases that would be implemented individually and then linked up.

Because the project is an area based improvement scheme, as part of the City's Borough Spending Plan funding application to TfL, the project was split into three project areas:

- Queen Street (including plazas & Watling Street)
- King Street (including Ironmonger Lane)
- Southwark Bridge (including Southern 'Gateway')

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="422 689 1391 757">List of Project areas within the Queen Street Pilot (February 2003)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 757 1391 884"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrance to Guildhall Yard • St Pancras Churchyard • Watling Street </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 884 1391 1086"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Street Upper & Lower Plaza • Cannon Street Crossing • Queen Street Gateway • Upper Thames Street Crossing </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 1086 1391 1310"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King Street • Queen Street • Ironmonger lane • St Pancras Lane • Well Court </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 1310 1391 1456"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Street Place • Southwark Bridge • Temple of Mithras </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	List of Project areas within the Queen Street Pilot (February 2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrance to Guildhall Yard • St Pancras Churchyard • Watling Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Street Upper & Lower Plaza • Cannon Street Crossing • Queen Street Gateway • Upper Thames Street Crossing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King Street • Queen Street • Ironmonger lane • St Pancras Lane • Well Court 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Street Place • Southwark Bridge • Temple of Mithras
List of Project areas within the Queen Street Pilot (February 2003)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrance to Guildhall Yard • St Pancras Churchyard • Watling Street 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Street Upper & Lower Plaza • Cannon Street Crossing • Queen Street Gateway • Upper Thames Street Crossing 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King Street • Queen Street • Ironmonger lane • St Pancras Lane • Well Court 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen Street Place • Southwark Bridge • Temple of Mithras 						

2. Link to Strategic Aims

This project has links to the following strategic aim:

- 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

This project will provide a more accessible, green and attractive street environment that has benefits for walking which is a sustainable mode of transport with other health related outcomes

3. Within which category does the project fit

Substantially reimbursable
Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)

4. What is the priority of the project?	Desirable																																																																											
5. Resources Expended	<p>The following tables (6.1 – 6.3) are a record of the resources expended. They have been separated into project areas, Queen Street Pilot, King Street Treatment and Southwark Bridge as originally approved in February 2003.</p> <p>Table 6.1: Queen Street Pilot Expenditure</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 568 1517 808"> <thead> <tr> <th>Project Code</th> <th>Task Name</th> <th>Approval Amount (Budget)</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Underspend</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>16008063</td> <td>Fees</td> <td>328,310.76</td> <td>315,696.09</td> <td>12,614.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Staff Costs</td> <td>23,115.24</td> <td>23,115.24</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Works</td> <td>1,552,025.00</td> <td>1,548,941.32</td> <td>3,083.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>1,903,451.00</td> <td>1,887,752.65</td> <td>15,698.35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There was a total underspend against budget £15,698.35. This project is now completed. See Section 14 “Outstanding Actions”</p> <p>Table 6.2: King Street Area Treatment Expenditure</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 987 1517 1200"> <thead> <tr> <th>Project Code</th> <th>Item</th> <th>Approval Amount (Budget)</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Underspend</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>16008064</td> <td>Fees</td> <td>140,381.10</td> <td>140,381.10</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Staff Costs</td> <td>11,151.90</td> <td>11,151.90</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Works</td> <td>982,394.00</td> <td>950,049.92</td> <td>32,344.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>1,133,927.00</td> <td>1,101,582.92</td> <td>32,344.08</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There was a total underspend against budget of £32,344.08.</p> <p>Table 6.3: Southwark Bridge Area Expenditure</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 1341 1490 1556"> <thead> <tr> <th>Project Code</th> <th>Item</th> <th>Approval Amount (Budget)</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Underspend</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>16008065</td> <td>Fees</td> <td>189,257.15</td> <td>189,062.97</td> <td>194.18</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Staff Costs</td> <td>23,177.67</td> <td>23,177.67</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Works</td> <td>1,033,069.00</td> <td>962,625.75</td> <td>70,443.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>1,245,503.82</td> <td>1,174,866.39</td> <td>70,637.43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There was a total underspend against budget of £70,637.43.</p> <p>The overall underspend against budget amounts is £118,679.86.</p>	Project Code	Task Name	Approval Amount (Budget)	Total	Underspend	16008063	Fees	328,310.76	315,696.09	12,614.67		Staff Costs	23,115.24	23,115.24	0.00		Works	1,552,025.00	1,548,941.32	3,083.68		TOTAL	1,903,451.00	1,887,752.65	15,698.35	Project Code	Item	Approval Amount (Budget)	Total	Underspend	16008064	Fees	140,381.10	140,381.10	0.00		Staff Costs	11,151.90	11,151.90	0.00		Works	982,394.00	950,049.92	32,344.08		TOTAL	1,133,927.00	1,101,582.92	32,344.08	Project Code	Item	Approval Amount (Budget)	Total	Underspend	16008065	Fees	189,257.15	189,062.97	194.18		Staff Costs	23,177.67	23,177.67	0.00		Works	1,033,069.00	962,625.75	70,443.25		TOTAL	1,245,503.82	1,174,866.39	70,637.43
Project Code	Task Name	Approval Amount (Budget)	Total	Underspend																																																																								
16008063	Fees	328,310.76	315,696.09	12,614.67																																																																								
	Staff Costs	23,115.24	23,115.24	0.00																																																																								
	Works	1,552,025.00	1,548,941.32	3,083.68																																																																								
	TOTAL	1,903,451.00	1,887,752.65	15,698.35																																																																								
Project Code	Item	Approval Amount (Budget)	Total	Underspend																																																																								
16008064	Fees	140,381.10	140,381.10	0.00																																																																								
	Staff Costs	11,151.90	11,151.90	0.00																																																																								
	Works	982,394.00	950,049.92	32,344.08																																																																								
	TOTAL	1,133,927.00	1,101,582.92	32,344.08																																																																								
Project Code	Item	Approval Amount (Budget)	Total	Underspend																																																																								
16008065	Fees	189,257.15	189,062.97	194.18																																																																								
	Staff Costs	23,177.67	23,177.67	0.00																																																																								
	Works	1,033,069.00	962,625.75	70,443.25																																																																								
	TOTAL	1,245,503.82	1,174,866.39	70,637.43																																																																								

Outturn Assessment

6. Assessment of project against Success Criteria	<p>The Queen Street Pilot Project was approved prior to the advent of the Project Gateway Reporting system. However, the main aim of the project was to provide a high quality, pedestrian focussed environment by enhancing both appearance and functionality, with innovative and carefully integrated design proposals.</p>
---	--

	<p>The main objectives are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create new and enhanced public spaces for the benefit of local workers, residents and visitors whilst promoting access for all. • Reduce street clutter using an integrated approach to street furniture, signposting etc. • Use a consistent palette of selected materials based on durability, low maintenance and value for money • Introduce more green elements such as street trees and pocket parks. • Accentuate streetscape with lighting and integration of public art whilst improving the setting of listed buildings and archaeological sites. • Create a safe and pedestrian friendly environment by means of widening of footways and improvement of crossings. Reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflict. Consideration of the integration of cycle routes. • Rationalise on-street parking, access and service requirements and minimise the detrimental impact of traffic, including noise. • Co-ordinate streetscape proposals with on-going programme of private development proposals. • Develop the Art Strategy, including the idea of curating the public space within the project area with a programme of (temporary) arts events. <p>The Queen Street Pilot Project has improved the appearance of streets and spaces within the area and to date this achievement has been recognised with awards for setting high standards for public realm. These have been summarised in the Project Summary section at the beginning of this report.</p>
<p>7. Programme</p>	<p>Given the broad nature of this project the programme was developed as a series of phases: Please see table below which lists completed schemes:</p>

Table 8.1: Summary of Completed Schemes 2003 - 2013

2003-2005	1) Guildhall Yard Phase 1 –	2) Guildhall Yard Phase 2	3) Gresham Street/King Street junction	4) College Street	5) Watling Street	6) Public Art Phase 1
2005-2007	7) Pancras Lane	8) Public Art Phase 2	9) Whittington Gardens	10) Ironmonger Lane	11) Central Plazas	
2007-2009	12) King Street Connecting Route	13) Queen Street - Connecting Route / Cloak Lane/ College Street	14) Public Art Phase 3 – City of London Festival Installations	15) Upgrading and Improving Lighting – Installation of wall mounted fittings across area		
2009-2011*	16) Guildhall Yard (King Street) – Seating and planting adjacent to crypt	17) Southern Gateway – Planting and cycle route / resurfacing upgrade				
2011-2013*	18) St Pancras Church Garden					

*On September 21st and 22nd 2009 respectively, Members approved a Queen Street Update report to both the Streets & Walkways and Finance Committees. At the time 15 schemes had been completed between 2003 and 2009 (as summarised in table 8.1 above).

The report highlighted that although the majority of the Queen Street schemes had been completed, 3 schemes (**16**, **17** and **18**) were outstanding and would be progressed as part of a subsequent revised programme of remaining works. These schemes have recently been completed and were as follows:

- St Pancras Churchyard,
- King Street Treatment (Guildhall Area)
- Southwark Bridge - Upper Thames Street/Southern Gateway

8. Budget

The total funding available for this project is £4,28m comprised of: £2,5m (On Street Parking Reserve - OSPR), £1,75m (Transport for London - TfL) and £30,000 (Arts Council).

The anticipated outturn cost, including the outstanding signage and paving for St Pancras Garden estimated at £29,000, is £4,193,202, a net reduction of £89,798 against the total budget. After taking account of additional funding from TfL of £60,000 secured in 2010/11, there was a net reduction in the call on the OSPR of £149,798. This reduced requirement has been largely factored in to the latest forecast of the reserve and has assisted in mitigating a potential shortfall.

9. Risk

The main project risks were as follows:

Table 10.1 : Main Project Risks

Risk	Mitigating Action
Ground conditions impact on design	Liaised with City Engineers, consultants, developer and other stakeholders with an interest (such as TfL and Utilities companies) early on to ensure designs were robust and fit for purpose.
Closures to implement works and impact on traffic	Liaised with the consultant CDM Co-ordinator, City's Engineers and the City Parking Service to ensure that closures were programmed in a timely manner. This ensured works were delivered to programme, did not impact on public safety and vehicular access was appropriately managed.
Legal Agreements impact on the programme and delivery of the St Pancras Church Garden scheme	Agreed a long lease agreement with the owners of the site and engaged with the Comptroller & City Solicitor, City Planning Officer and City Surveyor to ensure the project met the programme of delivery. Note: The City's acquisition of the garden space was part of an extensive legal process which spanned many years of negotiation as the ownership of the development site changed hands.
English Heritage require approvals for design/method statements	Met with the Inspector of Monuments (English Heritage) to ensure that designs were sensitive to the underlying archaeology on the site and artefacts remained undisturbed.
Programme shifts as a result of neighbouring redevelopments	The programme was extended to take account of the neighbouring redevelopments. The use of the City's term contractor was beneficial in this respect as they could be pulled off the site without incurring any cost penalties.
Bespoke granite from China not delivered on time.	There was a delay in receiving the bespoke granite planters from China. However, they were considerably cheaper than European alternatives and as a result this element came in under budget (Southern Gateway planters).
Proposed cost estimates exceed the budget tolerance	Design to budget. In the case of the St Pancras Church Garden scheme it was agreed that a partnership with the City and Guilds School would deliver the level of quality required at a competitive price compared to other consultant expressions of interest.

<p>10. Communications</p>	<p>Officers from the then Department Planning and Transportation worked closely with colleagues from the then Department of Environmental Services and the Open Spaces Department to deliver the extensive Queen Street project programme. Working with the Highways maintenance Term Contractor also assisted with continuity of communication across the various projects. The current Term Contractor has increased their communications role in projects with the use of a dedicated staff member for this purpose.</p> <p>Communication was managed in a number of ways to enable all interested parties to engage with the project development. There were regular update reports to Committee informing Members of the various stages of scheme development to obtain necessary approvals.</p> <p>Officers worked closely with a number of stakeholders in order to achieve the appropriate level of engagement and buy-in. It was important to engage with landowners and developers to ensure that they were kept informed of all relevant project progress.</p> <p>Public consultations exercises were undertaken by carrying out a series of exhibitions and delivering related consultation material either as leaflets or electronically on the City of London website.</p> <p>Liaison was necessary with stakeholders such as TfL to agree elements of project design. Where work was to be carried out close to TfL streets (Upper Thames Street) engagement was necessary over work permits and Section 159 agreements to agree TfL funding/reporting parameters.</p>
<p>11. Benefits achieved to date</p>	<p><u>Central Plazas at Queen Victoria Street and Cannon Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More space for walking • Shared use of space has reduced cycling speeds and no accidents have been reported. • Improved visual environment • Consistent coordinated use of materials as part of the agreed palette within Project area <p><u>Southern Plaza (Southern Gateway/Upper Thames Street)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More space for walking • Monitoring suggests that the shared use of space has reduced cycling speeds and no accidents have been reported. • Increased green coverage through introduction of planters and associated seating • Segregation of desire lines for pedestrians and cyclists to reduce conflict at the Queen Street / Upper Thames Street junction • Rationalisation of street furniture and introduction of way-finding information

	<p><u>Walking Routes (including: College Street Watling Street and Ironmonger Lane)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening of footways to provide more space for walking • Shared use of space and timed closures have reduced the impact of vehicular traffic, reduced cycling speeds and pedestrian conflict with other road users. • Improved visual environment through a consistent and coordinated use of materials <p><u>Whittington Gardens</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfiguration/re-landscaping of garden space • Improved visual environment through a consistent and coordinated use of materials • Increased/improved opportunities for seating • Introduction of publicly accessible artwork - installation of statues from the Italian Embassy <p><u>St Pancras Church Garden</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of new green public space from a previously disused derelict site • Partnership working with the City and Guilds School and links to educational opportunities to learn about arts and crafts and the City's archaeological heritage • Preservation of the City's Heritage assets <p><u>Guildhall + King St</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement of the City's processional routes. Namely, a positive improvement to the experience of the Lord Mayor's Show. • Improved crossing points and opportunities for seating close to the City's civic core (Guildhall) • De-cluttering and consistent use of street furniture to highlight the City's local heritage • Upgrading of lighting in King Street/Queen Street and walking routes off the main thoroughfare. <p><u>Light up Queen Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of temporary lighting installations as part of a wider City of London Festival programme.
<p>12. Strategy for continued achievement of benefits</p>	<p>The success of the Queen Street Pilot Project is typified by the consistent use of materials. This achievement has successfully created a link between spaces which often appeared unrelated in the past.</p> <p>The consistency of these enhancements has led to innovations throughout the Queen Street area and influenced the approach to</p>

	<p>subsequent public realm improvements throughout the City.</p> <p>It is important that an appropriate maintenance regime remains consistent to ensure the continued success and quality of the public realm.</p>										
<p>13. Outstanding actions</p>	<p>The Queen Street Pilot Project is complete. However, there are some minor outstanding actions which have yet to be implemented as part of the original project scope. These minor works consist of signage to highlight the public nature and historic evolution of the space; and some paving alterations.</p> <p>The total cost of carrying out these works is estimated at £29,000 as shown in Table 14.1 below.</p> <p>Table 14.1: Proposed St Pancras Garden Signage and Paving Alterations</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="422 745 887 952"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="422 745 678 801">Item</th> <th data-bbox="678 745 887 801">Estimate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 801 678 842">Fees</td> <td data-bbox="678 801 887 842">2,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 842 678 882">Staff Costs</td> <td data-bbox="678 842 887 882">3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 882 678 922">Works</td> <td data-bbox="678 882 887 922">24,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="422 922 678 952">TOTAL</td> <td data-bbox="678 922 887 952">29,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Estimate	Fees	2,000	Staff Costs	3,000	Works	24,000	TOTAL	29,000
Item	Estimate										
Fees	2,000										
Staff Costs	3,000										
Works	24,000										
TOTAL	29,000										

Review of Team Performance

<p>14. Governance arrangements</p>	<p>No project board was used. The project was led by the senior responsible officer, with committee approvals sought for project elements.</p>
<p>15. Key strengths</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The successful implementation of various Queen Street pilot project elements was developed through officers working closely with a number of designers and artists to achieve an innovative approach to public realm improvements. • The working relationship between the Environmental Enhancement Division, engineers, consultants, clients and other stakeholders was important to achieve an integrated scheme and preserve its longevity. • The use of the City's highway maintenance term contractor enabled a more flexible approach to the timing of the works which was necessary given the numerous external factors that influenced the programme over an extended period of time. • The ability to frame agreements with the Comptroller and City Solicitor has enabled an effective change control when priorities/scope of individual schemes was altered. • Utilising the Highways Maintenance Term Contractor to implement the works has provided a more efficient delivery of the projects and enabled changes to be made to programmes and details without incurring penalties.

16. Areas for improvement	<p>A Project board and use of the new Gateway system for a project of this size would have been beneficial. This would have enabled a more structured process for scheme development which would allow for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed priorities and processes • Programme changes • More efficient delivery of phases • Project Advocates/Champions • Clearer response to Issue resolution
17. Special recognition	n/a

Lessons Learnt

18. Key lessons and how they will be used and applied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The success of the project is defined by the importance of a consistent, standard palette of materials. This eases the burden of maintenance by utilising standard commercially available materials that are easily procured. • Shared surfaces have not only improved the appearance of the Queen Street Area but have also improved how people behave in a busy public realm. • Cyclists have had to adapt to the presence of pedestrians particularly in the central and southern plaza areas. This has resulted in reduced cycle speeds and improved safety for all road users. The Southern Gateway is a good example of reducing potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. • The use of granite setts is a feature of the Queen Street Pilot Project and has proved to be successful in areas of high pedestrian footfall. However, their use in busy road junctions and areas close to development sites has inadvertently hastened the degradation of the carriageway due to the high frequency of carriageway excavation to accommodate various services in this area. As a consequence of this experience officers have been trialling the use of anti-skid surfacing on raised tables as an alternative to setts and the results of this trial are expected soon. • Going forward, enhanced coordination of utility works and reparations would ensure the integrity of the streets and better preserve enhancements.
--	---

Appendices

Appendix A	Table 1: Final Outturn (November 2013)
	Table2: Completed Schemes to Date (2003-2013) - (to be read in conjunction with Map 1)
Appendix B	Map 1: Site Location Map (to be read in conjunction with Table 2)

Contact

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