

<b>Committee(s):</b> Streets and Walkways Sub Committee [for decision]	<b>Dated:</b> 31/05/2022
<b>Subject:</b> All Change at Bank: traffic and timings review plan	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 9, 11, 12
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Executive Director Environment	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Gillian Howard, Environment	

### Summary

A motion was approved at the Court of Common Council in April 2022 which included the following requirement in relation to Bank junction:

*“That the Planning & Transportation Committee be requested immediately to begin a review of the nature and timing of current motor traffic timing restrictions at Bank Junction, to include all options. This review will include full engagement with Transport for London and other relevant stakeholders, data collection, analysis and traffic modelling. The Planning & Transportation Committee should then present its recommendation to this Honourable Court as soon as practicable.”*

The methodology for the review, including assumptions and associated risks, is provided in Appendix 1. Members are asked to approve in principle this approach, acknowledging that it might have to vary depending upon the results of the work, engagement, and agreements with Transport for London on the technical specification of the traffic model (which has yet to take place). The outlined programme is indicative and may have to change.

Members are also asked to note that where a report is proposed to be submitted for committee consideration during the development of the review, it has been assumed that this remains with Streets and Walkways Sub Committee and/or Planning and Transportation. If this is not the case, and more committees wish to receive the reports, this may have implications on the indicative programme in the appendix.

### Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

1. Agree, in principle, the methodology set out in Appendix 1 for undertaking the traffic and timing mix review as part of the All Change at Bank project.
2. Note the associated risks with the proposed plan (outlined in paragraphs 19-24).

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. Following the motion agreed at the Court of Common Council in April 2022, this report seeks Members agreement of the approach detailed in Appendix 1.
2. The document in Appendix 1 sets out the objective of the review, the assumptions, how the review will be undertaken and the options that are under consideration along with an indicative programme and key risks.
3. There is a second report on this agenda for this meeting which if approved is the final decision required before the substantial transformation of the All Change at Bank project can commence construction. The Gateway 5 report was approved in December 2021 subject to the outcome of the statutory traffic order consultation. It was noted in the September and December 2021 reports that the review of traffic mix and timings would be undertaken, and a time frame of within 12 months of completion of the construction of the project was referenced.
4. If the traffic order report is approved, this will set a new physical layout for the junction. It will reduce the number of arms available for motor vehicles, simplify the layout of the junction, improving its safety and provide significantly more space for people walking in the area. It will also allow for new spaces for people to be able to stop and rest providing opportunities for tree planting and greener spaces supporting the Climate Action Strategy.
5. The approved design for the All Change at Bank does not prevent changes to the traffic mix and timing of restrictions on the remaining open arms.

### **Current Position**

6. If the principle of the scope and methodology outlined in Appendix 1 are agreed, then work on the review will commence and a full cost estimate to complete the review will be established.
7. The review is likely to be more complex to undertake from a technical perspective than originally envisaged at the Gateway 5 report in December 2021 when we were anticipating undertaking the review in the latter part of 2023 into 2024.
8. The complexity is in part due to the risk of the timing of the main data collection exercise during the experimental phases of the Bishopsgate and London Bridge schemes. With no firm decision on whether these schemes may be changed or removed this is likely to lead to more sensitivity tests being undertaken in the traffic modelling as a preferred option is established.
9. Also, stakeholder engagement is likely to be more complex given that the main benefits of the approved All Change at Bank design will not have been experienced by anyone when public consultation is likely to need to take place. This has the potential to affect people's views as they may not have a full

understanding of the way the streets will operate once the construction work has concluded.

10. It is proposed that an external consultant is appointed to develop the methodology for engagement and consultation and to undertake the consultation and analysis work.
11. Once work packages are developed and quotes received, we will be able to assess whether the funding estimated within the budget at Gateway 5 is going to be sufficient and, if required, submit an Issues report setting out the options for balancing the funding within the project budget.

## **Options**

12. At this stage, a way forward is presented in Appendix 1. Members are asked to consider the Appendix and confirm whether
  - a) That the key assumptions are acceptable
  - b) The outlined scope of work meets Members expectations for this review,
  - c) The proposed way forward to minimise the number of traffic modelling runs at the feasibility stage is acceptable.
    - i) i.e. that we concentrate on assessing the option to have Cornhill, Poultry and Lombard/King William Street 'open' to another mix of traffic in both directions in the first instance.
    - ii) If that is not feasible, to then start working through the appropriate movement options of either reducing the number of arms 'open' or banning movements to facilitate another vehicle type during the restricted hours.
  - d) That if the above is agreed, to note the risk associated with this approach.

## **Proposals**

13. To agree or amend the proposal in Appendix 1 of how to undertake the traffic mix and timing review.

## **Key Data**

14. N/A at this stage

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

Strategic implications

15. The review will take into account the Corporate Plan, Transport Strategy, Climate Action Strategy and any other relevant Corporate strategies and plans.

Financial implications

16. At this stage there are no financial implications – but there is a risk that the review will be more expensive than first envisaged. If the proposed way forward is agreed a costing exercise will be undertaken and if required, an Issues report submitted to explain how to balance the funding within the project budget.

Resource implications

17. There will be external commissions to be managed by a project manager within the project team.

#### Legal implications

18. Any proposal that comes out of the review will need to demonstrate how it complies with Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act which requires the traffic authority, in exercising its traffic authority functions, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians), so far as practicable having regard to

(a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.

(b) the effect of amenities of any locality.

(bb) national air quality strategy.

(c) public service vehicles.

(d) any other relevant matters.

#### Risk implications

19. Members should note the risk of undertaking the review whilst the experimental schemes by Transport for London on Bishopsgate and London Bridge, and the City's experimental schemes, are still in their monitoring phases. Undertaking the traffic counts to update the traffic model with these in place creates a risk of abortive work should it be later decided that these experimental schemes are not progressed into permanent schemes or change significantly from their current arrangements; particularly the Bishopsgate/London Bridge schemes.

20. The traffic modelling results will outline likely journey time impacts but rely on reasonable representative flow of traffic at each junction within the model. If those traffic flows on corridors change substantially during the process of us assessing the options for changing the traffic mix, then the impacts and/or benefits regarding journey times will not be representative.

21. This may impact our ability to be able to get a subsequent Traffic Management Approval (TMAN) for changing the traffic mix and or timing of the restrictions. It is possible that to progress a change of traffic mix and or timing that we could be asked to restart the traffic modelling process again if this were to happen.

22. With that risk in mind, the proposal in Appendix 1 assumes that Bishopsgate and London Bridge and the City's experimental schemes remain long term. This is what the traffic model once updated with new traffic flows will best represent.

23. In addition, there is a risk that at the stage of submission for the required Traffic Management approvals from TfL that they could refuse to approve the submission. Cornhill and Poultry are part of the Strategic Road Network as defined in the Traffic Management act 2004. This means that TfL are more than a consultee on these streets and able to veto proposals.

24. Early engagement should minimise this risk but there is a risk that a change in the traffic mix or timings of the restrictions at Bank may impact on their existing

experimental schemes, which may be made permanent, which could influence discussions.

#### Equalities implications

25. As the review progresses, equalities analysis and appropriate stakeholder engagement with impacted protected characteristics will be undertaken. These will be presented at the appropriate stages when Members are asked to take decisions.

#### Climate implications

26. No direct implications from undertaking the review. Any proposal for implementation will consider the implications of the Climate Action Strategy

#### Security implications

27. No direct implication from undertaking the review. If required consideration to security and safety will be included when assessing the proposals.

### **Conclusion**

28. Officers have been asked to bring forward the traffic mix and timing review of the restrictions at Bank junction to start immediately. The plan in Appendix 1 sets out in more detail how it is proposed to do this. It also sets out the assumptions that will be made and the risks associated with the approach outlined.

29. Members are asked to agree or amend the proposal in Appendix 1.

### **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Draft plan for restrictions review.

### **Background Papers**

Gateway 5: Authority to start work (December 2021)

<https://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=122207>

### **Gillian Howard**

Environment

T: 020 7332 3139

E: Gillian.Howard@cityoflondon.gov.uk