

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 26 September 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, 26 September 2023 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Graham Packham (Chairman)
John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Deputy Alastair Moss
Alderwoman Susan Pearson

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Melanie Charalambous	-	Environment Department
Gillian Howard	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Sam Lee	-	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Bob Roberts	-	Environment Department
Clarisse Tavin	-	Environment Department
Jake Tibbetts	-	Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Shравan Joshi, Paul Martinelli and Ian Seaton.

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

Deputy Fredericks stated that in relation to Agenda Item 4 – 100 Minorities: 278 Highway Works (Phase 1), and Public Realm Enhancements (Crescent Phase 2), she was a resident of Tower Ward, knew the architects of the two hotels and had attended the event currently taking place in Crescent.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED, That the public minutes of the meeting of 4 July 2023 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings.

Matters Arising

Letter from TfL regarding the rerouting of Number 11 bus route

A Member asked if a response had been received to the letter sent to TfL. An Officer stated that a response had been received and would be circulated to Members of the Sub-Committee.

Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Streets Plan

A Member asked about the governance of the joint project with Islington Council. An Officer stated that a working group had been established with Officers at Islington Council and the arrangements for Member level governance had been discussed. A Member working group would be set up to inform and oversee the work to develop the proposals and these proposals would be submitted to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. Islington had fewer ward Members than the City so it was suggested that two or three representatives from the City sit on the working group. The Chairman had suggested these representatives should be Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. The Officer stated that a meeting of Chairman and Deputy Chairman plus the relevant Executive Member at Islington Council would be arranged.

In response to a Member's question about when the proposals would be submitted, an Officer stated that it was anticipated they would be submitted to the Sub-Committee in the first half of 2024 and this would be followed by the consultation.

Dockless Cycles

A Member asked about the performance of Lime since the new agreement had been signed. She raised concerns about the cycles constricting the pedestrian flow on Cheapside. An Officer stated that the latest statistics from the operators had not yet been received, there had been increased usage over the summer and the City would be providing additional parking spaces. The operators had been asked to help manage the issues on Cheapside including at the junction with King Street.

In response to a question from a Member, an Officer stated that TfL and London Councils were looking into having a London-wide single dockless cycle contract. This was currently at an early stage of development. The contract should mean there would only be a set number of operators for the whole of London and there would be a consistency of parking arrangements.

4. **100 MINORIES: 278 HIGHWAY WORKS (PHASE 1), AND PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS (CRESCENT) (PHASE 2)**

Members received a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which outlined Phase 1 of the project which involved S278 funded highway works to integrate the hotel development at 100 Minories into the City's highway and Phase 2 of the project which involved public realm enhancements and the landscaping of Crescent.

The Chairman stated that a late public submission had been received and gave Members time to read it.

The Officer stated that there had been a delay in finalising the S278 agreement over several years and this had increased the costs. The costs had been reported to the hotel operator and the works could not proceed without payment. Any delays to the payment could result in further costs due to inflation.

The Officer stated that the design of the public realm enhancements had evolved following consultation and liaison with occupiers and TfL. She stated that TfL required 24-hour, 7 day a week access to their substation for the Circle and District Lines which was in the Crescent and they had made comments on the design which Officers had worked to address. Officers had also worked with the Destination City team to accommodate more event activities. The team had advised that the ideal space for events and activities was 100 square metres. Officers had also worked with the relevant Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and had held a workshop to explore alternative events. She advised that Officers had held several meetings with the hotel and the hotel architects and had taken on board their comments, which had evolved over the consultation. The Officer stated that two options had been developed.

The first option was similar to that approved in January 2023 by the Sub-Committee and the second option included more space for events. The Officer stated that consultation on this option had taken place. Numbers 6-7 and 8-11 Crescent were currently empty but contact had been made with the owner's representatives and they had submitted letters of support. TfL had also submitted a letter of support and a preference for option 2. The Officer stated that the BIDs considered that Option 2 met the needs of the community and was their preferred design. She advised that, generally those in support of Option 2 were in favour of the greening and landscaping at the edges of the space. The Officer stated that Option 2 also used climate action money and incorporated sustainable urban drainage so was a better environmental and more climate resilient scheme. There was also public seating and space for events and activities. The hotel had stated that they would prefer no permanent planting. Officers considered Option 2 to be the best option for the space and had received the most letters of support.

A Member stated that the scheme had evolved since the redevelopment of 100 Minories as it had become clear that the grassed landscaping was unsuitable as there was a railway line underneath it and there were issues with load-bearing and watering, as well as the access requirements for the sub-station. The Member stated that Tower ward was not lacking space with grass, trees and benches but was lacking activity space. She stated that the Sports Strategy and Destination City had sparked the imagination of the Aldgate and EC1 Business Improvement Districts and residents. She stated that she was concerned about a lack of consultation. The Member also stated that there were a number of open spaces in the ward in need of refurbishment including Trinity Square Gardens and the fenced off play equipment in Tower Hill Gardens. The Member stated that the scheme should be paused and revisited to consult the residents who had not been consulted and stated the importance of this when the Policy Chairman had a key policy to have a reset with residents. She also stated that the padel court, although temporary, had

brought people into the area and stated that events had to be on a scale to make them viable. The Member stated that Option 2 included more space for activities but it was in the area that required constant access to the substation. She therefore raised concern that any activity equipment had to be able to move quickly if TfL required access to the substation. The Member stated that at the workshop held about the scheme, no consensus was reached and commented that the EC1 BID had concerns about the proposed trees. She suggested that a pause and deep dive would ascertain how the space could be used and during this time, funding could be put into Tower Hill Gardens to make it a welcoming entrance to the City with new play equipment, and funding could be put into Vine Street's railway bridge in order to link up with the Crescent. The Member stated that whilst the hotel might favour a quiet garden, residents were concerned that other quiet spaces had turned into beer gardens.

The Chairman stated that Tower Hill Gardens was a separate issue and advised that this was a standalone project and was included under Item 10 as a proposal to be allocated Section 106 funds.

The Chairman asked Officers to outline the engagement that had taken place with residents. The Officer stated that there were not any residents close to the site. She advised that there had been a letter drop in the local area and a workshop with businesses had been held but there had not been direct engagement with residents as they were not close to the site. She stated that this was in line with the consultations undertaken with this type of proposal. The Officer stated that if there were residents interested in the design, Officers could meet them. A Member stated there was a residential block on the other side of the Minories and also one at 100 Pepys Street and she considered that as stakeholders in the area, they should be consulted.

A Member raised concern that if the Crescent scheme was implemented and then buildings on Crescent were refurbished, there would be a cost in reinstating elements of the scheme. An Officer stated that any works could be accommodated and Numbers 6-7 had completed a refurbishment and provided a written comment that they supported the design and were keen for it to progress quickly as they considered that this would help them let their buildings. Officers had met with the managing agent of Numbers 8-11 who had advised them of the plans for refurbishment and provided written responses supporting the proposal. An Officer stated that discussions had taken place about how refurbishment works could be accommodated and Officers considered this could be done quite easily as the works were almost entirely internal so there would be limited impact on the highway.

A Member commented that there were voices against Crescent being an entertainment space and voices against the permanent greening of the space. The Member stated that the proposal was a compromise and whilst it would be possible to undertake further consultation, the key stakeholders had been consulted and the BIDs would be aware of local needs.

A Member stated that in recent years there had been a renewed emphasis on keeping fit and the City had a strategy on sports which needed to be

implemented. He stated that the proposal would provide a combination of greening and a place to undertake sport. The Member commented that some people wanted greening, shrubs and seats and others wanted sports. He also stated that children's playgrounds were lacking in Destination City and were required to get families into the City. The Member stated that he would like the surface of the central piece to be soft as this gave the ability to have events and also facilitate activities such as yoga. An Officer stated that having permeable paving on the north side of the space was an option but as the central area would be used for events, it would need to be hard wearing. The Officer stated that York Stone could take the weight of the vehicles that would need to drive across it to access the substation. The Member stated that hardwearing soft permeable paving was available.

The Chairman stated that the proposal aimed to strike a balance between providing space for events and leisure. If the greening was not included, there would be no climate resilience, biodiversity planting, trees, shade or sustainable drainage system. An Officer stated that from a policy perspective, Members of the Sub-Committee had challenged Officers several times to find more space for greening and more trees as the Climate Action Strategy was a relevant policy consideration. The Officer stated that this proposal allowed the Cool Streets and Greening money to be used and if hard landscaping was used, the money would have to be taken out of the project. There were also likely to be other areas with greater priority if some of the elements of greening could not be delivered into the space.

A Member stated that the BIDs had made it clear in the workshop that they wanted flexible space and that the EC1 BID had suggested an ice rink. The Member stated that pausing and consulting residents would enable a green element to be included but also enable flexibility and showcase the landscape design of George Dance the Younger in Crescent, which was of historical importance in the ward and in the City.

The Chairman asked Officers for more detail on the consultation. An Officer stated that there were no residents close to the site so those in the vicinity of the Crescent had been consulted. All the occupiers around the edge had been consulted, as had occupiers on Vine Street as far as America Square, as well as the two BIDS. There was a mail shot and a letter drop. Officers had undertaken research to find the owners of the empty buildings and Officers contacted them by email and letter. The Officer stated that the workshop was held in August.

An Officer stated that residents could be consulted through a letter drop. However, the design had evolved to meet every need that had been identified with event space, planting, the Crescent occupiers being satisfied, TfL being satisfied that there would not be any equipment that could not be dismantled quickly to give access to their substation and Officers did not envisage any more needs being established by doing this. Any redesign was likely to be very similar but there could be an issue of additional costs being incurred.

A Member stated that he wanted to be confident that part of the scheme would not need to be deconstructed to enable office refurbishment. An Officer stated that refurbishment works would be accommodated as part of the design development. A relationship had already been established with the managing agent for Numbers 8-11 and Officers would coordinate with them to avoid having to deconstruct any part of the scheme. She stated that this could include not planting the tree on the North side in the next planting season and planting it in the following planting season if that was in the way of the hoarding and she stated that this was the only risk that had been identified.

A Member welcomed the inclusion of trees and asked how the space would be maintained. An Officer stated that 20 years of maintenance costs were included in the project budget, the materials to be used were City palette materials so would be quite easy to maintain, the planting would be climate resilient planting so would have lower maintenance over time and the trees would be established and generally would not require watering after five years.

A Member stated that office workers had expressed concern about having active sport in front of their office. The Member stated that primarily the City was about office work and whilst sport was important, sporting facilities should be placed carefully so as not to cause issues for office workers.

A Member stated that visitors should be a main consideration as the City wanted to attract them to the City. He stated that it was difficult to ask visitors what they would like to see, so the City had to act on their behalf. The Member also stated that office workers should also be considered and attracting both groups to the City would result in more money being spent in the City. He stated that currently there were 520,000 office workers attending the City midweek and there were 20million visitors to the City each year. He also stated that there were 8000 residents which included 4000 permanent residents, and there were none living adjacent to the proposed public realm project. The Member stated that in this instance residents considerations were the least important.

A Member commented that the freeholder of the office block was in favour of activity space in front of the block. She raised concern that the activity zone in Option 2 was in the area where there had to be access for the substation. She suggested a pause to enable Officers to ensure all the design ideas had been captured.

The Chairman asked Officers to clarify the situation regarding access to the substation. The Officer stated that only activities with moveable equipment would be licensed. She advised that one of the issues with the current padel board court was that it was large-scale and the equipment would need dismantling if emergency access to the substation was required. In the future, licenses would be granted to smaller scale activities. Options had been considered with the Business Improvement Districts and all of these activities had dismantlable equipment.

An Officer commented that TfL had concerns about the padel board court. They were content for the license to be extended for the summer but were clear that they were not prepared to accept this permanently. The Officer stated that access to the substation was a constraint of the space and the area would be a flexible space with the ability to deliver events accommodate the needs of TfL plus the premises on the west side regarding their potential requirements for refurbishment. Members were informed that Officers had been working on the design over the last 12-18 months and the design had evolved over time.

A Member commented that sockets could be pre-built in the ground so sporting nets could be put up and removed quickly. An Officer stated that TfL understood the City wanted to change the nature of the space in terms of a permanent design and temporary usage. Only activities which would not put at risk other key aspects e.g., the servicing of the substation, would be licensed. If proposed equipment could not be dismantled in a reasonable time period, this would be discussed with TfL to ascertain if they were prepared to accept the use. The design of equipment would be important.

Having fully debated the application, the Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 4 votes
OPPOSED – 1 vote
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Deputy Fredericks asked for her vote against the recommendations to be recorded.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the additional cost of £160,747 for Phase 1 (S278 Highway Works) to be funded in full by the owner and approve the revised total budget for Phase 1 of £705,525 (excluding costed risk);
2. That Option 2 is approved for Phase 2 (Public Realm Enhancements to Crescent);
3. That an additional budget of £47,000 is approved for Phase 2 to reach Gateway 5;
4. Agree the total estimated cost of Phase 2 at £900,000 - £1,228,000 (excluding risk);
5. Agree the funding sources for Phase 2 set out in Appendix 3 of the Officer report.

5. CITY CLUSTER AREA - PROGRAMME UPDATE (INCLUDING LEADENHALL STREET IMPROVEMENTS)

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on the delivery of the City Cluster programme.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Note and approve the content of this progress update;
2. Note the funding strategy in Appendix 2 of the Officer report, and the commitment of £1m from the EC Business Improvement District, subject to the outcome of the City's capital bid which has been submitted for consideration;
3. Approve funding of £35,000 from the S106 contribution of 40 Leadenhall Street for staff costs and fees for the management of the City Cluster programme including communications, for the next reporting period, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Officer report; and
4. Approve the following recommendations regarding the Leadenhall Street Improvement project, to enable the project to progress to Gateway 3:
 - i. Approve the progression of the project's design shown in Appendix 3 of the Officer report towards a more-detailed design with costed greening and public realm options for future consideration and approval by Members;
 - ii. Approve the increased and amended budget shown in Appendix 4 of the Officer report to enable the above work to take place and reach the next gateway, including the requested increase of £173,000 to a new overall budget of £391,000. (proposed to be funded by the 20 Fenchurch Street S106 monies);
 - iii. Approve the inclusion of a works budget line to accommodate trial holes to help validate potential greening locations along the street; and
 - iv. Approve the amended Risk Register in Appendix 5 that has been updated following the outcome of TfL's Bishopsgate Experimental Traffic Order to release the funding previously held in the register back into the project.

6. CREECHURCH LANE AREA IMPROVEMENTS (CITY CLUSTER PROGRAMME)

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning proposed public realm and highway improvements to the Creechurch Lane, Mitre Street and Bury Street area.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the initiation of this project;
2. Approve the budget of £75,000 (staff costs and fees) for the project to reach the next Gateway 3/4, funded from the Section 106 agreement of 40 Leadenhall Street development;
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £500,000-£780,000 (excluding risk); and
4. Authorise officers to prepare and agree a funding letter to receive the external funding contribution from the EC Business Improvement District.

7. ST PAUL'S CATHEDRAL EXTERNAL RE-LIGHTING

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to replace the ageing external lighting

system at St Paul's Cathedral with a new innovative and energy efficient system.

The Officer stated that there would be brighter light to the dome and the upper parts of the building and this would support distant views across London. There would be softer, dimmed light to the base of the building which would contribute to the ambience of its local setting in the City. There would be an appearance of light radiating out from the main body of the cathedral to create a sense of a living building.

Members were informed that lighting tests would be carried out in the near future and the proposed lighting would be demonstrated to key stakeholders, decision makers from the City, St Paul's Cathedral, external statutory bodies and sponsors. The Officer stated that a budget of £350,000 was requested to carry out these trials, progress the design details and prepare the next gateway report which was due to be submitted in Quarter 3 of 2024. It was anticipated that the Gateway 5 report would be submitted in Quarter 1 of 2025.

The Officer stated that the report also requested approval to formalise the handover of management and maintenance of the lighting system to St Paul's Cathedral. Members were informed that the Cathedral had agreed to take on the future maintenance, running costs and management of the lighting system. It was anticipated that the new system would deliver annual savings of approximately 60% of both running costs and maintenance. It would also reduce light pollution and the carbon footprint in line with the City's Lighting Strategy, the Lighting Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the Climate Action Plan.

The Officer stated that project funding had now been secured through Section 106 contributions which were complementing the initial City contribution that was previously approved. In addition, discussions had taken place with nearby Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and external high-profile partners. It was anticipated that if any further funding was required for the project, this would be secured through external sources. The Officer stated that if additional external funding was secured in excess of the project cost, the City Fund contribution could be reduced accordingly.

In response to a question from a Member, the Officer stated that the equipment to be used in the lighting tests would be returned afterwards so there would be no cost. However, the demonstration required some equipment to be purchased. If it was considered that it could meet the needs of the final project it would be stored. If it was not suitable, it would be returned and the cost of the equipment would be reimbursed.

A Member requested that Members of the Sub-Committee be invited to attend the lighting tests and demonstration.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the updated concept design;

2. Approve the budget of an additional £350,000 to undertake the lighting tests and demonstration trials, progress the detailed design, and reach the next Gateway; funded from the £1.16m capital bid previously approved in 2021;
3. Authorise the transfer of any underspend from the previous Gateway to this Gateway budget;
4. Note the revised budget of £675,000;
5. Approve the revised project programme;
6. Approve that Officers enter into the required legal agreement with St Paul's Cathedral regarding the future maintenance and management of the lighting system; and
7. Be invited to attend the lighting tests and demonstration.

8. **MANSION HOUSE STATION ENVIRONS - LITTLE TRINITY LANE PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment, outlining the project aims to deliver an enhanced public space through increased greening, improved seating, and accessibility improvements plus additional design objectives to maximise the delivery of climate resilience measures.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve design option 2 to be taken forward to the next gateway;
2. Approve an additional budget of £37,600 from the 39-53 Cannon Street S106 to reach the next Gateway, thus increasing the available project budget to £177,607;
3. Note the revised total estimated cost of the project at £650,000-£780,00 excluding risk;
4. Delegate the approval of a Costed Risk Provision to the Interim Executive Director, Environment should one be sought at Gateway 5;
5. Delegate approval to undertake the statutory consultation that may be required in relation to the reviewed position of the Doctor's parking bay and disabled bays, to the Interim Executive Director, Environment.

9. **WIDEGATE STREET BARRIER AND OPERATION S278**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the installation of a physical barrier on Widegate Street.

In response to a Member's questions about how the bollards would be removed when the street was open, an Officer stated that there would be a legal agreement between the City and the operator, Marugame Udon, a restaurant located in Widegate Street, and they would be required to remove the bollards when the street was open.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the proposals as detailed in the Officer report; and
2. Authorise the Comptroller to enter into the S278 agreement under the Highways Act 1980, with Marugame Udon, to fund the proposals as

detailed in this report, operate the removable bollards, pay for maintenance when required and the removal of the measures should they no longer be needed.

10. ALLOCATION OF RING-FENCED S106 DEPOSITS TO PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning approval for a further allocation of ring-fenced S106 funds, consistent with previous Member approvals and corporate priorities.

An Officer stated that the money was ring-fenced as all of the Section 106 funds were either geographically restricted or restricted in purpose and had therefore been allocated, or had an allocation proposed, based on these factors.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee approve the allocation of £8,953,294 in S106 deposits to programmes and projects, as outlined in the Officer report.

11. COMBINED SECTION 278 PROJECT INITIATION REPORT

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which was a gateway 1 and 2 report for 23 separate Section 278 projects.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve project budgets for each project to reach the next gateways as set out in the tables in Section 2 of the Officer report; and
2. Authorise officers to instruct the Comptroller and City Solicitor's department to negotiate and enter into Section 278 agreements for the individual projects.

12. COMMEMORATIVE BENCHES AND TREES POLICY

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the Commemorative Benches and Trees Policy which aimed to formalise the existing offer for benches and trees in City Gardens and Public Realm.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee approve the adoption of the draft Commemorative Benches and Trees Policy as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer report.

13. 22 BISHOPSGATE PUBLIC REALM PROJECT

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to deliver new and improved public realm in Bishopsgate, Crosby Square, Great St Helen's and Undershaft under the Section 278 and Section 106 agreements associated with the development at 22 Bishopsgate.

Following a Member's comment about wind levels when exiting from Horizon 22, and asking about possible mitigation, Officers stated they would raise this with Planning Officers and report back to Members.

In response to a Member's concern that trees had been planted but one was not looking healthy, and others having been removed and not replaced, an Officer stated that under planning conditions, the trees would be replaced. He would enquire as to the species being proposed and report back to the Member. The Officer stated that the trees that had previously been planted, had been planted by the developer with TfL approval but against Officer recommendations. He further stated that the trees planted by the City in the public realm had a very high success rate.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the delay to the completion of the S278 works associated with 22 Bishopsgate;
2. Note the 6-8 Bishopsgate S278 contribution of £105,000 towards the increased cost of the 22 Bishopsgate public realm project;
3. Approve an increase to the 22 Bishopsgate public realm project budget of £105,000 to complete the project implementation in Undershaft and note the revised total estimated project cost at £1,400,500; and
4. Approve the budget adjustment related to staff and works costs to be actioned as outlined in Table 2 Appendix 4 of the Officer report.

14. 35 VINE STREET SECTION 278 HIGHWAY WORKS

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to deliver an enhanced package of Section 278 highway and public realm improvements around the new development at 35 Vine Street, including the introduction of pedestrian priority measures in part of Vine Street, new cycle parking and ten street trees.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Agree to retain £14,987 as a commuted maintenance sum for City Gardens to maintain the ten street trees;
2. Approve the budget adjustment set out in Appendix 3, Table 2 of the Officer report;
3. Approve the content of the outcome report and agree for the project to be closed;
4. Authorise the return of unspent funds to the developer.

15. CREED COURT S.278

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to deliver public realm enhancements to the area surrounding the new development at Creed Court as outlined in the Sections 106 and 278 agreements, to accommodate the projected increase in pedestrian traffic and servicing needs of the hotel.

A Member commented that when the street was partially closed, many pedestrians were unaware the street was partially open and therefore businesses that relied on passing trade, had lost business. He advised that

once Officers were informed of this, they responded quickly, putting signage on Ludgate Hill advising that the businesses were still open. He stated that this was a learning point for the future.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the contents of this report and agree to close this project;
2. Approve the budget adjustment related to staff costs to be actioned as outlined in Appendix 3 of the Officer report;
3. Authorise return of unused funds to the developer, including any accrued interest as per the Section 278 agreement.

16. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out the list of Outstanding References.

RESOLVED – That the Beech Street Transport and Public Realm Improvements item be removed from the list of Outstanding References.

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

There were no questions.

18. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were two items of business to be considered under 18a and 18b.

18.1 Moor Lane Environmental Enhancements

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on recent activity and the next steps for Area B (the Western side of Moor Lane). The Officer stated that Area A (the Eastern side of Moor Lane) had already been agreed in July 2022 and work would start on Area A in October 2023.

An Officer stated that the report followed concerns raised by local resident representatives regarding design. The design which had been approved in May 2023 had an outstanding element relating to the greening aspects for the Rain Gardens, planters and the Clean Air Garden. The Officer advised that the recent representations were outside of the elements delegated in that approval and that the issues raised were contained within the Officer report. She stated that Officers had proposed to pause delivery and undertake a review of the design for the Western pavement and look at whether a change of traffic management in the Healthy Streets Neighbourhood Plan would offer a greater opportunity for additional greening and planting. It was also proposed that independent advice would be sought to review the proposals and feed into an overall design review. The Officer stated that the aim of the review was to establish if there were any other options that would allow taller trees or greater planting that would be deliverable, sustainable and maintainable in the longer term. This information would then be presented back to interested stakeholders

at a stakeholder progress meeting and there would then be a report back to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee in early 2024.

In response to a Member's question, the Officer stated that the constraints of the street still remained, particularly regarding London Underground and the requirement for access to the car park and 21 Moorfields.

The Chairman asked if Officers were fully aware of any limitations under the ground. An Officer stated that Officers were confident that the exact location of the Underground structure was known and Officers were aware of the limitations of very shallow depths. She advised that extra trial holes in the Clean Air Garden on the Barbican Estate land had identified a ramp. The Officer stated that if there was an opportunity to extend the footway further, some additional trial holes could be required at each end but it was unlikely that any further trial holes would be required in the middle section where the Underground structure was located.

A Member stated that the amount of planting seemed to have decreased and there was more pavement in the latest versions of the proposal. She stated that residents understood the constraints of the site in terms of depth but it was important to define the streetscape constraints e.g., the required widths of the pavement and road to improve understanding of why certain ideas were impossible or possible. The Member commented that trees had been promised and although there were constraints about the type of trees, there should be a clear understanding of the height that plants could grow to. She stated that whilst it was acknowledged that mature plane trees could not be planted, some bushy trees and an abundance of planting would help address concerns. She stated that although residents would be disappointed in a delay, this could mean the design was future-proofed. She also stated that residents had been in discussions with the Culture Mile Business Improvement District about the possibility of additional funding to spend in the area as it was a through-route and was part of Moorgate Crossrail and she suggested that linkages should be looked at when considering public realm. The Member suggested that if the current road closure was moved along the road, the road could be divided into two as there were only five entrances in the whole street that required servicing.

The Member also stated that not all of the residents wanted to keep the Clean Air Garden (Pot Garden). Many wanted the complete project to feel like a scheme rather than a continuation of this garden. She advised that although there was a Barbican interest in the Pot Garden, it was being looked after by people who did not live there.

A Member stated that the Clean Air Garden was intended to be temporary, and the materials chosen reflected that. He considered that there should be a uniform garden along Moor Lane. Although there were very few places a tree could be planted, it might be possible to include one in the Clean Air Garden. The Member stated there were divergent views and many residents felt their voices were not being heard. He further stated that open consultation with people in the area would help to address this and their views should be

recorded and considered. The Member stated that originally, green walls that were not attached to the building, were considered and he was unclear why this was no longer possible.

The Chairman stated that although engagement with local stakeholders would lead to further delays, it was important to have a decisive majority in favour of the eventual outcome. He also stated that there were constraints of the site and expectations had to be managed.

In response to a Member's query about the ramp, an Officer stated that it was her understanding that this was an old car park ramp. A Member stated that it was underground connection between estate and buildings and was still used for utilities.

In response to a Member's question about whether there was a time limit to the funding, the Officer stated that under S106 each agreement was different and there was usually a time limit. She advised that Cool Streets and Greening funds had to be spent by 2025.

A Member commented on the presumption that the road had to be 6 metres wide to have two-way traffic as there were other places in the City with roads less than 6m where chicanes and priority signs were used. An Officer stated that potential options for traffic management would be considered as part of the design review. He advised that they might need to be phased into improvements as they would be unfunded and any traffic management changes would be undertaken as part of the Healthy Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman commented that if there was agreement on an endpoint which was not immediately affordable, the project could be split into phases for delivery.

An Officer stated that it was important to look at opportunities to future-proof the scheme as streets changed over time. He advised that the Healthy Neighbourhoods agenda might look at the way in which traffic could be managed across the whole area and this might provide alternatives. He stated that the proposal put forward 10 years ago was more ambitious than could be delivered and it was understandable that residents were disappointed this could not be delivered. He further stated that the way the division was now structured meant this should not happen with future schemes. The Officer advised that Officers were committed to continue the engagement on this scheme. He informed Members that the City had some of the best expertise in planting and garden maintenance with the City's microclimate and there was confidence that the Gardens Team would help to deliver the best deliverable, sustainable and maintainable scheme given the constraints. He advised that climate resilient planting would be included.

The Officer stated that following a visit to the Clean Air Garden, there would be a wider meeting to consider the options. In response to a question as to who would be consulted, Officers stated that Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, ward Members, stakeholders who had written in, such as residents of Willoughby House, Heron House, the Barbican Association and Friends of City Gardens would be consulted. The Officer stated that if Members

had any further suggestions of people to invite to the site visit and progress meeting, these could be added to the list of invitees. The Officer informed Members that after the meeting, Officers would then make recommendations to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to consider.

In response to a Member's question about whether the Gardens Team should offer a consulting service to residents and businesses in relation to plants that should be planted for the City's microclimate, an Officer stated that discussions had been taking place with planning colleagues to ensure that there were resources available to provide the expertise within the Corporation.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

18.2 **Report of Action Taken**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out the action taken since the last meeting.

In response to a Member's question as to why the continuation of the traffic and timing mix review at Bank would cost £650,000, an Officer stated that if there was a robust reason to change the traffic order, traffic modelling would be required. Much of the money was to pay for consultants' time as well as TfL's time for the auditing of a large modelled area and £150,000 was for costed risk. Therefore, £500,000 had been set aside to progress the project to conclusion if there was a change to the traffic order. An Officer stated that approximately £100,000 had been committed to studies underway on taxi availability.

A Member commented that the Court of Common Council approved the need for a review, not necessarily for a change, and that wording should reflect the words of the motion.

A Member asked for a full breakdown of the costs of revisiting the mix of traffic at Bank and raised concern that the motion was not debated in Court. She also raised concern about the amount of Officers' time and resources spent on this. She raised further concern that the mix and timings of traffic might not be approved by TfL and stated that she would like the junction closed to traffic 7am-7pm and also at weekends. She stated that the closure had calmed the whole area and suggested that the Sub-Committee should undertake a review so lessons could be learnt going forward. The Member also raised concern that the decision was taken under urgency which meant the Sub-Committee could not discuss it.

An Officer stated that an update report would be submitted to the Planning and Transportation Committee in November 2023 and then an update report would be submitted to the Court of Common Council in December. He informed Members that when updates on projects were provided, a breakdown of money spent and forecast to be spent was provided and that this would be included in this report. The Officer stated that in this instance, the spend linked to the traffic and timing mix review would be differentiated as it was part of a wider budget. The Officer stated that the report on the wider traffic order review had detailed spending and this could be provided. The Officer stated that there had been an

overall allocation of £500,000 for the review and it had not all been spent on the review. Some of the changes and opportunities identified were to amend traffic orders to bring them in line or deliver wider benefits and these were being implemented. The Member asked for details of the projects that had not been undertaken as a result of the time and resources spent on this review and commented that there would be increased costs due to inflation. She stated that there had been a knock-on cost to developers in terms of Section 278 money.

A Member asked Officers that when showing the figures, to try and split the spend money between costs incurred into money that was spent as a result of the motion and money that would have been spent anyway as there was already a plan to have a review a year later.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 3.40 pm

Chairman

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