

<b>Committees:</b>		<b>Dates:</b>
Streets & Walkways Sub	- For Information	5 September 2017
Projects Sub	- For Decision	7 September 2017
Policy and Resources	- For Decision	21 September 2017
Planning and Transportation	- For Decision	Urgency
<b>Subject:</b> Temple Area Traffic Review	<b>Gateway 2 Project Proposal Complex</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of the Built Environment <b>Report Author:</b> Nasser Abbasi		<b>For Decision</b>

### Recommendations

- The **Project Sub-Committee and Planning & Transportation Committees** are asked to agree this project proposal as set out in this report, particularly those detailed in paras 1 to 4, except for the use of the On-street parking Reserve (OSPR).
- The **Policy and Resources Committee** is asked to agree to the use of the OSPR funding as detailed in paras 2 and 21.

It should be noted that in the normal course of events the use of the OSPR would have been considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and its recommendation subsequently ratified by the Policy and Resources Committee. Given that the Sub-Committee is not scheduled to meet again until 19 October 2017 and the need to press on with the project, approval is being sought from the Grand Committee directly.

<b>1. Approval track and next Gateway</b>	<b>Approval track:</b> 1. Complex <b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 3 - Outline Options Appraisal (Complex)			
<b>2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Funds/ Source of Funding</b>	<b>Cost (£)</b>
	Staff Costs	A resource, initially for 9 months, to carry out project management activities, including coordinating with all	On Street Parking Reserve (OSPR)	£110,000

		project partners, working groups, stakeholder engagement, developing and appraising options.		
	Fees	Appointment of professional services particularly for companies to obtain and analyse traffic data (see para 4 below)	OSPR	£50,000
	<b>Total</b>		<b>OSPR</b>	<b>£160,000</b>
	<p>Please note that Transport for London's (TfL's) costs have not been included. This is because they have agreed to work with the City to advance the review and that their costs have so far been absorbed within their business functions. The need for additional funding to meet TfL costs can be assumed following Gateway 3.</p> <p>Costs relating to highway consultancy work including any necessary specialist traffic modelling and design work consequent to the redesigning of the junctions with Embankment (should this be possible) has also not been included at this stage. This is because it is anticipated that the consultant contracted by the Inns will initially provide this advice. Confirmation is awaited and members will be advised of the latest position at committee.</p> <p>If it becomes apparent that additional costs for the activities above are required, an issues report will be submitted to Members for their consideration.</p> <p>The use of the OSPR funding is subject to the recommendation of the Officer Priorities Board and the agreement of Resource Allocation Sub Committee.</p>			
<b>3. Agree the objectives of this project</b>	Agree the objectives as set out at paragraph 8 of this report.			
<b>4. Next steps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commission and analyse traffic data e.g. vehicle composition, origin and destination, ease of movement at junctions and pinch points, loading, parking and servicing provision. Completion target end November 2017.</li> <li>• Consult with stakeholders impacted by possible changes in parking, loading and/or servicing provision. Target</li> </ul>			

	<p>commencement December 2017 and completion end of March 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review provision of cycle hire docking stations and opportunities for relocation. Target completion date end February 2018.</li> <li>• Establish potential new developments (including the Thames Tideway project) in the area and the impact of these in terms of construction and their future impact on the highway. Target completion date end February 2018.</li> <li>• Vectos working with TfL/City to explore the opportunities to improve access and egress onto the Embankment. Completion target end February 2018.</li> <li>• Submit Gateway 3 report. Target delivery date May 2018. This report will set out viable options, known implications and proposals for area wide consultation for Member agreement.</li> </ul>
--	---

## **Project Summary**

<p><b>5. Context</b></p>	<p>Following TfL’s implementation of their Cycle Superhighways along New Bridge Street and Victoria Embankment in early 2016, convenient motor vehicle routes into and out of the Temple area has been reduced. This affects the southern and eastern extremities of the area in particular.</p> <p>The convenience of traffic circulation within the streets bounded by Fleet Street, New Bridge Street and Victoria Embankment also needs to be assessed as part of this review.</p> <p>The Inns believe the above issues are having a negative impact on their business.</p> <p>Local Ward Members, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Streets &amp; Walkways Sub Committee as well as the Inns have requested that these streets and junctions be reviewed. The Chairman and Deputy Chairman have instructed that this review be conducted with urgency and this is reflected in the approach and programme as set out in this report.</p> <p>As part of on-going engagement between TfL, CoL and the Inns, a revised layout to improve access and egress from New Bridge Street is already in progress. This involves potential alterations to three junctions including Tudor Street, Bridewell Place and Watergate.</p> <p>It should be noted that access and egress to the area was first reduced following the introduction of the “Ring of Steel” in December 2003. Apart from providing improve security benefits, the restricted access and egress have also provided environmental improvements such as lower traffic volumes, less pollution (noise and air quality) and associated road safety</p>
--------------------------	--

	<p>benefits. It is therefore important to ensure that these benefits are appropriately balanced against the need for additional access and egress.</p> <p>Members should be aware that in delivering this project City officers will have to work closely with TfL. The City is responsible for the Temple area's street network however TfL are the Highway Authority responsible for the Embankment and as such are responsible for the operation of its junctions with Carmelite Street and Temple Avenue. This project will specifically explore options to improve egress and access at these 2 junctions and TfL have given their commitment to fully engage with this process. However it should be noted that TfL advise that they have already invested significantly in looking at this issue and consider improvement unlikely. It should also be noted that should options be identified to improve access and egress at the junctions then there may be consequential environmental impacts. These would need to be assessed and it would be necessary to consult widely with local residents, businesses and other stakeholders before formal recommendations are made.</p> <p>Finally it should be noted that any outline option presented and agreed at Gateway 3 would need to be fully modelled, assessed (including safety) and have a detailed design completed and approved by TfL before they can be taken as definitely deliverable.</p> <p>This project will therefore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider how effective vehicle movement (including HGVs) is within the area and where necessary, establish opportunities to improve these movements.</li> <li>2. Options for improving access and egress to the area (the Embankment in particular).</li> </ol> <p>In taking this project forward specific consideration will be given to the impact of the Thames Tideway project and the needs of any future developments within the area and the Gateway 3 report will, therefore, give specific recommendations in relation to the timing of any future improvements.</p>
<p><b>6. Brief description of project</b></p>	<p>The review will predominately focus on two elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly, the two key junctions off Victoria Embankment. (Temple Avenue and Carmelite Street). This is because these two junctions control access/egress onto the Transport for London Road Network which is intended to carry strategic traffic movement. As these two junctions are controlled and managed by TfL, it will require their participation and agreement to any future change and officers have secured their commitment to engage in the review process. It is anticipated that this element of the review will be carried out by Vectos, the</li> </ul>

	<p>consultant engaged by the Inns to provide them with professional advice, although this is awaiting confirmation. City &amp; TfL officers will ensure that the consultant's activity and advice meet the public's needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondly, improving movement within the streets and junctions bounded by Victoria Embankment, New Bridge Street and Fleet Street. In particular the project will examine whether the various highway facilities such as parking bays, cycle docking station, cycle lanes as well as the existing street layout, contributes towards a restriction on convenient traffic circulation, particularly for HGV's.</li> </ul> <p>Appendix 1 illustrates the area to be included within the review.</p> <p>The work envisaged includes data gathering and analysis of the existing street usage including identifying locations where access and egress is hampered or not available. Once the need for change and the available options are known wider local needs will be identified through local and political engagements. This process will be agreed through the Gateway 3 report and at this point the appropriateness of establishing a working party will also be considered. Future needs of the area such as developments or other changes to land use will also be taken into account e.g. Thames Tideway.</p>
<p><b>7. Consequences if project not approved</b></p>	<p>The desire for better and more convenient access, egress and circulation for some occupiers in this area would not be met.</p> <p>The Corporation could be seen as not being responsive to local needs.</p>
<p><b>8. SMART Objectives</b></p>	<p>The overall objective of the project is to deliver a balance, which is acceptable to the local community, between improved convenient vehicle movement, appropriate security needs and consequent environmental impacts. The subset objectives include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To comprehensively review options to improve egress and access in relation to the Embankment and where viable options are established and if appropriate, deliver these,</li> <li>• An appropriate level of security is in place,</li> <li>• Impediments to traffic circulation are identified and removed or modified,</li> <li>• Through traffic are not attracted to use the area, or if unavoidable, appropriate mitigation measures are introduced where possible,</li> <li>• Road danger is reduced where possible,</li> <li>• Improved public realm where practicable,</li> <li>• Air and noise pollution are not made worse or if unavoidable, appropriate mitigation measures are</li> </ul>

	<p>considered and introduced where possible,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The needs and aspirations of the wider community are taken into account in considering options.</li> </ul>
<b>9. Success criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options to improve access to and egress to the Temples area, particularly from the Embankment, are comprehensively explored and any viable options identified.</li> <li>Agreed measures are introduced to time, budget and quality,</li> <li>Any proposals meet local needs as identified through local resident, business and stakeholder consultation.</li> <li>Traffic circulation in the Temple area is improved.</li> </ul>
<b>10. Key Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local needs are met,</li> <li>Improved motor vehicle access to and from the Temple area,</li> <li>Improved journey times and reduced journey distances.</li> </ul>
<b>11. Notable exclusions</b>	<p>The junctions along New Bridge Street are excluded from this review as these are already in progress with TfL. However, the implications of changes at this location will be factored in the review of the area.</p> <p>The John Carpenter Street/Victoria Embankment junction should also be excluded because the public realm in this street was recently enhanced and meets local needs.</p> <p>The review does not take into account any costs associated with TfL or specialist traffic modelling/consultancy. If these are required, an issues report or if appropriate a gateway report will be submitted for Member decision.</p>
<b>12. Governance arrangements</b>	<p><b>Spending Committee:</b> Planning and Transportation Committee</p> <p><b>Senior Responsible Officer:</b> Iain Simmons</p> <p><b>Project Board:</b> No</p>

### Prioritisation

<b>13. Link to Strategic Aims</b>	1. To support and promote The City as the world leader in international finance and business services
<b>14. Links to existing strategies, programmes and projects</b>	It will be necessary to take into account the Thames Tideway Project as well as other known developments in the area.
<b>15. Project category</b>	7a. Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)
<b>16. Project priority</b>	C. Desirable

## Options Appraisal

<b>17. Overview of options</b>	<p>A number of options will be considered. This may range from minor measures such as changes to parking, waiting and loading restrictions up to complex junction alterations. Further details will be set out in the Gateway 3 report.</p>
--------------------------------	---

## Project Planning

<b>18. Programme and key dates</b>	<p><b>Overall programme and key dates:</b> See paragraph 4</p> <p><b>Other works dates to coordinate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thames Tideway</li> <li>• Known developments in the area</li> </ul>
<b>19. Risk implications</b>	<p><b>Overall project risk:</b> Green</p> <p><b><u>Key Risks &amp; mitigation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review of Embankment junctions does not deliver any options that TfL consider viable.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed mitigation:</u> Whilst this risk cannot be eliminated the engagement of Vectos expertise will work to ensure all options are vigorously explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of opposing stakeholder needs causing disagreements for an agreed outcome or proposal</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed mitigation:</u> Agree objectives, engagement and consultation once options established. Consider setting up working party.</p> <p><b><u>Key Issues &amp; Mitigation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery may be delayed due to Thames Tideway or other works.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed mitigation:</u> Keep Members/stakeholders and key CoL personnel regularly appraised of developments.</p>
<b>20. Stakeholders and consultees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Honourable Society of the Inner Temple</li> <li>• The Honourable Society of Middle Temple</li> <li>• Ward Members</li> <li>• TfL</li> <li>• City Police</li> <li>• Other emergency services</li> <li>• Local occupiers</li> </ul>

## Resource Implications

<b>19 Total estimated cost</b>	<b>Likely cost range:</b> 2. £250k to £5m						
<b>20 Funding strategy</b>	Choose 1: No funding confirmed	Choose 1: Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource					
	<table border="1" data-bbox="533 595 1351 833"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="533 595 1161 651">Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th data-bbox="1161 595 1351 651">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 651 1161 741">OSPR</td> <td data-bbox="1161 651 1351 741">160,000 – 3,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 741 1161 833" style="text-align: right;"><b>Total</b></td> <td data-bbox="1161 741 1351 833"><b>160,000 – 3,000,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="576 853 1439 1032">The Funding Strategy is subject to the recommendation of The Officer Priorities Board (which they accepted in August 2017) and the agreement of Policy and Resources Committee. The OSPR is already fully committed so would require the reprioritisation of other works.</p>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	OSPR	160,000 – 3,000,000	<b>Total</b>
Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)						
OSPR	160,000 – 3,000,000						
<b>Total</b>	<b>160,000 – 3,000,000</b>						
<b>21 On-going revenue implications</b>	No revenue implications have been identified at this stage, however if there are any, these will be set out in the next appropriate gateway report.						
<b>22 Investment appraisal</b>	N/A						
<b>23 Procurement strategy/Route to Market</b>	Quotations for fees and services will be obtained in line with procurement regulations.						
<b>24 Legal implications</b>	<p data-bbox="528 1462 1439 1682">In carrying out its traffic functions, the City must have regard, inter alia, to its duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular traffic and other traffic (which includes pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway - s.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1697 1439 1805">Depending on the scope of the measures, the City and TfL may need to exercise its highway and traffic powers. For example, the making of Traffic Regulation Orders.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1821 1439 2007">There may also be a need to enter into relevant legal agreements or amendments of existing agreements, for example, under s.8 of the Highways Act 1980 (providing for agreements between local authorities in relation to certain highway works).</p>						

	Further details will be provided as the project progresses.
<b>25 Corporate property implications</b>	None envisaged
<b>26 Traffic implications</b>	The purpose of the review is to improve traffic access, egress and circulation to and from the Temple area
<b>27 Sustainability and energy implications</b>	N/A
<b>28 IS implications</b>	N/A
<b>29 Equality Impact Assessment</b>	An equality impact assessment will be undertaken

### Appendices

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Plan showing the area to be included within the review
-------------------	--

### Contact

<b>Report Author</b>	Nasser Abbasi
<b>Email Address</b>	<a href="mailto:nasser.abbasi@cityoflondon.gov.uk">nasser.abbasi@cityoflondon.gov.uk</a>
<b>Telephone Number</b>	020 7332 3970