

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION)
COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 22 January 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Christopher Hayward (Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark

Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Alison Gowman (Ex-Officio Member)
Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)
Graham Packham

Officers:

Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Gillian Howard	- Department of the Built Environment
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment
Alan Rickwood	- City of London Police
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Ruth Calderwood	- Department of Markets and Consumer Protection
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Sam Lee	- Built Environment
Mark Lowman	- City Surveyor's Department
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Na'amah Hagiladi	- Department of the Built Environment
Karen McHugh	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Kevin Everett, Deputy Alistair Moss and Oliver Sells (Deputy Chairman).

The Chairman advised the Sub-Committee that Christopher Hill had offered to take over from Deputy Kevin Everett as the appointed representative of the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee on the Sub-Committee. Both Members were happy with this change which was likely to be actioned at the next meeting of Port Health & Environmental Services Committee.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 4 December 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Sub-Committee received a list of outstanding actions.

Swan Pier

The City Surveyor advised the Sub-Committee that the contractor had been appointed and had started to set up the site and finalise licenses. The project was on programme with no current issues. The contractors were taking the old pier out so that works to the flood defence wall could be carried out, and would leave it so that the pier could be re-established following the work.

22 Bishopsgate

The Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee that 95% of the details of the legal agreement had been agreed. A proposal had been drafted to break the impasse on the remaining negotiations which had been circulated to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman for information. The Chairman advised that he was satisfied with the proposals and advised officers to proceed.

Dockless Cycles

The Director of the Built Environment advised that discussions with the cycle hire operators were continuing. There had been additional approaches from operators about electric cycle schemes, but officers had asked them not to move to set up any such scheme until the Transport Strategy had been adopted.

A Member advised that they had had seen an electric cycle scheme operator presentation and had been impressed. The scheme had better technology than some of the existing schemes and could be a promising route forward. The Chairman added that he would be meeting with an operator next week.

Beech Street

The Chairman advised the Sub-Committee that he was continuing to meet with his counterpart from the London Borough of Islington and had discussed a possible two-way closure. A report on that would be brought back to Committee.

The Director of the Built Environment added that officers were also meeting with Islington to discuss possible closure plans and the ramifications for the wider network. Islington were also looking at their own project to promote walking and cycling, and the authorities had agreed to promote and support each other's aspirations. High-level discussions with TfL were also underway.

Modelling for a one-way closure in either direction had been approved but approval was still sought for two-way closure. The road had been closed for a period last year in order for Thames Water to undertake work and this was an opportunity to look at two-way closure as an additional option. Members were pleased to hear about the co-operative approach of Islington and TfL.

Blackfriars Bridge Underpass

The Director of the Built Environment advised the Sub-Committee that repairs to the lighting and a deep clean had been done by TfL, and a meeting had been arranged for next week to any remaining minor issues.

A Member reported that the underpass looked better but there was some minor work outstanding such as repairs to the tiling and treads. The Chairman asked that the item be kept on the outstanding references list until further feedback had been received.

5. BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment seeking approval to restart the All Change at Bank project, align it with the changes in the corporate project management processes and governance, incorporate the corporate plan outcomes, and seeking Members guidance on the trajectory of change desired at Bank to focus the design efforts and minimise the length of the programme. The Chairman reminded Members that the All Change at Bank project had been put on hold whilst the Bank on Safety scheme had been completed, and now officers sought authority to restart the project, and instruction from Members on how to develop the scheme.

The strategic options presented for consideration all had the possibility of allowing some traffic through the junction. The Chairman added that whilst he did not want to debate the point, the Sub-Committee should note that there was still support amongst some Members for permitting taxis to use the junction, and reported comments he had received from Members detailing the reasons for their support.

The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and gave a short presentation setting out the project timeline to date, project objectives, each strategic option for consideration and indicative timescales for the project. The recommendation was to proceed with option 2, working towards semi-pedestrian priority with areas for place activity. This provided balance which most closely reflected the responses to consultations and previous Members debate. Guidance on how the options worked against the project objectives was set out as an appendix to the report.

Members then discussed the strategic options. Some Members felt that option 1 should be the Corporation's ultimate aspiration for the junction, but that this may be a longer-term vision. If another option was taken, the scheme should be implemented in a way which kept option 1 open as a future possibility. A Member stressed that any scheme should retain the ability to direct traffic back

through the junction in an emergency. Furthermore, any scheme needed to be aligned with the Transport Strategy as this would form the basis of evidence supporting the scheme.

In response to a query from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment advised that TfL had not yet been consulted for their views on the three strategic options, but they were happy with the Bank on Safety scheme with regards to bus journey times. However, TfL were aware of the temporary nature of the Bank on Safety scheme and had already begun reducing bus traffic through the junction accordingly. The Director of the Built Environment felt that option 1 could be negotiated in the longer term, but that this was not confirmed.

A Member suggested moving towards option 1 but in two phases if necessary. It was important that TfL's position be clarified, so that no option would be ruled out unnecessarily. The Chairman asked whether Members were in favour of deferring the decision in order to get definitive TfL comments on the strategic options, particularly option 1. The Director of the Built Environment responded that the project currently had momentum and that officers were conscious of the target end date of 2022. Delaying the decision may delay the project by up to one quarter.

A Member suggested that the Sub-Committee support option 2 with the ultimate aspiration of implementing option 1 in the future. TfL may not be able to answer questions quickly and may need to undertake their own analysis beforehand. A Member added that moving with pace on the project was important. Pedestrian footfall had increased significantly in recent years and would continue to do so with the upcoming capacity upgrades to Bank station, and therefore it would be important to have something in place in time. As there were only two routes north from London Bridge, Bishopsgate and Bank junction, TfL were unlikely to agree to reroute the buses that used Bank junction and would not be able to do so in the current timescales.

A Member argued that they supported option 3, as the key measures of success set out in the report had been achieved through the Bank on Safety scheme. As part of the Department of the Built Environment review of project prioritisation, a number of plans had been deprioritised due to cost, and on this basis, Members should take account of the significant difference in cost between options 2 and 3. Delivery was also key and option 3 would be delivered faster than the other 2 options.

A Member stressed that it was important to continue to be bold, and to have a clear vision. The work done so far on the Bank project had been bold and had influenced work elsewhere. The ideal vision was for maximum place activity but without losing resilience for the junction, and approving option 2 with the aspiration of eventually implementing option 1 was supported. However, more details on cost and cost differences between the options would be required.

A Member said that on the basis of having option 1 as the ultimate aspiration for the junction, they could support taking option 2 as the next step. However, early conversations with TfL were imperative and Members would need an up-

to-date steer when the project was next reported to Committee. A Member added that they would like to see the timescales on option 2 tightened if this was the preferred option.

The Chairman emphasised the importance of political will and courage, and reminded Members that at one time, the majority of the Court of Common Council had been against the Bank on Safety scheme. The Chairman asked officers if option 2 could be implemented in time for the capacity upgrades to Bank station. The Director of the Built Environment responded that there were indications that it could be done, but it could not be promised. There was some dependence on other networks to implement the scheme. A report would be brought back to the April meeting of the Sub-Committee for further decision.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

- a) Approve for the Bank Junction Improvements Project (All Change at Bank) to be formally restarted;
- b) Approve the Project Objectives in paragraph 13 continue to be relevant to align with the wording of the Corporate plan;
- c) Note change to governance arrangements of the existing Project Board into a stakeholder working group, and the creation of a new internal Project Board;
- d) Proceed with feasibility design of Strategic Option 2 (semi pedestrian priority with some vehicle movement) to a Gateway 4 report, on the basis that the proposed timescales for the project be tightened, and that Strategic Option 1 be retained as the Corporation's longer-term aspiration for the junction. The next phase of work will investigate different options for highways alignment, design of public realm and vehicle mix to inform the Gateway 4 report;
- e) Note the options for procurement routes to include the option of any applicable framework contract (paragraph 44 and Appendix 6); and
- f) 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.

6. **GREENING CHEAPSIDE S106**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment presenting detailed design information and costs for Phase 1 of the Greening Cheapside project. The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and gave a short presentation setting out the two phases of the project and key observations. The recommendation was to approve the proposed design and details set out in the report relating to the budget.

A Member suggested that the plans might benefit from more bins, as the area tended to attract litter and particularly cigarette butts. The area should also be designed to be unattractive to skateboarders.

A Member queried whether there were plans to redesign the exit to the tube station, as the current area was a cluttered design with a busy coffee bar, a map that was often vandalised and a number of street obstructions. The area could be significantly improved if the station building was improved. A Member added that no solution to the existing issues with wayfinding were proposed, although it might not be within the Corporation's power to change the station building. Members asked that the Phase 2 report be submitted to Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee as well as the Open Spaces & City Gardens Committee.

A Member said that many people may still try to sit on the wall of the plant bed, and suggested making the wall deeper so that the plants were not disturbed. The Member added that he recalled the Corporation had tried to do something about the exit to the station in the past and had decided against it due to cost or another issue. A Member suggested requesting a message giving directions over the PA system within the station.

A Member asked what the anticipated budget for Phase 1B was, and how it was decided to allocate £20,000 to Phase 1B for the architectural design competition.

A Member queried whether people would sit on the stone column seating, whether signage and more cycle parking had been considered. The planter in front of One New Change should also be upgraded.

The Director of the Built Environment responded to the points raised by Members. The budget for the project had been capped and the project rescope following the prioritisation review. The project would focus on the existing planters. The funding for Phase 1B involved external sponsors with whom discussions were ongoing, and it was hoped this would be agreed by March. The £20,000 allocated would be to support the design competition in conjunction with the City Centre, similar to a number of competitions that had been run recently.

Officers understood Members' concerns about wayfinding and the station exit, but wholesale changes to the station exit were not possible for structural reasons. TfL were looking at upgrading the station building but the upgrades would be cosmetic.

New signage would be provided for the area as part of the Legible London scheme, and officers would explore options for better visibility. The design of planters to the north and west would be similar to the others in material and seating design. Armrests were also under consideration to increase accessibility. Measures against skateboarding would also be included. The stone columns were included as historic recall in character with the area, and it would be ensured that they were not intrusive. Due to the amount of existing

instructions, it was not recommended to add more cycle stands. Whilst the phase of the project relating to the churchyard would be led by the Open Spaces & City Gardens Committee, the report would also be submitted to Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.

A Member suggested that the map could also be replaced as part of the Legible London scheme.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

- a) Approve the proposed design and the total budget of Phase 1 and total city funding contribution to Phase 1B at an estimated cost of £380,154 funded from the sources described in Appendix 7, table 3 (including any related interest or indexation);
- b) Note that the £20,000 allocated to Phase 1B will only be utilised subject to the external funding for the implementation of Phase 1B of the project being secured; and
- c) Authorise delegation of budget adjustments between staff costs, works and fees, and between Phase 1 and Phase 1B to the Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain Department.

7. MOOR LANE ULEV SCHEME

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection concerning the proposed pilot scheme to introduce an ultra-low emission vehicle (ULEV) access only restriction at the southern section of Moor Lane in April 2019.

The Director of Markets and Consumer Protection introduced the report. It was proposed to postpone the pilot scheme for up to 6 months to avoid confusion with the Mayor of London's Ultra-Low Emission Zone. The pilot scheme had been out to consultation with responses received.

A Member said that they were troubled by some of the responses to the consultation, and queried whether the questions posed by Noble & Associates, set out on page 81 of the agenda, could be answered, and whether the scheme represented value for money.

A Member added that the responses to the consultation had been interesting. The proposed postponement was understandable but possible confusion would need to be dealt with eventually regardless, particularly with regards to signage and definitions of ULEV. The Member was not opposed to the pilot scheme but felt there were questions to answer. As the scheme was being postponed anyway, it was suggested that more thought should be put into the scheme and a report brought back to Committee with clearer proposals.

A Member said that the pilot schemes originated through funding from the Mayor of London and one of the key purposes was to remove traffic from

Beech Street. If this could not be delivered, then the funding should be returned or rerouted to the Beech Street project.

A Member drew the Sub-Committee's attention to the response from the LTDA, who raised a valid point about rapid charging points. Not enough of them had been delivered and the Corporation could not insist on electric taxis without sufficient provision. A Member suggested that if the pilot scheme could not be delivered then the funding could be used to deliver the charging points, as residents would need them as well.

A Member added that opposition to the scheme was significant and it needed to be taken further, with perhaps a further consultation if necessary. A Member suggested that another report be brought back to Committee, as better alignment would result in better engagement.

The Director of Markets and Consumer Protection responded to the points raised by Members. The issue had been brought to Committee because of the consultation responses. Officers were pleased with the level of engagement and discussion. A pilot was under consideration for thirty rapid charging points and there was other work being done around this issue. The original intention had been to trial a zero-emissions street but as this could not be delivered a ULEV scheme was considered as an alternative. The Transport Strategy worked towards zero-emission zones and this would be useful for informing that.

There were a number of things that would impact upon the scheme and discussions with taxi groups had taken place. Officers would also work closely with businesses and other local stakeholders. The focus was on promoting the idea and this was all part of the process. Responses to the questions put by Noble & Associates could be provided outside the meeting.

The Chairman then moved that Members consider the recommendations. A Member suggested that there was more work to be done and Members would not necessarily approve the pilot scheme in its current form following the postponement, and suggested the matter be brought back to Committee before making a decision. A Member added that the charging infrastructure was a critical point with wider implications, and it would be premature to make the experimental traffic order at this point. Members needed to establish if the scheme was understood as a priority, as the targets were achievable. A Member added that the next report should include detailed costs.

The Chairman said that it was clear that Members were satisfied with postponing the scheme, but wanted a further report with greater detail on the pilot scheme before agreeing to make the traffic order.

RESOLVED – That the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee:

- a) Agree that introduction of the scheme is postponed for up to 6 months to avoid confusion with the Mayor of London Ultra-Low Emission Zone and provide additional time for drivers to upgrade vehicles; and

- b) Instruct officers to bring a further report on the pilot scheme to Committee, taking account of Members' comments and responses to the consultation.

8. **ANTI-TERRORISM TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER: 2018 REVIEW**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment reviewing the use of the City's permanent Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) which was used only once in 2018, namely for the New Year's Eve celebrations as part of the Metropolitan Police-led operation. The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and advised the Sub-Committee that officers felt the system in place was proportionate and challenged police effectively.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

9. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

11. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.	Exempt Paragraphs
12	3
13 – 14	-

12. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

13. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 12.07 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee
tel. no.: 020 7332 1480
Joseph.Anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk