

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Committees:</b><br>Streets & Walkways Sub Committee ( <i>for decision</i> )<br>Operational Property and Projects Sub ( <i>for decision</i> ) | <b>Dates:</b><br>23 May 2023<br>05 June 2023                       |
| <b>Subject:</b> St. Paul's gyratory project – Phase 1<br><br><b>Unique Project Identifier:</b> 113377   | <b>Gateway 4:<br/>Detailed Options<br/>Appraisal<br/>(Complex)</b> |
| <b>Report of:</b><br>Executive Director Environment<br><br><b>Report Author:</b><br>George Wright, City Operations                              | <b>For Decision</b>  |
| <h1>PUBLIC</h1>   |  |

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>1. Status update</b> | <p><b>Project Description:</b> The project aims to transform the streets and public realm between the old Museum of London site and St. Paul's Underground station through the partial removal of the 1970's gyratory. It is a priority project for delivery by 2030 in the City's Transport Strategy.</p> <p>The project is split into two phases. Phase 1 covers the project area to the south of the rotunda roundabout. Phase 2 focuses on highway changes on the roundabout and is awaiting the outcome of the Museum of London/Bastion House redevelopment which is currently at pre-application stage. This report relates to Phase 1 only.</p> <p><b>Current status:</b> This is a Gateway 4 report that seeks to agree to progress the design of one highway layout option and associated public space improvements to public consultation.</p> <p>Positive progress has been made since the Gateway 3 report in September 2022 where Members approved the recommendation that three concept design options should be further developed and assessed. All three options remove the gyratory system to some degree and create a new public space. Option 1 delivers the largest new public space with the closure of the southern section of King Edward Street and the closure of the Newgate Street slip road. The other options deliver a smaller public space through the closure of the Newgate Street slip road only.</p> |
|-------------------------|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Comprehensive traffic modelling is progressing with Transport for London to assess the impact of the proposed options on buses and the wider highway network. To date, this indicates that all three options are forecast to have an acceptable impact in traffic terms, although modelling suggests option 2 has an overall impact on bus journey times which is likely to be unacceptable to TfL Buses.</p> <p>A public engagement exercise took place during December and January. The exercise was publicised via a press release and social media including the City Corporation's Twitter feed. Stakeholders on the projects database were contacted and all properties within the project consultation area were sent a letter and asked to give their views. Over 2,500 people participated, with strong support given for the proposed public space on King Edward Street and for measures to improve the environment for people walking and cycling.</p> <p>Respondents had the opportunity to select features they would like to see in any new public space, with greening and seating receiving overwhelming support. This feedback has assisted the consultants appointed to prepare the concept design proposal for the new public space. Responses received have also helped inform changes to the design options for the wider project area. Liaison has also continued with key local stakeholders such as the Cheapside Business Alliance, St. Paul's Cathedral and Bart's Hospital. Discussions have also been held with colleagues working on Destination City and will continue.</p> <p>Negotiations with the developer of 81 Newgate Street regarding a voluntary financial contribution towards the project are ongoing and details of the outcome are contained in the non-public Appendix 2.</p> <p><b>RAG Status:</b> Green (Amber at last report to Committee)</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Medium (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> £15-17 million (phase 1 only).</p> <p><b>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> No change, within cost range provided at last Committee.</p> <p><b>Spend to Date:</b> £900,459.</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Slippage:</b> No</p> |
| <p><b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b></p> | <p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 4B (Court of Common Council) and Gateway 4C (Streets &amp; Walkways).</p> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <p>Members of <b>Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee</b> are asked to:</p>   |

1. Approve the progression of Option 1 that introduces: two-way working on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand to its junction with Angel Street; and closes the southern section of King Edward Street and the Newgate Street slip road to all vehicles to enable the creation of a new public space;
2. Approve the progression of Option 1A that is the same as Option 1 except for the introduction of two way working on part of Montague Street;
3. Approve Option 1/1A to continue to be developed and progressed to public consultation;
4. Approve the concept design proposal for the new public space to be developed and progressed to public consultation;
5. Approve re-naming the project “St. Paul’s Gyrotory Transformation”;
6. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to approve the (non-statutory) public consultation content and then proceed with the public consultation, to include seeking the public’s views on the four proposed names for the new public space on King Edward Street

Members of **Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee** and **Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee** are asked to:

7. Note the approved financial bid for the project of up to £13,915,175 from OSPR and CIL contributions;
8. Approve an additional budget of £1,712,050 from the OSPR to reach Gateway 5;
9. Note the revised total project budget of £2,947,992 (excluding risk) to reach Gateway 5;
10. Note the total estimated cost range of the project at £15-17 million;
11. Approve the costed risk register of £280,000 in Appendix 3 and delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to draw down funds from this;
12. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to make any further adjustments (above existing authority within the project procedures) between elements of the budget.

**Next Steps:**

- June 23: Gateway 4B to Court of Common Council
- Jun-Dec 23: Preparation of detailed designs for the Option 1 highway layout
- Aug/Sept 23: Public consultation on approved option and naming of the new public space

|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October 23-February 24: Preparation of developed design for the new public space</li> <li>• December 23: Gateway 4C to Streets &amp; Walkways Sub Committee</li> <li>• January-April 24: Construction design package finalised and detailed construction works estimate</li> <li>• January 24: Transport for London scheme TMAN approval</li> <li>• February-April 24: Statutory consultation on Traffic Management Orders</li> <li>• May-June 24 – Gateway 5 Authority to Start Work.</li> <li>• Early 2025 – Commence highway works construction **</li> </ul> <p>**: Programming for highway construction works is provisional and highly dependent upon the construction programme of 81 Newgate Street; in particular the developer’s ability to clear their construction activities from the highway to enable access for the City’s Highway contractor and enable the required traffic changes.</p>  |                          |          |                          |          |                                |                                    |      |          |                       |  |      |          |                           |                    |      |         |                    |              |      |         |
|--|--|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|----------|-----------------------|--|------|----------|---------------------------|--------------------|------|---------|--------------------|--------------|------|---------|
| <p><b>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</b></p> | <p>The current budget approved for the project is £1,235,942 of which £900,459 has been spent at 30/4/23.</p> <p>The proposed additional budget to reach Gateway 5 is detailed below and is based on the approval of Option 1 progressing. It is requested that the funding is set up to reach Gateway 5 to ensure that the pace of the project is maintained between the various Gateway 4 reports and that the budget is available to be able to procure what is required when needed.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff costs: Policy &amp; Projects</td> <td>Project management, communications</td> <td>OSPR</td> <td>£362,880</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff costs: Highways</td> <td>Design development, surveys, utility liaison</td> <td>OSPR</td> <td>£236,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff costs: City Gardens</td> <td>Design development</td> <td>OSPR</td> <td>£22,570</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff costs: Legal</td> <td>Legal advice</td> <td>OSPR</td> <td>£10,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Item                     | Reason   | Funds/ Source of Funding | Cost (£) | Staff costs: Policy & Projects | Project management, communications | OSPR | £362,880 | Staff costs: Highways | Design development, surveys, utility liaison | OSPR | £236,600 | Staff costs: City Gardens | Design development | OSPR | £22,570 | Staff costs: Legal | Legal advice | OSPR | £10,000 |
| Item   | Reason   | Funds/ Source of Funding | Cost (£) |                          |          |                                |                                    |      |          |                       |  |      |          |                           |                    |      |         |                    |              |      |         |
| Staff costs: Policy & Projects                               | Project management, communications   | OSPR                     | £362,880 |                          |          |                                |                                    |      |          |                       |  |      |          |                           |                    |      |         |                    |              |      |         |
| Staff costs: Highways  | Design development, surveys, utility liaison   | OSPR                     | £236,600 |                          |          |                                |                                    |      |          |                       |  |      |          |                           |                    |      |         |                    |              |      |         |
| Staff costs: City Gardens                                    | Design development   | OSPR                     | £22,570  |                          |          |                                |                                    |      |          |                       |  |      |          |                           |                    |      |         |                    |              |      |         |
| Staff costs: Legal   | Legal advice   | OSPR                     | £10,000  |                          |          |                                |                                    |      |          |                       |  |      |          |                           |                    |      |         |                    |              |      |         |

|                                 |  |      |                   |
|---------------------------------|--|------|-------------------|
| Staff costs:<br>City Structures | Design assessment                                      | OSPR | £5,000            |
| Fees                            | Surveys, assessments, design, TfL fees, Traffic Orders | OSPR | £1,015,000        |
| Works                           | Trial holes, site investigations                       | OSPR | £60,000           |
| <b>Total</b>                    |  |      | <b>£1,712,050</b> |

**Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £280,000**  
(as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 3)

The staff costs above represent 2 Project Managers working full time on the project for 60 weeks; the cost of a Communications Officer working 2.5 days per week for 48 weeks; 2 days per week staff management for 60 weeks; 2 highway engineers working full time on the project for 50 weeks. The fees budget includes (but not exclusively) costs for consultancy fees for traffic modelling, landscape design, and Equalities Analysis support, public consultation fees including promotional materials and stakeholder engagement, TfL costs (Buses/London Underground/Signals/Network Performance), highway/utility surveys, air quality/traffic monitoring, legal fees, road safety audits and Traffic Order costs.

#### **Capital bid**

An internal capital bid for £13,915,175 was approved by Policy and Resources Committee on 20 April 2023. This comprises £2.91 million of CIL funding with the balance from the On Street Parking Reserve.

#### **External financial contribution**

Negotiations are on-going with the developer of 81 Newgate Street regarding a financial contribution to the project over and above the basic Section 278 works. The developer has provisionally agreed to make a contribution providing it is Option 1 (the full closure of King Edward Street between Newgate Street and Angel Street) that is approved for further development and secures all the necessary approvals to enable delivery/construction.

If formalised the external contribution could enable the internal capital funding allocated to the project to be reduced overall after Gateway 5; once the scheme is fully committed to being built and overall construction costs are fully understood. Further financial information is contained in Appendix 4.

#### 4. Overview of project options

Three design options were approved by Members in September 2022 for further development and assessment. Each option has a different highway layout for vehicles travelling through the project area and these layouts dictate the amount of new public space that can be created.

These three options have been further developed, being mindful of the project's approved objectives:

- To reduce casualties towards the Vision Zero target
- Improve pedestrian comfort levels
- To improve air quality by reducing NO2 levels
- To create new public spaces
- Improve the quality of the public realm to create streets and public spaces for people to admire and enjoy
- To ensure buildings and public spaces are protected

Option design development has also considered other important criteria including:

- the impact on the wider highway network in traffic terms and bus journey times
- how each assists the delivery of the City's strategies and initiatives including Destination City, the Transport Strategy and the Climate Action Strategy

Key elements of work undertaken since September include further traffic modelling, public engagement, stakeholder management, highway layout design development and concept design development for the new public space.

The gyratory itself is part of the strategic road network as designated in the Traffic Management Act 2004. Traffic management approvals and TfL's support for these changes is essential.

#### **Summary of options**

The Options Matrix at the end of this report provides more detail on each option and its assessment. All options propose changes to bus stop locations, bus stands, and coach and taxi bays. Indicative plans showing these changes are included as Appendix 5 and Appendix 6 and these include:

- a) The relocation of bus stops from their current location within the project area. The revised locations will be less than 200 metres from each other. The preliminary locations have been shared with TfL Buses who have not expressed any concerns to date.
- b) The removal of the route 100 bus stand on King Edward Street and its relocation to Giltspur Street.
- c) The short stay taxi bays currently on St Martin Le Grand and Angel Street will be re-located to the south side of

Gresham Street at the western end with no net loss of provision.

- d) The removal of the coach bays on St Martin Le Grand to accommodate the new highway layout, with two bays being retained on Angel Street. A net loss of six bays is likely if suitable relocation sites cannot be found.

The interim Equality Analysis concluded that each option may have an impact on some groups of people due to the proposed changes to the locations of bus stop and bus stands and motor vehicle journey times. In some cases, the new locations may provide a positive benefit but in others this may have a negative impact. It has been agreed with the Chair of the City of London Access Group (CoLAG) to present the preferred option to CoLAG members in the summer where issues can be identified and mitigation measures explored.

**Option 1** offers transformational change across the project area. The partial removal of the gyratory system sees the introduction of two way working for all vehicles on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand to its junction with Angel Street. Comprehensive improvements for people walking and cycling are proposed including better crossing facilities and protected cycle lanes where space permits. The closure of the southern section of King Edward Street enables the creation of a large, new public space which, at just over 3000sqm, would be larger than Aldgate Square.

Option 1 proposes changes to bus stop locations, bus stands, coach and taxi bays as set out above. The proposed relocation of the bus stand for route 100 is supported by Bart's Hospital who have expressed concern about the impact the King Edward Street bus stand has on blue light response times.

The feasibility traffic modelling for Option 1 suggests the impact on the wider traffic network is within acceptable parameters with regards to queueing at junctions and the bus journey times. There are some small delays to bus journey times identified but it is anticipated that this can be reduced by further work to mitigate impacts by signal time changes in the more detailed traffic modelling that will follow. Overall Option 1 performs well in terms of bus journey times at this stage of its development for such a large-scale change.

An Option 1A has also been developed. It is the same as Option 1 except it proposes the introduction of two-way working for vehicles on Montague Street between its junction with the rotunda and Little Britain north. This option has evolved as an analysis of traffic movements suggests there is likely to be an increase in traffic using Little Britain south if the gyratory is system modified; something the project is actively seeking to

avoid. Two way working on Montague Street as proposed could significantly reduce traffic on Little Britain south and shorten some blue light journeys to Bart's Hospital.

Option 1 has the potential to attract a significant external funding contribution from the developer of 81 Newgate Street.

**Estimated cost: £15-17m.**

**Option 2** proposes significant changes to the existing highway layout. It is less ambitious than option 1 in terms of the scale of new public space, only creating about half of the space Option 1 offers.

This option involves partial removal of the gyratory, enabling comprehensive improvements for people cycling (including segregation where space permits) but more modest improvements for people walking. King Edward Street south remains open for northbound buses, cycles and emergency vehicles.

Option 2 proposes changes to bus stop locations, bus stands, coach and taxi bays as set out above. The proposal for the relocation of the bus stand for route 100 is not necessary for the scheme but continues to be proposed due to the concerns expressed by Bart's Hospital about the impact the King Edward Street stand has on blue light response times.

The traffic modelling suggests the impact on the wider traffic network is within acceptable parameters with regards queueing at junctions. However, some bus journey times are forecast to increase by 5-7 minutes in the AM peak which is likely to be unacceptable to TfL Buses. If this option is progressed further mitigation to reduce this impact would be required. However, it may not be possible to provide sufficient mitigation.

Option 2 creates a smaller new public space of approximately 1400m<sup>2</sup> through the closure of the Newgate Street slip road. However, King Edward Street northbound would remain open for buses and cycles from Newgate Street. Option 2 would not attract the external funding contribution from the developer.

**Estimated cost: £11-13m**

**Option 3** proposes significant changes to the existing highway layout on Newgate Street with the introduction of two way working for buses and cycles with general traffic continuing to be able to travel westbound. However, it retains the core north-south gyratory movements on King Edward St and St Martin Le Grand. This option enables some positive improvements for people cycling, modest improvements for people walking and less new public space than option 1 (1400m<sup>2</sup>), as King Edward Street south remains open for all vehicles.

Option 3 proposes changes bus stops, bus stands, coach and taxi bays as set out above. As with Option 2, the proposed relocation of the bus stand for route 100 is proposed due to the concerns expressed by Bart's Hospital about impact the King Edward Street stand has on blue light response times but is not essential for the highway changes.

The initial traffic modelling suggests the impact on the wider traffic network is within acceptable parameters with regards queueing at junctions and bus journey times. It does not perform as well as Option 1 in the PM peak but the indications are still broadly positive.

Option 3 creates a small new public space through the closure of the Newgate Street slip road, but King Edward Street would remain open for all motor vehicles. This would impact on the enjoyment of the public space. Option 3 would not attract any external funding contribution from the developer.

**Estimated cost: £11-13m**

**Traffic modelling**

A comprehensive traffic modelling exercise in partnership with Transport for London is on-going to assess the impact of the new highway layouts and revised vehicle routes on the wider highway network and on journey times. The primary objective is to ensure journey time impacts are within acceptable levels and reduced where possible.

The current modelling outputs for bus journey times in the peak hours are summarised in the table below. These show that some bus journey times improve under the new highway layouts, whilst others experience increased journey times. An overall average of all bus route journey times shows that option 1 results in a 0-30 second increase in journey times; option 2 in a 1-2 minute increase; and option 3 in a 3-60 second increase.

**Bus Journey Times: Feasibility traffic modelling results**

| Option   | Seven bus routes in project area (both directions modelled): |         |         |                 |         |         | Avg of AM and PM peak periods journey times |
|----------|--|---------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|---|
|          | in the AM Peak   |         |         | In the PM peak  |         |         |   |
|          | Improve ment   | Delay   |         | improve ment    | Delay   |         |   |
|          | Between 0-2 min  | 0-3 min | 5-7 min | Between 0-3 min | 0-2 min | 2-3 min |   |
| <b>1</b> | 4  | 10      | 0       | 7               | 5       | 2       | 0-30 secs                                   |
| <b>2</b> | 3  | 9       | 2       | 4               | 7       | 3       | 1-2 mins                                    |
| <b>3</b> | 5  | 9       | 0       | 4               | 10      | 0       | 30-60 secs                                  |

Each option has 14 permutations i.e. seven bus routes each in each direction  
 Further details of the modelling outputs for each option can be seen in Appendix 7/8.

The modelling exercise will continue over coming months and will form a key component of the formal TMAN approval for the recommended highway option in 2024.

**Highway layout design development**

The results and feedback from the public engagement exercise and the traffic modelling have helped inform revisions to the design options. These include improved provision for people cycling through the area, alterations to pavement and crossing widths. The locations of bus stops, bus stands coach and taxi bays are also revised.

It should be noted that since February 2022 the coach bays on St Martin Le Grand west and Angel Street (six in total) have been out of use due to the construction of 81 Newgate Street and this will continue until March 2025 at the earliest. Surveys undertaken in March 2023 at all the available coach parking sites within the City of London show that there is overall spare capacity for coaches to park. The survey found that whilst on-street coach parking is operating close to capacity, there are spaces available at the Tower Hill coach parking facility.

Further surveys will be undertaken during the summer peak period and site investigations will continue to identify potential new sites for on-street coach parking. The layout and demand of the coach parking at Tower Hill Park will also be reviewed during the summer period to help understand current capacity demand and usage at peak visitor times.

The highway layouts for each option propose significant changes to the way the available public highway is utilised with a move away from a priority given to motorised traffic towards walking and cycling and the creation a new public space. The increase in footway space represents the amount of carriageway space that would be converted to footway. The new cycle lanes will be protected wherever space allows.

| <b>Highway changes</b>    | <b>Option 1</b> | <b>Option 2</b> | <b>Option 3</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Increase in footway space | 1436m2          | 732m2           | 1027m2          |
| New cycle lanes           | 819m            | 942m            | 781m            |
| New public space          | c. 3000m2       | c. 1400m2       | c. 1400m2       |

**Existing Public Engagement**

A six week public engagement exercise began in December 2022 to seek initial views on the principles of the proposals including levels of support for creation of a new public space. 2646 people responded. There was high support for measures to improve the environment for people walking (81%) and cycling (79%) and for a new public space at the southern end of King Edward Street (84%). Further details of the consultation

responses, including a breakdown of voter responses by mode of transport, can be found in Appendix 9.

More detailed written submissions were received from London Living Streets, the London Cycling Campaign, Bart's Hospital and St Paul's Cathedral.

### **Concept designs for the new public space**

Following a tender exercise, LDA Design were appointed to develop concept designs for the project's new public space. The primary focus of the commission is a holistic design for a new public space on both King Edward Street and the Newgate Street slip road. However, a design based on only the closure of the Newgate Street slip road has also been produced, should options 2 or 3 be progressed.

The tender brief stated design evolution needed to be underpinned by the objectives of the Transport and Climate Action Strategies and the Destination City initiative. LDA were asked to ensure Christchurch Greyfriars was sensitively integrated into the new space and the view of St Paul's Cathedral was enhanced when looking south down King Edward Street.

The feedback from the public engagement exercise has informed the design approach to the content of the square. Respondents' preferences for what they would like to see in the public space were:

- Trees and Plants 87%;
- Places to sit 79%;
- Cycle route 56%;
- Public art 40%;
- Water feature 32%;
- Refreshment kiosk 22%;
- Children's play area 17%;
- Event Space 16%.

A project steering group which includes officers, the developer of 81 Newgate Street and the Cheapside Business Alliance has overseen the design evolution and provided feedback at appropriate stages. Following a report presenting initial sketch designs, LDA were asked to develop concept designs based on the following:

**Soft landscaping:** Maximise greening with a strong emphasis on tree planting and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs). The designs should focus on creating a space where people want to stop and spend time as well as pass through.

Christchurch Greyfriars: The integration of Christchurch Greyfriars and its landscaped gardens into the new space; consider the future of the low wall introduced in 1990 to demarcate the original eastern Church boundary. Two proposals remain under consideration:

- complete removal of the wall and its original footprint clearly demarcated in the paving; and
- partial retention with new pedestrian routes created through it.

Seating: The space should include a range of seating that is comfortable, accessible, functional and easy to maintain; a mix of single seats, benches and informal seating opportunities.

Children's play area: Whilst the engagement exercise showed low public support for a children's play area, the steering group felt that was important to consider this within the context of the Destination City aims to increase the City's "*appeal to existing and new audiences by creating a fun, inclusive, innovative and sustainable ecosystem*". LDA were therefore asked to design-in subtle interventions that encourage creative play through a playable landscape.

Event space: There was also low public support for an event space. Mindful of Destination City, the steering group asked LDA to ensure that the space would be flexible enough to host occasional events. This could be achieved using seating in some areas which is not permanently fixed to the ground but is too heavy to move without lifting equipment. An example of this type of seating is shown in Appendix 10.

Public Art: Whilst not receiving majority support from the public, the steering group asked LDA to consider provision for occasional, temporary installations noting that during the engagement exercise St Paul's Cathedral had offered loans of sculptural objects from its collections for placement in public spaces.

Security: LDA were asked to ensure that any hostile vehicle mitigation measures required to protect the public space were designed into functional features such as planters and cycle stands, rather than overly reliant on bollards.

Lighting: Focus should be on quality functional lighting to suit the new space, avoiding lighting installed in the ground which is expensive to maintain.

Water feature: Whilst not attracting majority public support, a water feature could deliver climate benefits and play opportunities. However, LDA were asked not to progress this element as the estimated cost to maintain a meaningful water

feature over 20 years (based on Aldgate Square) would be approximately £1.5m; a cost that could need to be borne by the project.

Cycle route: A majority of respondents to the engagement exercise supported the inclusion of a cycle route through the new public space. However, LDA were asked not to incorporate this into the design for the following reasons:

- A dedicated, demarcated cycle route would be required to meet access standards, dissecting the new space in two;
- The wider gyratory project is providing dedicated north-south cycle routes on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand and people cycling should be encouraged to use these routes.
- If people cycling were encouraged to use the new public space when travelling north they would need to join the main northbound vehicular route which does not include dedicated cycle facilities.

During the design development, officers became aware of a substantial amount of large granite blocks salvaged from the Thames Tideway works on Victoria Embankment and that this was potentially available to the project (see Appendix 10). LDA were therefore asked to consider ways of incorporating the stone into the overall design, potentially as part of the playable landscape and informal seating.

Officers were also alerted to the City's emerging Sports Strategy and asked LDA to consider opportunities to design in features that could be used for fitness/exercise. However, following the steering group's review of the draft concept design proposals, group members considered the inclusion of large physical sports equipment as inappropriate for the new space and asked LDA to remove it.

The project steering group reviewed and fed back on a concept option in late March, leading to the preparation of a preferred concept design for each option. Various views of the concept designs are shown in Appendix 11.

As the design for the public space is developed, the steering group will be re-convened and the project team will continue to engage with the Destination City team and work with the Sports Strategy Manager to explore opportunities to incorporate features to encourage informal exercise and play.

### **Naming of the new public space**

During scheme development, the new public space on King Edward Street has been referred to as "King Edward Square" but this is only a provisional name.

It is proposed that four potential names for the square are included as part of the public consultation on the preferred option in September. These names are:

1. King Edward Square
2. Greyfriars Square
3. Newgate Square
4. Queen Elizabeth Square

The City's Street Naming and Numbering Policy states that the re-use of street names with a different suffix is acceptable where it is used to reinforce an area's historic identity. King Edward Square, Greyfriars Square and Newgate Square all meet this criterion. Naming the square after Queen Elizabeth would require approval from the Cabinet Office who need to approve the use of Royal names. This may also technically apply to the name King Edward Square since it is a modification of an existing name and this would need clarifying if that was the preferred name.

Street naming is normally handled through delegated authority. However, if Members did want the final decision to go to Committee because of its prominence, colleagues in Planning would prepare a short report to go to the Planning & Transportation Committee.

### **Conclusion**

Option 1/1A delivers improvements for people walking and cycling, a substantial new public space and key elements of the Transport and Climate Action Strategies and the Destination City initiative. Option 1 attracts a significant external funding contribution.

Whilst options 2 and 3 deliver improvements for people walking and cycling, the new public space is smaller resulting in much less greening. Neither option attracts the current external funding contribution that is on offer.

Members are therefore asked to approve that the highway layout Option 1 (and its variant 1A) is presented for public consultation in terms of changes to the public highway for vehicles, changes to bus stop, coach bays, taxi bays, waiting and loading, and that the concept design proposal for Option 1 is presented for public consultation alongside the highway layout to seek further feedback on the development of the public space for further detailed design.

### **Next steps**

The consultation scheduled for August/September 2023 will seek views from the public on the preferred highway layout, the concept design proposals for the new public space and the potential name of the new space.

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|                                 | <p>There will be a mix of virtual and in person opportunities for people to directly engage, as well as project information towers and drop-in sessions in the project area. The project has built up an extensive database of local businesses, residents and interest groups and they will be invited to take participate in the consultation. Social media will also be utilised to target people moving through the project area.</p> <p>The results of the public consultation and any subsequent design revisions will be brought back to Committee in the form of a Gateway 4C report in late 2023. Statutory consultation on any necessary Traffic Orders to implement proposals will not be commenced unless authorised at Gateway 4C reporting stage. Whether or not any necessary traffic orders are made cannot be prejudged until the outcome of the consultation has been evaluated.</p>   |
| <p><b>5. Recommendation</b></p> | <p>It is recommended that Option 1/1A in terms of traffic/highway layout is taken forward for public consultation with the associated concept public space design option.</p>  |
| <p><b>6. Risk</b></p>           | <p>The key risks associated with taking the recommended option forward to Gateway 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts on bus journey times mean that the proposed option does not receive the required level of support and approval from TfL; crucially the TMAN formal approval which is required to proceed with the scheme to construction. The roads impacted are largely part of the strategic road network so it is essential that TfL support the proposals. Officers will continue to liaise with TfL Buses during the development stages of the scheme to ensure all mitigation measures to reduce impacts on bus journey times have been investigated.</li> <li>• A challenge on procedural grounds or an inability to resolve objections to a Traffic Order may result in additional legal costs, as well as delays to the overall programme. A costed risk provision of £60,000 is included should additional legal costs be incurred.</li> <li>• The preferred option is not supported by Bart's Hospital due to concerns about increased traffic congestion affecting blue light response times. Officers have been in a regular dialogue with Bart's as the highway options have been developed and this will continue. Whilst levels of congestion are predicted to increase, junctions are predicted to operate within capacity. Much of the highway layout will be multi-lane that would allow vehicles to pull out of the way at busy times. Traffic queueing on Angel Street is not predicted.</li> <li>• The preferred option may result in an increase in motor vehicles using Little Britain south. There are mitigation measures that can be put in place to reduce this risk and these will be explored in more detail during the next phase of work. These include converting Montague Street to two-way</li> </ul> |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | <p>working to its junction with Little Britain north which would also provide a more direct route for Bart's ambulances and service vehicles arriving from Aldersgate Street and London Wall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to coach parking arrangements may result in objections from the coach industry and key stakeholders such as St Paul's Cathedral. Most of the local coach parking provision in the project area has been unavailable since February 2022 due to redevelopment of 81 Newgate Street. Whilst the closure of the Museum of London should reduce overall demand. Surveys undertaken in March 2023 showed that whilst on-street coach parking provision was operating close to capacity, there was surplus space in the Tower Hill coach park. The project will assess alternative on-street coach parking locations and, if feasible, consult on introducing these as part of the project.</li> <li>• The preferred option may negatively impact certain groups of people, particularly some disabled people and this has been highlighted in the Interim Equality Analysis (Appendix 12). It has been agreed with the Chair of the CoLAG to present the preferred option to CoLAG members in the summer and involve Transport for All in facilitating a feedback session where issues can be identified and mitigation measures explored.</li> <li>• Specific technical challenges associated with this project include the location of utility infrastructure, the London Underground and the City's piped subway structures, which are situated under parts of Newgate Street, King Edward Street and St Martin's Le Grand. Dialogue is on-going with the City Structures team, London Underground and utility companies. This will continue as the preferred option is progressed. Costed risk allocation: £170,000.</li> <li>• Several elements of the project are still at a concept design stage. As design development progresses there may be issues that are more technically challenging than first envisaged. As a result, the project may require additional staff resources. A costed risk allocation of £50,000 has been included within the budget to reach Gateway 5.</li> </ul> <p>Further information is available in the Risk Register.</p> |
| <p><b>7. Procurement strategy</b></p> | <p>The project will continue to be developed in-house by the City Operations Policy &amp; Projects and Highways teams. Specialist support will be procured via the Transportation and Public Realm Framework Contract which includes three consultancies.</p>   |

## Appendices

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Appendix 1</b></p> | <p>Project Coversheet</p>  |
| <p><b>Appendix 2</b></p> | <p><b>NON-PUBLIC ITEM</b> – Details of the potential financial contribution from the developers of 81 Newgate Street</p> |
| <p><b>Appendix 3</b></p> | <p>Risk Register</p>   |

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Appendix 4</b>  | Financial information  |
| <b>Appendix 5</b>  | Highway layout options   |
| <b>Appendix 6</b>  | Giltspur Street bus standing layout  |
| <b>Appendix 7</b>  | Appraisal of traffic modelling outputs   |
| <b>Appendix 8</b>  | Feasibility traffic modelling outputs for buses and general motor vehicle traffic                  |
| <b>Appendix 9</b>  | Engagement results summary   |
| <b>Appendix 10</b> | Moveable seating and Thames Embankment granite   |
| <b>Appendix 11</b> | Views of the new public space  |
| <b>Appendix 12</b> | Interim Equalities Analysis  |
| <b>Appendix 13</b> | Computer generated image of Newgate St/Cheapside/St Martin Le Grand option 1 and 2 junction layout |

### **Contact**

|                         |                                   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Report Author</b>    | George Wright                     |
| <b>Email Address</b>    | george.wright@cityoflondon.gov.uk |
| <b>Telephone Number</b> | 07802 378812                      |

## Options Appraisal Matrix

| <i>Option Summary</i>                 | <i>Option 1</i>   | <i>Option 2</i>   | <i>Option 3</i>  |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>1. Brief description of option</b> | Significant highway layout changes including substantial removal of the gyratory; comprehensive improvements for people walking and cycling; the creation of a large new public space with extensive soft landscaping.  | Significant highway layout changes including partial removal of the gyratory; comprehensive improvements for people walking and cycling; the creation of small new public space with soft landscaping.  | Modest highway layout changes with much of the gyratory system remaining. Minor improvements for people walking and cycling. Creation of a small new public space with soft landscaping.   |
| <b>2. Scope and exclusions</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-way working on Newgate Street and the southern part of St Martin Le Grand</li> <li>• Improved cycling infrastructure, including two way working on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand</li> <li>• Closure of southern section of King Edward Street and Newgate St slip road to create new public space</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian crossings and footway widening</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-way working on Newgate Street and southern part of St Martin Le Grand</li> <li>• Improved cycling infrastructure including two way working on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand</li> <li>• Closure of slip road on Newgate Street to create new public space</li> <li>• Southern section of King Edward Street open for buses and cycles only</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-way working on Newgate Street for buses and cycles only</li> <li>• Improved cycling infrastructure including two way working on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand</li> <li>• Closure of slip road on Newgate Street to create new public space</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian crossings and footway widening</li> </ul> |

| <b>Option Summary</b>             | <b>Option 1</b>  | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b>  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sub Option 1A also includes the introduction of two way working on part of Montague Street.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved pedestrian crossings and footway widening</li> </ul>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gyratory system largely retained for most motor vehicle journeys</li> </ul> |
| <b>Project Planning</b>           |  |   |  |
| <b>3. Programme and key dates</b> | <p>June 23: Gateway 4B to Court of Common Council</p> <p>Jun-Dec 23: Preparation of detailed designs for the Option 1 highway layout</p> <p>Aug/Sept 23: Public consultation on approved option and naming of the new public space</p> <p>October 23-February 24: Preparation of developed design for the new public space</p> <p>December 23: Gateway 4C to Streets &amp; Walkways Sub Committee</p> <p>January-April 24: Construction design package finalised and detailed construction works estimate</p> <p>January 24: Transport for London scheme TMAN approval</p> <p>February-April 24: Statutory consultation on Traffic Management Orders</p> <p>May-June 24 – Gateway 5 Authority to Start Work.</p> <p>Early 2025 – Commence highway works construction</p> |   |  |
| <b>4. Risk implications</b>       | <p>Overall project option risk: Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed traffic modelling will be necessary post Gateway 4 approval to continue to assess the impacts on the highway network and bus journey times. The risk therefore is that</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed traffic modelling will be necessary post Gateway 4 approval to continue to</li> </ul> |  |

| Option Summary | Option 1   | Option 2 | Option 3  |
|----------------|--|----------|---|
|                | <p>the preferred option does <i>not</i> receive the required level of support and approval from TfL; crucially the TMAN formal approval. This risk is considered low as officers have on-going and regular liaison with various departments of TfL to ensure all mitigation measures to reduce impacts bus/vehicle journey times have been investigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of London Underground infrastructure beneath King Edward and Newgate Street. Some of this is inactive and relates to the former, disused Post Office Station; some is active and involves air vents to the current tube station. Dialogue is on-going London Underground (LU) Infrastructure Protection team and will continue as the preferred option is progressed. Formal sign off from LU will be required.</li> <li>• There is a risk of objections from the coach industry regarding the amount of coach parking proposed within the project area. The preferred option proposes two spaces on Angel Street. Surveys undertaken in March 2023, showed that across the City there was surplus coach parking provision at available on-street and off-street sites. Since the start of the construction of 81 Newgate Street in Feb 22, there have only been two coach parking spaces available in the project area.</li> <li>• Several elements of the project are still at a concept design stage. As design development progresses there may be issues that are more technically challenging than first envisaged. This may require additional resources or necessitate value engineering. As a result, the project</li> </ul> |          | <p>assess the impacts on the highway network and bus journey times. The risk therefore is that the preferred option does <i>not</i> receive the required level of support and approval from TfL; crucially the TMAN formal approval. This risk is considered low as officers have on-going and regular liaison with various departments of TfL to ensure all mitigation measures to reduce impacts bus/vehicle journey times have been investigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of London Underground infrastructure beneath King Edward and Newgate Street. Some of this is inactive and relates to the former, disused Post Office Station; some is active and involves air vents to the current tube station. Dialogue is on-going London Underground (LU) Infrastructure Protection</li> </ul> |

| <b>Option Summary</b> | <b>Option 1</b>  | <b>Option 2</b> | <b>Option 3</b>  |
|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|
|                       | <p>many require additional staff resources. A costed risk allocation of £50,000 has been included within the budget to reach Gateway 5 and it is expected that an additional costed risk allocation will be recommended post-Gateway 5 approval.</p> |                 | <p>team and will continue as the preferred option is progressed. Formal sign off from LU will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several elements of the project are still at a concept design stage. As design development progresses there may be issues that are more technically challenging than first envisaged. This may require additional resources or necessitate value engineering. As a result, the project may require additional staff resources. A costed risk allocation of £50,000 has been included within the budget to reach Gateway 5 and it is expected that an additional costed risk allocation will be recommended post-Gateway 5 approval.</li> </ul> |

| <b>Option Summary</b>                 | <b>Option 1</b>  | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b>  |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>5. Stakeholders and consultees</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoL Members</li> <li>• CoL Highways, City Gardens, City Structures, Cleansing</li> <li>• Transport for London Network Performance, Buses, London Underground, Taxis, Coach and Tourist Buses</li> <li>• Emergency services</li> <li>• Bart's Hospital</li> <li>• Taxi trade</li> <li>• CoLAG</li> <li>• London Cycling Campaign</li> <li>• Residents, property owners and businesses including staff networks</li> <li>• Development team for 81 Newgate Street</li> <li>• Cheapside BID</li> <li>• St Paul's Cathedral and Access Group</li> </ul> |   |  |
| <b>6. Benefits of option</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets all project objectives</li> <li>• Gyratory system largely removed</li> <li>• 819m of north-south &amp; east-west safer cycle routes introduced</li> <li>• Improved &amp; increased crossing facilities for pedestrians including pedestrian countdown at traffic signals</li> <li>• 1436msq2 increase in new or wider footway space.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partially meets project objectives</li> <li>• Gyratory system partially removed</li> <li>• 942m of north-south &amp; east-west safer cycle routes introduced</li> <li>• Improved &amp; increased crossing facilities for pedestrians including pedestrian countdown at traffic signals</li> <li>• 732msq2 increase in new or wider footway space.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partially meets project objectives</li> <li>• Gyratory system partially removed</li> <li>• 781m of north-south &amp; east-west safer cycle routes introduced</li> <li>• Improved &amp; increased crossing facilities for pedestrians including pedestrian countdown at traffic signals</li> <li>• 1027msq2 increase in new or wider footway space.</li> </ul> |

| <b>Option Summary</b>           | <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b>   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large new public space of approx.. 3000msq2 created on part of King Edward Street and Newgate St slip road</li> <li>• Delivers key elements of Guildhall &amp; Cheapside Area Strategy, Transport and Climate Acton Strategy, the Cool Streets and Green Spaces Strategy Vision Zero and Destination City</li> <li>• Enables the introduction of tree planting and soft landscaping</li> <li>• Initial traffic modelling show new junctions operate within capacity</li> <li>• Secures an enhanced Section 278 contribution</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modest new public space of approx. 1400msq on Newgate Street slip road</li> <li>• Initial traffic modelling shows new junctions operate within capacity</li> </ul>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modest new public space of approx.. 1400msq on Newgate Street slip road</li> <li>• Initial traffic modelling shows new junctions operate within capacity</li> </ul>                    |
| <b>7. Disbenefits of option</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to bus stop &amp; bus stand locations may affect some passengers</li> <li>• Coach parking on St Martin Le Grand needs to be removed</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not meet all project objectives</li> <li>• Changes to bus stop &amp; bus stand locations may affect some passengers</li> <li>• New public space reduced in size as</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not meet all project objectives</li> <li>• North-south gyratory system not removed</li> <li>• Changes to bus stop &amp; bus stand locations may affect some passengers</li> </ul> |

| <i>Option Summary</i>          | <i>Option 1</i>  | <i>Option 2</i>   | <i>Option 3</i>  |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for an increase in traffic on Little Britain south without mitigation measures</li> </ul> | <p>King Edward Street remains open to buses and cycles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doesn't deliver aspirations of Guildhall &amp; Cheapside Area Strategy, Climate Action Strategy or Cool Streets and Green Spaces Strategy</li> <li>Coach parking on St Martin Le Grand needs to be removed</li> <li>Potential for an increase in traffic on Little Britain south without mitigation measures</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New public space reduced in size as King Edward Street remains open for northbound traffic</li> <li>Doesn't deliver aspirations of Guildhall &amp; Cheapside Area Strategy, Climate Action Strategy or the Cool Streets and Green Spaces Strategy.</li> </ul> |
| <i>Resource Implications</i>   |  |   |  |
| <b>8. Total estimated cost</b> | <p>Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £14m (reasonably confident)</p> <p>Total estimated cost: (including risk): £15-17m</p>           | <p>Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £11m (reasonably confident)</p> <p>Total estimated cost: (including risk): £11-13m</p>  | <p>Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £10m (reasonably confident)</p> <p>Total estimated cost: (including risk): £11-13m</p>   |

| <b>Option Summary</b>                     | <b>Option 1</b>  | <b>Option 2</b>                                  | <b>Option 3</b>                                  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>9. Funding strategy</b>                | OSPR, CIL, S278, S106, External voluntary contribution   | N/A  | N/A  |
| <b>10. Investment appraisal</b>           | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  |
| <b>11. Estimated capital value/return</b> | N/A  | N/A  | N/A  |
| <b>12. Ongoing revenue implications</b>   | <p>All hard landscaping works will involve improvements to the public highway and post-completion will be maintained, as now, by the Highway Department as part of its planned maintenance programme. The use of non-standard materials, outside the City's palette of materials, will require a commuted sum to be calculated which will be transferred to Highways when the works are completed. Similarly, commuted sums will be calculated in relation to any new soft landscaping and will be transferred to Open Spaces at project completion. A commuted sum will also be calculated to fund the additional cleansing the new public space will generate. Total commuted sum costs are estimated at £2.2m and are included within cost estimates.</p> |  |  |
| <b>13. Affordability</b>                  | Has the potential to lever in a substantial voluntary contribution from developer of 81 Newgate Street.  | Would need to be fully funded from central funds | Would need to be fully funded from central funds |
| <b>14. Legal implications</b>             | <p>The City Corporation as the local highway authority and traffic authority has wide powers under the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make changes to the highway and manage traffic. As proposals evolve further legal advice should be sought on affected land ownerships and relevant statutory powers.</p> <p>In developing proposals which require traffic management measures, the City Corporation must comply with its traffic management duties to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic having regard to effect on amenities (S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) and to secure</p>   |  |  |

| <b>Option Summary</b>                             | <b>Option 1</b>  | <b>Option 2</b>  | <b>Option 3</b> |
|---|--|--|-----------------|
|   | <p>the efficient use of the road network avoiding congestion and disruption (S.16 Traffic Management Act 2004). Regard should also be had to relevant statutory guidance. Traffic modelling will ensure efficient and convenient vehicular movements can be appropriately managed when delivering the proposals.</p> <p>When making decisions, the City Corporation must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not (the public sector equality duty). It is the intention that an Equality Analysis will be carried out as the evaluation of the options moves forward. This will assist the City Corporation in discharging this duty.</p> |  |                 |
| <b>15. Corporate property implications</b>        | None   |  |                 |
| <b>16. Traffic implications</b>                   | <p>All options will result in changes to the operation of the public highway across the whole project area.</p> <p>Formal TMAN approval will be required from Transport for London.</p> <p>As these options are developed, engagement will take place with those listed in section 5 above.</p> <p>A formal statutory consultation will be undertaken in relation to Traffic Management Orders that are required to facilitate proposed highway changes.</p>   |  |                 |
| <b>17. Sustainability and energy implications</b> | Helps deliver the Climate Action Strategy through introduction of a variety of measures in the City's Climate Resilience   | Limited delivery of the Climate Action Strategy with the introduction of new soft landscaping and tree planting at selected sites within the project area. |                 |

| <b>Option Summary</b>                 | <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b> | <b>Option 3</b> |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                       | <p>catalogue including tree planting and SUDs.</p> <p>Will assist the delivery of the biodiversity corridor between Bankside and the Barbican through the introduction new trees in the new public space on King Edward Street which will mature to form a cool route through the City.</p> <p>Should help contribute to an improvement in air quality through extensive greening.</p> <p>The construction phase will seek to reuse materials and select materials with the lowest environmental footprint.</p> |                 |                 |
| <b>18. IS implications</b>            | None  |                 |                 |
| <b>19. Equality Impact Assessment</b> | <p>Interim Equality Analysis completed.</p> <p>It has been agreed with the Chair of CoLAG that once a preferred option is approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A presentation would be made to members of CoLAG during the summer to discuss the proposals in more detail, and to help shape the content that will form part of the public consultation exercise that is currently planned to be undertaken during autumn 2023.</li> </ul>  |                 |                 |

| <b>Option Summary</b>                        | <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b> | <b>Option 3</b> |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoLAG will discuss/agree the involvement of Transport for All, and whether CoLAG would like them to help facilitate a feedback session with members of CoLAG regarding the proposals.</li> <li>• Other groups representing protected characteristics will be contacted during the next stage of engagement on the preferred option.</li> </ul> |                 |                 |
| <b>20. Data Protection Impact Assessment</b> | N/A   |                 |                 |
| <b>21. Recommendation</b>                    | Recommended   | Not recommended | Not recommended |