

| | | |
|--|---|---------------|
| Committees: | Dates: | |
| Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee | 23/03/2015 | |
| Projects Sub-Committee | 25/03/2015 | |
| Subject: London Wall Place Section 278 | Gateway 3 Outline Options Appraisal | Public |
| Report of: Director of the Built Environment | For Decision | |

Summary

Dashboard:

- (i) Project status: Amber
- (ii) Timeline: Gateway 3
- (iii) Project estimated cost: £2M-£5M
- (iv) Spent to date: £134,608 (staff costs and fees)
- (v) Overall project risk: Green

Progress to date

Planning permission for the London Wall Place development at the former St. Alphage House site was granted on 27th June 2011. This project relates to the Section 278 Highway and Public Realm Works that are necessary to integrate the development into the public highway and must be delivered in time for the buildings practical completion (April 2017). The first S278 Agreement to fund the evaluation and design of the project was signed in September 2014.

To ensure the project achieves the right balance between meeting the needs of the development and stakeholders, a Working Party has been established to guide the project. The Working Party comprises stakeholders in close proximity to the development and includes residents' representatives, the Salters Hall, the developer, the primary tenant and City officers.

Formed in February 2015, the Working Party has met twice and established a series of objectives that are set out in *Appendix 1* and form the basis of the project direction and the Gateway 3 approval. Owing to the opportunity to work with stakeholders in this way and to establish an early understanding of the scope of the project, it was not considered appropriate to produce design options at this stage, but rather to provide a clear agreement with all parties on what the project should seek to achieve. Options will be developed for Members' consideration at Gateway 4 once the proposed objectives in this report are agreed.

One key objective of the Working Party is for the City, developer and the tenant to work jointly to resolve outstanding issues relating to building security arrangements, including the eventual location and form of security infrastructure. The project has therefore been given an *Amber* project status until these issues are resolved and approved by Members.

Cultural Hub Context

For the development of the Cultural Hub, it is expected that improvements will be required to the public realm along London Wall to effect the level of change required to deliver an inclusive public realm commensurate with world class cultural institutions. The London Wall Place S278 project will deliver a number of highway

and public realm improvements on London Wall to accommodate the development; these improvements will not prejudice the City's ability to make future change to London Wall to meet the requirements of the Cultural Hub.

Proposed way forward

The Working Party for the London Wall Place development has unanimously agreed the objectives for the project and the scope of the survey and information gathering work that needs to be carried out as part of the design process. Members' agreement of these is now sought in order to move the project forward.

To ensure that proposals meet the needs of the area, the Working Party will continue to provide local input and guidance on the options as they are developed.

Once options have been drafted a wider public consultation is planned to ensure that stakeholders in the wider area are given an opportunity to consider and comment on the proposals. This will be carried out ahead of a Gateway 4 report being presented to Members, which is expected to be in December 2015.

Following Member approval of a preferred highway option the detailed design work will be completed and the estimated cost to implement the works presented to Members in a Gateway 5 report; where authority to start work will be sought (subject to completion of all necessary agreements and to all necessary consents, approvals and orders being in place). The City will then enter into a second S278 with the developer to fund the works.

The location of the site and scale of the highway and public realm changes required on a strategic street such as London Wall presents significant technical challenges during the design stage. As the project is entirely developer funded, it is proposed that the Director of the Built Environment be authorised to adjust the budget between elements (staff costs and fees) as required to meet the challenges of the project and to seek further funds from the developer, if necessary.

Procurement Approach

All consultancy work commissioned as part of the design stage will be procured by the City through City Procurement using the Section 278 evaluation and design funds. The works are proposed to be implemented in phases and coordinated with the developer's programme. At this stage, the preferred approach for implementation of the works is to utilise the City's highways term contractor. However, this will be confirmed at the next gateway.

Financial Implications

To date, the City has incurred total costs of £134,608 (comprising staff costs of £88,608 and consultancy fees of £46,000); with all costs funded by the developer. In order to progress to Gateway 4 a further £253k is required, bringing the total project spend up to an estimated £388k; this is based on an estimate of the costs to undertake the investigations, consultation and design. A total of £500k has been received from the developer via the first S278 Agreement to fund the project up to Gateway 5.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members:

- Agree that detailed options are developed in line with the project objectives set out in Appendix 1;
- Agree the budget setup (up to £388k) to reach Gateway 4; and
- Give Delegated Authority to the Director of the Built Environment to adjust the budget between elements (staff costs and fees) as required to meet the challenges of the project and to seek further funds from the developer if necessary.

Appendices

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Appendix 1 | Project Objectives and Next Steps agreed by the <i>London Wall Place Working Party</i> |
| Appendix 2 | Project Area |

Contact

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Report Author | Kristian Turner |
| Email Address | Kristian.Turner@cityoflondon.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number | 020 7332 1745 |

| Proposal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--|
| 1. Brief description | <p>Options are to be developed based on the project objectives that have been agreed by the Working Party (see Appendix 1) and the wider London Wall Stakeholders Group (see Appendix 2).</p> <p>These objectives stem from an analysis of local needs that have been identified by officers through initial consultation (also listed in Appendix 1), together with aspirations for the future enhancement of the highway and public realm on London Wall.</p> <p>The next steps to reach Gateway 4 include detailed transport and pedestrian studies that will assess existing and future needs, design development that will address key objectives and further consultation with the Working Party and local stakeholders.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Scope and exclusions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals are restricted to the areas of public highway within the reasonable vicinity of the development on Wood Street, St. Alphage Garden, Fore Street and Fore Street Avenue. On London Wall where there are wider traffic considerations, proposals will extend as far as required to mitigate the impact of the required highway changes on traffic and the urban realm. • The scope of the highway and public realm works required to enable the consented development as approved by the Planning and Transportation Committee include the widening of the footway on the northern side of London Wall, upgrade of the London Wall / Wood Street junction, public realm improvements on St. Alphage Garden and footway paving around the site. • The proposals do not cover areas of private land. • There is a separate process and Section 278 Agreement for the provision of City Walkways through the development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Programme and key dates | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Task</th> <th>Target date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Transport studies and design development</td> <td>June 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Public consultation</td> <td>Sept 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gateway 4</td> <td>Dec 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Detailed design</td> <td>June 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gateway 5</td> <td>July 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Start on site</td> <td>August 2016 (works phased, to be coordinated with developer's programme)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Task | Target date | Transport studies and design development | June 2015 | Public consultation | Sept 2015 | Gateway 4 | Dec 2015 | Detailed design | June 2016 | Gateway 5 | July 2016 | Start on site | August 2016 (works phased, to be coordinated with developer's programme) |
| | Task | Target date | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Transport studies and design development | June 2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Public consultation | Sept 2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Gateway 4 | Dec 2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Detailed design | June 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Gateway 5 | July 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Start on site | August 2016 (works phased, to be coordinated with developer's programme) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>4. Risk implications</p> | <p>Design options do not meet the aspirations of the developer Mitigate by including the developer in the Working Party that will guide the design. Close working with the developer on technical briefs ahead of commissioning consultancy work.</p> <p>Design options do not meet the aspirations of the tenant Mitigate by including the tenant in the Working Party that will guide the design and ensure the accessibility needs of staff are used to inform the design process.</p> <p>Objections from local occupiers and residents Mitigate by developing design options that take account of local needs and carry out public consultation. Continue to use the project Working Party.</p> <p>Significant accessibility improvements are not feasible Mitigate by developing alternative design options for highway layout and focus on the key routes identified by pedestrian modelling</p> <p>Proximity of Scheduled Ancient Monument and archaeological remains Mitigate by liaising with the City's planning officers and English Heritage to achieve suitable design options</p> <p>Changes to London Wall Car Park Structure Mitigate any impacts on the structural integrity and functionality of the structure by conducting comprehensive investigations early in the design phase</p> |
| <p>5. Stakeholders and consultees</p> | <p>The Working Party for the London Wall Place development has been established to guide the design approach, consultation, timing and undertaking of the Highway and Public Realm Works for the development.</p> <p>Members of the Working Party include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Developer (London Wall Place Limited Partnership), and their professional advisory team • The tenant (Schroders, 1 London Wall Place) • Barbican Association representative • Roman House representative • The Salters Company • City Officers <p>The London Wall Stakeholder group has been established to guide the strategic change along London Wall as a result of changes from projects as diverse as new developments, Crossrail and the emerging cultural hub built environment programme.</p> <p>Members of the Stakeholder Group include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aldermen of Aldersgate, Bassishaw, Coleman Street and Cripplegate |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward Members of Bassishaw • The Developer and tenant of London Wall Place • Barbican Association representative • Five City Livery Companies • Museum of London representative • Barbican Centre representative • Building owner representatives • City Police • City Officers |
| Resource Implications | |
| 6. Total Estimated cost | £2M - £5M |
| 7. Funding strategy | The project is to be entirely funded by the developer of London Wall Place (London Wall Place Limited Partnership) through the Section 278 Agreements. Funding for improvements to the public realm (over and above that normally covered by a Section 278 Agreement) can be funded by the Local Community and environmental improvement contribution secured by S106 agreement dated 26 August 2011 varied by the deed dated 30 June 2014. |
| 8. Ongoing revenue implications | To be confirmed at next Gateway. |
| 9. Affordability | The estimated cost of the project is fully funded through the Section 278 Agreements |
| 10. Procurement strategy | <p>Procurement of consultants for transport and pedestrian studies will be through City Procurement.</p> <p>Structural consultants will be procured through the City's Structures Term Consultants.</p> <p>The City's highways term contractor is likely to be recommended to construct the scheme. This is to be confirmed at the next gateway.</p> |
| 11. Legal implications | <p>The City has general powers to improve highways in section 62 of the Highways Act 1980 as well as more specific improvement powers (e.g. to vary the widths of footway and carriageway (s.75), alter the level of highway (s.77)</p> <p>In carrying out its highway and traffic functions the City must have regard, amongst other things, to its duty to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of the highway (s.120); to its duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians) and provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway having regard, amongst other things, to the effect on the amenities of the locality (s.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984); and to manage its road</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>network with a view to achieving the expeditious movement of traffic and facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on other authorities' road networks (s.16 Traffic Management Act 2004).</p> <p>The City must also have regard to the public sector equality duty in exercising its functions</p> |
| 12. Transport implications | <p>Officers have identified several transport issues related to traffic capacity, vehicle access, pedestrian access and cycle safety that will need to be taken into account in the development of options. These are set out in Appendix 1.</p> <p>It is proposed that transport studies are carried out as part of the development of options in order to ensure that the design meets local needs and also takes account of the impact of the new development.</p> |
| 13. Equality Impact Assessment | <p>One of the key objectives of the scheme is to enhance accessibility. This is because the existing street layout makes London Wall a point of severance for pedestrians. It is proposed to update the Equality Impact Assessment at Gateway 4 in line with the design approach.</p> |
| 14. <u>Recommendation</u> | <p>It is recommended that Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that detailed options are developed in line with the project objectives set out in Appendix 1 and 2; • Agree the budget setup (to £388k) to reach Gateway 4; and • Give Delegated Authority to the Director of the Built Environment to adjust the budget between elements (staff costs and fees) as required to meet the challenges of the project and to seek further funds from the developer if necessary. |
| 15. Next Gateway | Gateway 4. Detailed Options Appraisal |
| 16. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway | <p>The City has incurred total costs of £134,608 to date, comprising staff costs of £88,608 and consultancy fees of £46,000.</p> <p>To reach Gateway 4 it is estimated that a further 253k is required, estimated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff costs - £124,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P&T Pre-Eval Staff Costs (£90,000) • DES Pre-Eval Staff Costs – (£14,000) • OS Pre-Eval Staff Costs – (£5,000) • District Surveyors Staff Costs – (£15,000) ○ Fees - £127,000 to cover the estimated costs for traffic studies, pedestrian studies, public realm design and structural assessments. ○ Revenue - £2,000 to cover the expenses for working parties, printing, room hire etc. |

Appendix 1 – Project Objectives and Next Steps agreed by the *London Wall Place Working Party*

| London Wall Place Working Party – Project Objectives and Next Steps | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | Local Issues | Outcome/ Objective | Next Steps |
| | London Wall | | |
| LW-1 | Security of the building is a key issue for the tenant (Schroders) | LW01: A secure security perimeter exists to mitigate the threat of hostile vehicles LW02: The S278 public realm works integrate with the development to facilitate a secure perimeter LW03: The security measures are unobtrusive within publicly accessible areas | 1. That the developer, tenant and the City work jointly to resolve outstanding issues relating to building security arrangements for London Wall Place 2. That the design approach for the public realm on the public highway is integrated with the landscaping and security measures for the development |
| LW-2 | Desire for planter outside the drop off area to feature vegetation and a tree and extending into the public realm | | |
| LW-3 | Barbican residents broadly supportive of measures such as planters on London Wall to improve greening | | |
| LW-4 | Security bollards are less favoured than other solutions to achieve the same effect | | |
| LW-5 | Integrated security solutions are preferred so that the public are able to move through the area barrier free | | |
| LW-6 | Security measures should be landscaped across the site demise / highway boundary so that an “invisible” security perimeter is achieved | | |
| LW-7 | The developer would like some “give and take” on the site demise/highway boundary to rationalise security measures | | |
| LW-8 | It is important for all parties that the development is completed on time | LW04: Key project dates are shared with all parties | 3. A more detailed joint programme should be developed for the working party mapping out the key milestones of project gateways, consultation, design, implementation of highway works, building practical completion and building fit out. |
| LW-9 | The fit out of the building will take 18 months following practical completion of the building | | |
| LW-10 | A lot of building works going on at the moment require definite timelines for residents as it is like living in a constant building site | | |

| | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|
| LW-11 | Concern over the inability to move protestors under the buildings whilst on the public highway in the north east corner of site | <p>LW05: The design approach to the public realm around the site limits the potential for anti-social behaviour</p> <p>LW06: Ensure the long term management needs of the building are understood</p> <p>LW07: The management regime for public disorder in the public and private realms be clearly defined</p> <p>LW08: The opportunity for rough sleeping occurring around the development is limited</p> <p>LW09: Ensure that the management regime of the City Walkways routed through the development is defined and agreed by all parties</p> | <p>4. Seek expert advice on the potential for rough sleeping on the public highway underneath the structure.</p> <p>5. Assess the highway boundary line in detail to identify locations where anti-social behaviour and blocking of the entrances to staff may occur</p> <p>6. Discuss further what the building management requires from the public highway</p> <p>7. Gather information from other departments, including Legal and the City Police and develop a management strategy for the City Walkways through the site</p> |
| LW-12 | The public highway is up to the revolving door entrance, there is potential for this entrance to become obstructed. | | |
| LW-13 | Potential to attract rough sleepers in the dry areas underneath the building on public highway | | |
| LW-14 | Rough sleeping is not particularly prevalent in the sheltered areas of the Barbican but where it does occur it is managed sensitively | | |
| LW-15 | There are powers to enable ASBO type orders for areas to discourage certain activities | | |
| LW-16 | Generally homeless support charities are enlisted to assist rough sleepers and should be no criminalisation of homelessness within the public realm | | |
| LW-17 | Certainty required surrounding the management of the City walkways | | |
| LW-18 | Concern over possible anti-social behaviour, rough sleeping, protests and obstructions on City Walkways running through the site | | |
| LW-19 | The entrances to the London Wall carpark and the carpark's long term future are in question. What does this mean for the development? | LW10: The best long-term use for the car park is agreed and facilitated through the design of London Wall | 8. The Department for Built Environment, in consultation with the City Surveyor and Comptroller, should explore the car park's potential and determine its long term use. |
| LW-20 | A north south pedestrian crossing point across London Wall is very important for permeability of the development and the local area | <p>LW11: Footway space and crossing facilities for pedestrians are provided where this is needed most</p> <p>LW12: Pedestrians access routes between street level and the highwalks are of a high quality and provided</p> | <p>9. City Officers to carry out detailed review of pedestrian requirements along and across London Wall</p> <p>10. City Officers to undertake pedestrian modelling analysis to understand existing and anticipated</p> |
| LW-21 | Residents consider the north south connection important as well | | |
| LW-22 | The level change between ground and highwalk requires access from the middle of the development | | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| LW-23 | Wayfinding needs to be integrated and consistent | where they are needed most | desire lines and pedestrian volumes and recommends appropriate design response to accommodate the above. 11. Using the pedestrian modelling, design approach should follow best practice in designing intuitive pedestrian facilities for less able users and include Equality Impact Assessment. 12. City Officers to undertake a wider area study of future conditions e.g. Crossrail pedestrian predictions |
| LW-24 | Permanent bus stops are needed in the right locations; some are lacking shelters e.g outside Moor House | LW13: The bus stops along London Wall should be provided where they are needed most, be safe, comfortable and attractive | 13. Review the bus stop provision along London Wall including bus data to determine if stops are at the most useful location given the changing frontages and Crossrail. |
| Wood Street | | | |
| WS-1 | Pedestrian facilities at the London Wall / Wood Street junction need to be improved | WS01: Pedestrian facilities at the junction are legible, safe and on desire lines that enable access to the building entrances WS02: The footways on Wood Street are the appropriate width and quality WS03: The carriageway on Wood Street is the appropriate width and quality | 14. City Officers to develop a detailed picture of the traffic, pedestrian, public realm and amenity needs of the junction (existing and future) based on consultant studies and use these to inform design options 15. City Officers to carry out detailed review of pedestrian requirements along Wood Street |
| WS-2 | Schroders are currently compiling information on how their staff get to their existing office and how travel patterns may alter once the new building is occupied | | |
| WS-3 | Many staff are expected to approach the development from the south | | |
| WS-4 | The vehicle carriageway is very wide, does it need to be this wide? | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | 16. City Officers to carry out a review of the turning movements along Wood Street |
| WS-5 | Wood Street provides many functions including loading for 125 London Wall | WS04: The right balance of kerbside activity, parking provision and pedestrian amenity should be achieved to meet the local needs | 17. City Officers to carry out a review of the kerbside activity and determine the optimum provision of parking, loading and pedestrian facilities |
| WS-6 | The loading bay for 125 London Wall is constantly full with recycling and therefore loading activity takes place on Wood Street instead. | | |
| WS-7 | The amount of parking on Wood Street is sufficient | | |
| WS-8 | Make sure the Highwalks are considered as part of the pedestrian network | WS05: The Highwalks are well used, legible and accessible as part of the wider pedestrian network | 18. Review wayfinding and access, taking consideration of the Barbican Area Strategy wayfinding study |
| WS-9 | Students from the City of London Girls school regularly use the Highwalks | | |
| St. Alphage Garden/s | | | |
| StG-1 | Access to the servicing bay for no.2 London Wall Place is via Wood Street and St. Alphage Garden, all loading and deliveries, including for the restaurant, will be made from here. | StG01: The servicing of no.2 London Wall is accommodated within the design of the space of St. Alphage Garden StG02: The protection of the brick wall is accommodated within the design of the space on St. Alphage Garden StG03: Access for maintenance is accommodated with the design of the space on St. Alphage Garden StG04: There is good access for all between St. Alphage Gardens and the publicly accessible areas surrounding it StG05: The quality of St. Alphage Gardens is consistent with the high | 19. City Open Spaces team and Environmental Enhancement team liaise with planning officers, Access, City Surveyor, English Heritage and developer design team and Salters Company in developing the design 20. Incorporate the objective of improved accessibility into the design brief 21. Determine the extents of the consecrated burial grounds to understand constraints for the |
| StG-2 | The garden wall opposite the new servicing bay is single brick course and experience shows that the wall will be damaged by servicing vehicles | | |
| StG-3 | The Gardens may look somewhat shabby compared to new landscaped areas | | |
| StG-4 | Maintenance vehicles require access to maintain St. Alphage Gardens | | |
| StG-4 | Currently there is no step free access to the gardens | | |
| StG-5 | There will be disabled access to the lower garden via the Salters Gardens (when it is open) but no disabled access to the upper garden | | |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| StG-6 | The site includes a Scheduled ancient monument, burial ground and archaeological remains: any access improvements would need to be provided from the highway | quality landscape of the development StG06: The areas around the garden and St Alphage Gardens themselves remain sympathetic to the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument StG07: That the existing level of biodiversity is maintained and enhanced (where possible) | design approach |
| StG-7 | Can CoL, Salters and LWP consider land agreements and other opportunities to facilitate the enhancement of St Alphage Garden | | |
| StG-8 | The intricate details of the layout and boundary issues between St. Alphage Gardens, Salters Gardens and the interface with the development landscape couldn't be envisaged by all parties. Preference for site visit in advance of next workshop | | |
| Fore St | | | |
| FS-1 | Coach parking needs to be reviewed. Can cause issues to local residents e.g. noise of engines running | FS01: The location and management of coach parking is balanced with the needs of residents | 22. Officers to confirm if the existing coach parking provision is needed and if so what is the most appropriate location. |
| FS-2 | A simple sign may be effective in getting coach drivers to switch off their engines | | |
| FS-3 | Permeability is needed at ground level into the Barbican. How can people move up onto the Highwalks? | FS02: Fore Street is a more pedestrian friendly space FS03: The footways on Fore Street are the appropriate width and quality | 23. City Officers to carry out detailed review of pedestrian requirements along Fore Street and incorporate into the designs |
| FS-4 | A greater design focus on the pedestrian is desirable | | |
| FS-5 | Fore Street is a stark and sterile environment – could trees be incorporated? Keep linear park going along Moor Lane into Fore St | | |
| FS-6 | The junction of Fore Street and Fore Street Avenue is difficult for pedestrians to move through due to competition with vehicles and footways obstructed by the stairs and dropped kerbs that don't match pedestrian desire lines | | |
| FS-7 | The motorcycle bays on Moor Lane are likely to be relocated to accommodate the environmental enhancement scheme | FS04: The appropriate level of motorcycle parking and cycle hire exists in the area | 24. City Officers to carry out a review of motorcycle and cycle hire requirements in the |

| | | | |
|-------|--|---|--|
| FS-8 | The cycle hire site on Fore Street opposite the new service bay for no.1 LWP must be relocated | | immediate area |
| FS-9 | Fore Street (and Wood Street) form part of cycle quietway, a north south route to be used by cyclists that avoids busier roads | FS05: The design of Fore Street (and Wood Street) is consistent with the needs of the Quietway programme | 25. City Officers liaise with Transport for London to share designs of the respective projects |
| FS-10 | The general condition of carriageway is poor | FS06: The carriageway in Fore Street is the appropriate width and quality | 26. Liaise with Highways team for the resurfacing of Fore Street following the completion of LWP and Crossrail |

Appendix 2 – Project Area



