

Appendix 5

Supplementary appendix for the Planning & Transportation Committee

Following the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee on 23 May 2023, this appendix provides additional information to help Members with their decision making.

Costs to date

1. To date, approximately £137k has been spent on the traffic and timing review, including data collection, consultancy support for the traffic modelling and equalities assessment and officer time. This is split approximately £35k on staff costs and £102k on fees.
2. When the costs for the Gateway 5 for All Change at Bank were estimated, it was assumed that the traffic and timing review would coincide with monitoring data collection for the completed scheme. Given the spend to date there are now limited options for large scale data collection post scheme delivery.

Bid for funding.

3. A bid for further Capital funding of £650k is being submitted for the use of OSPR funding. This is the estimated maximum of £500k (as noted in the report) to get each of the options to the approvals for implementation plus £150k for Costed Risk Provision should there be a legal challenge, for which there is always an associated risk with these sorts of schemes.

Cost of moving forward

4. Three options to move forward are presented in the main body of the report (Paragraph 112-127) and summarised below for ease of reference. The Streets & Walkways Sub Committee endorsed Option C, which was the Officers recommended option.
5. The three options are:
 - a. Continue with a view to consulting on making a permanent change to the type of vehicle included in the restrictions, on a yet to be determined routing as set out in the original methodology for the review.
 - b. Change the methodology to work towards using an experimental traffic order to introduce a future recommended change and monitor how that works before a final decision is taken to make it permanent.
 - c. Pause further work on the traffic modelling exercise. Focus on identifying and evidencing the need for change and how this can be best addressed, and on doing further work to understand the potential latent demand. Subject to the outcome, this would then form the basis of resumed modelling in due course, in advance of public consultation and the taking of a final decision whether to make a permanent or experimental change.
6. Paragraphs 130-133 of the report set out indicative costs for the three options:
 - Option A – likely to be in the region of £500k
 - Option B – likely to be in the region of £430-450K*

- Option C likely to be in the region of £500k*

*Note that the costs for both Option B and Option C do not include the costs of implementing and monitoring an experimental traffic order. A further request for funding would be needed if it is decided to carry out an experimental scheme.

7. Graph 1 shows the likely cumulative cost profile for each of the options. It shows that in terms of potential abortive cost, option C offers a lower risk strategy.
8. Option B is a similar spend profile as Option A until later in the programme. This is because in pursuing an experiment, public consultation does not take place until after the experimental scheme is implemented. This reduces the associated analysis and reporting requirements.
9. The traffic modelling requirements are essentially the same for all options and are the substantive cost for the review. In Both Option A and Option B, traffic modelling would run concurrently with the further work on establishing the grounds for change and how, if required, these would best be addressed.

TfL approvals

10. At the end of the Traffic Modelling process (likely to be in the region of 12+ months) TfL will produce a scheme impact assessment. This will inform TfL's view on whether to support the Traffic Management Application (TMAN) that we would submit with our supporting evidence, including the grounds for any proposed changes.
11. TfL have the right to reject the TMAN application as Cornhill and Poultry are both on the Strategic Road network (this is supported by the [Highways Act 1980 Section 301A](#)).
12. Without TfL's support to change the traffic order based on the evidence we provide with the TMAN application the City Corporation cannot make any changes to traffic mix or timing of restrictions at Bank and we would not be able to proceed to implementation. This includes making changes using of an experimental traffic order. Therefore, the risk of large abortive exists in all three options.
13. Note that if we are to ask TfL to prioritise the traffic modelling for this the review then they are likely to have to divert resources from other modelling assessments. This could delay other City Corporation projects, such as the St Paul's Gyratory, and TfL projects, such as potential improvements to Monument junction.

Key Decision Milestones

14. For each of the three presented options, the indicative timeframes of when key decision would be taken is shown in Table 1 below.

<u>Table 1</u>	Evidence of need for change (City)	TMAN (TfL)	Gateway 5 approval (City)
Option A	Q2 2024	Q1 2025	Q2 2025
Option B	Q2 2024	Q4 2024	Q1 2025
Option C	Q2 2024	Q3 2025	Q3 2025

15. The milestones above rely on an agreement with TfL being reached regarding how to model the latent demand issue ahead of it being needed in the traffic modelling process in order to avoid delay to the programme.

Graph 1: The likely cumulative cost of Options A, B and C

