

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 7 March 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, 7 March 2023 at 2.15 pm

Present

Members:

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

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Tim Fletcher	- Town Clerk's Department
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Clarisse Tavin	- Environment Department
Samantha Tharme	- Environment Department
Kristian Turner	- Environment Department
George Wright	- Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Judith Pleasance.

Oliver Sells KC and Judith Pleasance observed the meeting virtually.

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

Deputy Lord declared an interest in Item 8 – Questions relating to matters in relation to the work of the Sub-Committee. In relation to the discussion on Arthur Street, they advised that they lived in the immediate vicinity. They advised that as a resident, they had not been consulted by TfL. Deputy Lord stated that they would not take part in the discussion on this item.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, That the public minutes of the meeting of 14 February 2023 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings.

Matters Arising

The Chairman reported that he and the Deputy Chairman had asked for a letter to be written from the Policy Chairman in relation to the proposal to stop the Number 11 bus route. Officers confirmed that this was being drafted. A Member stated that there was also a proposal to stop the Number 521 bus route. An Officer advised that there had been a report to the Sub-Committee towards the end of 2022 which detailed Transport for London's (TfL) list of implications and issues. Members requested that Officers ensure that the Number 521 bus route be included in the letter.

A Member stated that a TfL impact assessment was required as the bus routes were accessible and were used by people with disabilities and people with children in pushchairs and it could be difficult to use Bank Station, particularly at the weekends, when the lifts were closed. An Officer stated that TfL would be asked to explain their rationale so that representations could be made about the services that the City wanted retained. The Chairman asked Officers to summarise the outcome of the TfL consultation and circulate this to Members of the Sub-Committee.

4. **WEST SMITHFIELD AREA PUBLIC REALM AND TRANSPORTATION PROJECT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which was a Gateway 3 Issue Report updating the Sub-Committee on the project and requested authority to start the next stage of design – Stage 3.2 of the Public Realm and Transportation project around the Museum of London Site.

An Officer reported that works had been paused for further work on the Section 106 and associated Section 278 for the Museum of London. As a planning application had now been submitted and the Section 278 project had been agreed, authority was being sought to restart the project to ensure the Museum of London, Smithfield Meat Market and the public realm programmes aligned.

An Officer reported that stakeholder engagement would restart and a wider public consultation would take place. The Officer also reported that during the London Festival of Architecture in the summer, work would take place in relation to co-designing equity and inclusivity in the public realm.

A Member drew the Sub-Committee's attention to the list of consultees in the Officer's report and requested that the Smithfield Market Tenants Association be added to the list.

A Member asked for clarification on whether the summer activation and events could be funded from the On-Street Parking Reserve (OSPR). An Officer

responded that there were constraints on the use of the OSPR. The Foundation for Future London was funding the summer activation and events. There would be some work to support the viability of these events, and this component would be funded by the OSPR. A team of designers had been appointed following a design competition and the contract for the summer activities had been awarded to the Foundation for Future London. Officers would also be working with the Museum of London and there could be further funding from their budget, but it would not come from the specific Smithfield Public Realm Project budget.

A Member referenced the Sports Strategy, and requested that once approved, this be included in the Project Mission Statement.

A Member requested that the stakeholder engagement group consulted by Destination City, be added to the list of consultees.

RESOLVED, That the Sub-Committee

- 1) Note the updates from the work developed to date since last Committee Report;
- 2) Approve the budget of £70,000 for staff cost and £60,000 for fees to cover the next stage of the project;
- 3) Allocate £130,000 from OSPR from the £12m funding approved in principle for the project, subject to relevant approvals; and
- 4) Note the revised project budget of £1,405,014 (excluding risk), from the £12m estimated budget which is unchanged.

5. **MOORGATE CROSSRAIL STATION LINKS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on progress of each element of the project, the issues encountered and proposed next steps. The report also sought approval to draw down additional funds from the previously approved budget to enable further scheme development.

An Officer stated that the project had five interrelated areas as outlined in the Officer report. He advised that, to deliver high quality schemes in all five areas, a bid for additional funding from the On-Street Parking Reserve (OSPR) and/or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be submitted. If additional funding was not secured, value engineering methods could be used, e.g., lifting the old natural stone paving on the Eastern side of Moorgate and reusing the best paving stones. The Officer stated that it might not be possible to deliver certain elements of the scheme if additional funding was not obtained.

A Member asked for confirmation that the pedestrian overpass above Moor Lane would be included in the work. An Officer confirmed that these works would take place but a date was dependent on the progression of building work at 21 Moorfields. A Member stated that this delivery was a condition of 21 Moorfields being occupied.

A Member stated that the inclusion in the report of a map of the inter-related work areas would be useful. An Officer advised that there would be further reports on the specific schemes and drawings would be included in these.

A Member asked if it would be appropriate to combine the Finsbury Circus Western Arm project and the Finsbury Circus project rather than having two separate projects.

An Officer stated that currently work was taking place to secure funding for Finsbury Circus and progress with a contract for tenders. He advised that an appointment would take place in the next month and it would then be possible to look at timescales. He further advised that the Finsbury Circus project was being led by City Surveyors with a client whereas the Finsbury Circus Western Arm was an in-house project. Currently different drivers, technical complexities and programmes behind each project meant the schemes could not sensibly be combined at this stage.

An Officer stated that it was possible that in the future, the Finsbury Circus Western Arm be formally progressed at Gateway 5 through the Cool Streets and Greening Programme.

A Member suggested a table showing anticipated construction start dates, length of works and anticipated finishes would have been helpful. He stated that the Western Arm anticipated start date had been shown as Autumn 2023. He asked whether this was likely and whether the Western Arm would be open for the summer of 2024. An Officer stated that his was dependent on works to 84 Moorgate being completed. Officers had been advised these had been delayed and the developer would be in place until March 2024.

A Member asked which of the five projects outlined in the Officer report, was likely to be the first to be undertaken. An Officer stated that the first scheme was likely to be Ropemaker Street/Moorgate/South Place/Finsbury Pavement junction. Police approval had been given for the reconfigured police checkpoint and it was anticipated that TfL approval would be received soon. Islington Council were familiar with the preferred design but still had to give final approval. A Member asked if works could commence in 2023. An Officer stated that he would submit a Gateway 5 report to the Sub-Committee in the autumn but work was unlikely to start in 2023.

Members stated the importance of having a masterplan of the public realm, in its entirety and that this should include a plan.

RESOLVED, That the Committee

1. Note the progress made on the various elements of the project;
2. Note the revised timescales for Ropemaker Street junction improvements;
3. Approve the drawdown of £256,375 from the already agreed and secured funding allocation of £1,819,795 to continue the design development and assessment of each element of the project;

4. Approve a revised current project budget of £569,327 (including risk) as set out in appendix 2, table 2;
5. Approve the risk register in appendix 3 with the requested costed risk provision of £48,500, which is to be drawn down via delegation to Executive Director Environment;
6. Note the revised cost estimate of £430,022 for the 101 Moorgate Section 278 works, increasing the overall budget estimate by £30,022;
7. Note the intention to make further funding requests of an estimated £3.2 million to either the OSPR or CIL to progress elements of the work outlined in the Officer report and that this is reliant on further detailed work regarding feasibility.

6. **ANTI-TERRORISM TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided details of the Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order currently in place and recommended the continuing need for it to remain in place.

RESOLVED, That the Sub-Committee

Approve the continuation of the ATTRO subject to a further review in three years' time.

7. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Dockless Vehicles

The Chairman asked for an update on the dockless vehicles item and was advised that Officers had met separately with Lime and Human Forest and the operators had been asked to propose how they would better manage their service to set standards. An Officer advised that both providers were willing to negotiate, understood the problems being encountered and were sympathetic to high priority issues e.g., around fire escapes. They were both in agreement that they would do more to address these issues with their users. The Sub-Committee were informed that the operators had started banning frequent offenders from using the services and Officers had asked them for their records of this and the penalties issued. The next stage would be to draw up agreements around potential funding. A similar model as that for e-scooters was being suggested where there was a fee per deployment in the City which meant the numbers of bikes could be managed and accommodated appropriately. There were challenges in finding more spaces but the operators could also use deployment management to assist with this.

A Member stated that he understood that every borough had a slightly different contract with the operators. He suggested the City should work towards an individual agreement rather than wait for a London-wide agreement which could take some time. The Chairman stated that there could be difficulties with reaching a Pan-London agreement but as central London boroughs shared similar issues, it could be that a central London borough agreement could be reached. The Sub-Committee were advised that Westminster Council had recently introduced new methods to tackle issues. The Chairman asked Officers to report back to Members of the Sub-Committee on the measures being taken by Westminster Council. An Officer stated that whether a Pan-

London agreement or a more local immediate neighbours' agreement was reached, Officers were keen to continue with this approach. A member suggested that as Westminster and City shared an MP, concerns could be escalated through her.

Beech Street Consultation

An Officer advised that the Beech Street consultation had just been completed.

Bank Junction

The Chairman requested that the Wards be added to the Traffic Order Report before it was submitted to the Court of Common Council. He stated that it should be noted that some streets were shared by Wards and it was important that the right Members were engaged when proposals for changing traffic orders were explored. It was also acknowledged that Members from Wards on each side of a street could both have an interest even if only one side was proposed to have a traffic order.

RECEIVED.

8. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

A Member reported that there was TfL bus stop in King William Street that was moved to its current location whilst 33 King William Street was being built and while work was being undertaken on Arthur Street. The Member stated that its current location was inconvenient to road users and pedestrians. The Member requested that representation be made to return the bus stop to its previous location. Officers agreed to make representations to TfL.

A Member stated that TfL were undertaking consultation in relation to Arthur Street being closed to regular traffic and allowing cyclists to use it. An Officer stated that TfL were leading the consultation as they had the statutory duty to return the streets back to public use following their work. The Officer stated there were TfL junctions at the top and bottom of Arthur Street and as the street was a City street, TfL required the City's agreement to return the street to public use. Officers considered that a report should be submitted to the Sub-Committee and a recommendation made back to TfL as the City was fundamental to the decision. The Officer advised that the way the area was now operating had changed as there was previously a weight limit at the beginning of the north side of London Bridge and this led to Arthur Street being used as a through route prior to the work being started. This weight limit had now been removed but instead there was a traffic order from TfL to restrict traffic on London Bridge to buses and taxis. This would mean that if the traffic order continued, Arthur Street would not return to being used as a through route. Officers would submit a report to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee. Officers would discuss this with TfL to ensure that no action was taken until the City had considered this and responded. An Officer advised that until the shaft work had been completed, the other works could not progress.

A Member asked about how the works in Crutched Friars were progressing as residents were concerned about frequent gas leaks. An Officer stated that he

would raise this matter with the relevant Officers and provide Members with an update.

A Member commented that the signage in Hart Street required improving to avoid unnecessary reversing.

A Member referred to the trees at 22 Bishopsgate which were removed during the development but had not been replaced. An Officer stated that an update would be provided.

A Member raised concern that the lifts at Bank Station were closed at weekends which meant some people were unable to use the station. She stated that many people used this station as it was advertised as an accessible station and if it was not accessible at weekends, the notices should be updated. If it was possible to get the lifts working at weekends, this should be done.

A Member informed the Sub-Committee that in relation to Moor Lane there was an area called the pot garden which had been in the scope of the project but had now been removed. She requested that this be added back into the scope of the project. An Officer stated that Officers had concerns that it might not be possible to spend some of the Section 106 money on this area as it was in the Barbican Estate and this was being investigated. The Officer stated that she appreciated the disruption residents had experienced with 21 Moorfields and acknowledged that the scheme was launched in 2011 and was still not delivered. Officers were requested to ensure that the project information being presented was accurate and that the project was being moved forward as rapidly as possible.

A Member advised Officers about the lack of plants in two plant pots on the corner of Little Britain, Montague Street and King Edward Street. Officers would raise this with those responsible for the pots. The Officer stated that there had to be a balance in terms of the size of plants and trees and ensuring the plants thrived.

A Member referred to the Little Britain and Bart Square development. She reported that due to hard surfaces, noise was a problem. She suggested that trees be planted in pots to absorb some of the sound. A Member stated that using deliveries by electric vehicles could help to reduce noise. An Officer responded that the Transport Strategy was a broad document covering concerns such as these. He advised that often materials which led to less noise pollution were less affordable, harder to maintain and had a shorter lifespan so their use had to be carefully considered. The Officer stated that in the Transport Strategy refresh, issues such as communication, engagement and consolidation of deliveries for larger businesses, the impact of climate change and sustainability would be considered.

A Member stated the importance of having multi-level signage to indicate pedestrian walkways at higher levels. An Officer stated that there were previously multi-level isometric drawings on light boxes that helped people navigate to the Barbican upper tiers. The difficulties with these, were that every

time there was a major change, they became out of date. The Officer advised that with the Barbican Project there was the opportunity to discuss multi-level signage, costs and funding with the Barbican. The City of London Corporation had signed up to Legible London, the strategic signage strategy. A Member stated that proposed inserts for the light box signage had not materialised. The Chairman stated that using these could be a possible solution.

A Member asked a question about the status of the pedestrian walkway with the Smithfield shutdown. He raised concern that there was a blind corner and stated that the walkway should be reopened as soon as possible. An Officer stated that works were underway and Officers would request that the pedestrian walkway be reopened as soon as possible.

A Member asked about the way in which the works at Bank Junction were taking place and whether another method e.g., focusing on one or two locations at a time to complete them and reopen them more quickly, would minimise disruption. He also raised concern about the lack of signage showing the end state. An Officer stated that much consideration had gone into the way the works were being completed. The broad programme was to complete all the work that did not include pedestrianisation of Threadneedle Street before the Lord Mayor's Show in November 2023 and the full completion of work was scheduled for May 2024. Priority was being given to health and safety. There were constraints on working hours and noisy working hours with quiet work having to be undertaken around the noisy working hours, often at a different part of the junction. Members were informed that there were three teams working on the site and this was considered the optimal number. The current phase was the most complex and intensive and would last until June or July 2023. After that, the focus would be on the area outside Mansion House. As soon as an area was complete, it would be reopened. The Officer advised that there had been a delay with the hoardings but this had now been resolved and the hoardings should be in place by 17 March. Communication was taking place with nearby businesses to keep them informed and the hoardings would provide passers-by with details of how the junction would look once the work was complete.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer advised that a map of the various locations being worked on at Bank Junction could be provided to Members. This could detail when each location was scheduled to be completed and reopened. This could also be put on the Outstanding Actions list and reported on at each meeting until the work was complete.

A Member stated that cyclists were required to dismount and walk around the Bank Junction works for health and safety reasons. Recently more cyclists were dismounting.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis
Zoe.Lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk**