

Committee(s): Streets and Walkways Sub Committee	Dated: 17/01/23
Subject: Traffic Order Review – Phase 2 Update	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 9, 11, 12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Y
If so, how much?	£500,000
What is the source of Funding?	On Street Parking Reserve
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	Y
Report of: Juliemma McLoughlin, Executive Director Environment	For Decision
Report author: Clive Whittle, Environment Department	

Summary

In line with approved methodology, the Traffic Order Review is proceeding in three stages.

- Stage 1 – Compile an index of all experimental and permanent traffic management orders (TMOs)
- Stage 2 – Review TMOs and measures using the outputs from the data collection exercise and against the outcomes of the Transport Strategy
- Stage 3 – Implementation of any modifications identified

Stage 1 was completed in September 2022. In September and October 2022, the Planning & Transportation Committee and the Court of Common Council agreed to the broad methodology and process to be followed for Stage 2 of the review.

In November 2022, the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee agreed the detailed scoring approach that would be used to rank measures against various policy and transport metrics. This scoring approach seeks to ensure a thorough, methodical, and consistent approach to reviewing TMOs across the city.

The scoring against Transport Strategy outcomes for each category of TMO is provided in Appendix 1. Members are asked to agree this.

Stage 2 is split into two phases. Stage 2a involves a desktop review of all non-excluded TMOs whilst Stage 2b will involve site visits and further interrogation of a short list of the highest-ranking measures.

Stage 2a is now complete with 1299 orders and measures scored and ranked. It is recommended that the 75 highest-ranking measures are progressed to Stage 2b for further investigation. These are highlighted in Appendix 2. The outcome of these investigations will inform the final recommendations to the Planning & Transportation Committee in March and the Court of Common Council in April.

Recommendation(s)

Members of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee are asked to:

- Agree the scoring against Transport Strategy outcomes for each category of traffic order, as detailed in Appendix 1.
- Note the outcome of the Stage 2a desktop review, which has ranked every TMOs and measures as detailed in Appendix 2.
- Agree to progress the 75 highest-ranking TMOs and measures for further investigation during Stage 2b, as outlined in paragraph 12 and highlighted in Appendix 2.

Main Report

Background

1. In May 2022, following a motion passed by the Court of Common Council in April, officers were tasked by the Planning & Transportation Committee with reviewing all Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) in the City. The review follows the approved three stage approach.
 - Stage 1 – Compile an index of all experimental and permanent traffic orders
 - Stage 2 – Review TMOs using the outputs from the data collection exercise and against the outcomes of the Transport Strategy
 - Stage 3 – Implementation of any modifications identified
2. In September and October 2022, the Planning & Transportation Committee and Court of Common Council agreed the broad methodology for Stage 2. Members also agreed the following categories of TMOs would be excluded from the review:
 - Experimental Orders
 - Disabled, Doctor's, and Diplomatic parking bays
 - Streets with only double yellow line restrictions
 - TMOs which enable the creation of traffic free public spaces
3. Members agreed to extend the deadline to complete the TMO review from December 2022 to March 2023, with a final report to the Court of Common Council in April 2023. This was to allow more time for officers to complete the review, given the size of the task involved, and to give the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee the opportunity to scrutinise the review process.
4. Stage 2 of the TMO review is split into two parts. Stage 2a involved a desktop review of all non-excluded orders and measures, assessing them against the agreed scoring criteria. Stage 2b will involve site visits and further interrogation of those measures that ranked highest in Stage 2a. This will identify TMOs that may require amending, revoking or further review. The outcomes of Stage 2b will be reported to the Planning & Transportation Committee in March and the Court of Common Council in April.

5. In November, Members of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee approved the scoring approach to be used for Stage 2a. This included using a red/amber/green (RAG) status to score each category of TMO against the Transport Strategy outcomes.
6. All categories of TMO were found to support at least one Transport Strategy outcome (Green, weighted 0). Most orders also have a partial positive or negative impact on one or more outcomes (Amber, weighted 2). None were considered to go against any outcome (Red, weighted 5). Grey (weighted 0) scores were used to indicate when a category of order has no impact or influence on a particular outcome.
7. Members are asked to review and agree this scoring which is provided in Appendix 1. If any changes are required, these will be incorporated immediately following Committee and the list of highest-ranking measures updated to reflect any changes to ranking that may result.

Current Position

8. Stage 2a is now complete with 1299 TMOs and measures scored and ranked (Appendix 2).
9. The scoring used the agreed approach of weighted red/amber/green (RAG) statuses. Red is given the highest score and indicates disagreement with a policy outcome or a high potential negative impact on the efficiency or accessibility of the street network. Green is given the lowest score and indicates support for a policy outcome or a very low potential negative impact on the efficiency or accessibility of the street network. The full criteria for scoring and ranking TMOs is detailed in Appendix 3.
10. Due to data and processing time limitations, some measures and orders were aggregated during the scoring process. For instance, if multiple loading and waiting restrictions or measures exist on a single street these measures have all been attributed the same weighted score.
11. Final scores have been calculated by totalling the weighted scores and ranking each individual or aggregated order or measure from “worst” (highest numerical score) to “best” (lowest numerical score). These highest-ranking orders are those that:
 - are least in alignment with relevant Transport Strategy outcomes, which also align with the Climate Action Strategy and Destination City initiative
 - may have a negative impact on the efficiency or accessibility of the street network
 - are nearby or on streets with high numbers of collisions
 - are on streets that have been mentioned through public, stakeholder and Member engagement activities
12. It is proposed that the 75 highest-ranking orders and measures are progressed through to Stage 2b. This is considered to be an appropriate balance between capturing the “worst” performing TMOs and measures and ensuring that Stage

2b review can be completed by mid-February in order to meet the reporting deadlines for the Planning & Transportation Committee in March.

13. We are currently liaising with WSP to understand the costs and resources required to review this number of measures in such a short time. It may not be possible to fully complete this exercise between now and mid-February, in which case we will report on all measures and orders that have been reviewed and provide a timeline for completing the review of any remaining measures.
14. This approach ensures resources and time available are used in the most efficient and cost-effective manner; focussing detailed review and analysis on those measures which are likely to be most in need of changes to improve their operation.
15. We have requested but have not yet received details of all Transport for London (TfL) TMOs that apply to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) in the City. We are continuing to chase this information from TfL and once received this will go through the Stage 2a desktop review process.
16. If received in time, the outcomes of this exercise will be reported in March, with details of any orders or measures that we recommend TfL review. The City Corporation has no powers to implement or make changes to traffic orders on the TLRN or to direct TfL to do so.

Public and member feedback

17. Feedback was gathered through a public survey of 1000 City of London workers, residents, students and visitors.
18. The streets highlighted through the survey and included in the scoring are listed in Appendix 4. Survey respondent feedback was not specific to individual orders or measures. Any relevant feedback was applied at a street level to all orders or measures on the primary street mentioned in each response.
19. In December, all Members were asked to highlight any issues relating to traffic management to help identify traffic orders that might require further review.
20. Three Members provided feedback. In summary, comments related to:
 - The need to review any streets that have plastic wands
 - The need to start with the assumption that all potential road users deserve access unless there is a clear reason to exclude or restrict them
 - The safety of contra-flow cycling on Rood Lane, Mincing Lane and Philpot Lane.
21. As the first two comments did not refer to specific locations these were scored for all streets with wands (except those under experimental traffic orders) and all streets with access restrictions. The measures enabling contraflow cycling on Rood Lane, Mincing Lane and Philpot Lane have been scored accordingly.

Next Steps

22. Subject to Member approval, the detailed Stage 2b investigation of the 75 highest-ranking measures will be undertaken in January and February.
23. A final report with the list of TMOs and measures to be amended, revoked and/or requiring further review will be brought to the Planning & Transportation Committee in March and to the Court of Common Council in April.
24. Throughout Stage 2 we are also seeking to identify opportunities where TMOs and measures could be amended to better support Transport Strategy outcomes irrespective of overall final scores. For example, the timed access restriction on Bow Lane scores well against the Transport Strategy outcomes but could potentially be improved by extending the hours of operation. These opportunities will be included in the final report to the Planning & Transportation Committee and the Court of Common Council.

Corporate and Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

25. The traffic order review will take account of the Corporate Plan, Transport Strategy and Climate Action Strategy as well as other relevant strategies and initiatives including Destination City.
26. The results of data collection, analysis and engagement will also be used to inform the ongoing reviews of the Transport Strategy and City Plan.

Financial implications

27. Revenue funding from the On-Street Parking Reserve has been agreed with the Chamberlain to support this review. A budget of up to £500,000 has been allocated to cover the costs of data collection and analysis, engagement, and consultancy support required. £268,000 has been spent or committed so far.
28. Additional funding may be required at the end of this review process to deliver any changes to traffic orders or new orders (Stage 3 of the review) which will need to be progressed as separate projects. Depending upon the changes required, this may require a request for funding through the annual capital bid process.

Resource implications

29. Resources for managing the review process can be accommodated within the Transport Strategy and Network Performance teams. Some prioritisation of existing activity may be required but we do not expect a significant impact on delivery of Transport Strategy and Climate Action Strategy projects and initiatives. WSP will continue to conduct the review and support data analysis.

Legal implications

30. There are no legal implications during Stages 1 and 2 of the review. Any changes proposed to be promoted during Stage 3 will be subject to the usual statutory due process for authorising, making and consulting on traffic orders and considering of any objections. Legal review of large numbers of orders may require additional legal resource.

Risk implications

31. There are no significant risks for Stages 1 and 2 of the review. The process of making a traffic order is open to legal challenge, including via judicial review. The risks of legal challenge will be considered during Stage 3.
32. The review considers the effect of traffic orders on measures to mitigate the following Corporate and Departmental risks:
 - CR30 – Climate Action
 - CR21 – Air Quality
 - ENV-CO-TR 001 – Road Safety

Equalities implications

33. Equalities implications are considered throughout the review process. Stages 1 and 2 do not require an Equalities Impact Assessment, since there will be no actual changes made. Changes to be delivered during Stage 3 may be subject to Equalities Impact Screening and Assessments.

Climate implications

34. The traffic order review takes account of the Climate Action Strategy and may identify opportunities to further support delivery of the transport elements of the strategy. Where applicable, any further climate implications will be reported at Stage 3.

Security implications

35. Some traffic orders have been made to enable the delivery of security measures. Any security implications identified in the review process will be set out in reports as non-public appendices and if necessary, excluded from the review process.

Conclusion

36. Stage 2a of the traffic order review has now been completed and it is recommended that the top 75 highest-ranking measures will now be investigated further.
37. The review remains on track to submit a final report with the list of TMOs and measures to be amended, revoked and/or requiring further review to the Planning & Transportation Committee in March and to the Court of Common Council in April.

38. During the recent engagement a Member highlighted specific concerns about the safety of contra-flow cycle lanes on Rood Lane, Mincing Lane and Philpot Lane. Only the one-way street order for Philpot Lane is included in the highest-ranked orders. Rood Lane and Mincing Lane will not be reviewed further as part of this exercise. Officers will review these separately in the same way as we would usually review issues raised at any time by Members or the public.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Scoring of TMO categories against Transport Strategy outcomes.
- Appendix 2 – Full ranked list of reviewed measures
- Appendix 3 – Criteria for scoring and ranking TMOs
- Appendix 4 – Streets highlighted in public survey responses

Background Papers

- [Report to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, 08/11/22, agenda item 12](#)
- [Report to the Court of Common Council, 13/10/22 agenda item 10](#)
- [Report to the Planning and Transportation Committee, 20/09/22 agenda item 5](#)
- [Report to the Planning and Transportation Committee, 17/05/2022, agenda Item 6](#)
- [Minute of Motion passed by the Court of Common Council \(page 20\), 21/04/2022](#)
- [City of London Transport Strategy](#) (pdf)

Clive Whittle

Senior Design Engineer, Environment Department

T: 07706 000 265

E: clive.whittle@cityoflondon.gov.uk