

Committees: Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee <i>[for decision]</i> Projects and Procurement Sub-Committee <i>[for information]</i>	Dates: 09 July 2024 15 July 2024
Subject: 2 Aldermanbury Square Unique Project Identifier: 12359	Gateway 3: Outline Options Appraisal (Regular)
Report of: Interim Director Environment Report Author: Andrea Moravicova	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Deliver changes to the public highway in the vicinity of the development at 2 Aldermanbury Square, also known as City Place House, through a Section 278 agreement that is fully funded by the developer.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £833,060 - £1,204,096</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): The total estimated cost of the project remains within the range provided at Gateway 2.</p> <p>Spend to Date: £56,639</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: None</p> <p>Slippage: None</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 4: Detailed Options Appraisal</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete relevant surveys and assessments. • Continue developing proposed designs. • Continue negotiations of the Section 278 agreement with the developer. <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve that officers continue with the design of all three options whilst necessary surveys are undertaken and analysed, and negotiations with the developer are concluded; 2. Approve the budget adjustment related to fees to be actioned as outlined in Appendix 2;

3. Authorise officers to invoice the developer any reasonable costs necessary to progress to the next gateway (Detailed Options Appraisal), in advance of the full S278 payment to avoid delays to the programme. The amount would be deducted from the full S278 works implementation payment;
4. Note the total estimated cost of the project for Option 1 at £1,204,096 (excluding risk).

3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway

Expenditure to date is £50,087.59. Activities completed include radar and topographic surveys, development of the design and negotiations with the developer regarding these proposals and Section 278 agreement, liaison with officers in Legal, Structures and Transportation teams on design proposals and their wider impact.

Table 1 outlines the costs necessary to reach the next Gateway (Detailed Options Appraisal).

The staff costs will cover project management, detailed design and construction package completion, local stakeholder liaison, developer negotiations and report writing.

Fees will cover structural surveys to establish a potential impact of introducing one traffic lane in westbound direction on London Wall, on the structure of the car park.

Table 2 indicates an estimate of the overall costs of the project, including maintenance, for an implementation of a desired Option 1.

Table 1: Revised budget to reach next Gateway			
Item	Funds received to date (£)	Resource required to reach next gateway (£)	Revised budget to next gateway (£)
Staff costs	60,000	-23,000	37,000
Fees	40,000	23,000	63,000
Total	100,000	0	100,000

Table 2: Estimated overall costs for Option 1		
Item	Cost (£)	Funds/ Source of Funding
Staff costs	187,000	S.278
Fees	88,830	
Works	794,094	
Utilities	95,000	
Maintenance	39,172	
Total	1,204,096	

Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £0

4. Overview of project options

The project aims to deliver a well-functioning street environment that improves the usability and safety of the area for people walking, wheeling and cycling. The scope of the project was outlined within the Section 106 Agreement.

When developing the design options, officers liaised with the developer and other City departments and divisions and considered the existing street layout together with the changes brought by the new development.

Three options have been outlined and are proposed to be taken to the next stage of the design.

All three options have the same design proposed for Basinghall Street but differ in the proposals for London Wall and are shown in Appendix 3.

Option 1 (preferred - aligns to the scope outlined in the Section 106 agreement)

- Widen the southern pavement on London Wall between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Gardens.
- Widen the central reservation at the two raised table points on London Wall to provide additional space for people waiting to cross.
- Reduce road width of London Wall to one lane westbound.
- Introduce a section of hatched lining to separate cycle lane from motor traffic lane along the westbound cycle lane to enhance safety for people cycling.

Option 2 (also reflects the scope of works outlined in the Section 106 agreement but with limited scope compared to Option 1)

- Widen the central reservation at the two raised table points on London Wall to provide additional space for people waiting to cross.
- Reduce road width of London Wall to one lane westbound.
- Introduce a section of hatched lining to separate cycle lane from motor traffic lane along the westbound cycle lane to enhance safety for people cycling.

Option 3 (minimal changes to London Wall area, due to potential issues with loading on the underground structure)

- Retain two lanes of traffic
- Repave the southern pavement on London Wall between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden.
- Introduce a mandatory cycle lane on London Wall westbound.

Legal implications

In making determinations in respect of traffic orders or changes to the highway, regard must be had to the duty to secure the efficient use of the road network, avoiding congestion and disruption, and the duty to secure the expeditious convenient and safe movement of traffic, having regard to effect on amenities, as set out Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act.

Equalities implications

Tests of relevance assessing the impact of all three options on protected characteristics concluded that all options, albeit in varying extent, could improve walking and wheeling experience on people with protected

characteristics. However, removal of a lane of traffic may increase the travel times and costs, and therefore negatively impact some people with protected characteristics of age, disability, and pregnancy and maternity, who may be more reliant on a motor vehicle as a mobility aid.

The options will continue to be reviewed as design progresses and a full Equality Impact Assessments will be undertaken prior to Gateway 5.

The Option 1 proposal was also assessed using the City of London Streets Accessibility Tool (CoLSAT), which enables street designers to identify how street features impact on the different needs of disabled people. The tool recognises that the needs of different groups of disabled people can be contradictory; that improving accessibility for one group may decrease accessibility for another. CoLSAT identifies trade-offs that may be needed to ensure no one is excluded from using the City's streets and provides the basis for engagement and discussions to maximise the benefits for all.

The Options 2 and 3, which retain two-lane of motor traffic westbound will likely result in slightly lesser improvement on London Wall for people walking and wheeling as the road width remains unchanged.

CoLSAT Summary Results Table.

	Total 0 scores – severe accessibility issue				Total 1 scores - significant accessibility issues			
	Basinghall Street		London Wall		Basinghall Street		London Wall	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Electric Wheelchair user	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Manual Wheelchair user	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Mobility Scooter user	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Walking Aid user	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Person with a walking impairment	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	3
Long cane user	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Guide Dog user	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	2
Residual Sight user	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Deaf or Hearing impairment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Acquired neurological impairment	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Autism/Sensory -processing diversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Developmental Impairment	2	0	0	0	3	1	4	2
Total	7	0	1	0	16	4	16	7

The table above shows the severe and significant issues identified through the CoLSAT assessments of the existing condition and proposed design. The proposed scheme has a potential to improve the walking and wheeling

experience for all assessed characteristics. The scheme, however, will be unable to resolve several significant accessibility issues. These relate to: maintaining or introducing tactile paving to the crossing points, taxi drop-off locations, level crossovers and distance to changing places toilets, which may have potential implications for people with walking impairment and / or guide dog users.

Healthy Streets assessment

A Healthy Streets Design Check was undertaken on the current arrangements in London Wall and Basinghall Street and the preferred proposal (Option 1) listed in this report.

The results of this check suggest a slight improvement to the area after the implementation of the scheme, although two “zero” scores from the current layout on London Wall, related to the vehicle volumes and ease of crossing between junctions remain featuring in all proposed designs. The ‘wheel’ below provides a summary of the results. The Options 2 and 3 are likely to score slightly lower than Option 1, as the road width that people walking and wheeling are expected to cross remains unchanged.

Healthy Street score for London Wall comparing the existing situation (faded colour) and Option 1 (bold colour)

	Existing Layout Score	Proposed Layout Score
Healthy Streets Score	48	57
Everyone feels welcome	54	67
Easy to cross	25	42
Shade and shelter	33	33
Places to stop and rest	83	92
Not too noisy	33	40
People choose to walk and cycle	54	67
People feel safe	49	62
Things to see and do	67	67
People feel relaxed	54	67
Clean air	25	33

The results also suggest that the area of Basinghall Street between Aldermanbury Square and Basinghall Street Avenue will be improved through implementation of the proposed scheme. The three “zero” scores from the current layout on Basinghall Street remain unaddressed in all options; these relate to ease of crossing at junctions and missing tactile paving at some crossing points, which were identified within the assessment area, but are outside the S278 project scope. The space for cycling also remains similar to existing arrangements due to the available traffic lanes widths. Officers will investigate if any alternative funding is available to

undertake these small elements of work at the same time as the S278 project.

Healthy Street score for Basinghall Street comparing the existing situation (faded colour) and Option 1 (bold colour)

	Existing Layout Score	Proposed Layout Score
Healthy Streets Score	43	52
Everyone feels welcome	44	54
Easy to cross	46	50
Shade and shelter	33	33
Places to stop and rest	33	50
Not too noisy	53	67
People choose to walk and cycle	44	54
People feel safe	49	59
Things to see and do	33	44
People feel relaxed	44	54
Clean air	50	58

5. Recommendation It is recommended that designs are progressed for all outlined options while further analysis and surveys are undertaken. These will inform the recommendation at the next gateway, when detailed options appraisal is presented to Members for consideration.

6. Risk

- Developer disagrees with the upper cost estimate of the project.*
Risk response: accept
All options were designed to align with the scope defined within the S106 agreement to mitigate the impact of the development. As the design progresses the costs will be refined. The negotiations with the developer are progressing and are planned to be concluded prior to the detailed options appraisal report. This report will recommend the most viable option to committees for consideration.
- Delay to the Section 278 agreement sign-off.*
Risk response: reduce
Negotiations and close liaison with the developer on designs for the developed options will continue to ensure project associated costs are defined as accurately as possible and Section 278 agreement is finalised before September 2024.
- Underground structures condition prevents the implementation of a desired option.*
Risk response: reduce
The works area in London Wall lays directly above an underground structure which may be negatively impacted by the proposed changes to

	<p>loading on these structures. Officers are liaising with the City Structures team and commissioning relevant surveys to determine the impact and will report the outcome of the survey to the committees at the next stage of reporting. An option which does not change the impact on the structures is being progressed alongside the desired option to minimise the risk to the programme.</p> <p><i>4. Programme delays.</i></p> <p>Risk response: reduce</p> <p>Delays to the implementation of the Section 278 works may impact the developer's desired date for occupation and presents a reputational risk to the City Corporation. This has been mitigated by the inclusion of some out of hours working costs in the estimate and consideration to allocate additional resources to each phase of works.</p> <p>Further information is available in the Risk Register (Appendix 4).</p>
<p>7. Procurement approach</p>	<p>The design is being developed in-house by the Highways team, although a specialist consultant was appointed to propose new seating arrangements in Aldermanbury Square.</p> <p>All construction is expected to be implemented by the City's term contractor and nominated sub-contractor or statutory undertaker as necessary, under the supervision of the Environment Department, and in line with the developer's programme and considering other major works planned in the London Wall area.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project coversheet
Appendix 2	Finance tables
Appendix 3	Proposed options plans
Appendix 4	City of London Streets Accessibility Tool checks
Appendix 5	Risk register (for preferred option)

Contact

Report Author	Andrea Moravicova
Email Address	Andrea.moravicova@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	02073323925

Options Appraisal Matrix

<i>Option Summary</i>	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
1. Brief description of option	Section 278 highway works in the immediate vicinity of the new development at 2 Aldermanbury Square. All three options have the same design proposed for Basinghall Street but differ in the proposals for London Wall.		
2. Scope and exclusions	<p>Proposal consistent with the scope outlined in the Section 106 agreement. Design deemed to have the most positive impact on people walking, wheeling and cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue • Improvements to cycle provision on London Wall westbound. • Repaving surfaces in the City standard palette • Widening of the southern pavement on London Wall between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. • Widening the central reservation at the existing raised tables on London Wall. 	<p>Proposal aligns to the scope outlined in the Section 106 agreement, but with no changes to the southern pavement on London Wall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue • Improvements to cycling provision on London Wall westbound. • Repaving surfaces in the City standard palette <p>Exclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening the southern pavement on London Wall 	<p>Proposals meet the requirements of the Section 106 agreement but with minimal adjustments to the area of London Wall due to potential issues with loading on an underground structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue • Improvements to cycling provision on London Wall westbound. • Repaving surfaces in the City standard palette <p>Exclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening the southern pavement on London Wall • Widening the central reservation at the existing raised tables on London Wall.
Project Planning			
3. Programme and key dates	<p>Expected completion: 2026 (dates TBC to align with development programme)</p> <p>Key dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise S278 Agreement – September 2024 • Gateway 4 report – October 2024 • Draft Construction package – November 2024 		

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 5 report – Q1 2025 • Issue Construction package – March 2025 • Pre-construction planning – April / June 2025 • Project construction starts – summer 2025 • Construction completion – summer 2026 • G6 report – Q4 2026 		
<p>4. Risk implications</p>	<p>Overall project option risk: Low</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delay to the Section 278 agreement sign-off 2. Underground structures condition prevents the implementation of a desired option. 3. Programme delays <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>		
<p>5. Stakeholders and consultees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers • Local businesses • City divisions and departments, including Planning & Development, Remembrancer, Chamberlain and Comptroller & City Solicitor; • Transport for London • Culture Mile BID 		
<p>6. Benefits of option</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the development upgraded to the standard palette of high quality materials. • The proposed design for the immediate vicinity of the development helps promote active travel. • Level crossings at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction improves the public realm for people walking and wheeling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the development upgraded to the standard palette of high quality materials. • The proposed design for the immediate vicinity of the development helps promote active travel, albeit to a lesser extent than Option 1 due to minimal changes proposed for London Wall. • Level crossings at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction improves the public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the development upgraded to the standard palette of high quality materials. • Level crossings at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction improves the public realm for people walking and wheeling, which helps promote active travel. • Provision of a mandatory cycle lane.

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A hatched area to separate the cycle lane from motor vehicles on London Wall could contribute to safer cycling experience. • Wider pavement on London Wall for people walking and wheeling between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. • Widened central reservation at two raised table points on London Wall to facilitate safer crossing of the road for people walking and wheeling. could also contribute to reducing vehicles speed in the area. 	<p>realm for people walking and wheeling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A hatched area to separate the cycle lane from motor vehicles on London Wall could contribute to safer cycling experience. 	
7. Disbenefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one lane available to westbound motor vehicles could potentially increase travel times for people using motor vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one lane westbound available to motor vehicles, that could potentially increase travel times for people driving. • Does not improve the current environment for people walking and wheeling when crossing London Wall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only minor improvements for people walking, wheeling and cycling are delivered. • Does not improve the current environment for people walking and wheeling when crossing London Wall.
Resource Implications			
8. Total estimated cost (including maintenance)	£1,204,096	£857,023	£833,060
9. Funding strategy	The project will be fully funded by external contribution from the developer through Section 278 agreement.		

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
10. Investment appraisal	None required – scheme is fully funded by Section 278 with the developer.		
11. Estimated capital value/return	N/A		
12. Ongoing revenue implications	The cost of the scheme includes the commuted sum which accounts for the anticipated replacement of the materials and street furniture for 20 years.		
13. Affordability	The scheme options offer good value for money and have been deemed affordable by the developer.		
14. Legal implications	A Section 278 agreement will be entered into with the developer to secure payment for the works and comply with an obligation of the Section 106 agreement.		
15. Corporate property implications	None		
16. Traffic implications	<p>Space for motorised traffic reduced to one lane westbound between access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. This will mirror the arrangements on the eastbound carriageway.</p> <p>Wider pavement and central reservation are likely to improve the permeability in the area for people walking and wheeling.</p>	<p>Space for motorised traffic will be reduced to one lane westbound between access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. This will mirror the arrangements on the eastbound carriageway.</p>	<p>No changes to the traffic movement as two lanes will be maintained as per existing arrangements.</p>
17. Sustainability and energy implications	Use of high-quality standard pallet materials specified within the will contribute to the longevity of the surfaces post construction and better maintenance. The project will endeavour to re-use suitable materials wherever possible.		
18. IS implications	N/A		

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
19. Equality Impact Assessment	<p>The proposal aims to improve accessibility for people walking, wheeling and cycling.</p> <p>The test of relevance assessment concluded that the design of this option will have the most positive impact on people with the following protective characteristics: age, disability, pregnancy and maternity.</p> <p>It shows neutral impact on people with other protected characteristics.</p>	<p>The test of relevance assessment concluded the proposed changes will have either positive or neutral impact on people with protected characteristics, although to a slightly lesser degree, particularly in the London Wall area, when compared with the Option 1 design.</p>	<p>Despite minimal changes proposed as part of this option to the area of London Wall, the Test of relevance concluded that the changes will have either positive or have neutral impact on people with protected characteristics.</p>
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	N/A		
21. Recommendation	It is recommended all three options are progressed whilst feasibility continues to be assessed.		