

Committees:	Dates:	
Corporate Projects Board Streets and Walkways Committee Planning and Transportation Projects Sub Committee	17/12/2018 22/01/2019 29/01/2019 20/02/2019	
Subject: Bank Junction Improvements Project: All Change at Bank (UPI 11401)	Gateway 3 Issue Report: Complex	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Gillian Howard		For Decision
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Summary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last Gateway approved – Gateway 3 • Progress to date including resources expended <p>A pedestrian and cycle movement survey has been undertaken and analysed to update the previous 2015 counts. This data has been analysed to feed into the short-term improvements being designed as part of the Bank on Safety project, and to inform the future design of the longer-term plans for the Bank area (All Change at Bank project).</p> <p>Work has continued with stakeholders bridging the gap of expectation between what the Bank on Safety scheme was delivering and what changes could be expected in the future. Drafting of consultancy briefs and investigations into framework options for procurement have also been undertaken as well as survey work including utility and ground radar surveys.</p> <p>Staff costs have been incurred since Gateway 3 in December 2015 making continued attempts to progress this project in parallel with the Bank on Safety experimental scheme. Progress has been frustrated due to the close relationship with the experimental scheme. Instead it became clear that there were valuable lessons to be learned from the experiment which could prevent too much speculative feasibility design for the longer-term design. We were also aware of not predicating the outcome of the experiment.</p> <p>Resource expended to date (since project initiation in 2013) is £816,667 of the current £1,179,000 approved budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of issue <p>The longer-term Bank Junction Improvements project, referred to as ‘All Change at Bank’, was placed on hold in February 2018. Work on this project has not been undertaken, other than data collection on pedestrian numbers/movements and the development of this committee report.</p>		

This report seeks to:

- Restart the Bank Junction Improvements project (All change at Bank);
- Align it with the changes in the corporate project management processes and governance;
- Incorporate the corporate plan outcomes; and
- Seek Members guidance on the trajectory of change desired at Bank to focus the design efforts and minimise the length of the programme.

• Proposed way forward

To formally restart the project with a specific design focus and for a further report in April/May 2019 to be prepared on that basis. This will set out the expected milestones for the project, scenario tests to be undertaken, anticipated public engagement activities and expected costs to reach Gateway 4. As part of this subsequent report the scenarios will include proposed options for the types of vehicle to pass through the junction.

Total Estimated Cost

£4-18 million

(depending upon the strategic option chosen from this report and the subsequent design investigations. The subsequent work will identify options for Members to choose between which will vary in cost and 'look and feel'. Given the challenge of building over an existing London Underground structure, even fairly minor alterations to kerb lines for example, may still be complex to achieve .)

Recommendations

Members of all Committees to:

1. Approve for the Bank Junction Improvements Project (All Change at Bank) to be formally restarted.
2. Approve the Project Objectives in paragraph 13 continue to be relevant to align with the wording of the Corporate plan.
3. Note change to governance arrangements of the existing Project Board into a stakeholder working group, and the creation of a new internal Project Board
4. Proceed with feasibility design of Strategic Option 2 (semi pedestrian priority with some vehicle movement) to a Gateway 4 report. This next phase of work will investigate different options for highways alignment, design of public realm and vehicle mix to inform the Gateway 4 report.
5. Note the options for procurement routes to include the option of any applicable framework contract (paragraph 44 and Appendix 6).

For Members of Streets and Walkways and Planning and Transportation Committee only to:

6. Note that Streets and Walkways will remain the nominated client Committee for future reports on this project, with escalation to Planning and Transportation Committee as required.

Main Report

1. Issue description	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are five issues that need to be considered as part of this report. Firstly, the project needs to be formally restarted following the February 2018 report, when it was put on hold.2. Secondly, it is prudent to confirm the original project objectives are still relevant. The project has been on hold and the Bank on Safety experiment has been made permanent, changing the baseline for the future project both in terms of data and timescale. There is also a need to ensure that any future project helps to deliver the Corporate Plan outcomes.3. Thirdly, confirmation of whether Streets and Walkways Sub or Planning and Transportation Committee will retain the day to day overview and decision making of this project's development is needed. The reporting lines were enhanced for the Bank on Safety scheme due to the political nature of project.4. Fourthly, prior to the project being put on hold, the existing governance arrangements had a Project Board. The Project Board consists largely of external stakeholders. However, looking forward this grouping will not be the correct forum to make project related decisions (those outside of Committee decision making). It is therefore proposed to dissolve the current Project Board and to regroup the external stakeholders as a working party. This would retain the ability to continue to engage regularly with these stakeholders and seek their opinion on options as they develop.5. It is proposed to create a new Project Board consisting of internal officers who are able to take and action decisions on behalf of the City Corporation (that do not require committee approval). This will extend to Transport for London (TfL) representation as necessary.6. And lastly, establishing the appetite for change at Bank Junction. Whilst the Bank on Safety scheme has provided many lessons and delivered a safer environment, it was developed as an interim measure to reduce the probability of collisions. With growing numbers of pedestrians and cyclists through the junction, the impact of the change will not sustain the level of safety improvement required in the longer term.7. This report presents to Members three strategic options for the direction this longer-term vision for Bank could take. Within each option there are numerous variations that can be explored in terms of the space created and type of movement
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>undertaken. The range of cost within each strategic option is dependent upon the design decision taken by Members at a later date. However, this longer-term vision risks not being achieved at the pace required to meet the growth of the City's daytime population. London Underground's Bank Station Capacity Upgrade is due to complete in 2022; It is possible that construction of the final scheme at Bank Junction will not complete before its opening. To minimise this risk, the following report seeks a decision from Members to focus the next phase of work to a particular direction of change.</p>
<p>2. Last approved limit</p>	<p>£1,179,000</p>
<p>3. Options</p>	<p>8. Following the introduction of the Bank on Safety scheme as a permanent measure in September 2018, the focus has turned to ensuring that the longer-term project, known as All Change at Bank, is delivered.</p> <p>9. Following the current corporate project management review, and the approval of the Corporate Plan, it is proposed to make some adjustments before this project is restarted to better align the project with these. Given the baseline, in terms of data and timeframes, has also changed with the introduction of the Bank on Safety scheme, it is appropriate to review the objectives and governance of the longer-term project.</p> <p>Project Objectives</p> <p>10. The likely completion of the All Change at Bank project is still several years away. It is important that the objectives are meaningful and help to deliver the corporate priorities and policies. Members are requested to agree some small changes to the projects existing objectives to better align the wording with the current Corporate Plan outcomes. This will assist with measuring progress against these.</p> <p>11. The substantive meaning of the objectives remain the same as the pressures for the junction and surrounding area remain relatively unchanged. Although improvement in casualties and air quality have been realised during the Bank on Safety experiment, there is still a lot that can be done to further improve these.</p> <p>12. The current agreed objectives headings are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. To reduce casualties; B. Reduce pedestrian crowding levels; C. Improve air quality; and D. Improve the perception of 'place' – as a place to spend time in rather than to pass through.

13. It is suggested that moving forward the objectives be placed under the Corporate Plan headings and outcomes of:

Bank Junction Improvements Project Objectives	Corporate Plan Aim	Corporate Plan Outcome	Corporate Plan High-level activity
A - To continue to reduce casualties	Contribute to a flourishing society	1 – People are safe and feel safe	C – Protect consumers and users of building, streets and public spaces.
B - To reduce pedestrian crowding levels	Shape outstanding environments	9 – We are digitally and physically well-connected and responsive	D – Improve the experience of arriving in and moving through our spaces.
C - To improve air quality	Shape outstanding environments	11 – We have clean air, land and water and a thriving and sustainable natural environment	A – Provide a clean environment and drive down the negative effects of our own activities.
D - To improve the perception of place as a place to spend time in rather than to pass through.	Shape outstanding environments	12 – Our spaces are secure, resilient and well maintained	A – Maintain our buildings, streets and public spaces to high standards.

14. The above high-level key outcomes from the Corporate Plan will help to be delivered by the All Change at Bank project to varying degrees depending upon the direction of travel Members wish to take for the long-term project. There will also be other corporate outcomes not mentioned above that this project may contribute towards, but which are not part of the project's key objectives.

15. Linking the objectives to existing targets such as for A) vision zero, will also align the project with the draft City Transport Strategy which, following public consultation, is expected to

be adopted in March 2019.

Client Committee

16. With the nature of the Bank on Safety experimental scheme, there was a very high level of scrutiny across the committee system. This was, on occasions, outside of the usual committee procedure for projects. Whilst it is understood that the future of Bank continues to be a topic that interests many people, it is assumed that the 'All Change at Bank' project will go back to the project reporting structure outlined in the gateway approval process, with Streets and Walkways being the 'service committee'. However, should issues be raised which fall into the remit of other committees, or it is felt by the Chairmen of the parent committees that a matter should be referred up, then this can be undertaken as is necessary.

Project Board

17. As part of the governance review, it is suggested that the existing Project Board is dissolved in its current form. This is to ensure that the project continues to be set up within corporate guidelines. The board currently has a number of external stakeholders and it is suggested to reintroduce the group with a new terms of reference as a stakeholder working group instead.

18. This would continue the level of transparency that the project has shared with the local stakeholders, such as the Bank of England, Royal Exchange and the City Property Association. It would also give the project team the opportunity to have an internal Project Board which is best placed to make necessary decisions for the project. The new Project Board will also require Transport for London's involvement, as some decision making will be for them to also act on.

Direction of travel for design

19. The Gateway 3 report (December 2015) approved to continue investigations into three varying degrees of restrictions to motor vehicles and one option to reduce traffic movement by 50% as the four options for the All Change at Bank project.

20. With the learning from the Bank on Safety scheme, and with the pending introduction of the Transport Strategy it is logical to revisit those options outlined in the original Gateway 3 to ensure that it is still the best way forward. To continue in our original Gateway 3 approved route it is likely to take in the region of 18 months before a Gateway 4 report can be brought back to Committees.

21. It is proposed that the original timeline would not be time effective if the aim is to deliver change at the junction to

accommodate the growth of pedestrians through the area, including the Bank station capacity upgrade, as soon as possible. It is suggested that there are effectively three strategic options for the direction the design could take from where we are now; taking the experience and comments that we have gained through the Bank on Safety project to date.

22. These strategic options are:

1. Work towards maximising the space available for Place activity, including walking and cycling movement through the area with limited, if any, vehicular movement;
2. Work towards an enhancement of space available for Place activity, including walking and cycling, with space retained for other vehicle movements (type of vehicle to be established); or
3. Retain ability for vehicle movements (type of vehicle to be established), improving the pedestrian experience with greater space and priority, but little opportunity for Place activities. (effectively operationally very similar to the existing situation, with some changes).

23. Below is a high-level overview of the scope that each strategic option outlined above includes.

Strategic Option 1

24. To push towards the greatest amount of pedestrian priority and greatest place opportunity that is possible:

- Investigate the opportunity for a full vehicle closure (times to be investigated), or
- Four arms further restricted to vehicle movement than at present.

The space between the buildings can then be designed to give the desired lines of travel, whilst also providing amenity of seating, shade, shelter and activity etc. to enhance the place function as appropriate.

25. Failing the ability to be able to achieve this extensive level of place or pedestrian priority in the desired time frame, it may be necessary to subsequently investigate the permutations of Option 2 as a phased approach to achieving Option 1.

26. Given that there is a lot more work to establish the viability of the potential scenarios in Option 1, and the necessary agreements from TfL (when considering re-routing several bus routes), a Gateway 4 report would be anticipated to take

until approximately Spring 2020. Full detailed design would still need to be established and a Gateway 5 is unlikely to be achieved before summer 2021.

Strategic Option 2

27. Work towards an enhancement of the space available for Place activity, including priority for walking and cycling, with space retained for some other vehicle movements (type of vehicle to be established). Within this option there is the possibility of providing enhanced Place function, providing amenity of seating, shade, shelter and activity etc. but to a lesser extent than Option 1.

28. It could be expected that the opportunity to restrict two or three arms of the junction further to create pedestrian priority corridors but with some vehicular access (types to be established through design) to be the main focus of this approach.

29. It's anticipated that a Gateway 4 could be expected by Members towards the end of 2019/early 2020, with a possible Gateway 5 late 2020/ early 2021. This strategic option is recommended for approval for the way forward.

Strategic Option 3

30. This option is essentially the same division of place and vehicle movement as is currently in place under Bank on Safety.

31. However, this option offers the opportunity to refine what has already been achieved, including the investigation into the revision of vehicle types allowed, timings of operation and whether any further turning movements can be restricted. The opportunity to investigate a limited east/west route specifically for taxis would fall into this option.

32. This option would be the simplest to achieve. Some work is already underway to be presented to Members in early 2019 to widen footways and to help improve behaviour in the junction using temporary materials under the Bank on Safety Project.

33. This option does not offer significant opportunity to provide added Place function for the community, further improvement to air quality at the junction, or significant relief of pedestrian crowding. It would be anticipated that a Gateway 4/5 report could be with Members in the autumn of 2019.

Overall

34. In Appendix 2 there is a matrix looking at how the above three

strategic options might perform against:

- the projects objectives;
- the potential impact on some of the key considerations of for the future design; and
- the potential risk to deliverability.

35. In Appendix 3, 4 and 5 are some illustrative sketches to give an impression of what could be achieved with the different levels of space reallocation from an aesthetics perspective.

36. For Strategic Options 1 and 2 there is still a lot of technical work to be undertaken to ascertain the best balance of use, understand traffic reassignment and its achievability, as well as the probable engineering difficulties of constructing above the underground station and within a conservation area. Depending upon the Strategic Option taken, a more detailed programme and milestones report will be presented to Members in April 2019.

37. Members are being asked to determine what level of place they want to achieve with the long-term project. Officers can then begin to start detailed feasibility studies within that strategic option and the necessary technical work, such as any necessary traffic modelling and pulling together the information for the associated future equality analysis.

38. Within each of the above options, there will still be decisions needed to determine things such as:

- The routing of vehicle movements;
 - The appropriate traffic mix either near to, or across, the current junction;
 - Timings of the operation; and
 - How the space should be used to fulfil a sense of Place.
- Members are not being asked to make these decisions now.

39. Defining Members preference for a place and movement function split at this stage will enable officers to focus on delivering change more in time with the Bank station capacity project. It should be noted that if it is requested that the focus of work is wider spread, and covers two or all of these options, the ability to scope so many scenarios thoroughly is likely to lengthen the time to deliver and complete any final solution.

40. Members may want to consider a phased approach to change at Bank, incrementally building as other policy initiatives for traffic management take effect. For example, Members may want to aspire to a vehicle free junction in the future, but believe that in the medium term, option 2 would provide an opportunity to improve the area and could be designed as a

stepping stone for further improvement at a later date. In the long run this approach is likely to cost more, but it may be less controversial and deliver the greatest amount of change. However, the decision of where we first should aim to rebalance the priority and space at Bank is still required.

41. Whichever option is agreed the design approach will be to consider a calm scheme which provides a setting for the listed buildings which surround the junction. We would seek to use materials in accordance with the City's Public Realm SPD and that is fitting of the conservation area. Lighting of the space and setting is likely to be an area that is considered as part of the long-term design in accordance with the City's lighting strategy. The future design will be developed with flexibility of use in mind and how this can all be achieved to deliver value for money.

42. On balance, officers recommend Strategic Option 2 as the route forward. It offers the potential to deliver the key objectives, is still likely to be challenging to achieve but should be deliverable and the indicative programme aligns with the London Underground programme at Bank.

After this report

43. Once an option for developing scenarios is decided Officers will work up the appropriate programme and costs for that option, resetting the milestones for the project. This will include detail on the costs to reach the next gateway report. This will then be reported back to Members, with a view to submitting this information for the April 2019 committee cycle. Work on developing the feasibility scenarios will be progressed in the meantime and initial work to get procurement of any necessary consultancy support underway.

Procurement

44. In the previous Gateway 3 report, it was agreed that consultancy support for the All Change at Bank project would be procured through the TfL Framework contract. Services were not procured as it became apparent that the Bank on Safety schemes success, or not, would shape the direction of any long-term proposal. It is therefore appropriate to review this option. A draft PT4 from is in Appendix 6 outlining the options available which will be updated once a decision from this report on the direction of the forthcoming design options is agreed and therefore the scope of work is more defined. This will subsequently be reported back to Members.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Cover sheet
Appendix 2	Matrix of options for comparison
Appendix 3	Illustration of potential for Strategic Option 1
Appendix 4	Illustration of potential for Strategic Option 2
Appendix 5	Illustration of potential for Strategic Option 3
Appendix 6	Draft PT4 procurement form.

Contact

Report Author	Gillian Howard
Email Address	Gillian.howard@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 73323139