

# **STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 6 September 2022**

Minutes of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held at Committee Room 2 - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 6 September 2022 at 10.00 am

## **Present**

### **Members:**

Deputy Graham Packham (Chairman)  
Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Randall Anderson  
John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)  
Alderman Ian David Luder (Ex-Officio Member)  
Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)

### **Officers:**

Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Olumayowa Obisesan	- Chamberlain's Department
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Kristian Turner	- Environment Department
Tom Noble	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Jayne Moore	- Town Clerk's Department

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Deputy Susan Pearson, Judith Pleasance, Ian Seaton, and Oliver Sells QC.

## **2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were no declarations.

## **3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**, That the public minutes of the meeting of 05 July 2022 are an accurate record of the proceedings.

The Sub-Committee took the opportunity to express its gratitude to Leah Coburn who recently left the organisation and congratulated her on her valuable contribution to the work of the Corporation.

An update was given on the review of projects under way across the Corporation portfolio. The review was in response to significant medium-term financial pressures being raised with Members by the Chamberlain, and its aim was to focus on strengthening financial discipline, ensure funding allocations

are sufficient, and make sure that projects are aligned to the City's strategic priorities and essential activities.

All departments had been asked to provide summary information on each and every project within their remit, the only exceptions being projects funded by developer s278 contributions, Bridge House Estate projects, and those approaching Gateway 6 completion.

The summary information focused on inflationary impacts, costed risk, justification against corporate priorities, and implications of not progressing each project.

For Environment as a whole, that involved the submission of detailed information concerning 27 projects already past Gateway 5 and around 50 projects at a pre-G5 stage, the majority of which have been subject to past approval by either the Sub Committee or the Planning & Transportation Committee.

Each and every project within scope of the review is potentially at risk of being deferred, amended or halted if the information provided does not address the Corporation's concerns around inflationary impacts, prioritisation, and wider issues of affordability.

The reports before the Sub Committee today therefore fall into one of three categories:

- they concern non-project related issues
- they relate to projects funded through s278
- they concern projects in scope of the review but it has been agreed that the Sub Committee can consider them rather than wait for this review to be concluded because such a delay would have a material impact on that project.

In the event that the Sub Committee today agrees reports from that last category, they will still need to be approved under the review process in order to proceed.

Some less pressing Gateway reports have had to be deferred so that the project can be considered first under the review before the next Gateway can be reached.

Members noted that transport project funding sources were hypothecated, and noted that further information on the review criteria would be requested.

#### 4. **SALISBURY SQUARE DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY WORKS**

A Member commented that the project was s278 only in respect of the £100K fees involved and suggested that the project be referred to the Capital Buildings Board, particularly in view of the contentious nature of the project's process.

A Member commented that the Sub-Committee was considering the works in its capacity as a Highways Authority, and the meeting heard that the scope of this project was such that it would not go to the Capital Buildings Board.

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee:

1. Note that funding is subject to the capital programme review, and that the final decision on whether to proceed will be dependent on the outcome of that review and approval by the Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee.
  2. Approve the commencement of the project;
  3. Approve a budget of £100,000 (amount already received) for detailed design, engagement with stakeholders and survey work to reach the next gateway, as identified in **Appendix 2**;
  4. Authorise officers to agree the works with the City Corporation as the Developer; and
  5. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £3m-£4m (excluding risk).
5. **ST PAUL'S GYRATORY PROGRAMME G3**  
The meeting heard that the Amazon hub facility would not be progressed and that the application had been withdrawn.

A Member asked whether all possible modelling options had been considered, including Beech St options, and the meeting heard that other considerations would be taken into account given likely changes.

A Member sought clarification on the wider impact of service vehicles in the City, and commented that, realistically, minimal options were open given the developer funding available. The Member also asked whether funding might be available from other developers as a way of expanding the scheme. The meeting heard that no such funding had been sought so far, and that the modelling covered a wider area than was evident from the report. The meeting heard that a G4 report was expected in March 2023, at which point any developer contribution would be known.

The meeting heard that the area fell within a Business Improvement District and that dialogue around BID opportunities had been initiated.

A Member commented that a rat run could be created along Little Britain, and queried whether hospital access had been properly considered.

A Member commented that certainty on developer funding was needed.

A Member commented that there was mileage in exploring opportunities for further contributions in the event that Option 5 was taken.

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee:

1. Note the revised project budget of £1,235,942 (excluding risk);

2. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £10-22 million (excluding risk);
3. Agree that Options 1, 3 and 4 be approved for further assessment and progressed to Gateway 4; and
4. Note that funding is subject to the capital programme review, and that the final decision on whether to proceed will be dependent on the outcome of that review and approval by the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee.

## 6. TFL'S LONDON BRIDGE EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC RESTRICTION

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee:

- Agree the City Corporation's response to the London Bridge ETO as set out in paragraphs 21 – 22 and agree that officers will continue working with TfL to resolve the objection; and
- Delegate the final wording of the response to TfL to the Director of City Operations in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of this sub-committee.

## 7. BEECH STREET TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC REALM PROJECT

A Member commented that some compromise might be needed in order to avoid hostile relations with London Borough of Islington (LBI), and that hybrid vehicles were a step forward.

A Member commented that Option 1c was not a sensible option and was likely to be rejected, and asked whether the City could move to an area-wide consultation alongside 1c. The meeting heard that the intention was to engage on a wider area plan, though funding was uncertain.

Members reiterated that the options presented were subject to the agreement of LBI and that good relations with LBI were important, particularly in view of the fact that CoL and LBI wanted the same outcome. A Member asked for a timeline around the consultation, and the meeting heard that further discussions were expected to be completed by mid-October 2022 around the sub options set out under Option 1.

A Member asked whether it was just the Bunhill area that was concerned, and the meeting heard that though the Bunhill area was affected there was wider interest, commenting that there were probably more families in that area using schools and other family-related amenities than there were people concerned with vehicle access.

A Member commented that Options 1 and 2 were not mutually exclusive, though funding was an issue.

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee approve Option 1, as recommended, with a 4-week timetable for finalising the position with LBI. If no support from LBI is forthcoming for sub-option a or b, then a decision would be taken under Delegated Authority around option c. The Committee granted Delegated

Authority to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, who agreed that Members would be consulted outside the confines of the Committee once the discussions with LBI had concluded.

Option 1:

Undertake public consultation on a revised (permanent) zero emission scheme on Beech Street which includes three sub options, to be finalised as set out above following discussions with LBI:

- a) Closing Golden Lane to all motorised vehicles at the junction with Beech Street and installing a right-hand turn ban at the Fortune Street / Whitecross Street junction (subject to the agreement of LB Islington);
- b) Closing Golden Lane to non-zero emission vehicles at the junction with Beech Street and installing a right-hand turn ban at the Fortune Street / Whitecross Street junction (subject to the agreement of LB Islington).
- c) Keeping Golden Lane open at the junction with Beech Street to all vehicles. (Note that the left turn from Beech Street northbound into Golden Lane would only be available to zero emission vehicles).

## 8. **COMBINED SECTION 278 PROJECT INITIATION REPORT**

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee

1. Approve the project budgets as set out in the tables in Section 2; and
2. Note the total estimated costs of the projects (excluding risk) as set out in the Project Briefings.

## 9. **CITY CLUSTER HEALTHY STREETS PLAN - G6**

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee

1. Approve the content of the outcome report; and
2. Agree to close the project.

## 10. **PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY STREETS PROGRAMME - PHASE 1 (PROGRESS REPORT)**

The Committee discussed the Pedestrian Priority Streets Programme – Phase 1.

## 11. **BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS - ALL CHANGE AT BANK. G5 ISSUES REPORT**

A Member commented that the project needed to be progressed, and sought clarification on where any blockages might be - noting that delays would cost money. The meeting heard that the implementation programme was in two

phases around November 2022, with work to be started in early October 2022 and the majority of the work starting in mid-November 2022 after the Lord Mayor's Show, noting also that prices of materials should ideally be locked in as soon as possible.

The meeting heard that the Committee would write to the Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee to request confirmation that the project does not fall within their review scope.

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee

1. Note that funding is subject to the capital programme review and the final decision on whether to proceed will be dependent on the outcome of that review and approval by the Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee;
2. Note that the additional allocation from the Climate Action Strategy 'Cool Streets and Greening' programme of £165,000 (approved in February 2022) is added to the project budget to deliver (and maintain) the street trees and SUDS gardens in Queen Victoria Street and Threadneedle Street;
3. Note the revised Project Budget of £6,842,930 including risk (subject to recommendation 2 being approved) a. This is made up of £6,176,432 excluding risk, and the current risk provision of £666,498;
4. Note the minimum total estimated cost of the project to deliver the base scheme has increased to £6.17m (excluding risk);
5. Note that the Costed Risk provision is drawn down by £423,502 from risk 16 to cover the estimated uplift in the costed base project. a. The remaining risk provision of £276,498 against risk 16 will remain in the register to protect from any further increase in material or labour cost during the construction that is currently unknown (including for security aspects within the design);
6. Note that a revised total for the Costed Risk Provision of £666,498 is approved and to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer, (of which £562,598 is currently funded (see section 3));
7. Agree to delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to accept additional funding into the project (that is outside of the capital funding remit) to deal with the currently unfunded S106 shortfall of £103,900 as it is within the existing agreed overall project total;
8. Agree that in principle (subject to the Chamberlain's agreement of the future staff overhead calculation methodology) the funding released from this revised calculation should in this instance be retained within the project budget to cover items detailed in paragraph 26;
  - a) And that the budget adjustment be delegated to the Executive Director Environment and the Chamberlain, if agreed, to action once the details of the split of funding against the various tasks has been fully identified;
9. Note that the public realm priorities in Table 2 are approved; and
10. Note the change in the estimated construction programme to completion in Spring 2024, with Gateway 6 likely to be Autumn 2025

## 12. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Committee noted the report of the Clerk.

13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

A Member commented that signage should be arranged for Barbican Podium in view of the new public realm landscaping, and that further exploration of that issue would take place.

14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

15. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**, That the public be excluded in line with the wording set out in the agenda documentation.

**The meeting ended at 11.45am**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Jayne Moore**  
**Jayne.Moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk**