

Committees: Corporate Projects Board - <i>for information</i> Streets and Walkways Committee - <i>for decision</i> Projects Sub Committee - <i>for decision</i>	Dates: 02 February 2022 15 February 2022 17 February 2022
Subject: London Wall Place Section S278 Highway and Public Realm Improvements Unique Project Identifier: 11376	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of the Environment Report Author: Kristian Turner – City Transportation	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: To deliver high-quality public realm around the London Wall Place development that integrates the development into the public highway. RAG Status: N/A Risk Status: N/A Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A – Project predates the requirement for a costed risk provision. Final Outturn Cost: £2,823,655
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: Members of Streets and Walkways and Project Sub-Committees are asked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note and approve the contents of this outcome report; • Authorise the Chamberlain's department to return unspent funds to the developer as set out in the respective legal agreements, after any required maintenance sums are accounted for and subject to the verification of the final accounts which has yet to take place; and • Agree to close the project following payment of the outstanding invoices and confirmation of the project's final account.

3. Key conclusions	<p>The highway works to accommodate the London Wall Place development required substantial redesign of the public highway and highwalk network around the development.</p> <p>The former site of St. Alphage House featured the main building tower and an upper podium of public space and retail premises. The northern side of London Wall adjacent to the site was a blank frontage with a footway that was very narrow in parts.</p> <p>The London Wall Place development featured two buildings with entrances at the ground floor level with significant areas of private (but publicly accessible) public realm between the buildings.</p> <p>The project involved a wide range of measures on the highway around the development that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enabled access to the new buildings for people and vehicles; • enhanced provision for pedestrians by providing improved footways and crossings; • enhanced provision for cyclists by providing a segregated eastbound cycle lane on London Wall; • enhanced the public realm in St. Alphage Gardens to provide an improved environment for workers, residents and visitors. <p>The most significant part of the Section 278 scheme was the narrowing of the carriageway on London Wall eastbound to create a wider footway to access the new building entrances. This required major adjustments to the London Wall car park structure to create a wider footway, involving bridge joint replacement works and waterproofing/carriageway resurfacing as well as other structural adjustments.</p>
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>The design has successfully accommodated the associated new private development. The City's Highways Team and the term contractor (J B Riney) worked together with the client and their various agents and contractors to re-programme works where necessary and to ensure that the construction seamlessly integrated to deliver work with the construction of the buildings.</p>
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. Options appraisal	<p>The constraints of the car park structure meant that a decision had to be taken on what to do with eastbound carriageway; the options were to remove the cycle lane and have two lanes of traffic or one traffic lane and a cycle lane. Traffic modelling was undertaken which concluded that removing a traffic lane and retaining the cycle lane would not affect overall journey time as the main constraint on traffic in the area is the Moorgate junction. It was proven that whilst eastbound traffic queues may seem longer, this would not affect journey times as two traffic lanes were retained on the immediate approach to the Moorgate junction.</p>
6. Procurement route	<p>The services of transport consultants were procured to undertake traffic and pedestrian modelling and do road safety audits.</p> <p>Structural designs were prepared by the City Structures teams term consultant.</p> <p>The detailed designs for the highway works were prepared in-house by the City's highways team.</p> <p>The City's term contractor, JB Riney, was then used to deliver the majority of the highway works. Specialist structural contractors were procured for the structural works.</p>
7. Skills base	<p>The Project Team, for the most part, had the skills, knowledge and experience to manage and deliver the majority of the project. The exception to this was related to structures, therefore the City Structures team were asked to input into this technical area. This proved an on-going challenge in terms of resourcing and different ways of working. In future for projects of this nature which have a large structural component we would need to consider how best to resource this and ensure this function is fully integrated into the Project Team.</p> <p>External specialists such as traffic modelling were contracted by the project team where needed to provide specific expertise when required.</p>
8. Stakeholders	<p>A Working Party was established at Gateway 3 comprising the following stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Developer (London Wall Place Limited Partnership) • The tenant (Schroders, 1 London Wall Place) • Barbican Association representative • Roman House representative • The Salters Company • St. Giles Church

	The Working Party set a series of objectives for the security, public realm and highway approach to the transformation of the space around the development.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The project met the key project milestones. The highway works were coordinated with the development contractor and implemented in phases. The necessary highway and security works were completed to meet the developer's timelines for the occupation of the building.</p> <p>Delivery of the raised tables on London Wall however was delayed due to technical complexities around the joint replacement works and availability of the City's Road network to accommodate the closure of London Wall in both directions. This was complicated due to the large number of other works taking place such as utility works on Cannon Street, the traffic restriction at Bank junction and the experimental traffic restriction at Beech Street. This pushed delivery of the raised tables from Spring 2018 to November 2021.</p>
10. Assessment of project against Scope	<p>There was no change to the scope of the works to that approved by the City's committees from Gateway 4 onwards.</p> <p>Regarding programme, most of the works to facilitate the development and meet the needs of the occupiers were completed on time by December 2017 as per the Gateway 5 report, except for the raised tables, completed in December 2021, which slipped due to the availability of road space due to other programmes. For more details on this, please see section 18.</p>
11. Risks and issues	<p>Most of the technical challenges identified as risks in the project were mitigated.</p> <p>Two main risks which did become issues that had to be managed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The replacement of the bridge joints on London Wall • New raised tables in London Wall
12. Transition to BAU	With the project now being complete, BAU maintenance responsibilities have now been passed over to the Highways Maintenance and Open Spaces teams.

Value Review

13. Budget

Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)

Estimated cost: £1-5m

Summary Table: Expenditure to date - London Wall Place S278 - 16800279 & 16100279

Description	Approved Combined Budget(s) (£)	Expenditure (£)	Balance (£)
Pre-Evaluation	£ 72,306	£ 72,306	£ -
Works	£ 1,892,263	£ 1,582,820	£ 309,443
Utilities	£ 336,393	£ 112,786	£ 223,607
Fees	£ 484,593	£ 389,191	£ 95,402
Staff Costs	£ 674,574	£ 666,552	£ 8,022
Commuted Maintenance			
Barbican signage			
TOTAL	£ 3,460,129	£ 2,823,655	£ 636,474

For full details, please see **Appendix 1 – Finance Tables**. As part of the final works on the raised tables and after the road had been excavated, it was determined by the Assistant Director of Engineering that further waterproofing measures to protect the London Wall Car Park were required than had been accounted for. Therefore, at short notice the specialist contractor was instructed to return and further supplement the already-installed measures. With this taking place at pace to minimise the time that London Wall was closed to traffic, the cost of the additional work was unknown, and it is now expected to appear in the final invoice. However, it is fully expected to be within the existing approved budget envelope and therefore not present an issue to the project and the City.

The final account for the project will be finalised once invoices for the above works have been reconciled. It is recommended that final project closure will take place after this has been completed.

Overall, there was a project underspend of 18%. Part of this is due to an underspend on allowances and estimates for Utilities works which were either not needed or were over-estimated by the respective utility companies. The civils works also saw an underspend due to a variety of factors, several risks in the construction programme that had been costed for did not eventuate. Further savings were made on sharing of traffic management with the development contractor and on professional fees where some services did not end up being required.

14. Investment	Not Applicable, fully developer funded.
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	The project predates the requirement for SMART objectives.
16. Key benefits realised	<p>The project has delivered the following key benefits in the area around the London Wall Place development. These can be defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The widening of the northern footway on London Wall between Fore Street and Wood Street so that there is sufficient footway for access to the new building entrances and accommodate the building design; • The upgraded London Wall / Wood Street junction that mitigates the impact of the development on road safety and pedestrian facilities; • Integration of the development into the local highway network at street level, linking the development and highway works with adjacent projects; • Wider highway adjustments including widened footways, street lighting and environmental enhancements to accommodate the development (<i>along the northern footway on London Wall, pedestrian comfort levels have improved from 'F' to 'A' and 'B' scores</i>); • Upgraded facilities for cyclists; and • Successfully meeting the requirements of the developer.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<p>A collaborative working relationship was developed between the project team and the developer team. At the start of the project, the developer design team had a limited understanding of the S278 process and what the scope of the project would be. Initially the developer expected the scope of the highway work would be only the widening of the London Wall footway and expected to undertake this work themselves with a limited budget.</p> <p>Through the Evaluation and Design approach undertaken by the Major Projects team, the needs of the public were considered in the design and the scope of the project to facilitate the development was more accurately defined. All of the work was transparently shared with the developer to agree the project scope which was estimated at £3.6M.</p>
---------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>The creation of the Working Party to include local stakeholders was a positive aspect of the project as it gave a forum for local residents and businesses to have their say in the detail of the design approach. It was through the Working Party forum that the need to enhance St. Alphage Gardens was identified so that the public space was enhanced commensurate with the quality of the development private realm. The size of the gardens was increased by using redundant carriageway space, and the links and interfaces between St. Alphage Gardens, Salters Gardens and London Wall place improved. This was delivered as a separate, centrally funded project but both project teams worked together to ensure the schemes were integrated</p>
18.Improvement reflections	<p>The design of the London Wall Car Park structure is unique. Complex and iterative design work went into determining the technical requirements for the renewal of the bridge joints and methodology for the works. This highlighted the need for the City Structures team ways of working to become more embedded into the delivery of developer funded projects. For future projects of this complexity a member of this team would be included in the Project Team.</p> <p>The delays in delivering the raised tables in London Wall raises a point about how such delays are reported internally if they are driven by the City's other priorities. In this case, other more important work and projects required that London Wall be kept open to compensate for the effects of other closures and restrictions elsewhere. Whilst this was deemed appropriate, it reflected negatively on this project. It is therefore suggested that discussions take place with the Project Management Office to assess how best to manage similar situations in future.</p> <p>Regarding Security, the City's policy with regards building protection measures was largely adhered to, the vast majority of security measures have been facilitated on private land with the exception of one small area at the southeast corner of the site where City of London Police's advice recommended some measures on the public highway.</p>
19.Sharing best practice	<p>Dissemination of lessons learnt and project improvements has been raised with the department management.</p>
20.AOB	<p>The project predated the requirement for a project coversheet.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Finance Tables
Appendix 2	Before and After Photos

Contact

Report Author	Kristian Turner
Email Address	Kristian.Turner@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1745