

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 19 March 2024

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, 19 March 2024 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Graham Packham (Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Deputy Shravan Joshi MBE
Deputy Charles Edward Lord
Alderswoman Susan Pearson
Ian Seaton
Deputy Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Melanie Charalambous	- Environment Department
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Daniel Laybourn	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
David Morris	- Environment Department
Tom Noble	- Environment Department
Giles Radford	- Environment Department
Clarisse Tavin	- Environment Department
Giacomo Vecia	- Environment Department
Clive Whittle	- Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from John Edwards, Deputy Marianne Fredericks and Deputy Alastair Moss.

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

In relation to Agenda Item 14, Ian Seaton declared that he was church warden at St Lawrence Jewry and Deputy Edward Lord declared that they were on the Guild Church Council of St Lawrence Jewry.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, That the public minutes of the meeting of 30 January 2024 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings.

Matters Arising

Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Streets Plan

The Chairman stated that he had met with Councillor Rowena Champion, who held the Transport Portfolio at Islington Council and he advised that work was progressing well.

King William Street bus stop at the top of the steps under London Bridge

An Officer stated that TfL had replied to the request to relocate the bus stop and they had advised that it would not be possible to move it further south as it would be closer to the bridge and would interfere with the lanes. They had stated that buses could potentially get stuck behind each other when they were using the bus stop and this could lead to delays and congestion on the bus network. A Member stated that there was currently significant crowding by the bus stop and the steps by King William Street which made it very difficult for pedestrians to pass. They requested that TfL be asked to relocate the bus stop to the north where the pavement was wide and the bus stop would not interfere with lanes. The Officer stated he would request TfL to move the bus stop northwards and would also follow up with TfL on the bridge repairs request at the last meeting as he had not yet received a response.

4. **PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY STREETS PROGRAMME - PHASE 1 (KING WILLIAM STREET TRANSFORMATION AND PROGRAMME UPDATES)**

Members considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the King William Street Transformation and Programme Updates as part of the Pedestrian Priority Streets.

Members were informed that scheme would include wider footways, a narrowed carriageway to 6.4m, the minimum for two-way buses, greening and substantial tree planting, new side entry treatments where they were not already in place to help people walking and wheeling, raised carriageway tables at King William Street at the junction with Lombard Street and Nicholas Lane junctions to complement the London Underground step-free accesses, two purpose built inset loading bays. The scheme accounted for TfL's plans at Monument Junction so less work would be required on the City Network as part of that. It was proposed to start work in Summer 2024 and for work to last for 18 months.

In response to the Chairman's question about the local Members consulted and their responses, the Officer stated that there had been minor comments about design elements e.g. street furniture but there was support from all the Members consulted. Following a Member's question about specific feedback given, the Officer stated that there had been comments about the Lombard Street Corner and the number of people using the London Underground entrance. Officers had responded to the feedback and they would continue with design work on this corner. There were also comments on the cycle stands and

trees. In response to a Member's question, the Officer confirmed that black taxis at Bank Junction had not been raised.

In response to Members' questions, the Officer confirmed that surveys had been undertaken and trees could be planted and the bicycle racks would be Sheffield stands. Also, the inset loading bay loading restrictions mirrored others in the area. Due to the bays being located on the footway, the restrictions sought to avoid peak hours when the footways were busiest.

A Member asked how the Bank Junction decision due to be made by the Court of Common Council in June 2024 would impact upon this scheme. The Officer stated that the design of this scheme would not change regardless of the Bank Junction decision.

A Member asked for confirmation that, if a decision was taken to reopen Bank Junction to black taxis, this would not impact on the design of this scheme. An Officer stated that it would not. He added that Bank Junction did not have 24 hours restrictions in place and therefore vehicle movement was allowed through the junction.

The Chairman asked if there would be any changes to the vehicle restrictions and the Officer responded that in this scheme, there would be no changes to the Traffic Management Order (TMO) that was previously approved. There would be changes to the waiting and loading restrictions.

A Member asked for details on the improved drainage system. The Officer stated that current King William Street was serviced by four drain covers along its 400m length. A more contemporary drainage system would be installed. There would not be an increase in the highways drainage as there would still be the same amount of water, but the extended footways would be accommodated. The Officer confirmed that the high-level drainage would be replaced, but the actual drainage system this would go into, would not change.

The Chairman asked if there would be a pedestrian controlled crossing at the Monument junction end of the street. Members were informed that Officers had worked with TfL and their Safer Junctions team who were designing Monument junction. They planned to consult after the mayoral elections. Officers had designed a scheme that was ready for that project. The Officer stated that the crossing would be improved and moved back so a dropped kerb could be accommodated. It would be an informal crossing with a temporary traffic island until the Monument Junction work was completed and then pedestrian controlled lights would be installed. The Officer stated that the phasing of Monument Junction did not currently allow for a full green man crossing. The system being built would enable TfL to put signals in as part of their scheme.

In response to the Chairman's questions about the phasing of the scheme, an Officer stated that work would start at the southern end and move towards the northern end, working on roughly a third of the street at a time. There would be some full closures of the street to allow for resurfacing and this would be undertaken at the least disruptive times. The Officer stated that there would be

no southbound traffic on King William for 18 months to allow for the working space. Northbound access for motor vehicles, pedestrian access and accessibility access would be retained as best as possible at all times throughout the scheme apart from during resurfacing work. Work was taking place with TfL on the diversion route for buses. Work was also taking place on diversions and phasing plans for cycles and motor vehicles. An Officer stated that there would be publicity and a briefing note on the details of the works and Members of the Sub-Committee would be provided with this in advance.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the final highway and public realm design for King William Street (shown in Appendices 2, 3 and 4 of the Officer report) which widens the pavements on both sides of the street, allows for the planting of a number of street trees, the provision of some seating and reconstruction of the carriageway;
2. Approve the requested overall budget of £5,756,690 (an increase of £3,572,261, excluding costed risk and maintenance, funded by previously approved funding) to implement the King William Street Transformation and continue work on the rest of the programme;
3. Approve the Costed Risk Register in Appendix 5 and the requested increase of the Costed Risk Provision from £417,200 to £518,000 (an increase of £100,800) for the entire programme, and that the Executive Director Environment is delegated to authorise the drawdown of funds from this register;
4. Approve the commuted maintenance budget of £87,000 for the trees on King William Street. This is to be funded by the Cool Streets & Greening Programme funding which is included in this overall budget; and
5. Agree that the Corporate Programme Management Office, in consultation with the Chairman of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee and Chief Officer as necessary, is to decide whether any project issues or decisions that falls within the remit of paragraph 45 of the 'City of London Project Procedure – Oct 2023' (Changes to Projects: General), as prescribed in Appendix 6 of this report, is to be delegated to Chief Officer or escalated to committee(s).

5. OLD JEWRY AND IRONMONGER LANE

Members considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning details of the potential improvements to Ironmonger Lane as requested by Members at the last meeting.

An Officer stated that there had been discussion at the last sub-committee meeting around the options for potentially opening Old Jewry in a southbound direction and Members indicated support for Option 2 - the southbound reopening of Old Jewry at all times and then pausing any work on potential improvements whilst conducting an experimental traffic order around the reopening. The Officer stated that there had also been discussion at the meeting about the potential for Ironmonger Lane. Officers were asked to consider how the two schemes might link and whether there was merit in looking at them together. The Officer stated that Officers had concluded that

Ironmonger Lane was unlikely to be an alternative route to most of the people currently using Old Jewry as they were not on the same desire lines. Whilst this could change due to routes available to people walking in the area when the new route through a development on Frederick's Place, Officers did not consider the projects to be linked and suggested that if Members chose to proceed with Option 2A, this scheme would be taken forward separately to any improvements to Ironmonger Lane. Members were informed that some of these improvements would come forward as part of a Section 278.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that the timeframes for the scheme were as outlined in the Officer report to the previous sub-committee meeting and Officers would provide these to the Member.

A Member commented that Ironmonger Lane was scheduled to reopen in July 2024 and asked whether it was appropriate to open it at this point if it would then be substantially closed shortly afterwards. An Officer stated that it was currently closed for construction activity and it was possible it might be needed for longer for fit out works. The Officer stated that he considered it appropriate to allow the street to open up first before the consideration of time restrictions. He added that this could be dealt with separately from Old Jewry. The Officer added that the number of vehicles that previously used the street was minimal so there would be a minimal impact if there was a closure to implement in due course a scheme to improve and enhance the street.

A Member commented that the pavements on Ironmonger Lane were very narrow. She stated that any project should make it more pedestrian friendly. An Officer stated that Officers proposed to extend the scope of the Section 278 project to raise the carriageway and potentially introduce pedestrian zone restrictions and there would be a report on this to a future meeting of the sub-committee. He added that there would need to be a bid for funding as it was not a funded project and funding would need to be secured before a project could proceed.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Confirm the decision to proceed with Option 2a, as indicated at the January meeting of this Sub Committee, to initiate a traffic experiment to reopen Old Jewry to all traffic in a southbound direction, at all times; and pause any work on potential improvements until the conclusion of the experiment; and
 2. Note that, subject to a successful funding bid, the scope of the project to deliver the s278 for Dauntsey House will be expanded to incorporate improvements along the length of Ironmonger Lane, including a potential pedestrian zone.
6. **PAN-LONDON RENTAL E-SCOOTER TRIAL EXTENSION UNTIL MAY 2026**
Members considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the extension of the Pan-London rental scooter e-trial until May 2026.

The Officer stated that e-scooters were a form of dockless vehicle. They were managed very differently to dockless bikes as they were regulated in a way that dockless bikes were not. The e-scooter trial had been helpful in informing the forthcoming London wide contract and this could also improve dockless bike management.

The Chairman queried whether, if the City of London Corporation declined to participate, it would free up space for more dockless bikes. An Officer confirmed this would be the case, but the amount of increased space would not be sufficient to resolve the space issues. He added that Officers were looking to identify additional parking spaces for e-scooters and bikes. Officers had explored with TfL and London Councils the option of leaving the trial and having more spaces available and they were keen for the Corporation to stay in the trial. They found having a destination like the City of London as part of the trial was useful in understanding how people used e-scooters. The wider learnings for the trial were helpful in terms of informing the broader policy approach to the management of both bikes and scooters in the future.

A Member commented that the behavioural pattern between cyclists and e-scooters was different. He stated that there was a need to find more space for e-bikes rather than leaving the trial to gain more space.

A Member asked why delegated authority was being sought. An Officer stated that another extension was not anticipated but if there was one, it would be of a similar nature and it was considered that it would be appropriate to work with the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen to process any necessary extensions should this matter arise.

A Member raised concern that if the City was not part of trial, it could increase the number of scooters being left at the periphery of the City. She asked for statistics of the numbers using e-scooters. An Officers stated that statistics showed there had been a year-on-year increase in the number of e-scooter trips on the trial. There had been enforcement against private e-scooter use and anecdotally it seemed the number of private e-scooter users had declined following the rise in the number of private rental e-scooters. The number of rental dockless bikes had also increased significantly.

A Member asked how the safety statistics in the Officer report compared to other forms of transport. An Officer stated that this information had been requested from TfL who had stated that analysis was ongoing and it would take additional time to provide like-for-like figures. He also added that it was difficult to fully capture the rate of safety incidents on e-scooters because Stats 19, the Department for Transport regulated collision and accident reporting guidance and guidelines, did not list e-scooters as a mode of transport.

In response to a question from the Chairman as to why e-scooters were less problematic than e-bikes, an Officer stated that there were less well used than e-bikes and were more tightly controlled through a contract with TfL. They were not legal for use on the public highway and were only permitted to operate as part of these trials. There were also legal controls around the use of e-scooters

and rental e-scooters, in particular where they were permitted to end journeys and park. Officers considered that the contractual regulatory environment as well as the legal regulatory environment led to higher rates of compliance and officers would continue to advocate for legislation that would provide additional powers to manage dockless bikes.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the City of London Corporation's participation in the extension of the pan-London rental e-scooter trial until May 2026; and
2. Delegate authority to approve participation in any further rental e-scooter trials or extensions beyond May 2026 to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chairs and Deputy Chairs of Planning & Transportation Committee and Streets & Walkways Sub Committee.

7. **ST PAUL'S CATHEDRAL EXTERNAL RE-LIGHTING**

Members considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on the works completed to date.

An Officer stated that the cathedral lighting was over 30 years old and was out of date in terms of technology and energy use. The Corporation had historically managed the lighting and once of the outcomes of this process was to hand control over to the cathedral. The Officer stated that the lighting trial was intended to prove the concepts and demonstrate the control that could be applied over the lighting of the cathedral. The ambition was to better reveal the architecture of the building at night, to improve the quality of the lit environment and to look at how technology could better deliver a low energy solution with approximately a 75% reduction in energy. There were considerable heritage considerations. The Officer reported that the trial was a success with a significant amount of positive feedback. Detailed design would now take place. He added there was considerable work needed to be undertaken around the consent process particularly with the cathedral itself and in relation to the buildings adjacent to the cathedral. The Officer stated the complexity of having to deliver the lighting on such an important building.

Members were shown a number of photographs from the lighting trial which focussed on the west elevation. Members were shown comparisons between the current lighting and the lighting trial with the concept of light coming from within the building to show that it was a live building and a place of worship. The new lighting would reveal the architecture of the building, showing depth and architectural details and features that were currently in shadow. The colour of the lighting would make the building stand out in the local and wider environment. The trials provided a good opportunity to test different levels of lighting with the gradual dimming of lighting throughout the night.

Members were also shown photographs from key points across London. Members were informed that the new lighting would be warmer than that of many other buildings so the Cathedral dome would be more visible.

In response to a Member's question about costs, an Officer stated that this would be part of the next stage with the detailed design work as part of the quantity surveyor process. Officers had worked to secure funding from a number of external sources. The Corporation would also contribute and would continue to look at funding as the programme evolved.

The Chairman asked Officers to outline the operational costs once the lighting was completed. An Officer stated that the cost would transfer to St Paul's Cathedral. The energy and maintenance costs would reduce and would be affordable for the cathedral to take on.

A Member asked if it was possible to shorten the timeframe. An Officer stated that the timeframe was realistic given the required permissions and consents which were outside the Corporation's control. He added that the cathedral was fully engaged with the process. After this time, there could be ways to accelerate the process. Officers would keep Members informed.

In response to a Member's questions, an Officer stated that the delivery phase was not just the time on site but also included fixtures and fittings being made. The procurement process would be followed for the supply of these. The Officer added that challenges in delivering the lighting scheme would include the heritage nature of the building and services taking place which meant there would have to be phased working hours.

In response to a Member's question about funding sources, an Officer stated these were included on page 151 of the agenda pack.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that the project aligned with the Climate Action Strategy objectives and moving the City towards net zero.

The Chairman asked about engagement with Historic England. An Officer stated that the individuals involved had been positive and consultation would be taking place.

The Chairman asked for further details on who was on the joint project board. An Officer confirmed it comprised Officers, external experts and representatives from St Paul's Cathedral. The Officer also confirmed that there was currently one project manager who was an Officer.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the procurement and appointment of services required to reach the next Gateway;
2. Approve the additional budget of £705,000 funded from the S106 contributions allocated to the project (£640,000) and the previously approved £1.16M capital bid (£65,000) as detailed in Finance Tables in Appendix 2; and
3. Note the revised budget of 1,380,000 (excluding risk).

8. **STONECUTTER COURT S278**

Members considered a Gateway 3/4/5 options appraisal and authority to start work report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning Stonecutter Court S278.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve a budget of £631,400 is approved to reach the next Gateway;
2. Note the revised total estimated project budget is £696,400 (excluding risk);
3. Approve a Costed Risk Provision of £100,000 (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer) as set out in the risk register in Appendix 4 of the Officer report;
4. Note the Commuted Maintenance sum of £45,100, is included in the budget and will cover any additional future maintenance costs for a period of 20 years;
5. Approve the design option shown in Appendix 2;
6. Note that the making of the necessary Traffic Orders, subject to no objections, or the resolution and consideration of any objections, is delegated to the Director of City Operations under the scheme of delegation;
7. Delegate to the Executive Director Environment authority to approve budget adjustments, above the existing authority within the project procedures and in consultation with the Chamberlain, between budget lines within the approved total project budget; and
8. Delegate to the Executive Director Environment authority to further increase or amend the project budgets in the future (above the level of the existing delegated authority) provided any increase be fully funded by the Developer.

9. **65 GRESHAM STREET S278**

Members considered a Gateway 2: project proposal report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning 65 Gresham Street S278.

A Member asked if St Lawrence Jewry would be involved in discussions and an Officer confirmed that they would be approached as a local stakeholder.

In response to a Member's questions, an Officer stated that this proposal had come out of the 278 negotiation as part of the planning process. He added that this was a gateway report stating that there was a potential project in this space that the developer was happy to fund the first piece of work which was to investigate the possibility. He added that there would be transparency about what would be delivered. Any possible road closures would require the sub-committee's approval and a public statutory consultation. Although there was a delegation for projects under £1million, given the traffic order requirement and the interest of members, this would come to the sub-committee.

A Member who was on the Guild Church Council of St Lawrence Jewry, raised concern that the church had not been consulted on the planning application and

stated that under Section 106 there could have been greater engagement with St Lawrence Jewry.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve a budget of £100,000 to reach the next Gateway as set out in Section 2;
2. Authorise officers to instruct the Comptroller & City Solicitor's department to negotiate and enter into a Section 278 agreement;
3. Agree that the Corporate Programme Manager, in consultation with the Chairman of the Projects & Procurement Sub Committee and Chief Officer as necessary, is to decide whether any project issues or decisions that fall within the remit of paragraph 45 of the 'City of London Project Procedure – November 2023' (Changes to Projects: General) is to be delegated to Chief Officer or escalated to committee(s); and
4. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to approve budget procedures in consultation with the Chamberlain, between budget lines if this is within the total project budget amounts.

10. **FENCHURCH STREET AREA HEALTHY STREETS PLAN**

Members considered a Gateway 2: project proposal report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve a budget of £100,000 to reach the next Gateway;
2. Note the total estimated cost of the project to develop the plan is £240,000 (excluding risk); and
3. Approve the boundary of the Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan as set out in Appendix 3 of the Officer report.

11. **BEVIS MARKS SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE SYSTEM (SUDS)**

Members considered a Gateway 6: outcome report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the Bevis Marks Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS).

In response to a question from the Chairman, an Officer confirmed that engineers had stated the square meterage of paving that now flowed into the SUDS beds and the planting and permeable paving was 200 square metres. Officers would undertake a data review on the combined SUDS projects in terms of the amount of water saved from the drainage system and would also look to collate statistics of typical figures from summer storms and the impact of the schemes.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the content of this outcome report;
2. Approve the budget adjustment summarised in section 13 and Table 2 of the Officer report;

3. Agree to close this project once the budget adjustment to cover an increase in staff costs has been completed (refer to section 13 of the Officer report); and
4. Agree for the unspent funds from this project to be re-allocated to the Climate Action Strategy programme – Phase 3.

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

Members considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning an update on the Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee note the usage of the ATTRO during 2023, and that it will remain in place until the next review in two years' time.

13. *** OUTSTANDING REFERENCES RECEIVED.**

14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

A Member stated that the Moorfields Highwalk had recently come into operation but the lifts and escalators were not working at weekends and evenings. She added that the highwalk was one of the main links to the Barbican Centre and was also used by residents so it was important it was accessible at all times. The Member asked about the planning requirements. An Officer stated that it appeared the developer was switching off the lifts and escalators out of hours. Officers were investigating the requirements of the planning consent. He also advised that from the point of adoption, the Corporation would have more ability to control the timing of the facilities.

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no urgent business to be considered.

16. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting on 30 January 2024 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings.

18. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no urgent business to be considered in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 3.00 pm

Chairman

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