

<b>Committees:</b> Streets and Walkways <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Open Spaces <i>[for information]</i>	<b>Dates:</b> 18 February 2021 23 February 2021 27 April 2021
<b>Subject:</b> Greening Cheapside: Sunken Garden (Phase 1B & Phase 2) <b>Unique Project Identifier:</b> 10991	<b>Gateway 3:</b> <b>Outline Options Appraisal</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of the Built Environment <b>Report Author:</b> Leila Ben-Hassel	<b>For Decision</b>
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

<b>1. Status update</b>	<b>Project Description:</b> <p>The Greening Cheapside project was identified as a high priority of the Cheapside and Guildhall Area Enhancement Strategy. A key objective of the strategy is to enhance the local environment and improve air quality particularly through new green spaces and tree planting. As such the project contributes to the aims of the City’s Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy as well as the City’s newly adopted Climate Action Strategy.</p> <p>In 2019, Members approved the proposal to deliver the Greening Cheapside project in phases (see location map in appendix 2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phase 1A: St Pauls Tube station Area Improvements</li> <li>- Phase 1B: Sunken Garden (the subject of this G3 report)</li> <li>- Phase 2: St Peter Westcheap churchyard</li> </ul> <p>As part of the “DBE Review of projects” report, approved by Members in December 2018, the total allocation of S106 funding towards the Greening Cheapside project budget was capped. The project scope was subsequently limited to Phase 1A (St Pauls Tube station Area Improvements) with the progression of Phase 1B and Phase 2 subject to alternative funding sources being identified.</p> <p>Following positive discussions with local stakeholders in 2019, officers secured external funding to progress Phase 1B (Sunken Garden) from C Hoare &amp; Co. who agreed a voluntary</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>contribution of £200k to deliver public realm enhancements works to the Sunken Garden. These include a sustainable design approach aligning with the recently completed Phase 1A, and historic interpretation commemorating the original site of the first C Hoare &amp; Co bank ahead of its 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2022. It is anticipated that Phase 1B will start on site in January 2022 and complete in time for C Hoare &amp; Co bank anniversary celebration in June 2022.</p> <p>Subsequently, further funding from the Cheapside Business Alliance has been secured, which has enabled an update of the base scheme for Phase 1B, presented in this report as Option 1. Both Phase 1B and Phase 2 also offer the opportunity to pilot a sustainable urban drainage scheme and other environmental resilience measures in support of the Climate Action Strategy. The additional funding required to deliver these extra items (and whether or not this project meets the criteria for the use of Climate Action funding) is subject to confirmation at the next Gateway report.</p> <p><b>RAG Status:</b> Green</p> <p><b>Previous RAG status:</b> Green</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Low</p> <p><b>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> £296,095-£515,000 (Phase 1B), including spend to date.</p> <p><b>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> Increase of £96,095 - £315,000 since last report to Committee following opportunity to secure additional external funding.</p> <p><b>Spend to Date:</b> £36,095 (Phase 1B)</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: 0</b></p> <p><b>Slippage:</b> The project is on time and not overspent. However, as officers managed to secure additional funding from other external sources, including Cheapside Business Alliance, the scope of the base scheme for Phase 1B has increased to maximise environmental benefits. Furthermore, there is an opportunity to pilot Sustainable Urban Drainage measures (SuDs) on this site, in support of the Climate Action Strategy and to monitor the impact and benefits of the environmental resilience measures introduced to inform future projects. This is a shared aspiration of the project's key stakeholders.</p> <p>As a result of the development of the base scheme and possible further enhancement, the cost range for Phase 1B has increased from £200K at last gateway to £296,000-£515,000 (including spend to date and excluding costed risk provision).</p>
<p><b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b></p>	<p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 4/5 Detailed Options Appraisal and Authority to Start Work (anticipated July 2021)</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirm additional sources of funding and finalise total funding available for phase 1B (Sunken Garden) and phase 2 (St Peter Westcheap).</li> <li>- Develop the design of Member-approved options and consult key stakeholders on the preferred design.</li> <li>- Finalise detailed design of the option selected and present to Members at next Gateway.</li> </ul> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the increased scope, in response to additional external funding secured, be approved;</li> <li>2. That all options are approved and to note that options 2 'silver' and 3 'gold, will only be progressed should further funding be confirmed. This funding decision will be taken by Members via a separate report on the implementation of the Climate Action Strategy.</li> <li>3. That additional budget of £50,000 is approved for fees and staff costs (fully externally funded) to reach the next Gateway (G4/5) and that £13,905 underspent from the current budget allocation is carried forward to be used on this next stage of the project.</li> <li>4. Note the total estimated cost of the project (Phase 1B) at £296,095-£515,000 (excluding costed risk provision).</li> </ol>																
<p><b>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</b></p>	<p>The below table shows the proposed budget to progress the project to the next Gateway 4/5:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P&amp;T Staff costs</td> <td>Project Manager time incl. design development, stakeholder engagement, funding strategy and legal agreement. Also includes Group Manager supervision time</td> <td>C Hoare &amp; Co bank</td> <td>21,799</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highways Staff costs</td> <td>To input in design development, produce construction package, oversee investigations, produce cost estimates</td> <td>C Hoare &amp; Co bank</td> <td>11,183</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open Spaces Staff Costs</td> <td>To input in the design development</td> <td>C Hoare &amp; Co bank</td> <td>2,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	P&T Staff costs	Project Manager time incl. design development, stakeholder engagement, funding strategy and legal agreement. Also includes Group Manager supervision time	C Hoare & Co bank	21,799	Highways Staff costs	To input in design development, produce construction package, oversee investigations, produce cost estimates	C Hoare & Co bank	11,183	Open Spaces Staff Costs	To input in the design development	C Hoare & Co bank	2,000
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)														
P&T Staff costs	Project Manager time incl. design development, stakeholder engagement, funding strategy and legal agreement. Also includes Group Manager supervision time	C Hoare & Co bank	21,799														
Highways Staff costs	To input in design development, produce construction package, oversee investigations, produce cost estimates	C Hoare & Co bank	11,183														
Open Spaces Staff Costs	To input in the design development	C Hoare & Co bank	2,000														

Legal Team Staff costs	Draft legal agreement	C Hoare & Co bank	0
P&T Fees	Site investigations, Specialist Consultants, consultation/engagement	C Hoare & Co bank	17,518
<b>Total</b>			<b>50,000</b>

Please note staff costs are calculated on the basis of reaching the next gateway (G4/5) in Summer 2021 and on the basis of the construction package being produced in-house with input from technical specialists externally appointed.

No Costed Risk Provision is requested at this stage.

The £13,905 underspent from the current budget allocation is to be carried forward to be used on this next stage of the project. Spend to date and revised budget information is presented in appendix 3.

#### 4. Overview of project options

Officers developed 3 concept designs for review by the project steering group and key internal and external stakeholders, including Cheapside Business Alliance.

- **Option 1 (£296,095-£315,000):** This ‘bronze’ option was developed as it fits within the existing budget. The design is simple and based on the footprint of existing planters in the Sunken Garden and includes minimal environmental measures such as replacing existing planting with more biodiverse and sustainable species to align with Phase 1A, additional seating space, basic lighting design and historic interpretation design details as this is a key design element (Plaque and paving details), but no greater improvement to accessibility of the space. The design provides opportunities for informal play and activation by local occupiers.
- **Option 2 (£345,000-£400,000):** The ‘silver’ option creates a fully accessible “soft bowl garden”. The design provides the greatest area of permeability out of all concept design options, new biodiverse and sustainable planting aligning with Phase 1A, increased seating, basic lighting design and historic interpretation design details as this is a key design element (Plaque and paving details). The design provides opportunities for informal play and activation by local occupiers.
- **Option 3 (£400,000 - £515,000):** The ‘gold’ option is to fully re-landscape the site using the historic urban grain to create large “rain garden” and new biodiverse and sustainable planting aligning with Phase 1A. It creates

	opportunities for informal play and activation by local occupiers. A path is introduced through the rain garden as part of the informal play.
<b>5. Recommendation</b>	That all options are approved but options 2 'silver' and 3 'gold', will only be progressed should further funding be confirmed. This funding decision will be taken by Members via a separate report on the implementation of the Climate Action Strategy.
<b>6. Risk</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall project risk: low</li> </ul> <p>The main risks to the project, include the design scope being impacted by site conditions; resourcing and manufacturing of any bespoke items impacting programme; Brexit impacts cost and sourcing of materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costed Risk Provision Utilised at Last Gateway: 0 (none sought at last stage)</li> <li>• Change in Costed Risk: 0</li> </ul> <p>Further information is provided in the Options Appraisal matrix on risks specific to design options and in the attached project risk register (Appendix 4).</p>
<b>7. Procurement approach</b>	At this stage of the project, any necessary specialist consultant will be appointed following the City's Procurement code. Any site investigations such as trial holes will be undertaken by the City's Highways Term Contractor.

## Appendices

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Coversheet
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Map of project area
<b>Appendix 3</b>	Finance tables
<b>Appendix 4</b>	Risk Register
<b>Appendix 5</b>	Visuals of proposed design options

## Contact

<b>Report Author</b>	Leila Ben-Hassel
<b>Email Address</b>	<a href="mailto:leila.ben-hassel@cityoflondon.gov.uk">leila.ben-hassel@cityoflondon.gov.uk</a>
<b>Telephone Number</b>	020 73321569

**Options Appraisal Matrix: Greening Cheapside Phase 1B – Sunken Garden**

<b><i>Option Summary</i></b>	<b><i>Option 1</i></b>	<b><i>Option 2</i></b>	<b><i>Option 3</i></b>
<p><b>1. Brief description of option</b></p>	<p>This option (“Bronze option”) was developed as it fits within the budget available. The design is simple and based on the footprint of existing planters in the Sunken Garden. Please refer to appendix 5 for indicative plans and artist impressions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hard landscaping:</b> The existing large planter would be removed, and a ramped access created (some stepped access would be retained). The layout creates opportunities for informal play and activation by local occupiers. Additional seating space would be created (additional 29 spaces bringing total to 50). The lighting design would be simple introducing a subtle LED lighting strip under granite benches. This design option also includes elements of historic interpretation as this is a key requirement of the Steering Group as this is a key design element (Plaque and simple paving detail).</li> <li>• <b>Greening:</b> Existing trees would be retained. This design would result in the same of area of greenery, but existing</li> </ul>	<p>This option (“Silver option”) is centred on the concept of a fully accessible “soft bowl garden” and provides the greatest area of permeability out of all concept design options. Please refer to appendix 5 for indicative plans and artist impressions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hard landscaping:</b> All entry point into the garden are accessible creating a soft variation in levels/gradients. This option proposes to predominantly use bounded gravel thereby increasing the permeable area of the site by 4 times. The layout creates opportunities for informal play and activation by local occupiers. Seating would be integrated into existing steps and the total seating capacity of the site would be increased by 49 seats. This option provides the greatest seating capacity of 70. The lighting design would involve LED lighting strip under granite benches and opportunities would be explored for further architecture lighting details. This design option also includes elements of historic interpretation as this is a key requirement of the</li> </ul>	<p>This option (“Gold option”) is based on the historic grain of the large planters. Please refer to appendix 5 for indicative plans and artist impressions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hard landscaping:</b> This option proposes to fully re-landscape the area of the garden to create a large “rain garden”. The design would create opportunities for activation by local occupiers. It introduces a meandering narrow path through the rain garden as informal play. Seating would be integrated into existing steps and the total seating capacity of the site would be increased to 60 seats. The lighting design would involve LED lighting strip under granite benches and opportunities would be explored for further architecture lighting details. This design option would include more opportunities for historic interpretation, incl. a plaque and several paving inlets throughout the site (“the Golden Bottle”).</li> <li>• <b>Greening:</b></li> </ul>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	planting would be replaced with more biodiverse, low maintenance planting.	Steering Group as this is a key design element (Plaque and paving details running throughout the site). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Greening:</b> Existing trees would be retained. This design would result in a 24% increase in greenery with more biodiverse and low maintenance planting.</li> </ul>	Existing trees would be retained. This design would result in a 50% increase in greenery with more biodiverse and low maintenance planting (20% more than option 2).
<b>2. Scope and exclusions</b>	The scope of the project is defined by the site boundary shown in red on the map included in appendix 3. It includes the sunken space and surrounding planters.		
<b>Project Planning</b>			
<b>3. Programme and key dates</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design development, incl. construction package: February 2021 – June 2021 (Gateway 5: July 2021)</li> <li>• Pre-construction activities: July – November 2021</li> <li>• Start works on site: January 2022</li> <li>• Complete works on site: May 2022</li> </ul>		
<b>4. Risk implications</b>	<p>Overall project option risk: Low Key risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brexit: possible increase of material costs and delays of sourcing materials. This would impact the overall project cost and the project programme. This is mitigated by the City's Term Contractor factoring delays in their orders and increasing its stock of materials.</li> </ul>	<p>Overall project option risk: Low Key risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brexit: possible increase of material costs and delays of sourcing materials. This would impact the overall project cost and the project programme. This is mitigated by the City's Term Contractor factoring delays in their orders and increasing its stock of materials.</li> <li>• This design option involves some bespoke design elements which could impact the project</li> </ul>	<p>Overall project option risk: Low Key risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brexit: possible increase of material costs and delays of sourcing materials. This would impact the overall project cost and the project programme. This is mitigated by the City's Term Contractor factoring delays in their orders and increasing its stock of materials.</li> <li>• This design option involves some bespoke design elements which could impact the project</li> </ul>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
		<p>programme if any delays in manufacturing are incurred. This would be mitigated through production of thorough shop drawings and researching sub-contractors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site conditions limit design scope. This would be mitigated through undertaking site investigations. A Tree Root survey has already been carried out to inform design development. The budget sought at this stage include allocation for further site investigations.</li> </ul>	<p>programme if any delays in manufacturing are incurred. This would be mitigated through production of thorough shop drawings and researching sub-contractors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site conditions limit design scope. This would be mitigated through undertaking site investigations. A Tree Root survey has already been carried out to inform design development. The budget sought at this stage include allocation for further site investigations.</li> <li>• Not sufficient funding secured. This option is the most costly and could require officers to secure further external funding. If this design option was preferred by stakeholders, officers would tailor the design detail to fit available funding.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Stakeholders and consultees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal stakeholders: Highways, Environmental Policy Team (CoL Planning), Historic Environment (CoL Planning), Open Spaces</li> <li>• External stakeholders: Project Steering Group (incl. landowners Landsec, Hoare bank and Cheapside Business Alliance), other local occupiers and visitors</li> </ul>		
<b>6. Benefits of option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Openness and accessibility</li> <li>• Increased visibility through and to garden with new planting strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Openness and increased visibility (greater lines of sight) through and to garden with new planting strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Openness and increased visibility (greater lines of sight) through and to garden with new planting strategy</li> </ul>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased seating capacity to 50 spaces (29 more)</li> <li>• Opportunities for activation</li> <li>• Informal play elements</li> <li>• New planter with enhanced biodiversity and introducing small area for SUDs (soak away)</li> <li>• Reuse of existing York stone (circular economy – more environmentally friendly)</li> <li>• Lower end of the cost range – fits within funding available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garden would be fully accessible from all sides</li> <li>• Increased greenery area by 30%</li> <li>• Largest permeable surface for water run off</li> <li>• Opportunities for informal play</li> <li>• Delivers the greatest increase of seating (70 seating capacity)</li> <li>• The gentle variation of levels echoes the historic sunken nature of the garden</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garden would be fully accessible from all sides</li> <li>• Vast greening area - Increased planting by over 50% with enhanced biodiversity &amp; SUDs strategy</li> <li>• Opportunities for activation</li> <li>• Walkway through rain garden as informal play</li> <li>• Reuse of existing York stone (circular economy – more environmentally friendly)</li> <li>• Memorial site to mark Hoare’s Bank</li> <li>• Historic urban grain echoed in the footprint of planters</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Disbenefits of option</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the new planting, visibility and lines of sight would be improved however although the design proposes the introduction of a ramp, steps would be retained and therefore the space would be accessible but this option would not deliver full accessibility of all entry points</li> <li>• This option would deliver enhanced biodiversity through a new planting strategy, though the area of greenery would remain the same following the footprint of the existing planters.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope of opportunities for activation more restricted due to gradient changes</li> <li>• Possible greater maintenance requirement due to the use of binding gravel which isn’t a standard City of London material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less permeable area than option 2 but larger greening area</li> <li>• Possible greater maintenance cost as greening area a lot larger compared to greening currently maintained in Sunken Garden (this would be mitigated by the use of low maintenance species)</li> <li>• On the higher end of the cost range</li> </ul>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less scope for historic interpretation than the other 2 options but would meet expectations of stakeholder to celebrate the history related to C Hoare Bank Co.</li> </ul>		
<b>Resource Implications</b>			
<b>8. Total estimated cost</b>	£296,095-£315,000	£345,000-£400,000	£400,000 - £515,000
<b>9. Funding strategy</b>	This option would be fully funded by external parties (Hoare Bank and Cheapside Business Alliance)	This option would be fully funded by funding secured from external parties and some CoL Climate Action funding (subject to confirmation)	This option would be fully funded by external parties and some CoL Climate Action funding (subject to confirmation)
<b>10. Investment appraisal</b>	Not applicable		
<b>11. Estimated capital value/return</b>	Not applicable		
<b>12. Ongoing revenue implications</b>	A full estimate of the impact on revenue departmental budget will be carried out ahead of the next gateway. It should be noted that the design approach aims to minimise and reduce where possible maintenance costs by using robust materials and replacing existing high maintenance planting with low maintenance sustainable planting. Any lighting introduced will be in accordance with the City's Lighting strategy and using specifications that are as low energy as possible (LED mostly).		
<b>13. Affordability</b>	All options would be fully funded by external parties' contributions, some S106 and some CoL Climate Action funding (subject to committee approval of the City's climate action plan).		
<b>14. Legal implications</b>	Legal implications are minor for this phase of the project. To enable external parties to fund the project, CoL legal officers will be entering into voluntary agreements with funders.		

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
<b>15. Corporate property implications</b>	Not applicable		
<b>16. Traffic implications</b>	None		
<b>17. Sustainability and energy implications</b>	<p>This option delivers less environmental benefits compared to the other 2 design options. However it would introduce more biodiverse plant species and lower maintenance planting. Any lighting introduced would be low energy LED.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of robust materials</li> <li>• low maintenance sustainable and biodiverse planting.</li> <li>• This option provides the largest area of permeable surface</li> <li>• Any lighting introduced will be as low energy as possible (LED mostly).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of robust materials</li> <li>• This option provides the largest area of greening (low maintenance sustainable and biodiverse planting).</li> <li>• This design option provides the largest area of permeable surface</li> </ul>
<b>18. IS implications</b>	Not applicable		
<b>19. Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<p>Officers will undertake a full Equality Impact Assessment of the final design ahead of the next gateway.</p> <p>The design approach of the project is to balance the needs of various user groups to minimise any negative impact on any protected characteristic groups.</p>		
<b>20. Data Protection Impact Assessment</b>	Not applicable		
<b>21. Recommendation</b>	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended