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

# Tuesday, 17 January 2023

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, 17 January 2023 at 1.45 pm

#### Present

#### Members:

Deputy Graham Packham (Chairman) John Edwards (Deputy Chairman) Deputy Shravan Joshi Deputy Randall Anderson Deputy Marianne Fredericks Alderwoman Susan Pearson Ian Seaton Alderman Ian David Luder (Ex-Officio Member)

#### Officers:

Ian Hughes Gillian Howard Kristian Turner Melanie Charalambous **Clarisse Tavin** Tom Noble **Michelle Ross** Samantha Tharme Emmanuel Ojugo Bruce McVean Giles Radford Jayne Moore Olumayowa Obisesan Maria Herrera Daniel Laybourn Mark Lowman Zoe Lewis

- Environment Department
- Town Clerk's Department
- Environment Department
- Environment Department
- Environment Department
- City Surveyor
- Town Clerk's Department

# 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Judith Pleasance and Oliver Sells KC. Paul Martinelli observed the meeting via video-conferencing facilities.

# 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 08 November 2022 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings subject to the following change to the minutes in respect of item 6:

from

"The meeting heard that there were a few playgrounds in the City already."

to:

"The meeting noted that there was a single playground in the City."

4. 40 LEADENHALL STREET SECTION 278 HIGHWAY WORKS (INCLUDING DEFERRED WORKS FROM THE 52-54 LIME STREET S278), 10 FENCHURCH AVE S278 PROJECTS, AND 51 LIME ST S106 PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS

The Committee considered the following reports together: 40 Leadenhall Street Section 278 highway works (including deferred works from the 52-54 Lime Street S278 and 10 Fenchurch Avenue S278 projects); and 51 Lime Street S106 public realm enhancements – outstanding work.

A Member queried the £1.2M costings figure and asked whether there was money still to spend. The meeting heard that the initial figure was an estimate range and that the current more detailed estimate was robust. It was confirmed that no money was being returned to the developer at this time.

A Member asked why only a part of the pavement was being taken over (according to the plans submitted). The meeting heard that the amended land adoption was negotiated with the developer and that the developer was being charged under a commuted maintenance sum for its future maintenance, therefore there was no financial risk to the City under the current plans.

A Member asked whether there would be any discernible difference in the surface finishings of the roadway and/or footway either side of the lines shown on the plans. The meeting heard that different building materials were expected to be used, and there would be clear delineation between the two.

A Member asked for further information on the methodology used in drawing up the table on p.25 of the main agenda pack to be submitted to the Grand Committee and to the forthcoming awayday. A Member asked whether a cleansing arrangement could be agreed with a building owner/developer (particularly for cleaning up when people have been unwell on private land), noting the difficulties of asking the building's owner to maintain and cleanse the area. The meeting noted that such arrangements and requests presented a challenge, and that discussions were ongoing and needed to take into account elements of privately-owned infrastructure (such as rising bollards). The Committee noted that a Late Night Levy was already in place in respect of licensed premises.

# **RESOLVED,** That the Committee

- 1. Note and approve the contents of the reports and the intention to complete outstanding works;
- Approve an increase in the approved budget of £995,111 (an increase of £895,111, excluding costed risk and commuted maintenance) to reach Gateway 6;
- 3. Approve the Risk Register in Appendix 2 and the requested Costed Risk Provision of £190,000, and approve delegation to the Executive Director Environment to authorise the drawdown of funds from this register;
- 4. Note the Commuted Maintenance sum of £47,135;
- Note the revised total project cost of £1,232,246 inclusive of costed risk and commuted maintenance; 52-54 Lime Street and 10 Fenchurch Avenue S278 projects;
- Approve that the previously approved works from 52-54 Lime Street and 10 Fenchurch Avenue projects which were deferred (as shown in Appendix 4 and 5 respectively) will be delivered using their existing funding alongside the improvements around 40 Leadenhall Street;
- 7. Approve the budget adjustment for the 10 Fenchurch Avenue S278 project as shown in Appendix 6;
- 8. Note that the associated remaining budget is sufficient to complete the 52-54 Lime Street S278 work; and
- 9. Approve the additional tree-planting and budget adjustment in respect of 51 Lime St as set out in Appendix 1 to the 51 Lime St report to enable the works to proceed.

# 5. 100 MINORIES PHASE TWO: PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

A Member asked for further clarification on the permeable paving to be used that limited water going into drains. The meeting heard that the paving would be bound gravel that was currently being tested at Cheapside and Bevis Marks, noting that the associated additional maintenance costs had been factored in. A Member commented on the potential for that material to be hazardous in wet and cold weather.

# **RESOLVED**, That the Committee

- Approve the additional budget of £49,500 to reach Gateway 5 Authority to Start Work, funded from S106 receipts as detailed in Appendix 2;
- Approve the revised total estimated cost range (excluding risk) of £900,00 £1,150,000, with the additional costs to be funded from S106 receipts, as detailed in Appendix 2;
- 3. Delegate approval of Costed Risk Provision to Chief Officer if one is sought at Gateway 5; and
- 4. Approve the statutory consultation on proposed traffic management changes as set out in Appendix 6.

# 6. CANNON STREET PEDESTRIAN CROSSING - BSCU

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

# **RESOLVED**, That the Committee

 Authorise officers to negotiate and enter into a S278 agreement with TfL, to implement the proposal as detailed in the report, noting that all costs associated with the project will be fully funded by TfL and noting also that this authority must be given by the Streets and Walkways Subcommittee and that all other requested decisions (below) be delegated to the Director of City Operations Division:

#### Decisions Delegated to Director of City Operations Division:

- 2. Agree the proposal as detailed in this report;
- 3. Approve a budget of £175,000 to reach the next Gateway;
- 4. Note the total estimated cost of the project as £175,000 (excluding risk). All costs associated with this project are to be fully funded by TfL; and
- 5. Approve a Costed Risk Provision of £15,000 for works (to be drawn down via delegation to the Director of City Operations Division).

# 7. CITY GREENING AND BIODIVERSITY - PHASE 3 OF THE COOL STREETS AND GREENING PROGRAMME

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

#### **RESOLVED**, That the Committee

- 1. Approve the proposals for re-landscaping and re-planting strategically located sites in the City to reach Gateway 5 as described in the report;
- Approve the additional budget of £95,000 for design development of the re-landscaping and re-planting proposals to reach the next Gateway, funded from the On Street Parking Reserve (OSPR) Climate Action Strategy funding agreed for the Cool Streets and Greening programme;
- Note that the tree-planting proposals have already been approved at Gateway 5 at a total estimated cost of £755,000 (excluding risk) and are to be implemented across the next two planting seasons; and

- 4. Note the total estimated cost of the project (Phase 3) at £2.5m (excluding risk).
- 8. CITY CLUSTER VISION WELL-BEING & CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE PROGRAMME: JUBILEE GARDENS IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

**RESOLVED,** That the Committee

- 1. Agree authorisation to implement the Jubilee Gardens relandscaping works as set out in Appendix 3;
- Approve an increase in the project budget of £80,000 to a total cost of £680,000 (excluding risk) to be funded from 60-70 St Mary Axe (S106), 40 Leadenhall Street (S106 LCEIW), Cool Streets & Greening Programme (OSPR) funding breakdown is set out in Appendix 5;
- Approve a Costed Risk Provision of £95,000 (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer) funded by 40 Leadenhall Street (S106 LCEIW), taking the total budget (including risk) to £775,000;
- 4. Agree that the Comptroller and City Solicitors Department are permitted to finalise all necessary legal agreement amendments to facilitate the implementation of relandscaping works to Jubilee Gardens; and
- 5. Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Environment and Chamberlain to adjust the project budget between staff costs, fees and works, provided the overall budget is not exceeded beyond standard tolerances (inclusive of interest accrued to date).

# 9. DOCKLESS CYCLES POLICY AND LEGAL POWERS UPDATE

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

The Committee noted that a co-ordinated penalty arrangement was desirable to deal with misuse of bikes, noting also the relative paucity of parking spaces in the west part of the City. The Committee heard that bike parking provision was to be improved.

Noting the disparity in operators' performance and the recommendation to extend Lime's review period in the light of that, the Committee discussed means of enforcement and the following points were made:

- Bikes (and e-scooters) tend to fall over when parked
- It is incumbent on operators to ensure that bikes are parked safely, particularly in respect of pavement-users with disabilities and those using wheelchairs and buggies
- Operators already fine users who do not park the bikes properly, though some users appear to be indifferent to these charges
- Approaches vary across neighbouring boroughs on enforcement, and it would be resource-intensive to co-ordinate any such measure
- There is scope for enhancing sanctions for misuse, and it would be desirable for the Corporation to work constructively with operators on the issue.

# **RESOLVED**, That the Committee

- 1. Agree to continue to approve dockless cycle hire operators in the City, renewing HumanForest's status and extending the review period on Lime's approval status until May 2023 (Option 2, paragraphs 39 to 45); and
- Delegate powers relating to changes to the structure of voluntary financial contributions from dockless cycle hire operators to the Executive Director Environment in consultation with the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of the Planning & Transportation Committee and the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.

# 10. FLEET STREET AREA HEALTHY STREETS PLAN

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

# **RESOLVED**, That the Committee

- Approve that the budget be increased by £35,000 to £276,254 (excluding risk) as set out in Appendix 3, following the receipt of the funding from the Fleet Street Quarter BID;
- 2. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £276,254 (excluding risk);
- 3. Approve the draft Healthy Streets plan for public consultation; and
- 4. Delegate authority to the Director of City Operations, in consultation with the Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, to approve the (non-statutory) public consultation content and then proceed with the consultation.

# 11. MUSEUM OF LONDON S278 PROJECT

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

**RESOLVED**, That the Committee

- 1. Approve a budget of £100,000 to reach the next Gateway, when received from the developer;
- Note the total estimated cost of the project at £5-£10M (excluding risk) at this preliminary stage;
- 3. Authorise officers to enter into a Section 278 agreement with the developer at the appropriate time; and
- 4. Delegate authority to the Chief Officer, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to increase and/or adjust the project budget for the Design and Evaluation phase if - following initial Design and Evaluation work further investigation is deemed necessary to complete the phase (to be carried out at the Developer's cost).

#### 12. VISION ZERO PLAN 2023 - 2028

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

A discussion ensued, during which the following points were made:

- Proper enforcement of any further speed limit is critical, otherwise the benefit of any speed limit is reduced;
- Lower speed limits reduce the incidence of serious injury in the event of a collision;
- Consistent speed limits across boroughs would be welcome;
- A cyclist can reasonably expect to travel at 15mph (the proposed new speed limit);
- Speed-limiting devices are currently fitted to about a third of TfL buses travelling through the City;
- It is important for the City to continue to be accessible to vehicles, particularly for businesses;
- Further focus on safe behaviours would be welcome (encompassing cyclist, pedestrian and driver behaviours);
- Further low-tech measures (including refuges and traffic-calming) are worth considering; and
- There are fewer pedestrian barriers and more dropped kerbs in the City than there used to be, which has altered the pedestrian environment.

A Member disagreed with elements of the draft Plan, noting the change of classification of serious injury and the negative cumulative effect to the City of the action points, including speed reductions that could negatively impact vehicle movement.

A Member asked whether estimates were available to support a reduction from 20mph to 15mph. The Committee heard that such figures were not currently available and heard that research strongly suggested that speed reductions reduced injuries. The Committee asked for further data on the impact of a reduction from 20mph to 15mph.

**RESOLVED,** That the Committee agree with the recommendation to progress the draft Vision Zero Plan to the Police Authority Board and to the Planning & Transportation Committee for further consideration, noting the points made above.

# 13. SPECIAL EVENTS ON THE HIGHWAY

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

A Member commented that Sunday closures were likely to impact on congregations attending places of worship. The meeting heard that the matter had been taken into consideration, particularly in respect of the impact of event

closures on the churches of St Bride's and St Magnus-the-Martyr (among others).

On the Sports Strategy (paragraph 22) a Member expressed concern that any consultation appeared more formal in nature than was actually the case. The meeting heard that the view would be fed back to the forum, and that formal engagement was desirable.

On appendix 4, a Member queried the accuracy of the parking suspension figures in respect of the St Matthew's Day Parade of 06 October 2022, noting that a corrected version would be circulated within the next week.

The meeting heard that Destination City had recently proposed a reconstituted St Bartholomew's Fair in September 2023.

#### **RESOLVED,** That the Committee

- 1. Agree to support the regular core events programme listed in paragraph 7 and detailed in Appendix 1;
- Agree to support the additional one-off events outlined in paragraphs 14-22, subject to final assessment regarding safety, licencing, traffic orders (where required) and impact on local stakeholders; and
- 3. Note the benefits in kind listed in Appendix 4, subject to a correction of the error shown in respect of parking suspension figures against the event of 06 October 2022.

#### 14. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

The Committee noted the report of the Clerk.

TfL London Bridge Experimental Scheme: A response to the consultation has now been provided, and the item has been removed from the list.

#### 15. TRAFFIC ORDER REVIEW - PHASE 2 UPDATE

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director, Environment.

A Member sought clarification on the status of Bishopsgate as part of the review.

The meeting heard that Bishopsgate was part of the TfL network, and that no information had yet been provided by TfL on the status of Bishopsgate as part of TfL's Traffic Orders. Recommendations based on that information could be submitted to the Committee once that information had been provided. The previously-agreed experimental scheme at Bishopsgate would not be covered by the review as such a scheme is subject to review by its nature.

Referencing paragraphs 13 and 14, a Member noted the resources dedicated to the exercise so far, commenting on the benefit of collating the information contained in the report.

A Member suggested that a note be written to Members outlining the current report contents offering the option of accessing the report submitted to this Committee in order to give Common Councillors the opportunity to properly scrutinise the report.

The Committee noted that the report was expected to be submitted to the Planning & Transportation Committee in March 2023, and then to the Court of Common Council.

#### **RESOLVED**, That the Committee

- 1. Agree the scoring against Transport Strategy outcomes for each category of traffic order, as detailed in Appendix 1;
- 2. Note the outcome of the Stage 2a desktop review, which has ranked all TMOs and measures as detailed in Appendix 2; and
- 3. 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.

# 16. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

Referencing Moor Lane environmental enhancements considered by the Committee in July 2022, a Member commented that the scheme may not have been considered in its entirety, expressing concerns around the delays (to September 2023) and asking whether the west side of the street would be completed. The Member sought clarification on whether a small area had been taken out of scope.

The Committee noted that the process had been ongoing since at least 2012, and that any further consultation might benefit from being more user-friendly.

The Committee heard that communication on delays with the developer was ongoing, and that the Corporation had no control over those delays. A further report was expected to be submitted to the Committee on the scheme during the first half of 2023 that would take into account the feedback received, and the aim was to ensure that all the work ran concurrently to reduce disruption.

A Member asked who was meeting the costs of these delays, noting that a firm line should be taken on asking for developer funding if the developer was the cause of the delay. The meeting heard that the developer was funding all eastside works and that the current agreement did not provide for developer funding of delays to the west-side works, noting that the cost of the west-side works still fell within the budget envelope due to changes made to the programme, though there were other reasons for the delay.

On the bus review, a Member asked whether a view had been expressed on the number 11 bus, noting that the local MP was running a campaign to keep it going. The meeting heard that a consultation had taken place, and that no view had formally been taken beyond that noting also that a different route was being re-named to 11.

# 17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

A question was asked by a Member on the process around the proposed closure of West Smithfield Road, noting the disruption that such a closure

would cause. The Member asked whether the correct consultation procedure had been followed.

The meeting noted that temporary traffic orders to facilitate temporary works (that can last up to 18 months) are governed by a different process to the one that governs permanent or experimental traffic orders. Temporary orders are required to be advertised in the press (once their suitability, impact and appropriateness has been considered), and the City of London also usually issues local notices though that is not a requirement. The standard process requires the developer (the applicant) to undertake local engagement with affected stakeholders. The City heard that surrounding streets would be kept open to facilitate movement through the area, and that recent restrictions nearby would not affect the Smithfield area.

A Member sought clarification on the status of Giltspur St, and the meeting heard that Giltspur St was part of the 'ring of steel' and that changes in the area were likely to involve further security infrastructure.

The meeting heard that further (and permanent) road-strengthening, waterproofing and road-rebuilding work was required. Two meetings with the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association on the issue took place during the final quarter of 2022 during which it had become clear that the original 12-week closure was likely to be extended, though it appeared likely that a single carriageway could be open in May 2023 assuming a road closure as of mid-January 2023.

A Member noted that road closure details and maps were helpful, noting that the website updates were now available at <u>Road closures - City of London</u>, and that work was ongoing to make a live map available.

#### 18. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Committee agreed to exclude the public from the Non-Public part of the meeting in line with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

#### 19. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the meeting of 08 November 2022.

# 20. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

The Committee received the report of the Clerk.

# 21. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

#### 22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

# The meeting ended at 4.10 pm

Chairman

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