

## Report – Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee of the Planning & Transportation Committee

### North-South Cycle Superhighway – Proposed Temporary Experimental Traffic Orders – Tudor Street

*To be presented on Thursday, 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons  
of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

#### **SUMMARY**

On 22 February 2016, your Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee agreed to the making of experimental Traffic Orders under section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to facilitate the introduction of Transport for London's North-South Cycle Superhighway. The Cycle Superhighway is being introduced on the west side of New Bridge Street and the proposed experimental Traffic Orders provide for Tudor Street at its junction with New Bridge Street to be closed to motor vehicles, Bridewell Place to be returned to two way traffic, and contra flow cycling removed from Kingscote Street and Watergate. There are further changes proposed in relation to parking provision, loading restrictions and waiting restrictions and these are dealt with in more detail in the main report.

Your Planning and Transportation Committee duly noted the proceedings of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee at which these decisions were made.

Prior to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee considering the matter, the City Corporation conducted Traffic Order public consultations in September and December 2015.

As a result of those consultations, ten formal objections were received particularly from those living and working in the Temple and these are dealt with more fully in the main report. The City Corporation, together with representatives from TfL, held a meeting with the objectors and respondents to the consultations to discuss their concerns and to see if it was possible to address them. Unfortunately, under TfL's proposals, it was not possible to resolve them although a better understanding of the concerns of those living and working in the Temple area was achieved.

The original recommendation of the Director of the Built Environment to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee was for the making of permanent Traffic Orders. Your Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee did, however, take into account the objections received together with representations made at its meeting by Members of the affected Wards and concluded that it would be more appropriate to agree to the Orders on an experimental basis of up to 18 months duration, in order to assess their impact and effectiveness.

The use of experimental Traffic Orders allows for a period of observation and comment before a scheme may be made permanent. It also allows for modifications to be made to a scheme in the light of operational experience and even for its removal more quickly should it be deemed necessary.

Subsequently, the provisions of Standing Order No.9(4) were invoked. This involved 20 Members of the Court of Common Council requesting that the decision of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee be referred to the Court and meant that no action could be taken to implement the Sub-Committee's decision until such time as the Court had considered the matter. A copy of the written request is attached at Appendix 9.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Court of Common Council approves:

1. the making of experimental Traffic Orders under section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, so that Tudor Street at its junction with New Bridge Street is closed to motor vehicles, Bridewell Place is returned to two way traffic and contra flow cycling is removed from Kingscote Street and Watergate.
2. the making of experimental Traffic Orders under section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in relation to loading and waiting restrictions and provision of parking spaces, so as to implement the mitigation measures as detailed in Appendix 6.
3. the objectors and Transport for London being informed of your decision accordingly.
4. officers obtaining a written undertaking from Transport for London to monitor and fund, if necessary, further mitigation measures in the Tudor Street and Temple area.

## **MAIN REPORT**

### **Background**

1. Transport for London is introducing two major cycle routes in London as part of the Mayor's Vision for Cycling. The Cycle Superhighways run East-West and North-South. The North-South Cycle Superhighway runs from Elephant & Castle to King's Cross, passing through the City of London via Farringdon Street and New Bridge Street. These streets are part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) within the City of London.
2. A public consultation was carried out between 3 September 2014 and 9 November 2014 by TfL on the full length of the proposed route. TfL state that a consultation leaflet was delivered to all properties along the route and to properties within 500m from the route prior to the start of the consultation. In February 2015 the TfL Board considered the results of the consultation – 90% of responses were in favour – and therefore decided to proceed to construction.
3. In February 2015, Members accepted the Mayor of London's proposal for Cycle Superhighways within the City of London and agreed for officers to work with

TfL to facilitate its introduction using the powers and authority available to the City of London Corporation.

4. Although the Cycle Superhighway runs along the TLRN, the associated measures to facilitate its introduction and operation are required in the side streets where the City Corporation is the traffic/highway authority. The main proposal consequent to the Cycle Superhighway is the closure of Tudor Street at its junction with New Bridge Street, while the remainder of the measures set out in this report are to assist traffic to use the alternative access and egress routes following this closure. Please see Appendices 3 and 5 for these proposals.
5. The Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee considered a report on the objections to the introduction of the measures to facilitate the Cycle Superhighway at its meeting on 11 January 2016. The Sub-Committee agreed to arrange a meeting with the objectors and respondents to the two consultations. This meeting was held on 28 January 2016 and enabled discussion of the issues following presentations from Transport for London and from the City of London Corporation.
6. As a result of the discussions, Transport for London agreed to provide some additional information on the proposals; to review the design of the junction of Carmelite Street with Victoria Embankment with a view to allowing traffic to turn eastbound onto the Embankment; to clarify the consultations that were carried out by TfL for the introduction of the Cycle Superhighway; and to give a commitment to continue to monitor the Temple area after the introduction of the proposed measures and to take any action to alleviate any problems that might arise. A letter to the committee chairman on these topics is included as Appendix 7.

### **Objections**

7. The Traffic Order consultations (using press and street notices, and additionally frontager letters for the second consultation) for these associated measures were carried out by the City Corporation from 8 to 29 September 2015 and from 10 December 2015 to 6 January 2016. As a result of this, ten objections were received. These are summarised below but are appended in Appendix 1.
8. A further 3 objections were sent directly to the Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and tabled at the meeting on 22 February. These are appended in Appendix 8.

### The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple

9. The Society objects to two elements of the proposals – the no motor vehicles restriction at the junction of Tudor Street with New Bridge Street and the restoration of two-way working in Bridewell Place.

“Tudor Street is the only access route for vehicles visiting the Temple. The Temple is occupied by the Honourable Society of Inner Temple and the Honourable Society of Middle Temple, and houses a large number of Barristers’ Chambers employing in excess of 2500 people across both sites. Tudor Gate at

the western end of Tudor Street is the only vehicular access point to the Temple.”

“The resident businesses receive numerous deliveries throughout the day in vehicles of various sizes. The Inn’s themselves undertake annual preventative maintenance requiring scaffolding which can only be delivered by articulated lorry. The proposed closure of the junction of Tudor Street with New Bridge Street – and the proposal of using the narrow, right-angled Bridewell Place as an alternative – will cause great difficulty for the larger vehicles sending them into the oncoming carriageway in order to negotiate the turn.”

“This will result in real difficulties for the running of the Temple as a thriving and world class employment centre for the legal profession. The creation of a traffic light controlled junction at the Tudor Street and New Bridge Street intersection allowing exit to northbound and southbound carriageways, and the closure of the junction of Bridewell Place with New Bridge Street would seem to be a more sensible alternative, and avoid large vehicles having to negotiate the right angled turn within Bridewell Place.”

The Honourable Society of the Middle Temple

10. The Society supports the objections raised by the Inner Temple.

“It should also be noted that Tudor Street provides the only viable means of access for firefighting tenders and as such the proposal to restore two-way traffic flow to Bridewell Place, with its restricted turning capacity, could have a detrimental effect in an emergency.”

“The proposal put forward by Richard Snowdon to install traffic lights at the intersection of Tudor Street and New Bridge Street presents the logical solution and we hope that this is adopted so as to preserve the current access arrangements into the Temple”

Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

11. The LTDA objects to the proposals to prohibit motor vehicles entering or leaving Tudor Street at its junction with New Bridge Street and to restore two-way working for vehicles in Bridewell Place.

“This is on the grounds that Bridewell Place is too narrow to safely accommodate two way traffic, particularly as vehicles would have to negotiate a tight right angled turn in doing so. The street is busy with traffic much of which is made up by vehicles servicing premises within the Temple. The traffic includes some large articulated vehicles. In our view it would be very much preferable to construct a safe signalised junction at Tudor Street with New Bridge Street to avoid traffic having to use the less suitable Bridewell Place.”

Jasper Warwick

12. Mr Warwick “believes that the closure of Tudor Street and New Bridge Street will lead to chaos for deliveries to the Temple. Retaining Tudor Street junction and expanding it for north and south traffic would make sense.”

Wendy Mead OBE, Farringdon Without Ward Member

13. The Ward Member believes that her constituents of the Inns of Court of Inner and Middle Temple will be detrimentally affected by the closure of Tudor Street.

“The barrier controlled main entrance to the Temple complex is at the western end of Tudor Street and is used by large scale delivery vehicles. The Bridewell Place alternative given in the consultation document is woefully inadequate, being too narrow for the proposed two-way traffic stream, even with some pavement reduction, and the acute right-angled bend will create, at the very least, altercations and at worst, head-on collisions.”

Charles Samek

14. Mr Samek believes “The proposed changes are completely unworkable and would cause traffic to pass down streets which are wholly unsuited to the flow proposed. Moreover, the changes are unnecessary for the safe and proper functioning of the highway and would cause tremendous inconvenience to road users and result in much heavier traffic congestion down Fleet Street and result in unnecessarily longer journeys with the attendant increase in emissions.”

Geoffrey Hamer

15. Mr Hamer finds the proposals unacceptable.  
“While I appreciate that your policy is exclusively for the benefit of cyclists, they represent only a small fraction of road users in the Tudor Street area and, accordingly, there must be consideration shown to others, particularly pedestrians and motorists, i.e., the majority of users. Clearly, the closure of the New Bridge Street / Tudor Street entrance-exit and the Temple Avenue / Embankment exit to motor vehicles will contribute to grid-lock in the area. Further, the entire area to the south of Fleet Street is totally devoid of pedestrian crossings! So much for pedestrian safety! Furthermore, in recent years both Bouverie Street and Carmelite Street (from Tudor Street to Fleet Street) have been made one way streets for motor vehicles, but two way for bicycles, thereby giving cyclists priority over all other road users, particularly pedestrians, at the corners on Tudor Street. This regularly places pedestrians in danger from cyclists exercising their right to ride against the traffic flow/direction.

Hence, I suggest that pedestrian crossings be established on all corners in the area, including the entrances to both Cycle Super Highways and that these crossings be traffic light controlled and with indication that crossing rules also apply to cyclists.”

Desiree Artesi

16. Ms Artesi is concerned that although the removal of obstructive parking and deliveries does assist traffic flow, the proposals will make deliveries to the residents in the Inner Temple impossible. Bouverie Street has been advocated as an alternative route but this is narrow and often further constricted by parking for the Polish Embassy, disabled parking and cycle hire. No proposals have been received which shows any proposed alteration to these constrictions.

Richard Humphreys, Temple Residents Association

17. Mr Humphrey's responded on behalf of the Temple Residents Association committee.

Bouverie Street – “The proposal is inadequate. The northern end of Bouverie Street is not addressed at all. There, the usable carriageway is very narrow in width because of a disabled parking bay (east side) and a dedicated cycleway on the western side; moreover, a little further south on the eastern side there are approximately 30 “Boris” bicycle hire stands in the carriageway and immediately opposite a very narrow section of footway on the western side (alongside the entire length of no 8 Bouverie Street). Immediately to the south of this section of Bouverie Street is the Polish Embassy where vehicles will necessarily need/seek to wait.

Bouverie Street is not, therefore, presently a suitable route to accommodate safely or otherwise satisfactorily a substantial increase in vehicular movement, especially delivery vehicles; and the proposed measures are insufficient.

Perversely, measures to improve the cyclist's journey seem to be at the expense of introducing dangers for other road users.

Although the closure of the New Bridge Street/Tudor Street is taken as a given in this consultation exercise, the proposed measures (above and below) call into serious question the wisdom of this measure. (It is not clear why cyclist is not to be accommodated in the central section of New Bridge Street, allowing delivery vehicles to turn into and out of side roads? – all traffic including cyclists will in any event have to stop at the Ludgate Circus traffic lights.) The whole scheme appears to be an expensive, ill-thought-through, proposal.”

Bridewell Place – “The above proposals do not appear to make it possible for 2 vehicles to pass each other where traffic using the east-west arm of Bridewell Place turns into (and across the notional centreline of) the north-south arm.

Given that this is proposed to be a main route to/from Tudor Street, it is astonishing that 2-way traffic, particularly delivery vehicles, can be contemplated.”

“The consultation letter dated 10th December suggests that, in addition to Bridewell Place and Bouverie Street, the other ‘entry’ point will be Dorset Rise/Salisbury Court. This road again is totally unsuitable: beginning at its north end with Fleet Street, it is narrow because of a dedicated cycle lane and has a shared level with the adjoining pavements. This is hardly appropriate for turning delivery vehicles. A short way down the street there is a dedicated bay on the eastern side for doctors’ parking, making vehicular traffic even by a single car impossible (other than by mounting the pavement on the western side) and in any event the cycle lane must be used; moreover along the whole length of the street there are only single yellow lines on either side. After the square there are dedicated parking bays on the western side of the street followed by dedicated motorcycle bays for approximately 12 motor cycles. It appears that none of these restrictions will be altered or removed by the proposed changes.”

Gregory Jones, Farringdon Without Ward Member

18. Agrees with the comments submitted by his fellow Ward Member (Wendy Mead).

**Transport for London's design rationale**

19. The objections received were all in response to the proposal to close Tudor Street to motor vehicles at its junction with New Bridge Street. Tudor Street is currently the main access to the area that is bounded by Fleet Street, New Bridge Street, Victoria Embankment and the Temple. Northbound and southbound traffic on New Bridge Street can enter Tudor Street, but egress from Tudor Street into New Bridge Street is restricted to northbound only while southbound vehicles can use Bridewell Place. Watergate provides an alternative northbound exit.
20. In order to keep Tudor Street open it would require the introduction of a signal controlled junction to prevent conflict with the expected high flow of cyclists in the cycle track. There are three main reasons why this location is not considered suitable for a signalised junction.
  - i. The junction would be too close to the major junction at Blackfriars. When northbound traffic is held by the signals at Tudor Street, queuing vehicles would reach back into the Blackfriars junction and block traffic on the east – west route.
  - ii. The Tudor Street junction would require a separate lane on New Bridge Street for vehicles turning left into Tudor Street. There is insufficient space on the carriageway for a left turn lane to be introduced as the carriageway is too narrow and is further impacted by the need to retain the bus stop between the Tudor Street and Watergate junctions.
  - iii. The above mentioned bus stop can't be relocated as the carriageway north of Tudor Street is not wide enough to accommodate a wide island (for bus patrons waiting/alighting) between the carriageway and the cycle track while still allowing northbound traffic to pass a stationary bus. The bus stop is part of a busy interchange between underground, rail services and bus services at Blackfriars. Its removal is therefore not an acceptable option for TfL. A detailed rationale is provided by TfL in Appendix 2.

**Traffic movements**

21. As part of the assessments, TfL has carried out a survey to establish the level and type of traffic using Tudor Street. The survey used video cameras to record traffic in Tudor Street at the junction with New Bridge Street for 24 hours. This showed that the majority of traffic used Tudor Street to enter the area (4359 vehicles) but only a quarter (986 vehicles) used it to egress. The reason for this significant difference is likely to be down to the fact that Tudor Street is the only access route along the southern and eastern side of the area whilst there are three different egress routes, one of which leads directly onto Victoria Embankment. Tudor Street is also the easiest access route as this is fairly wide and straight, making it simpler to negotiate and less likely to encounter obstructions (as opposed to the other routes). Appendix 3 illustrates the existing access & egress routes.

22. The survey also identified that the vast majority of vehicles (5102 vehicles or 95%) using the area are the smaller vehicle types (from pedal cycles to light goods vehicles and mini-buses). The larger vehicles using the route included 224 (or 4%) medium sized goods vehicles and 18 (1%) heavy goods vehicles. A breakdown of the vehicle composition is provided in Appendix 4.
23. The proposed closure of Tudor Street will therefore displace traffic to use alternative routes. Vehicles travelling northbound along New Bridge Street will be able to use Bridewell Place (as it will become two-way) but vehicles travelling southbound will be required to enter Fleet Street and access the area either via Bouverie Street or Salisbury Court / Dorset Rise. The access routes from Fleet Street remain unchanged by the proposals.
24. Vehicles that currently exit the area via the Tudor Street / New Bridge Street junction can still travel both north and southbound within the proposed changes as follows: southbound traffic will continue to use Bridewell Place (although there will be traffic entering as well) and northbound traffic will be required to use Kingscote Street and Watergate, which is an existing route. Appendix 5 illustrates the amended access and egress routes.
25. It should also be noted that the East-West Cycle Superhighway intends to close Temple Avenue at Victoria Embankment but open Carmelite Street as the alternative exit route. The Victoria Embankment slip road will become two-way as part of the project and retain the option to turn either way as that currently exists from Temple Avenue. The only difference is that traffic wishing to proceed eastbound on Victoria Embankment will not be as direct and will need to proceed through Blackfriars to Puddle Dock before joining the route. The Traffic Order consultation for this took place from 28 April 2015 to 19 May 2015. No objections or comments were received from this and, therefore, this closure and associated measures will be delivered under delegated authority.
26. To ensure that adequate access & egress is still available following the closures of Tudor Street and Temple Avenue, vehicle swept path analysis of a range of standard vehicles have been modelled. This has shown that, with the further mitigation measures as set out at Appendix 6, all vehicles would still be able to access and egress the area. However, the junctions along Tudor Street remain tight for the largest of the vehicles (12m rigids and 16.5m articulated HGV's). Although, in the survey, only 8 (0.1%) of these vehicles were recorded entering the area from Tudor Street and none used it to egress. It should also be noted that vehicles exceeding 12 metres in length are not permitted to access this area unless they are serving a property. This has been in place for many years to safeguard the area from HGV's using the area as a through route.

#### **The mitigation measures**

27. To maintain adequate movement, access and egress for the occupiers of the area, mitigation measures are considered necessary. These are summarised below but are further illustrated on the plan in Appendix 6.
  - Additional “at any time” waiting & loading restrictions in a number of streets and junctions. These have been kept to the minimum to ensure that some space is still available for local occupiers to service.



- Relocate existing parking places and the taxi rank. There are no reductions in these provisions.
- Alterations to kerblines, footways and associated street furniture at junctions.
- Alteration to the police check point island.

Based on the above mitigation measures being agreed and implemented the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee consider that the objections received to date, and set out at Appendix 1, are adequately addressed.

28. In addition to the mitigation measures, officers are continuing to work with TfL to agree:-
- a regime which will allow Bridewell Place to be used as a diversionary route if there is a planned event, closure or emergency situation along Fleet Street.
  - a commuted maintenance payment from TfL to cover any increase in maintenance liabilities. The extra vehicles negotiating the tight junctions and other locations may lead to instances of vehicles mounting and damaging footways and other associated street furniture.

### **Conclusion**

29. The objections from the Inner and Middle Temples stated that Tudor Street is the only access route to the Temple and that closing the junction would be detrimental to the running of the Temple. The traffic survey showed that the majority of traffic used Tudor Street as an access route, egress is much less. We have been advised that much of the vehicular traffic entering the Temples leaves to the west via Middle Temple Lane to Victoria Embankment. Other access routes (Bouverie Street and Salisbury Court) into Tudor Street already exist and are unchanged as a result of the Cycle Superhighways. Tudor Street may currently be the preferred route but closing the junction with New Bridge Street would not prevent access or egress for the Temple.
30. The alternative access routes to Tudor Street were modelled to ensure that HGVs could still enter or leave the area if the closure was implemented. The modelling indicated that access to the Temple was possible for all vehicles capable of entering through the Temple Gate as well as larger vehicles even if they can't get through. The Gate is a listed building with signed vehicle limits on width of 2.4m and height of 3.4m.
31. The objectors have concerns regarding the volume of traffic using Tudor Street and that the alternative routes are not suitable to accommodate this volume. The traffic count showed that the ratio of vehicles entering Tudor Street to those using it as an exit is over 4 to 1. For taxis this ratio raises to over 6 to 1 which suggest that it is used more as a through route to avoid the Ludgate Circus junction than it is used for access into the area. The Sub-Committee was advised that the proposed changes may potentially deter this from happening and therefore provide additional benefits associated with a reduction of traffic.
32. There were concerns from the objectors that Bridewell Place was not a suitable alternative access route as it was narrower than Tudor Street, had right-angle turns and considered this to be more dangerous. Mitigation measures have

been proposed to assist traffic to flow while still retaining some parking and provisions for deliveries. A realignment of the footway to the north of Bridewell Place is also proposed to increase pedestrian safety and convenience. In addition, a safety assessment of the measures has also been carried out to ensure the measures are safe. With these mitigation measures, this alternative access is considered appropriate.

33. The request from the objectors for Tudor Street to remain open and the junction to be converted to a signal controlled junction with New Bridge Street is not possible for TfL. The reasons have been covered in paragraph 20.
34. Whilst the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee was advised that, with the mitigation measures detailed in this report, appropriate and safe access and egress could be maintained following the closures of Tudor Street and Temple Avenue, it nevertheless took into account the various objections received. At its meeting when the matter was considered, several Members from the affected Wards were present and were given the opportunity to address the Sub-Committee and, on behalf of their electorate, they too expressed concern over the proposals.
35. The original recommendations by the Director of the Built Environment were for the proposed Traffic Orders to be made on a permanent basis. However, the Sub-Committee, taking into account the objections received and the views of the Ward Members, concluded that the new arrangements should be introduced experimentally for a period of up to 18 months, thus enabling their impact and effectiveness to be assessed and reviewed.
36. The use of experimental Traffic Orders allows for a period of observation and comment before a scheme may be made permanent. It also allows for modifications to be made to a scheme in the light of operational experience and even for its removal more quickly should it be deemed necessary.
37. Subsequently, the provisions of Standing Order No.9 (4) were invoked. This involved 20 Members of the Court of Common Council requesting that the decision of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee be referred to the Court and meant that no action could be taken to implement the Sub-Committee's decision until such time as the Court had considered the matter.

## **Appendices**

1. Objections received
2. TfL full design rationale for Tudor Street closure
3. Plan of existing access & egress routes
4. Vehicle composition at Tudor Street junction with New Bridge Street
5. Plan of amended access and egress routes
6. Plans of mitigation measures
7. Letter from Transport for London
8. Late objections received on 22 February 2016 and tabled at Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee

9. Copy of request to refer the decision to the Court of the Common Council

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March 2016.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Michael Welbank, M.B.E**  
Chairman, Planning and Transportation Committee