

## Covid Transportation Measures – Lessons Learnt Session 22/02/2021

### Quality:

- The end product of temporary plus materials (Wands, bolt down kerbs) and parklets looks good. Better quality than some other interventions in other locations.
- Footway widening is not effective when not raised to carriageway level. Street users are unclear about different spaces for people walking and cycling.
- Signage was and is in place messy and looks like temporary traffic management. Could have implemented more permanent looking signage earlier.

### Cost

- Staff costs high for comparable projects – but this is based on percentage proportion and construction costs are significantly lower than a 'standard highways project'.
- Project scope was unknown at time of costing, and we had no experience of pricing for this type of project using temporary materials.
- Bid for external funding was made before we had determined designs. Transition into temporary plus not costed for.
- Some abortive costs incurred for streets where interventions were then removed.
- Anticipated greater take up of social distancing stickers – because of way lockdowns and restriction have occurred these haven't been taken up as expected some abortive costs incurred.
- 

### Programme – design, into delivery, timeframes

- Unknown programme duration at start of project – anticipated that measures might be in place until end of 2020 with the majority of people returning to the office over the summer.
- Identifying what changes to make to which streets was a successful process. Based on Transport Strategy and utilising a range of data, (pedestrian flow / footway width data, cycle volumes etc)
- The design decisions were also taken collaboratively working between teams in Highways and Transport.
- Design issues between various teams in Highways and Transport– lack of clarity around who was client and who were designers. A lot of this was due to pace of delivery. This improvee over time as moved into 'temporary plus'.
- Because of home working requirements, and lack of other detailed information, a lot of the highways design was based on OS maps which were out of date . This resulted in changes needing to be made on site.
- LL – checked on site at key locations,
- For future projects would be useful to include Construction Logistics officers to understand construction site locations, and the extent of their highway

occupation. This particularly impacted ability to deliver changes in the City Cluster

- With the teams there is a good local knowledge of the network and the impact of changes.
- Working with Transport for London on Bishopsgate and London Bridge changes was a good example of co design.
- For the Phase 3 works (Parklets and seating) the split of design responsibility between design teams made Phase 3 work more difficult to coordinate. An overall base CAD plan would have been useful
- Worked well using temporary barriers, working out issues, then transitioned into 'temp plus' once design crinkles ironed out
- Made a lot of changes from original proposals. Questions regarding value for money although this did meet the flexible approach we had set out in reports.
- We did not have a process for systematically updating design drawings with changes made on site by various people. Therefore we often did not know exactly what had been deployed on site. This made it challenging in responding to correspondence on occasions.
- Timeframes for delivery – slower deployment than anticipated, temporary measures quickly out on site, temporary plus was slower than anticipated due to some material supply issues. Cycle parking design work was slower than planned (why was this?)
- Removal of cycle parking and other measures for utilities work etc working well – A process for removal and reinstatement for 3<sup>rd</sup> parties has been developed.
- For future projects of this type, with limited underlying topographical information consider agreeing key design parameters and design on site.

## **Governance**

- Lack of governance and setting out of clear role and responsibilities did lead to some issues in design and delivery of the project. In cases there were overlaps of roles.
- The gateway reporting system isn't appropriate for a project like this which required pace and ability to be reactive. A form of delegated reporting would have been useful as committee reports were required almost monthly. A considerable amount of staff time was spent on drafting reports.
- Bronze group met weekly but should have been set up earlier in process. This group could have used more effectively, especially if delegations were made. Decision making needed to be more systematically documented.

## **Procurement**

- Suppliers for phase 3 works – ordering process between decision to order placed took longer than anticipated (demand from other boroughs)
- Purchasing of temporary barriers was quick but in hindsight should have looked to hire of purchase such a substantial amount.

## **External approvals**

- Existing relationships with adjacent Boroughs and Transport for London means that all external approvals were granted relatively quickly for phase 1 and 2 works.

## **Communication**

- Single point of contact worked well for external correspondence.
- Difficult to reach all business and residents – no centralised communication database. An email bulletin was set up for all Covid related communications but this has limited takeup.
- Visitors to webpage, and consultation uptake were low in volume. The online consultation was set up for a different scenario than what eventuated i.e a more substantial return to normality in mid 2020.
- Webpage didn't give enough information to users as to what changes were made.
- We were slow to pull together a schematic map of changes. Would have been useful at start to communicate to wider range of people