

Annex 3

Committees: Corporate Projects Board Streets & Walkways Sub Projects Sub	Dates: 06 May 2020 26 May 2020 27 May 2020
Subject: 1 Angel Court Area Improvements Unique Project Identifier: 11539	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Emmanuel Ojugo	For Decision

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description:</p> <p>The project has improved pedestrian access to Angel Court following the development of 1 Angel Court. Other streets within the improvement area were Throgmorton Street, Tokenhouse Yard, Great Swan Alley, Whalebone Court and Copthall Avenue. Proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Raising carriageways to footway level and resurface them in York Stone to improve pedestrian access and to tie in with changes to the new building footprint that meant a significant change to the layout of Angel Court.• Provision of new seating encouraging visitors to dwell• Replacement and relocation of cycle stands to the central area to facilitate pedestrian movement;• Planting of trees in an area that has a low coverage of greenery subject to ground conditions. <p>Construction works were finally completed in December 2018, with works staggered a number of construction cycles in order to accommodate development activity in the area associated with Moorgate, London Wall and Copthall Avenue.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (same at last Gateway)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (same at last Gateway)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £299,435</p>
-------------------------	--

2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: Members are asked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the content of this Outcome Report and agree to close this project.
3. Key conclusions	<p>The project delivered on its main objectives as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more accessible environment, through the provision of level surfaces and new seating; • An improved experience for pedestrians in Angel Court; • A safer, more attractive environment that enhances the setting of both adjacent listed buildings and the Bank Conservation Area; • Reduce conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. <p>Key learning and recommendations for future projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close co-ordination and engagement with stakeholders and project teams enables smooth project delivery. • Better engagement with the schedule of development in the area may have reduced the staggered implementation of some project elements. • Early engagement with utilities programmes will reduce conflicts when accommodating highways activities. • Early engagement with the City Surveyor with the developer is also invaluable to ensure a more cohesive approach to internet service provision and other telecommunication services.

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>The design of the scheme was relatively simple as it utilised the existing palette of materials in neighbouring streets. It was agreed early on that Angel Court was the main street that would derive the most benefit from improvement proposals. The previous layout was an irregular combination of public and private land, with corresponding material and level changes.</p> <p>The plan was to raise carriageway to footway level to remove level changes in favour of a pedestrian thoroughfare in an area that would introduce a number of retail units at street level.</p> <p>In order to ensure the seamless transition between public and private land the developer agreed to appoint the City's Term Contractor on a</p>
--------------------------------	---

	<p>private basis to make sure the private areas would integrate with the public areas.</p> <p>Surveys conducted early on revealed the presence of basements making tree planting difficult. There was also a decision by the developer to dispense with an architectural water feature when they soon realised that access to service glazing panels on Angel Court would not be possible.</p> <p>It was clear that building works would temporarily affect adjacent occupiers in Lothbury, Copthall Avenue, nearby retail in Throgmorton Street and managed offices in Tokenhouse Yard.</p> <p>It was necessary to phase the delivery to reduce the impact on local occupiers during construction phases. The location of plant, materials and welfare required a wider communication with stakeholders than usual due to the presence of residential occupiers namely in Lothbury.</p>
5. Options appraisal	<p>The relative simplicity of the design meant that there was a single option considered that utilised standard natural materials such as York Stone in different module sizes to respond to some of the irregular building footprints along Angel Court.</p> <p>A number of minor changes were made to the design during implementation. As previously stated, the developer was to install a water feature in the private section of Angel Court. However, due to access and servicing issues this idea was abandoned and the linear bench to which it would respond spatially was a lacking an architectural reference point.</p> <p>It was agreed to integrate drainage services in Angel Court due to the irregular widths between public and private land. Maintenance of the drainage would be by the developer as 90% of it would be located in private land. The City would retain step in rights.</p> <p>There was a possibility of introducing tree planting instead of the water feature but this was not pursued due to the possibility of an adjacent development in the area that would also require access.</p> <p>Other streets in the area were improved by improving courtesy crossings as required. The junction of Copthall Avenue and Lothbury was upgraded to a new compliant crossing point to mirror efforts to improve King's Arms Yard and Tokenhouse Yard.</p>
6. Procurement route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the relative simplicity of the design City Engineers worked closely with the developer of 1 Angel Court to progress the scheme and finalise the design. • The construction package was prepared collaboratively between the developer and City Engineers. • Hard landscaping and civils works on-site were undertaken by the City's term contractor.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All soft landscaping was to be delivered by the City's Open Spaces gardens team subject to ground conditions.
7. Skills base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team has the skills, knowledge and experience to manage delivery of this and similar future projects. • Specialist landscape consultants were appointed to progress designs to inform the final construction package. • In House utilities engineers were also engaged in the process to ensure that utilities companies programmes were accommodated in the City's Highways Activities Programme.
8. Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project was delivered in close liaison with the developer and stakeholders to ensure the proposals meet their needs. • Comments from the public consultation were considered during the development and delivery of the project. • Regular updates were provided to all interested parties throughout the project.

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The construction programme was affected by risks that have materialised, including delayed site release from the adjacent developers, namely at 1 Angel Court, and 51-55 Moorgate as post office services relocated from 53 Moorgate to 45 London Wall.</p> <p>Gateway 5 – April 2016 Committee Approval</p> <p>Construction works scheduled to accommodate the developer's activity and respond to their programme.</p> <p>Initial Construction Programme – October 2016 – March 2017</p> <p>Due to developer's programme slippage some works were delayed allowing time to resolve issues that arose with telecommunications and other service utilities companies. It was necessary to agree a schedule for allowing them to access the site or risk abortive works.</p> <p>Another issue that arose during construction was the consequences of the developer's relatively poor lighting plan on the Angel Court frontage. In order to move the programme forward there were further negotiations with the developer to address their failure to provide the necessary lighting coverage in Angel Court. At the planning stage it was agreed that new street lighting was to be erected on the new building. However due to the nature of the glazed cladding this was not possible. Therefore, a further legal agreement needed to be drafted following an agreed solution to relocate street lighting to a building opposite that would guarantee coverage of an area in shade at night.</p>
--	---

	<p>These delays had the effect of extending the programme beyond the original target date by over a year, once the main works and subsequent snagging were completed.</p> <p>Main works were subsequently completed by summer 2018.</p>
10. Assessment of project against Scope	<p>The project's scope remained unchanged and is summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full pedestrianisation was achieved in Tokenhouse Yard. • Where, trees were unable to be planted in the main thoroughfare alternative locations were found such as Whalebone Court. A planter was also located in Telegraph Street to improve local green coverage/biodiversity in an area usually devoid of planting. • Local walking routes have improved due to the improved pedestrian environment, both the morning and evening rush hours have clearly improved connectivity to and from transport hubs at Moorgate, Liverpool Street, Bank and London Bridge. • Access has been improved for those with ambulant disabilities, wheelchair users, the elderly or those with prams or buggies. This has been achieved by introducing courtesy crossings at King's Arms yard and raising carriageway to footway level on streets with narrow footways. • By utilising natural stone materials, the project has adhered to local heritage constraints to enhance the environment and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Bank Conservation Area.
11. Risks and issues	<p>During the construction phase a few risks materialised affecting the overall programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact to the programme was mainly as a result of competing highway activities in the City and being able to accommodate them throughout the programme. • Unforeseen ground conditions, whilst surveys had been undertaken prior to works it is not uncommon to uncover voids or infra structure. • There were very little complaints regarding noise from local vendors, aside from dome representations from a resident at Lothbury. It was agreed to adjust the noisy works period to reduce the noise impact

Value Review

12. Budget	<table><tr><th colspan="4">Expenditure to date - Angel Court Environmental Enhancement</th></tr><tr><th>Description</th><th>Approved Budget (£)</th><th>Expenditure (£)</th><th>Balance (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Pre-Evaluation</td><td>24,899</td><td>24,605</td><td>294</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>110,672</td><td>110,655</td><td>17</td></tr><tr><td>Fees</td><td>6,791</td><td>6,790</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Works</td><td>188,845</td><td>152,385</td><td>36,460</td></tr><tr><td>Maintenance</td><td>5,000</td><td>5,000</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>336,207</td><td>299,435</td><td>36,772</td></tr></table> <p>The final account for this project has been verified.</p>	Expenditure to date - Angel Court Environmental Enhancement				Description	Approved Budget (£)	Expenditure (£)	Balance (£)	Pre-Evaluation	24,899	24,605	294	Staff Costs	110,672	110,655	17	Fees	6,791	6,790	1	Works	188,845	152,385	36,460	Maintenance	5,000	5,000	0	TOTAL	336,207	299,435	36,772
Expenditure to date - Angel Court Environmental Enhancement																																	
Description	Approved Budget (£)	Expenditure (£)	Balance (£)																														
Pre-Evaluation	24,899	24,605	294																														
Staff Costs	110,672	110,655	17																														
Fees	6,791	6,790	1																														
Works	188,845	152,385	36,460																														
Maintenance	5,000	5,000	0																														
TOTAL	336,207	299,435	36,772																														
13. Key benefits realised	<p>The enhancements to the 8-10 Moorgate area improved pedestrian amenity and provided opportunities for rest and leisure whilst introducing greenery. Servicing arrangements have been a success due to vehicle access restrictions during the day.</p>																																

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

14. Positive reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong co-ordination and engagement with key stakeholders were key to developing designs and delivering this project. • Early engagement and ongoing communication with local businesses namely, the Telegraph Public House and managed offices on Tokenhouse Yard was essential to ensure the work programme was a success. • Early engagement with the City's Engineers was essential and helped to frame the programme and phase works accordingly.
15. Improvement reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better co-ordination between highways activities and planned works would have optimised the programme. Whilst this is not always possible with developers or utilities companies, closer collaboration would have improved efficiencies and reduced the impact on local occupiers. • Clearer policies in the Local Plan relating to the future of on-street motorcycle parking would have simplified the process for reducing or relocating parking spaces.
16. Sharing best practice	<p>Information will be disseminated through team and project staff briefings.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Plan
Appendix 2	Before and after photos

Contact

Report Author	Emmanuel Ojugo
Email Address	emmanuel.ojugo@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1158