



## Projects and Procurement Sub-Committee **INFORMATION PACK**

**Date:** MONDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2023  
**Time:** 1.45 pm  
**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

**Members:**

Alderman Timothy Hailes (Chairman)	Deputy Charles Edward Lord Paul Martinelli
Deputy Shравan Joshi (Deputy Chairman)	Anett Rideg Tom Sleight, Bishopsgate Without
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Luis Felipe Tilleria
Deputy Madush Gupta	Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Caroline Haines, Queenhithe	
Deputy Christopher Hayward	

**Enquiries:** **Matthew Stickley, Governance and Member Services Manager**  
**Matthew.Stickley@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

### **Accessing the virtual public meeting**

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

**Ian Thomas CBE**  
**Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

# AGENDA

## Public Gateway Reports - For Information

6. **\*GW5 ISSUE: BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT: ALL CHANGE AT BANK- TRAFFIC AND TIMING REVIEW**

Report of the Executive Director Environment.

**For Information**  
(Pages 5 - 16)

## Non-Public Gateway Reports - For Information

14. **\*GW2: CLSG SATELLITE/EXPANSION SPACE IMMEDIATE NEEDS**

Report of the Headmistress of the City of London School for Girls.

**For Information**  
(Pages 17 - 32)

15. **\*GW1-4: CITY OF LONDON SCHOOL FOR GIRLS - 2024-27 IMPROVEMENT AND REVENUE WORKS**

Joint report of the City Surveyor and Headmistress of the City of London School for Girls.

**For Information**  
(Pages 33 - 52)

16. **\*GW3 ISSUES: CITY OF LONDON SCHOOL MASTERPLAN**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**  
(Pages 53 - 72)

17. **\*GW4-5: BARBICAN FIRE SAFETY PROJECT**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**  
(Pages 73 - 86)

18. **\*GW5: GUILDHALL COOLING PLANT REPLACEMENT**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**  
(Pages 87 - 106)

19. **\*GW5 ISSUE: ORACLE PROPERTY MANAGER (OPN) REPLACEMENT**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Information**  
(Pages 107 - 124)
20. **\*GW5 ISSUE: ISELDEN HOUSE INFILL PROJECT**  
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**  
(Pages 125 - 142)
21. **\*GW5 ISSUE: MIDDLESEX STREET COMMUNAL HEATING REPLACEMENT**  
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**  
(Pages 143 - 156)
22. **\*GW5 ISSUE: WINDOW REPLACEMENT AND COMMON PARTS REDECORATIONS: HOLLOWAY ESTATE**  
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.
- For Information**  
(Pages 157 - 164)
23. **\*GW5 ISSUE: SYDENHAM HILL WINDOW REPLACEMENT AND COMMON PARTS REDECORATIONS**  
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**  
(Pages 165 - 172)
24. **\*GW5 ISSUE: WINDSOR HOUSE WINDOW REPLACEMENT AND COMMON PARTS REDECORATIONS**  
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**  
(Pages 173 - 180)
25. **\*GW6: CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT PLANT REPLACEMENT: PHASE 4**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Information**  
(Pages 181 - 224)

This page is intentionally left blank

<p><b>Committees:</b>  Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee <i>[for decision]</i>  Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee <i>[for decision]</i></p>	<p><b>Dates:</b>  Urgency  Click here to enter a date.  Urgency</p>
<p><b>Subject:</b>  Bank Junction Improvements Project: All Change at Bank-Traffic and Timing Review</p> <p><b>Unique Project Identifier:</b>  11401</p>	<p><b>Gateway 5 Complex Issue Report</b></p>
<p><b>Report of:</b>  <b>Executive Director Environment</b></p> <p>Choose an item.</p> <p><b>Report Author:</b>  Gillian Howard</p>	<p><b>For Decision</b></p>
<h1 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h1>	

<p><b>1. Status update</b></p>	<p><b>Project Description:</b> To improve the safety, air quality and pedestrian experience of the area around the Bank junction to reflect the historic and iconic surroundings with the appropriate sense of place.</p> <p>This report relates to the traffic and timing review relating to the restrictions at the junction and whether they should be amended from buses and cycles only Monday to Friday 7am to 7pm.</p> <p><b>RAG Status:</b> Amber (Amber at last report to Committee)</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Medium (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £6.67M - £7.3M</b> (max figure includes utilisation of unspent costed risk to deliver public realm enhancements if available, and inclusion of the Cool Streets funding)</p> <p><b>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> Increase of £500k since last report to Committee specifically for the traffic and timing review.</p> <p><b>Spend to Date:</b> £3,495,398 (01/08/23)</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised:</b> 423,502 (which was drawn down in the last report to Committee Sept 2022 covering the</p>
--------------------------------	--

	<p>initial increase in the price of materials for construction);</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> TfL/S106/Capital funding (OSPR). (request for further funds from OSPR)</p> <p><b>Slippage:</b> Scope of the traffic and timing review has had to be expanded and more funds requested following the conclusion of the earlier work. This identified that more detailed analysis would be required to support any future recommendation from the review on whether to promote a change of the traffic mix at Bank.</p>								
<p><b>2. Requested decisions</b></p>	<p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Choose an item. <b>G6</b></p> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <p>Resource Allocation Sub Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree to allocate £650,000 from the On Street Parking Reserve (including £150,000 costed Risk Provision for Risk R21) as recommended by Corporate Priorities Board in July 2023, to fund the continuation of the traffic and timing mix review at Bank.</li> </ol> <p>Streets &amp; Walkway’s Sub Committee- Subject to the outcome of Recommendation 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Agree the £650,000 additional budget is approved for the use of the Traffic and Timing Review at Bank.</li> <li>3. Note the total revised project budget of 6,676,432 (excluding risk) increased by £500,000.</li> <li>4. That an additional Costed Risk Provision of £150,000 is approved (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer) specifically for the use of the Traffic and Timing Review.</li> <li>5. Note that this would take the remaining available Costed Risk Provision for the entire project to £816,498.</li> <li>6. Approve the amended risk register in Appendix 2 (inclusion of the £150k in R21).</li> <li>7. Approve that the City can enter into a S278 Agreement relating to the delivery of a taxi rank on Poultry outside the Ned hotel (paragraph 7)</li> </ol>								
<p><b>3. Budget</b></p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="528 1749 1390 2031"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="528 1749 754 1895">Item</th> <th data-bbox="754 1749 1007 1895">Reason</th> <th data-bbox="1007 1749 1217 1895">Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th data-bbox="1217 1749 1390 1895">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="528 1895 754 2031">Project Management Staff costs</td> <td data-bbox="754 1895 1007 2031">To manage the commissions, engagement</td> <td data-bbox="1007 1895 1217 2031">OSPR</td> <td data-bbox="1217 1895 1390 2031">55,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Project Management Staff costs	To manage the commissions, engagement	OSPR	55,000
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)						
Project Management Staff costs	To manage the commissions, engagement	OSPR	55,000						

		with stakeholders, progress the traffic modelling work and report back on progress		
	Fees	Commissioning of external third parties for services	OSPR	445,000
	<b>Total</b>			500,000
	<p><b>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: added £150k</b> (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 2 – Risk 21)</p>			
<b>4. Issue description</b>	<p><i>As requested by the Court of Common Council in April 2022:</i></p> <p><i>“That the Planning &amp; Transportation Committee be requested immediately to begin a review of the nature and timing of current motor traffic timing restrictions at Bank Junction, to include all options. This review will include full engagement with Transport for London and other relevant stakeholders, data collection, analysis and traffic modelling. The Planning &amp; Transportation Committee should then present its recommendation to this Honourable Court as soon as practicable.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The initial review undertaken between the motion and May 2023 did not identify a clear need to proceed with the process for making changes to restrictions at Bank and established a number of complex and challenging issues that need to be explored in more detail before a case for change can be successfully made. This was set out in the report to the Court of Common Council in July 2023.</li> <li>2. A request for further funding to undertake this work was considered by Corporate Priorities Board in July 2023 based on the report that had been submitted to the Planning &amp; Transportation Committee in June. This request for funding was subject to the outcome of the July Court of Common Council meeting where a report was being considered on how to proceed. This report was agreed.</li> <li>3. At the Court of Common Council meeting in July 2023 a commitment was given by the Chairman of the Planning</li> </ol>			

	<p>and Transportation committee that a progress report would be presented to the Court in December. For meaningful progress to be made and reported, there are elements of work that are required to be commissioned as soon as possible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The additional funding is to undertake the work to more fully evidence the equalities benefits and impacts of making a change to the traffic mix and or timing of the current traffic restrictions at Bank. Evidencing the availability of taxis is a key area of work that is required to be commissioned. Most of this work is required to be undertaken by third parties and cannot proceed until the funding has been approved and purchase orders able to be raised.</li> <li>5. The current fees allocation for the project is not sufficient to commission the work that is required having already utilised the money in the first round of data collection and commissions which led to the July Court of Common Council report.</li> <li>6. In summary the scope of the review is now larger than originally envisaged and must consider the challenging and complex issues that need to be addressed in order to provide a robust and well evidenced case for change. Additional funding is required to cover this expanded scope.</li> <li>7. In addition, outside of the Project scope but in the vicinity of the current construction work at Bank, negotiations regarding the installation of a taxi rank outside the Ned hotel on Poultry have concluded and officers seek authorisation to enter a S278 agreement to complete the work. If the request for authorisation to enter the agreement was not given until the next available Streets &amp; Walkways committee (26 September 2023) the installation is unlikely to be able to be programmed and gain the efficiency of the resurfacing work taking place as part of the All Change at Bank project.</li> <li>8. The process to install the taxi rank and progress the amendments to the relevant traffic orders does not require any other Member approvals other than the authorisation to enter the legal agreement.</li> </ol>
<p><b>5. Options</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. It is requested that Resource Allocation Sub Committee consider the application for a total of £650,000 from the On Street Parking Reserve (OSPR) in advance of their meeting scheduled for the 6 September 2023, and outside of the new quarterly approval timetable. The outline of the funding submission to Priorities board is in Appendix 1.</li> <li>10. Funding is requested to be split as set out in table 1 in section 3. Agreement of early release of the funding is required to enable the commissioning of the various work streams and for meaningful progress to be made and</li> </ol>



	<p>reported back to the service committee and subsequent Court of Common Council in December 2023.</p> <p>11. Subject to Resource Allocation Sub Committee agreeing to the early release of funds from the OSPR, Streets &amp; Walkways are requested to approve the inclusion of these funds into the project budget.</p> <p>12. This will be an additional £500k making the total project budget (excluding risk) £6,676,432. In addition, a further £150k to be added to the Costed Risk Register specifically for the use of the review and will not be rolled into the project budget for funding public realm enhancements if it is not utilised.</p> <p>13. The inclusion of the additional £150k in to costed risk (R21 in appendix 2) will bring the total available Costed risk budget to £816,498.</p> <p>14. If funding release were to wait for the 6 September Resource Allocation Sub and the 26 September Streets &amp; Walkways Sub Committee meetings, the ability to undertake any meaningful work to report back to Court of Common Council would be severely compromised.</p> <p>15. The option above is the most expedient option to deliver the work in the timeframe set out at the Court of Common council meeting. Without the additional funding the review cannot continue, and it would not be possible to conclude the original Court motion.</p> <p>16. In addition, if the authorisation to enter the S278 agreement were not given until the 26 September by Streets &amp; Walkways Sub Committee this would delay the installation of the taxi rank on Poultry and the efficiency of coinciding with the All Change at Bank construction work in this area would be lost. The other aspects of the ranks installation already fall within delegated powers and does not form part of the All Change at Bank Project delivery.</p> <p>17. It is therefore requested that these items be considered under Urgency.</p>
--	--

### **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Outline of funding submission
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Risk Register

### **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Gillian Howard
<b>Email Address</b>	Gillian.howard@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<b>Telephone Number</b>	020 7332 3139

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix 1**

### **1. Bank Junction Improvements Project - OSPR**

In April 2022, the Court of Common Council passed a motion requiring the immediate start of the review of traffic mix and timing restrictions at Bank Junction. This review forms part of the highway improvement project at Bank and was due to start 12 months after construction of the All Change at Bank Project had completed (approx. Spring 2025).

This bid seeks additional funding, over and above that already allocated to project delivery, to complete the review, which has become much more complex than originally envisaged when the original approach and timetable was set. As a result of this added complexity, including additional traffic modelling requirements, the original funding ring fenced for monitoring and review is no longer sufficient and has largely been exhausted by the work undertaken to date.

Feasibility traffic modelling has been undertaken which has highlighted an issue regarding latent demand which requires further investigations before it would be possible to proceed with any traffic modelling approvals to make a change to the restrictions at Bank.

Additional funding is required to complete the review (including costed risk to cover the cost of a potential legal challenge) and conclude whether, on balance, a change to the traffic order is required. This work is essential if we are to demonstrate to TfL, who must give approval for either a permanent change to the traffic order at Bank or to run an experimental order.

A bid for £650,000 is requested from OSPR (includes Risk provision of £150k).

The Bank project supports the following strategies and priorities:

- Highway improvement project;
- Projects that facilitate the London Transport Strategy;
- Environmental improvements, specifically improving or maintaining the appearance or amenity of roads; and
- Support the delivery of 'Vision Zero' by reducing serious and fatal collisions and projects that would improve accessibility.

This page is intentionally left blank

**City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register**

Project name: *All Change at Bank*

Unique project identifier: *11401*

Total est cost (exc risk) *£6676432*

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

PM's overall risk rating	Medium						
	Avg risk pre-mitigation	11.9	Minor impact	Serious impact	Major impact	Extreme impact	
	Avg risk post-mitigation	7.9	Likely	4	8	16	32
	Red risks (open)	2	Possible	3	6	12	24
	Amber risks (open)	4	Unlikely	2	4	8	16
Green risks (open)	2	Rare	1	2	4	8	

Costed risks identified (All)	£1,195,000.00	18%	Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project
Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)	£1,121,500.00	17%	" "
Costed risk post-mitigation (open)	£636,498.00	10%	" "
Costed Risk Provision requested	£816,498.00	12%	CRP as % of total estimated cost of project

- (1) Service Delivery/ Performance
- (1) Compliance/Regulatory
- (2) Financial
- (3) Reputation
- (4) Contractual/Partnership
- (4) Legal/ Statutory
- (5) H&S/Wellbeing
- (6) Safeguarding
- (7) Innovation
- (8) Technology
- (9) Environmental
- (10) Physical

Number of Open Risks	Avg Score	Costed impact	Red	Amber	Green
2	7.0	£55,000.00	0	2	0
3	10.7	£157,000.00	2	0	0
4	7.5	£120,500.00	1	1	2
1	8.0	£8,000.00	0	1	0
1	32.0	£700,000.00	1	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
3	5.0	£81,000.00	0	2	1

Issues (open)	1
All Issues	1

	Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
Open Issues	1	0	0	0
All Issues	1	0	0	0

Cost to resolve all issues (on completion) £423,502.00

Total CRP used to date £423,502.00

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: <b>All Change at Bank</b>	PM's overall risk rating: <b>Medium</b>	CRP requested this gateway: <b>£ 816,498</b>	Average unmitigated risk: <b>11.9</b>	Open Risks: <b>12</b>
Unique project identifier: <b>11401</b>	Total estimated cost (exec risk): <b>£ 6,676,432</b>	Total CRP used to date: <b>£ 423,502</b>	Average mitigated risk score: <b>7.9</b>	Closed Risks: <b>5</b>

General risk classification										Mitigation actions						Ownership & Action							
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification on post-mitigation	Impact Classification on post-mitigation	Costed impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/Realised & moved to Issues	Comment(s)
R1	5	(2) Financial	Inaccurate or incomplete project estimates, including baxters/ inflationary issues leads to budget increases	If an estimate is found at a later date to be inaccurate or incomplete, more funding and/or time resource would be needed to rectify the issue or fund/ underwrite the shortfall. More specifically, inflationary amounts predetermined earlier in a project may be found to be insufficient and require extra funding to cover any shortfall.	Likely	Major	16	£7,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	* Undertake regular cost reviews via the highways team.	£0.00	Likely	Serious	£6,000.00	8	£0.00	staff time	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Ben Bishop		passing to gateway 5, revised risks for construction.
R2	4	(4) Contractual/Partnership	TfL buses engagement and their requirements on a project.	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with TfL didn't go as planned.	Unlikely	Serious		£4,500.00		B - Fairly Confident	* Ensure early engagement with TfL buses in the design phases so they can consult internally * Design the measures to help minimise impacts on the bus network	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor			£0.00	Costs to cover TfL staff time and/or costs of their consultants	14/09/2020	Leah Coburn	Neil West	22/11/2021	
R3	5	(4) Contractual/Partnership	LUL engagement and their requirements on a project.	Further time and therefore resource may be required during construction	Unlikely	Minor	2	£3,000.00		A - Very Confident	* Ensure early engagement with LUL in the design phase to ascertain their requirements for working near their infrastructure.	£0.00	Rare	Minor		1	£0.00	Costs to cover LUL staff time and/or costs of their consultants	14/09/2020	Leah Coburn	Neil West	22/11/2021	
R4	4	(4) Legal/ Statutory	Issue(s) with external engagement and buy-in	Further time and therefore resource may be required if planned engagement work with local external stakeholders didn't go as planned	Possible	Serious		£7,000.00		A - Very Confident	As restrictions ease make contact with busiensses that have not been engaging these last few months to ensure they understand the proposals	£0.00	Rare	Minor			£0.00	Costs to cover staff time	14/09/2020	Leah Coburn	Gillian Howard	22/11/2021	TO this stage engagement has been contained within the estiamted budget.

R5	5	(2) Financial	Funding constraint/ conditions implications	Further resources may be required to identify additional funding or make alternative arrangements if constraints/ conditions change.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£3,500.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	* Track and locate other possible additional funding streams * In co-operation with City Highways staff, strive to make efficiency savings where possible during detailed design phase.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£2,000.00	4	£0.00	Costs to cover staff time	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard		
R6	5	(2) Financial	Accessibility and/ or security concerns lead to project change	Further changes to the project's design if necessary may impact on accessibility/ security concerns leading to further changes.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£20,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	* On-going dialogue with the accessibility/ security workstreams	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£15,000.00	1	£0.00	Costs to cover staff and/ or fees	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Neil West		nothing over and above anticipated levels
R7	5	(1) Service Delivery/ Performance	Unforeseen technical and/ or engineering issues identified	Identification of any engineering or technical issues that disrupt delivery could result in further costs whether they be time, funding or resources.	Unlikely	Major	8	£35,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	* Work closely with the highways team to help identify any unforeseen technical or engineering issues at an early stage.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£22,000.00	4	£0.00	Costs to cover staff and/ or fees	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Ben Bishop/ Neil West		
R9	5	(10) Physical	Trial holes/ utility investigations lead to further information being required and an increase in time.	Delays could occur which result in unplanned costs if utility companies don't engage as expected or additional utility surveys are required.	Possible	Serious	6	£8,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	Liaise closely with design engineers to work out an approach to cover utility delays or site discoveries. Trial holes to be undertaken once security measures have been developed further.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£5,000.00	1	£0.00	staff time	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Ben/ Bishop/ Neil West		reworded to extend into construction given the risk around cost inflation and possible need to make alterations.
R10	5	(3) Reputation	Expectation of the look and feel of the scheme is higher than what can be achieved with the budget available.	It is possible that we lose support for the proposed changes whilst still having a need to make functional change to support the growth in pedestrian numbers.	Likely	Serious	8	£8,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	Liaise closely with design engineers to maximise public realm opportunities that can be included, subject to site and budget constraints.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£7,000.00	6	£0.00	cost to cover staff time	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Ben/ Bishop/ Neil West		
R11	5	(1) Service Delivery/ Performance	Additional investigations or surveys may be required by internal/ external parties to further validate the design.	Delays could occur to the programme if validation of the design is delayed.	Unlikely	Serious	6	£20,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	Liaise with internal/ external parties at an early stage to agree the scope of any additional investigations/ surveys.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£11,000.00	1	£0.00	Costs to cover staff time and/ or consultants time/fee	14/09/2020	Gillian Howard	Neil West		reworded to extend into construction given the risk around cost inflation and possible need to make alterations.
R12	4	(1) Service Delivery/ Performance	We may need to cover more of the costs for TfL/ consultants fees for the Eastern Cluster project.	Delays could occur to the programme if funding isn't available to cover costs associated with the Eastern Cluster project.	Possible	Serious	6	£40,000.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Ongoing dialogue with Eastern Cluster Team to understand budget constraints.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£30,000.00	1	£0.00	Costs to cover TfL staff time and/ or costs of their consultants	14/09/2020	Leah Coburn	Gillian Howard/ Neil West	29/07/2022	closed out by year end by ECC team.
R13	4	(1) Service Delivery/ Performance	Some of the temporary schemes implemented as part of the City Transportation's and TfL's response to COVID-19 may be made permanent and could impact on the proposals at Bank Junction.	Making some of the temporary measures permanent could impact on the viability of proceeding with the project.	Possible	Serious		£15,000.00		B - Fairly Confident	Ongoing monitoring and further sensitivity testing will be undertaken to help identify which temporary schemes could be made permanent.	£0.00	Rare	Minor			£0.00	Costs to cover staff time and/ or fees	14/09/2020	Leah Coburn	Gillian Howard/ Neil West	21/11/2022	
R14	5	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	legal challenge regarding the decision to proceed with an agreed scheme	significant staff cost and legal fees in defending any legal challenge as well as no longer able to meet the project timeframe	Likely	Major	16	£150,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	ensure a transparent considered scheme, linked to policy and that all processes are followed accordingly	£0.00	Possible	Major	£140,000.00	12	£0.00	Staff costs, counsel costs, fees	01/02/2021	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard		
R15	4	(1) Service Delivery/ Performance	Delay to the TfL statutory bus consultation, delays the G5 submission	delay to programme - cannot guarantee progression of the scheme without the bus reroutings being approved by TfL.	Possible	Serious	6	£4,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable	continue working with TfL to ensure they have all the information they need to progress the consultation in good time	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious		4	£0.00	Costs to cover staff time	24/05/2021	Leah Coburn	Gillian Howard/ Neil West	15/11/2021	bus routings are agreed (but traffic orders are not)
R16	5	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Change in term contractor/supplier rates taking into account recent market changes not available at the G5 stage	increased price of construction costs and associated services limiting ability to deliver full design	Likely	Extreme	32	£700,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable	impact of changes are out side of our control - we can only change scope to accommodate the budget available	£0.00	Likely	Extreme	£276,498.00	32	£423,502.00	works costs/ including site supervision	19/10/2021	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard/ Neil West		created and issue as we now know the current cost increase figure. Remain risk funding to remain as a risk to cover the construction programme over its anticipated 18 month build
R17	5	(10) Physical	Delay during construction increases associated Traffic Management costs	costs increase to those estimated,	Possible	Serious	6	£35,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	regular construction meetings with all providers to reduce probability of an issue	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£32,000.00	4	£0.00	works costs or fees	19/10/2021	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard/ Ben Bishop		bus routings are agreed (but traffic orders are not)
R18	5	(10) Physical	Enforcement changes are required to enforce the restrictions if abused to encourage greater compliance	cost increase to amend or add to the enforcement cameras or signage in the area (including warning and directional)	Possible	Minor	3	£38,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	monitoring the traffic compliance with the revised restrictions before committing to the enforcement camera solution	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£38,000.00	3	£0.00	Fees and staff/works	08/11/2021	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard/ Neil West		
R19	5	(2) Financial	increased costs of site supervision due to delays	increased site supervision costs and associated work	Possible	Serious	6	£90,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	regular construction meetings to get early warning of any problems.	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£77,000.00	3	£0.00	staff costs	08/11/2021	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard/ Ben Bishop		
R20	5	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Need to clear site for an emergency during construction.	cost of site clearnace and making good to accommodate the emergency	Likely	Major	16	£7,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable	Work in area sizes that can be cleared and made good within a short window if required. consideration to cost impacts on overall project to be considered.	£0.00	Likely	Serious	£5,000.00	8	£0.00	staff cost/ works costs	14/11/2021	Gillian Howard	Gillian Howard/ Ben Bishop		
R21	6	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Traffic mix and timing review decisions are challenged and require legal advice and possibly goes to Court	significant delay to deliver the outcome of the review, and if challenge lost this may impact ability to progress	Possible	Major	12	£150,000.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	undertake process correctly and ensure decisions are made by Members with good evidence and data available to them	£0.00	Unlikely	Major	£150,000.00	8	£0.00	staff costs/ legal fees	03/08/2023	Gillian Howard			This sum is not to be used for public realm enhancements once risk of challenge regarding the Traffic and Timing review has passed



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank