

# Project Coversheet

## [1] Ownership

**Unique Project Identifier:** 11599      **Report Date:** 17/01/2022  
**Core Project Name:** Bank Junction Interim Safety Scheme (Bank on Safety)  
**Programme Affiliation:** Bank Junction Improvements Project (All Change at Bank)  
**Project Manager:** Gillian Howard  
**Next Gateway to be passed:** G6

## [2] Project Brief

**Project Mission statement:** To improve safety and reduce casualties at Bank Junction ahead of the original longer-term project delivery (which was scheduled for completion by 2021 – now 2022).

**Definition of need:** Heightened Member and public concerns regarding how dangerous the junction was following a fatality in 2015. It was not acceptable to wait to deliver a safety improvement as part of the overall holistic project which was not planned to deliver change until 2021, now 2022.

### Key measures of success:

- 1) A significant safety improvement at Bank (minimum 25%)
- 2) Maintain access for deliveries
- 3) Improve Air Quality at Bank – and not make the wider monitoring area worse
- 4) Not unreasonably impact on traffic flow, whilst preferably improving bus journey times.

## [3] Highlights

### Finance:

**Total anticipated cost to deliver [£]:** 1,822,374  
**Contingency Approved (unadjusted) [£]:**33,000 (£13,549 was returned to the Projects sub contingency fund)  
**Total potential project liability (cost + contingency) [£]:**1,822,374  
**Contingency used [£]:**19,322  
**Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]:** Annual cost for enforcement cameras which will be met out of the On-Street Parking account  
**Programme Affiliation [£]:** (up to) £8.5 million combined with Bank Junction improvements project

[A] Budget Approved to Date*	[B] New Financial Requests	[C] New Budget Total (Post approval)
£1,822,374	£0	£1,822,374
[D] Previous Total Estimated Cost of Project	[E] New Total Estimated Cost of Project	[F] Variance in Total Estimated Cost of Project (since last report)
£1,822,374	£1,782,571	- £39,803
[G] Spend to Date	[H] Anticipated future budget requests	

£ 1,778,518	Final account to be done following last processing of staff costs.
-------------	--

*\*Contingency when realised and used is expected to be included here*

### **Headline Financial changes:**

#### **Since 'Project Proposal' (G2) report:**

◀▶ £120,000 was approved of an estimated £500,000 project in December 2015.

Increased approved budget to £387,100 approved in Sept 16.

#### **Since 'Options Appraisal and Design' (G3-4) report:**

▲ ▶ ▼ No G3 report

#### **Since 'Authority to start Work' (G5) report:**

▲ a G4/5 approved December 2016 – Approved budget £1,179,100

*Further increase requested to £1,368,207 in September 2017 to cover additional staff costs*

*An additional £33,000 was agreed from the Project Sub contingency in February 2018 to complete an additional piece of work. This giving a total current approved budget of 1,401,207*

*An additional £36,000 was agreed in September 2018 to investigate "Phase 2" of improvement works following the experiment being made permanent. This took the total budget to £1,437,207 (working budget of 1,423,658 once unused contingency returned)*

#### **Since 'Options Appraisal and Design' Phase 2 (G4/5) report:**

▲ *an additional £398,716 is requested within the G4&5 report.*

### **Project Status:**

**Overall RAG rating:** Green

**Previous RAG rating:** Green

### **[4] Member Decisions and Delegated Authority**

The Court of Common Council, on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2018, decided to make the Bank on Safety experimental scheme permanent.

Streets and Walkways had approved Officers to "investigate additional measures to further improve compliance, behaviour and performance in the vicinity of the junction" in July 2018. This work is labelled Phase 2.

In early April 2019, Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and the Policy and Resource Committee then approved the recommendation to allocate £400,000 to the construction of the scheme.

### **[5] Narrative and change**

#### **Date and type of last report:**

G4/5 (phase 2) July 2019

#### **Key headline updates and change since last report.**

Interim pavement widening completed in September 2020 but due to COVID 19 pandemic and the national restrictions in place, there was a delay in being able to observe how the temporary scheme was operating.

#### **Headline Scope/Design changes, reasons why, impact of change:**

**Since 'Project Proposal' (G2) report:**

n/a

**Since 'Options Appraisal and Design' (G3-4 report):**

n/a

**Since 'Authority to Start Work' (G5) report:**

No significant design change since G4/5 report in December 2016 to the final decision in September 2018

Post September 2018 phase 2 design work undertaken and presented in a G4&5 report June 2019. Includes options for improving pedestrian comfort levels, shortening crossing distances and helps to reduce the opportunity for pedestrian and cycle conflicts as an interim step towards achieving the long-term vision at Bank. Additional Design Measures have also been included.

**Timetable and Milestones:**

**Expected timeframe for the project delivery:** November 2018 (experiment ends)

**Milestones:**

- |   |
|---|
| 1) <del>Court of Common Council Decision September 2018</del> (met)   |
| 2) Outline improvements to the Bank on Safety scheme, if approved, to improve behaviour and compliance in January/February 2019 (not met) |
| 3) NEW:   |
| 4) G4&5 report submitted for approval for the improvements submitted in summer 2019 (met)   |
| 5) NEW  |
| 6) Implementation of improvements complete by Spring 2020 (delayed to September 2020 due to pandemic)                                     |

**Are we on track for this stage of the project against the plan/major milestones?**

**Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery?**

**Risks and Issues**

**Top 3 risks:** no longer relevant

<i>Risk description</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The pre-allocated budget amount</b> – Should project costs increase, descoping of the project would be required to maintain delivery within the budget.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Construction delays</b> – If elements of the construction phase take longer than planned, costs would increase accordingly.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Road network access and TfL Approvals</b> - With Bank junction still being used to reduce the traffic impacts of other work in the City, access to do work there could be difficult. Also, any construction plans will need to account for the nine bus routes and be approved by TfL via its TMAN processes.</li> </ul>

**Top 3 issues realised:** There was a delay in the construction of the temporary pavement widening. However, due to the national restrictions once the contractors were able to get back onto site, they were able to work at a quicker pace as there were less people in the vicinity. Therefore the cost impact was minimised.

**Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing?**

The Bank on Safety scheme has generated a reasonable amount of media, both positive and negative, locally and nationally. The most popular piece focuses on the generation of Penalty Charge Notices at the Junction. This money is ring fenced for Transport Improvements under the terms of the On-Street Parking Reserve. Most media cover the PCN story with the reasons for the scheme; largely they are quite balanced pieces.

There has also been a lot of public interest which is largely positive and encourages the City to go further. Conversely there is some public response regarding the restrictions on taxis across the junction and that this should be relaxed.

.