

**The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)  
(England) Regulations 2012**

**City Public Realm  
Supplementary Planning Document**

**Statement of Adoption**

**July 2016**



1. This adoption statement is published to meet the requirements of Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
2. The City of London City Public Realm (SPD) was adopted on 26 July 2016.
3. The appendix to this statement sets out the modifications made to the SPD to take account of representations during the consultation period and other relevant matters.
4. Any person with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt the SPD may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of that decision.
5. Any such application must be made promptly and, in any event, not later than 3 months after the date on which the SPD was adopted (26 July 2016).
6. Copies of the SPD, the statement of consultation and the adoption statement are available on request at the Department of the Built Environment enquiries desk, North Wing, Guildhall, London EC2V 5DH. These documents can also be viewed on the City of London website: [www.cityoflondon.gov.uk](http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## Schedule of changes to City Public Realm Supplementary Planning Document, July 2016

Page	Para-graph	Change: <u>Strikethrough</u> denotes text that has been deleted <u>Underlining</u> denotes text that has been added	Reason for Change
4	1.1.3 (Seventh bullet point)	A distinctive cityscape combining modern architecture and some of Europe's tallest buildings within a rich historic environment, including over 600 listed buildings, 26 conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, <del>and 4 historic parks</del> <u>and numerous gardens</u> and churchyards.	Changed for accuracy.
9	2.3.7 Footnote 4. To read:	<u>Central Activities Zone – Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016 – London Plan</u>	Response to comment from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)
13	3.2.5	The City Corporation Community Infrastructure Levy was introduced in July 2014. CIL <del>will</del> <u>has replaced</u> Section 106 obligations as the primary source of developer funding for public realm enhancement schemes <del>in the longer term</del> . Section 106 funding will nevertheless continue to be appropriate in some circumstances.	Revised for accuracy in response to comments from DP9 (planning consultants) / City Property Association
14	4.1.2	<del>over approximately 420,000</del> <u>400,000</u> workers	Changed for accuracy in response to Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)
16	4.2.4	Streets and spaces will support an increasingly diverse range of <u>users</u> , experiences, cultures and activities throughout the week and all year round.	Response to comment from Publica (Urban Design Consultants)
18	4.5.1	4.5.1 The design of the public realm, the choice <u>and placement</u> of	Response to

		furniture, planting and surface materials should be developed from an assessment of local context and established character, including historic character.	comment from Publica (Urban Design Consultants)
19	4.8.1	The setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas need to be carefully considered when developing enhancement schemes <u>for the City's public realm.</u>	Clarification following comment from John Schofield (City of London Archaeological Trust)
19	4.10.1	The City's public realm should be planned, designed and managed in ways that positively influence the health and wellbeing of workers <u>and residents.</u> <del>and visitors and release the enormous potential of the City's streets and spaces to nurture and improve physical, emotional and mental health.</del> This includes <u>improving air quality</u> and encouraging healthy modes of transport such as walking and cycling.	Response to comment from David Coleman and revised for accuracy.
20	4.12.1	The City's historic network of interconnected streets and spaces should be <u>preserved</u> and only in <u>exceptional circumstances</u> <del>rarely</del> altered or diverted. In mobility terms, the pedestrian network should be continuous, accessible, legible, joined-up, and without barriers.	Response to comment from David Coleman (Resident)
23	5.2.2	Traffic lanes on some streets are wider than necessary and lane widths can often be reduced to free up space for widening the footways, <u>without compromising space for cyclists.</u> In some cases, where there is more than one traffic lane in each direction, there is the opportunity for this to be changed to a single lane with the resulting freed up space used for widening the footways. <u>These proposals should take into account the street hierarchy and should be developed in consultation with City Transportation.</u>  <i>(Figure to be added) The example of Cheapside, illustrates a scheme where footways were widened to nearly twice their size, whilst maintaining carriageways in both directions.</i>	Response to comment from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)
25	5.2.15	Constricted footways encourage pedestrians to walk on the	Response to comment

		<p>carriageway where they are likely to come into conflict with vehicles_ and cyclists, particularly in those parts of the City where pedestrian flows are high or projected to increase.</p>	<p>from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)</p>												
25	<p>5.2.16 Table at top of p. 25 to be updated to reflect TFL Guidance.</p>	<p><del>Manual for Streets Two: Wider Application of the Principles (September 2010), endorsed by HM Government, recommends the use of the 'Gehl Standard' to assess appropriate footway widths. The City Corporation has therefore adopted the Gehl Standard of a maximum of 13 pedestrians per metre of unobstructed footway width per minute 1. Flows at or below this threshold generally afford sufficient opportunity for people to comfortably pause and linger without feeling as though they are obstructing others.</del></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="510 703 1626 1062"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><u>PCL B (Pedestrian Comfort Level) Recommended Minimum for all areas (ppmm: pedestrians per metre))</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>B+</u></td> <td><u>9 to 11 ppmm</u></td> <td><u>31% Restricted Movement</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>B</u></td> <td><u>12 to 14 ppmm</u></td> <td><u>41% Restricted Movement</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>B-</u></td> <td><u>15 to 17 ppmm</u></td> <td><u>50% Restricted Movement</u></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>PCL B+ is the recommended level of comfort for all area types. This level provides enough space for normal walking speed and some choice in routes taken. At PCL B and PCL B- normal walking speed is still possible but conflicts are becoming more frequent and, in retail areas, people start to consider avoiding the area.</u></p> <p><u>The City Corporation applies TFL guidance, "Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London", to assess appropriate footway widths <sup>1</sup></u></p> <p><u>1 See Transport for London Pedestrian Comfort Guidance (2010).</u></p>	<u>PCL B (Pedestrian Comfort Level) Recommended Minimum for all areas (ppmm: pedestrians per metre))</u>			<u>B+</u>	<u>9 to 11 ppmm</u>	<u>31% Restricted Movement</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>12 to 14 ppmm</u>	<u>41% Restricted Movement</u>	<u>B-</u>	<u>15 to 17 ppmm</u>	<u>50% Restricted Movement</u>	<p>Update and Response to comment from Transport for London</p>
<u>PCL B (Pedestrian Comfort Level) Recommended Minimum for all areas (ppmm: pedestrians per metre))</u>															
<u>B+</u>	<u>9 to 11 ppmm</u>	<u>31% Restricted Movement</u>													
<u>B</u>	<u>12 to 14 ppmm</u>	<u>41% Restricted Movement</u>													
<u>B-</u>	<u>15 to 17 ppmm</u>	<u>50% Restricted Movement</u>													

26	5.3.2	City buildings should <del>be designed to accommodate and integrate</del> traffic signs when required. <del>if required without detrimental impact on the City's townscape, the building's appearance, or its efficient functioning.</del>	Changed for accuracy
29	5.3.10	In the medium and longer term, traditional road safety measures will continue to have a part to play, but it is envisaged that achieving a significant reduction in casualties will require a more fundamental review of the operation and management of the City's streets. <u>Measures include managing out-of-hours deliveries and street timed closures where appropriate, restructured bus routes and the provision of high quality strategic walking and cycle routes combined with a corridor based approach to secure improvements at the local level.</u>	Response to comment from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)  Response to comment from Transport for London
29	5.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting London-wide cycling schemes (<u>Quietways and Central London Grid</u>)</li> <li>• Dedicated cycle lanes where they are appropriate, <u>such as Cycle Superhighway.</u></li> </ul>	Response to comment from Transport for London
37	7.1.11	<del>The City's conservation areas and ancient monuments are destinations in themselves and distinct from one another.</del> <u>The City includes a large number of designated heritage assets many of which are destinations in their own right and may possess both individual and collective significance.</u> It is this distinct variety which is part of the City's appeal as a business, financial <u>and cultural</u> centre. Enhancement schemes should therefore be tailored to reflect this local distinctiveness <u>where appropriate.</u>	Response to comment from Richard Parish (Historic England, Historic Places Adviser).
38	7.1.14	<del>Significant</del> <u>Heritage</u> assets identified in <del>each</del> <u>Conservation Area</u> Character Summaries and Management Strategy SPDs <del>and other</del>	Response to comment from Richard Parish

		adopted Supplementary Planning Documents should be retained.	(Historic England, Historic Places Adviser)
43	8.2.12	Effects should be modeled and public realm mitigation measures <del>such as tree planting,</del> <u>should be introduced at the first instance within the development site, and in the public realm where appropriate.</u>	Clarification in response to comments from Transport for London
43	8.2.10	The City Corporation has required recently permitted and constructed schemes to retain and integrate <u>high quality</u> pedestrian routes through the sites that reflect the distinctive pattern of alleyways that characterise the City.	Response to comment from Publica (Urban Design Consultants)
45	9.2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Provide</u> alternative 'quiet' cycle and pedestrian routes <del>either segregated from or routed away from main roads.</del></li> <li>• <del>Provide Wider footways in areas of the City where the public is encouraged to spend time outdoors.</del></li> </ul>	Response to comment from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)
51	10.3	<p>Guideline 10.2: The <u>3 4</u> key principles <u>on material selection</u> <del>set out in the Materials Review</del> should be applied to all public realm enhancement and traffic management proposals.</p> <p><del>10.3.1 A Materials Review was carried out by the City of London in 2010 with the purpose of examining the social, environmental, and economic sustainability implications of the City's palette of materials. This was to ensure that street design complies within the City's sustainability policy objectives and commitments.</del></p> <p><u>10.3.1 The City has adopted a limited palette of paving materials This ensures a consistent approach to street enhancement schemes, whilst maintaining a high standard of design and quality.</u></p> <p><del>10.3.2 The outcome of the Materials Review was a proposal to facilitate improved management of the City's existing restricted palette of materials via a set of 3 key principles, which consider uses of the materials as well as the maintenance implications, in accordance</del></p>	<p>General Update</p> <p>Response to comment from Transport for London</p>

		<p>with the City's on-going commitment to sustainability.</p> <p><u>10.3.2 Transport for London (TfL) Streetscape guidance should be reviewed alongside this section in order to ensure there is a consistent approach to street enhancements in TfL's road network.</u></p>	
56	11.5.4 Pictures in the Manual have been updated.	<p><del>This has led to only Two</del> main styles of bollard <del>that</del> are encouraged to be used in enhancement schemes in the City; the "C3" and "D3". <u>Refer to picture 1 and 2 above.</u></p>	Response to comment from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of London)
57	11.6.3	<p>The effect of <u>activities such as skateboarding</u> on and against seating should be considered at an early design stage and <del>and anti-skateboarding measures installed wherever necessary</del> <u>measures should be taken to reduce the likelihood of damage.</u></p>	Changed for accuracy
58	11.8	<p><del>11.8.1 Flat horizontal surfaces such as benches and seating areas as well as steps and handrails, can be appropriated by skateboards for for recreational use, resulting in damage to structures and finishes.</del></p> <p><del>11.8.2 The City Corporation requires designers to consider ways of discouraging the use of street furniture and steps as skateboarding surfaces, by taking a positive design approach to the design of public spaces from the outset. Further details on approaches and specifications will be included in the City Public Realm Manual.</del></p> <p>The City Corporation requires designers to include within their schemes design features which will minimise the likelihood of skateboarders using the City's public realm, especially street furniture and steps. Design features may include for example decorative grooves cut into stone surfaces, the use of alternative paving surfaces, or judicious use of planting and seating. Other measures designed to increase the popularity of a space, and therefore reducing the likelihood of</p>	Changed for accuracy



		skateboarding, will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Further details on approaches and specifications are included in the City Public Realm Technical Manual.	
64	12.4.1	Such features can enrich the public realm, adding an extra layer of quality, <u>sense of place</u> and attractiveness to the urban environment.	Response to comment from Publica (Urban Design Consultants)
66	13.1.1	The objective of this section is to provide guidance on planting in the public realm and the <del>creation</del> <u>design</u> and improvement of <u>spaces which integrate soft landscaping features such as planters, planting beds and trees.</u> <del>soft landscaped spaces.</del>	Response to comment from Publica (Urban Design Consultants)
67	13.3.3	<u>The planting of fruiting trees liable to cause maintenance issues on City streets is discouraged.</u>  <del>Fruiting trees are discouraged in the City streets due to their maintenance implications and flowering trees will normally only be accepted if maintenance funds are provided through the relevant project.</del>	Changed for accuracy
68	13.4.2	New fixed planters should be carefully designed to relate effectively to their context and, where necessary, <u>measures should be taken to reduce the likelihood of damage from skateboarding or similar activities</u> <del>anti-skateboarding measures should be designed in.</del>	Changed for accuracy
70	13.6.2	Play facilities should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connect children to nature and elements natural to the site <u>by integrating soft landscape and planting where appropriate.</u></li> </ul>	Response to comment from Publica (Urban Design Consultants)
74	14.5.1	People are more likely to walk or cycle if there are well-maintained, <u>well-lit</u> and unobstructed footways <u>and</u> cycle <del>paths</del> routes with traffic calming measures. Attractive walking and cycling routes take in to	Response to comment from Mr. Jeremy Simons (CC Member City of

		<p><u>account</u> well-known sights, open spaces, active street frontages, historic routes, <del>shops</del> and places where people come together. <del>as well as paths and connections to other streets.</del> There are also a number of Visitor Trails <u>and Historic Walks</u> that the City has developed to encourage visitors to walk between City attractions.</p>	London)
101	Appendices	<u>Appendix 5. Glossary</u>	Addition of a glossary of terms in response to various comments.