

Committees: Streets and Walkways Sub Committee - <i>for decision</i> Operational Property and Projects Committee – <i>for decision</i>	Dates: 06 September 2022 26 September 2022
Subject: City Cluster Healthy Streets Plan Unique Project Identifier: 12071	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Executive Director of the Environment Report Author: Leah Coburn – Policy and Projects	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: <p>Following adoption of the Transport Strategy and City Cluster Vision by the Court of Common Council in May 2019, work is underway to implement changes to the way streets within the City Cluster are managed and used by motor traffic and people walking and cycling.</p> <p>The first phase of work was the development of the City Cluster Healthy Streets Plan. The Healthy Streets Plan tested the feasibility of the proposals in the City Cluster Vision and sets out the traffic management changes required to provide pedestrian priority and a high quality and safe public realm for workers and visitors. It also identifies where experimental and interim changes to the function of streets can be made to demonstrate and test the benefits of proposed interventions.</p> <p>Transport and public realm changes across the City Cluster are coordinated through the City Cluster Programme. This contains three workstreams delivering Traffic Reduction and Pedestrian Priority, Wellbeing and Climate Resilience, and Activation and Engagement. This programme is reported on bi-annually.</p> <p>The Healthy Streets Plan sets the framework for delivering change through the Traffic Reduction and Pedestrian Priority</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>programme. The plan identified options related to traffic access restrictions and public realm improvements and set out a phased delivery plan.</p> <p>RAG Status: Amber – delay in completing due to pandemic</p> <p>Risk Status: Low</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £301,614</p> <p>The project was completed 12 months behind the original schedule.</p>
<p>2. Next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <p>Members are asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve the content of this outcome report; and 2. Agree to close the project.
<p>3. Key conclusions</p>	<p>The Healthy Streets Plan was approved at Committees as an appendix to a Progress Report in July 2021.</p> <p>Work on the traffic modelling was paused while the City of London’s transport response to COVID-19 was implemented in the study area. Therefore, the Healthy Streets Plan was finalised 12 months behind the original schedule.</p> <p>The Healthy Streets Approach gives the Healthy Streets Plans their name. The Approach is a human-centred framework for embedding public health in transport, public realm and planning. It is based on 10 evidence-based Healthy Streets Indicators that capture the elements that are essential for making streets attractive and accessible places to walk, cycle and spend time, and for supporting social and economic activity.</p> <p>A Healthy Streets Plan therefore looks to reduce the use of Local Access streets by through traffic to enable improvements to the walking and cycling experience, enhance the public realm and create new public space.</p> <p>This Healthy Streets Plan has provided an area-based approach to identifying traffic management measures allowing us to look holistically at required network changes both inside the Cluster and alongside other measures such as Bank Junction. It provides a tested and recommended phasing schedule for the delivery of the City Cluster Vision proposals and identifies where initial delivery can be undertaken to restrict traffic on streets before full implementation of the proposals (subject to separate Committee approval).</p>

	Further Healthy Streets Plans are proposed for other areas of the City. While each one will be different and tailored to the area, the approach to Healthy Streets Plans can be used as a basis for those plans also. The key difference for the Cluster is that the City Cluster Vision had already been adopted and so the majority of the work related to this plan was more focussed on the technical aspects of delivering that Vision rather than stakeholder engagement.
--	---

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	This project had no physical works and therefore no design into delivery.
5. Options appraisal	The chosen option reduced the study area that originally included the area to the south of Fenchurch Street. This was due to the City Cluster area already having an approved Vision that had included significant stakeholder engagement. This Healthy Streets Plan therefore did not meet one of the original objectives; 'to provide an understanding of the impact of the City Cluster proposals on the area around Fenchurch Street station, and the level of traffic management measures required to implement the Transport Strategy's street hierarchy in this area.' However, the option met the other project's objectives for the City Cluster area. This change to scope was agreed by Committees at Gateway 3/4/5.
6. Procurement route	The following elements of the Healthy Streets Plan were procured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and pedestrian surveys (open tender) • Traffic modelling (design services in highways term contract) • Equality Analysis (open tender) <p>All services were procured as expected and their methods worked well.</p>
7. Skills base	The Project Team had the skills, knowledge and experience to prepare the Healthy Streets Plan, with exception to the specialist tasks outsourced as mentioned in Section 6.
8. Stakeholders	Internal stakeholders were engaged throughout the project via the City Cluster Officer Working Group. <p>Extensive external stakeholder engagement was undertaken for the adopted City Cluster Vision. As the majority of the work related to this plan was focussed on the technical aspects of delivering that</p>

	<p>Vision rather than stakeholder engagement, external engagement was through the Eastern Cluster Partnership Steering Group.</p> <p>The project was delivered to Stakeholder's satisfaction.</p>
--	---

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>As mentioned in Section 3, the finalisation of the Healthy Streets Plan was delayed by 12months due to the implementation of COVID-19 transport recovery measures in the area and wanting to understand the impacts of these measures and whether they should lead to any adaptations to the proposals set out in the City Cluster Vision.</p> <p>The Gateway 5 completion date was July 2020. The actual completion date was July 2021.</p>
10. Assessment of project against Scope	No changes were made to the project after the approved Gateway 3/4/5.
11. Risks and issues	The only significant issue was the delay to the project due to the COVID-19 transport recovery measures.
12. Transition to BAU	As there are no physical works or changes made as a result of the project, no transition to BAU is applicable.

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td> <td> <p>Estimated cost (including risk): £350,000</p> <p>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £350,000</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	<p>Estimated cost (including risk): £350,000</p> <p>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £350,000</p>																					
	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	<p>Estimated cost (including risk): £350,000</p> <p>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £350,000</p>																							
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i></th> <th><i>Final Outturn Cost</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Fees</i></td> <td>£193,587</td> <td>£236,716</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£88,846</td> <td>£64,898</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Works</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Purchases</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Other Capital Expend</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Costed Risk Provision</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Recharges</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>	<i>Fees</i>	£193,587	£236,716	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£88,846	£64,898	<i>Works</i>	£0	£0	<i>Purchases</i>	£0	£0	<i>Other Capital Expend</i>	£0	£0	<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0	<i>Recharges</i>	£0	£0
	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>																							
<i>Fees</i>	£193,587	£236,716																							
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£88,846	£64,898																							
<i>Works</i>	£0	£0																							
<i>Purchases</i>	£0	£0																							
<i>Other Capital Expend</i>	£0	£0																							
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0																							
<i>Recharges</i>	£0	£0																							

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Other*</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Total</i></td> <td>£282,433</td> <td>£301,614</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Other*</i>	£0	£0	<i>Total</i>	£282,433	£301,614
<i>Other*</i>	£0	£0					
<i>Total</i>	£282,433	£301,614					
	<p>Appendix 2 includes tables for the spend on the project and funding sources. To note, the funding sources table shows the revised funding received from TfL as no further funding under Liveable Neighbourhoods from FY 2020/21 onwards was allocated.</p> <p>There was an increase in fees dealt with by a budget adjustment due to the need to fund an update of TfL's strategic One Model which hadn't been taken into account at the time of Gateway 5.</p> <p>Please confirm whether or not the Final Account for this project has been verified. NO</p>						
14. Investment	Not applicable						
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p>The project delivered three out of the four objectives. The fourth objective was not delivered due to a reduction in the size of the study area at Gateway 3/4/5, as mentioned in Section 5.</p> <p>The number of pedestrian priority streets that can be implemented within the area (measured by length) was identified as up to 8 streets with a total length of 1.6km.</p> <p>The reduction in traffic volumes that could be achieved is a minimum of 50% (depending on specific access arrangements) on key streets such as St Mary Axe and Leadenhall Street.</p> <p>A tested and recommended phasing schedule for the delivery of the City Cluster Vision proposals has been prepared within the Healthy Streets Plan, taking into account constraints associated with large scale development in the City Cluster planned during the next several years.</p>						
16. Key benefits realised	<p>All key benefits have been realised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. An area-based approach to identifying traffic management measures allows us to look holistically at required network changes, as well as be informed by other area-based projects such as the City Cluster Zero Emission Zone and any area-based approaches to the management of freight and servicing. <p>The traffic modelling demonstrated that restricting traffic on St Mary Axe and Leadenhall Street, with reduced capacity on Bevis Marks and Fenchurch Street (to allow for cycling and pedestrian crossing improvements) can be achieved with minimal</p>						

	<p>increases in vehicle journey times with mitigating measures. These measures were also modelled with the All Change at Bank traffic scheme and TfL’s Bishopsgate scheme to help understand how wider schemes may impact on the City Cluster and vice versa (see Healthy Streets Plan for further detail – link provided in Section 20).</p> <p>b. It will allow the proposals in phases 2 and 3 of the City Cluster Vision to be delivered (now restructured into the Traffic and Reduction and Pedestrian Priority Programme), which will provide the transformational change to the way the streets look and feel.</p> <p>Leadenhall Street Traffic Management Measures has now been initiated as a discrete project to deliver traffic changes for pedestrian and cycling improvements, building on the feasibility modelling undertaken in the Healthy Streets Plan. Work on traffic management on St Mary Axe is also being progressed to deliver initial and longer-term changes and improvements for people walking and cycling.</p> <p>c. It will identify any initial delivery that can be undertaken to restrict traffic on streets where there will minimal/negligible impact on the rest of the network, before full implementation of the proposals that will provide a high-quality space for people walking, cycling and spending time.</p> <p>This has been considered alongside the constraints associated with large scale development in the area over the coming years, the inter-relation between City Cluster schemes and TfL’s scheme for Bishopsgate, and building on the temporary traffic restrictions that were implemented as part of the COVID-19 transport recovery measures. These were factored into the delivery plan within the Healthy Streets Plan, and now being taken forward in the Leadenhall Street and St Mary Axe projects.</p>
--	--

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

<p>17. Positive reflections</p>	<p>While the COVID-19 transport recovery measures delayed the project, it worked well to understand how these measures (that were similar to the proposals in the City Cluster Vision)</p>
--	--

	worked on the ground and it helped to progress how the proposals should develop going forward. Traffic modelling work was coordinated with the Bank proposals.
18.Improvement reflections	Generally, the project ran smoothly with the exception to the delay in the finalisation of the Healthy Streets Plan.
19.Sharing best practice	The Healthy Streets Plan will support the development of forthcoming traffic management projects in the City Cluster. It can also be used as a starting point for other Healthy Streets Plans identified for other areas of the Square Mile.
20.AOB	Link to Healthy Streets Plan: Appendix 2 Healthy Streets Plan.pdf (cityoflondon.gov.uk)

Appendices

Appendix 1	Finance Tables
-------------------	----------------

Contact

Report Author	Leah Coburn
Email Address	leah.coburn@cityoflondon.gov.uk