

**STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION)  
COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 9 July 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, 9 July 2024 at 1.45 pm

**Present**

**Members:**

Graham Packham (Chairman)  
Deputy John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Randall Anderson  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Deputy Shravan Joshi MBE  
Ian Seaton  
Brendan Barns (Finance Committee - Ex-Officio Member)  
John Foley (Port Health & Environmental Services Committee - Ex-Officio Member)  
Eamonn Mullally (Natural Environment Board - Ex-Officio Member)

**Officers:**

James Aggio-Brewe	- Environment Department
Melanie Charalambous	- Environment Department
Maria Herrera	- Environment Department
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Andrea Larice	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Andrea Moravicova	- Environment Department
Tom Noble	- Environment Department
Clarisse Tavin	- Environment Department
Samantha Tharme	- Environment Department
Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received.

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

The Chairman made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 11 - Temple Avenue and agreed to leave the room during deliberations of that item.

The Deputy Chairman made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 9 – Cool Streets & Greening Ludgate Broadway and St Andrew’s Hill as his property was in the area and agreed to leave the room during deliberations of that item.

### 3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That, the public minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 May 2024 be approved as an accurate record of proceedings.

#### **Matters Arising**

##### Bus stop by the Monument on London Bridge

The Chairman indicated that he had not yet had an opportunity to meet with Transport for London (TfL) regarding the bus stop at London Bridge and requested this be added to the standing items.

##### Update on use of highway for sporting purposes

The Chairman requested an update on the use of the highway for sporting purposes. Officers reported that they constituted events in the legal context and could not be extended past three days without permission from the Secretary of State. The Department for Transport (DfT) had granted permission for events in the City recently, but the issue had led to some debate and more thought around criteria and timescales for future events and this needed to be built into the Corporation’s approval processes. The Committee suggested making the process similar to the existing process that used heat maps that showed impact and benefit. Officers indicated they were exploring how applicants were measuring success.

Members enquired how many of the applicants for events using the highway for sporting purposes were Business Improvement Districts (BIDs). Officers reported that there were a number of applications bundled together by the Central London Alliance and some of the BIDS were members of the organisers.

Members considered whether DfT could be approached to find a way to bypass the process of having to apply for an extension as the public would not necessarily consider Aldgate Square to be a highway. Officers indicated they would refrain from trying to change the designation of such areas but did raise a question for engagement with DfT regarding what they would allow the Corporation to do.

### 4. **TRANSPORT STRATEGY REVIEW - REVISED DRAFT AND CONSULTATION REPORT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report that included changes to the Transport Strategy, the Engagement Plan for the Strategy Review and the responses received during the consultation period.

Members received a presentation reporting changes in detail but not the overall substance and it was noted by Officers that the response rate from stakeholders had been positive.

Members highlighted there had been a few changes at the Corporation since the document was first published and noted that there had been 20 million annual tourists, not 10 million, with an aspiration to increase to 22 million as part of Destination City.

Members indicated that the key walking routes noted in the documents ran along main road routes which ran contrary to the Healthy Streets Initiative encouraging people to walk on lanes away from busy traffic and felt this should be reflected in the Strategy.

Members suggesting adding that play areas and exercise facilities were also being added to the enhancement of the Riverside Walkway mentioned on Page 168 and noted that there had been a Barbican Phase Two approval since the last document was written which also included exercise facilities and play area.

In reference to Legible London, a Member suggested some wording should be added mentioning work being carry out on 3D signage taking into account the example the Beech Street Gardens which did not show on a 2D map.

Members also highlighted Page 199 of a list of locations for priority locations which are dangerous for traffic and noted that a few particularly bad ones were missing and were the responsibility of TfL. Members suggested they be added to the priority list despite this.

It was advised that the Lighting Charter should be referenced next to the mention of the Lighting SPD in the Strategy document. Members also indicated that refrigerated cargo bikes should be mentioned in the Cargo Bike Action Plan.

Members noted their agreement with those amendments.

The Sub-Committee suggested adding words of substantial encouragement from the Corporation to Proposal 43 with regard to the City Property Association's (CPA) expressed support for finding app-based solutions that would allow disabled passengers to use taxis in instances where traffic restrictions would otherwise prevent access. Officers indicated that they did intend to do this but would make it more specific as requested.

Members expressed concerns around the number of respondents to the consultation. Officers noted that over the period of 18 months, early survey work canvassing 1000 people, including representative views of whether the Corporation was taking the correct approach. This was considered to be a good number surveyed to be representative. Officers also had over 400 people respond online and responses had also been received in detail from the BIDs and the CPA who represented a large number of businesses across the city.

A Member raised concerns about those with limited mobility getting around the City and whether a hopper bus may be a useful addition. Officers indicated there was already a high provision of services crossing the city and were not sure a hopper bus would be appropriate to fill any gaps in public transport provision. The Chairman highlighted a tool the Corporation was using to design public realm projects to cater for mobility impaired travellers and pointed out that some solutions for some mobility impaired travellers could create problems for others.

It was indicated by Members that the expectation in some areas of the City was that vehicles should travel at significantly less than 15mph despite the view that 15 mph aspiration should be replaced with 20mph. Officers responded that appropriate speeds should be looked at on a case-by-case basis and should be designed into the characteristics of the street and through engineering approaches so drivers can visually see they need to drive slower. The Chairman suggested the further use of pedestrian refuges as a solution to calm traffic through on narrow busy streets.

The Sub-Committee queried whether performance statistics could be mandated from consolidation centres to measure their operational effectiveness. Officers noted that the number of deliveries centres could receive by four-wheeled vehicles was limited and there was some voluntary monitoring and Officers were pushing for reporting of progress and achievements through planning conditions being set. Officers also reported that there was regular monitoring of all traffic, including cargo bikes, but needed to be careful to ensure cargo bikes did not go places they should not.

Questions were asked by Members as to whether there were practical examples for use of emerging technologies and how the Corporation was engaging with providers. Officers indicated they had been forced into emerging technology development due to e-bikes and e-scooters due to app-based sharing rides and were engaging with Catapult and DfT on any initiatives that were coming out in relation to automated vehicles. The Chairman requested it be noted that the considerate contractor scheme does encourage and recognise the use of innovative technology.

A Member cautioned at amending too much, in detail, of the wording in the report due to the danger of tying the hands of Members and Officers in five years when the Strategy comes up for review.

The Sub-Committee queried whether there were any further procedural steps for the Strategy once it had been to Planning & Transportation Committee in July. Officers indicated this was the plan and that it did not need to go to Policy and Resources Committee or the Court of Common Council. A member requested a business summary be circulated to consultees highlighting the key elements of the refresh, as well as feedback on how their responses have been considered.

Members considered how accurate delivery figures were to consolidation centres in tall buildings that were being granted planning permission. Officers

noted there was some monitoring information that was provided from buildings that were operating consolidated service and would like to make monitoring data part of the annual report on Transport Strategy.

The Chairman requested an update paper on deliveries, referring to a visit to 22 Bishopsgate where a significant reduction in deliveries was claimed to have been accomplished. Officers indicated they would discuss with Planning colleagues and then provide an update.

The Chairman requested an update on experiments with virtual parking and loading bays. Officers indicated they would provide a general update on deliveries and servicing in the Autumn.

**RESOLVED** - That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approve the changes to the Transport Strategy; and
2. Request that the suggested amendments be presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration alongside the report at the meeting on 23 July 2024.

## 5. **SMITHFIELD AREA PUBLIC REALM AND TRANSPORTATION**

The Sub-Committee considered a report aiming to coordinate and deliver new public spaces in the Smithfield area in line with the City Transport Strategy, the Climate Action Strategy and the anticipated increase in visitors to the opening of the new Museum of London (MoL) and the future transformation of the Meat Market.

Members received a presentation highlighting the project area for where transformation would happen and reported that the project was to be delivered in line with the City Transport Strategy and the Climate Action Strategy, as well as the anticipated major increase of visitors in the area. Officers noted that the project would be delivered in phases to align with the opening of the Museum of London.

The Sub-Committee sought assurance on re-work not being needed in Phase Two following Phase One. Officers explained this was why a phased approach was being taken to ensure announcements were made aligned with Museum of London (MoL) programme work and to ensure there's no repetitive works.

It was raised by the Chairman what would occur should visitor numbers be significantly higher than the predicted 2,000,000 visitors annually. Officers explained they had been carrying out traffic modelling on this and the MoL project was looking into work that needed to be done to facilitate the museum opening; the design being proposed would be able to accommodate the additional number of people but additional measures may need to be considered if it was much higher.

A question was considered as to whether coordination had taken place with another Section 278 project occurring at the hotel at the top of Long Lane.

Officers assured they were coordinating with developer and had engaged with them early on as part of their previous planning application.

Members enquired as to which side visitors to the new Museum of London would be encouraged to exit from at the Farringdon Elizabeth Line station as concerns were expressed about the west arm of Long Lane not having wide walkways. Officers explained that the new MoL would be encouraging people to arrive from the Farringdon exit, but Officers were looking at improvements to Long Lane in the first phase of works to improve the arrival to MoL from the Barbican exit.

The Sub-Committee considered whether discussions were taking place with the Culture Mile BID as they were conducting their own public realm survey. Officers confirmed that they were engaging with them on a regular basis, and they were aware of the strategy behind the project.

Members queried how the potential future buyers of the Annexe buildings would have input on the public realm. Officers acknowledged the complexity of the site and were engaging with colleagues from City Surveyors on what will happen with the Annexe buildings.

A clarification was offered from a Member who noted that it was no longer the Museum of London, it was now the London Museum.

It was considered by Members whether there would be any road closures, and whether water fountains or toilets in that area with baby changing facilities would be installed. Officers answered that a few options for road closures would be considered – a full closure, a timed closure or no closure at all. Officers indicated they would be able to update on the preferred approach at the next meeting. It was also noted that the Museum would be open with extended hours with access to toilet facilities.

**RESOLVED** - That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approve the budget of £335,000 for the Smithfield Area Public Realm project to cover the next stage of the project, funded from the £12m OSPR funding, approved in principle for the project, subject to the relevant approvals;
2. Note the revised project budget of £1,695,014 (excluding risk), from the £12m estimated budget which is unchanged;
3. Approve the £35,000 in Costed Risk Provision;
4. Note the revised programmatic approach to coordinate projects in Smithfield area, and the changes to the delivery plan; and;
5. Note the updates since the last Committee Report.

**6. MUSEUM OF LONDON S278**

The Sub-Committee received a report on a project to ensure the effective and safe operation of the new MoL development via Section 278 obligations.

**RESOLVED:** That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approve the additional budget of £335,000 to reach the next Gateway funded from S278 contributions (subject to receipt of funding);
2. Note the revised project budget of £435,000 (excluding risk);
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £3m - £7m (excluding risk);
4. Approve a Costed Risk Provision of £50,000 (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer); and
5. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to make any adjustments between elements of the approved budget, provided the total approved budget of £435,000 (exc. CRP) is not exceeded.

## 7. **FINSBURY CIRCUS ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee received a report on a project seeking to implement accessibility improvements and to rearrange parking to enable improvements and micromobility parking in line with the Liverpool, Street Area Healthy Streets Plan.

A Member queried the lack of a progress report given the cost of £860,000. Officers noted that gateway projects under a value of £1,000,000 are delegated to the Chief Officer and explained that there was no need for a progress report as part of the governance process to complete the project. Officers assured members that if there was a problem with the project, whether with timescale or money, it would be flagged and an issues report would go to Committee.

Members explored the opportunities of achieving cost reductions and in sourcing projects such as this one. Officers explained it was being funded through a workstream related to Crossrail, so any cost reductions would flow back into a wider project as it is one of several schemes being delivered in that area. Early engagement with FM Conway was done to price everything and Officers were confident that when Gateway 6 reports came to the Sub-Committee, it would demonstrate the projects delivered value for money. Officers maintained that the contract procured was considerably cheaper than others at the time.

**RESOLVED -** That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Agree to the proposal as detailed in Section 6 of the report, and to note that the making of the necessary traffic orders, subject to no objections, or the resolution and consideration of any objections arising from the statutory processes, is delegated to the Director of City Operations under the Scheme of Delegation;
2. Approve the budget of £556,000 to reach the next Gateway, to be funded from the Liverpool Street Crossrail Urban Integration project (Phase 2);
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £556,000 (excluding risk).
4. Approve the Costed Risk Provision of £304,000 (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer); and

5. Delegate to the Executive Director Environment authority and in consultation with the Chamberlain to approve budget adjustments between budget lines and within the approved total project budget, above the existing authority within the project procedures.

## 8. **CREECHURCH LANE AREA IMPROVEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee received a report on a project for public realm and highway improvements to the Creechurch Lane, Mitre Street and Bury Street areas, specifically on accessibility and walking improvements, public realm improvements such as parklets and planting and relocation of parking bays.

The Members considered where parking was going to be re-allocated. Officers noted that the motorcycle bays to Billiter Street, the Lime bikes and e-scooters would be moved to Bury Street and one parking bay would be moved to the other side of Creechurch Lane. Two parking bays would be permanently lost where the existing parklets were already placed.

The Sub-Committee expressed concern that Bury Street was a tight turn, especially for some large vehicles. Officers acknowledged this would be reviewed and consider if containing of the bike bay was needed.

**RESOLVED** - That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approve recommended Option 1 to reach the next gateway, which involves widening of pavements on the eastern side of Creechurch Lane, the reallocation of parking and paving of carriageway and junction in granite setts;
2. Approve the budget of £60,000 (staff costs and fees) for the project to reach the next gateway, funded from the Section 106 agreement for the 40 Leadenhall Street development;
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £650,000-780,000 for Option 1 (excluding risk);
4. Authorise officers to finalise a funding letter to receive the external funding contribution from the EC BID;
5. Agree to delegate to the Chief Officer the approval and drawdown of the costed risk provision at the next gateway; and
6. Agree to undertake the process to prepare the traffic orders to relocate payment, motorcycle, e-scooters and cycle hire parking in the area in advance of Gateway 5 stage.

## 9. **COOL STREETS & GREENING LUDGATE BROADWAY AND ST ANDREW'S HILL**

Deputy John Edwards left the room as per his declaration.

The Sub-Committee received a report on the Cool Streets and Greening programme, replacing the current temporary parklet at Ludgate Broadway with a permanent design with a widened pavement, a raingarden and tree planting, along with improving accessibility works. The report also sought to introduce a



rain garden and tree planting at St Andrew's Hill with pavement adjustments and the relocation of the parking bay.

A presentation was given by Officers outlining the removal of the current temporary parklet at Ludgate Broadway and replace it with a widened pavement with a rain garden, tree planting and pedestrian walking and accessibility improvements. At St Andrew's Hill, a rain garden is being installed in the place of an existing parking bay which would be moved slightly further up St Andrew's Hill.

Members queried whether Lloyds Avenue was part of the programme. Officers confirmed it was; that was another site that detail was yet to be developed on and a further report would come back to the Sub-Committee once the design for it had been developed. Rain gardens, widening pavements and improving crossing points would be part of it but that was not part of this report.

Concerns were expressed by a Member about the flowerbeds being installed on St Andrew's Hill and abandoned dockless cycles. Officers explained that some extra cycle racks would be included and consultation from the Healthy Street Programmes suggested that consultees wanted greenery installed. Dockless bikes did not tend to be left in planted beds.

A Member expressed surprise at the drawings as it seemed to suggest the flowerbed would be at street level. Officers indicated that there was no curb on this due to the collection of rainwater from the carriageway to go into the planter. The whole Cool Streets & Greening Programme was about 30 projects and Officers were happy to share information on them.

As the pavement was to be widened as part of the proposal, Members asked if there was going to be a table and chairs pavement license applications coming from the venue adjacent to the widened pavement. Officers acknowledge this could happen, but the design of the plan indicated where would be best to place tables and chairs and there was also a little bit of public seating being installed. Officers would work closely with the licensing team to ensure all the space was not taken.

**RESOLVED** - That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approve the budget adjustment/increase as per the Table 2 in Appendix 4 of the report in order to fund the staff costs and fees required to reach the next gateway (£35,000 budget adjustment and £40,000 budget increase);
2. Approve the design of the projects as set out in this report, including recommended option 1 for Ludgate Broadway;
3. Approve the funding strategy for the Ludgate Broadway project as set out in Table 4 in Appendix 4 of the report and note the total estimated project cost (excluding risk) is £440,000 - £475,000 for Option 1;
4. Note that the cost of the improvements at St Andrew's Hill is £190,000 – £220,000;
5. Delegate approval and drawdown of the Costed Risk Provision to the Chief Officer if sought at Gateway 5;

6. Approve to undertake and complete the statutory processes and consultation for the proposed relocation of parking bays, changes to the waiting and loading restrictions and the raised carriageways, as set out in the report; and
7. Authorise the Executive Director Environment to consider responses to the traffic order consultation and if they consider it appropriate, to make the Order.

Deputy John Edwards rejoined the meeting.

#### 10. **2 ALDERMANBURY S278**

The Sub-Committee received a report seeking to deliver changes to the public highway in the vicinity of the development at 2 Aldermanbury Square through a Section 278 agreement that was fully funded by the developer.

**RESOLVED** - That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

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 of the report;
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; and
4. Note the total estimated cost of the project for Option 1 at £1,204,096 (excluding risk).

#### 11. **TEMPLE AVENUE**

The Chairman, Graham Packham, left the room as per his declaration.

The Sub-Committee received a report on public realm, climate resilience, greening and accessibility improvements to Temple Avenue, including relocation of cycle racks and parking bays, a permanent design to replace parklets installed in 2021 and 2022 and accessibility improvements. Cycle access through the street would be maintained.

**RESOLVED:** That Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approve the initiation of this project;
2. Approve the budget of £80,000 (staff costs and fees) for the project to reach the next Gateway 3/4, funded from the Cool Streets and Greening Programme (OSPR) (£50,000) and S106 receipts allocated to the Fleet Street Area Programme (£30,000); and
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £350,000-750,000(excluding risk).

The Chairman, Graham Packham, rejoined the Committee.

**12. 21 MOORFIELDS AND FORE STREET AVENUE S278**

The Sub-Committee received a report which included enhancements to the pedestrian environment without compromising security in Moorfields and Fore Street Avenue, as well as public realm improvements to Moor Lane, including greening and walking environment.

Members asked whether the developer would be minded to permit the use of unused funds for the other side of the street which was partly delayed by their project. Officers noted they had asked on several occasions and the developer indicated they wanted the money returned as per the terms of their S278 agreement. Members expressed their disappointment at this outcome.

**RESOLVED:** That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Note the contents of this report;
2. Approve the budget adjustment related to staff costs to be actioned as outlined in the Appendix 2 of the report;
3. Authorise transfer of £80,500 (including staff costs for a supervision of works) from the Moor Lane S278 budget, to cover the planned resurfacing of Moor Lane, to the Moor Lane S106 project budget;
4. Agree to close the 21 Moorfields and Fore Street Avenue Section 278 project;
5. Agree to close the Area A – Section 278 part of the Moor Lane Environmental Enhancement project; and
6. Authorise return of unused funds to the developer, including any accrued interest as per the Section 278 agreement once the final accounts for these projects are completed.

**13. \*ADVERTISING BOARD UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report informing Members of Officers' intention to start an engagement phase between July and December 2024 to communicate the advertising board ban to businesses. The report noted it would outline advertising boards were an obstruction and could be a trip hazard, particularly for those with visual impairments.

Members received a presentation on the report from Officers. Officers highlighted there was no legal licensing framework for licensing advertising boards and action could only be taken to enforce against them and noted that prior to the pandemic there had not been a zero-tolerance approach. Officers suggested that the report was about respecting a decision previous taken at the Sub-Committee moving toward a position of advertising boards not being on City streets and engaging with business to gather information. Officers noted they were also looking to engage with other Local Authorities and would bring another report after the engagement process in January or February 2025.

Members suggested there was a contrast between the presentation and the content of the report. Officers referenced the timeline and the plan for engagement going forward and cautioned on a two-tier approach as locations would have to be identified on where and where not to enforce.

The Chairman highlighted that some local authorities were operating a two-tier hybrid approach treating advertising boards differently depending on the safety implications of their location and suggested this be considered in the consultation. Officers indicated there had been numerous enforcement policies over the years and more work with neighbouring authorities would be good to understand how advertising boards policy were being applied street-by-street.

A Member suggested there was no need for advertising boards to be on the pavements and drew attention to the example of Hackney that had a zero-tolerance approach to advertising boards, making use of hanging signs and neon signs instead. The Member also discussed the difficulty for those with visual disabilities in trying to navigate around advertising boards.

RECEIVED.

14. **\*BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT: NEXT STEPS FOLLOWING THE OUTCOME OF THE TRAFFIC AND TIMING REVIEW**

The Sub-Committee received a report informing Members of the indicative timetable for work to be carried out as included in the appendices of the June 2024 Court of Common Council paper.

The Chairman informed the Sub-Committee that he had previously enquired whether the timetable could be accelerated and was assured by Officers it could not be – the timetable had been agreed by the Court of Common Council.

Members queried whether there was any outline of the funding required to implement the project. Officers informed the Committee that there would not be yet as the success criteria had not yet been identified for monitoring which meant the costs were not in a position to be calculated yet. Officers indicated that an additional sum may have to be requested to get through potentially 18 months of monitoring. The Chairman requested this be a standing item on the agenda for upcoming meetings.

The trial was discussed and whether TfL accepting it would be the most likely scenario. Officers noted that early engagement with TfL indicated they appreciated the view of the Court and want to be reassured that bus journey times are not materially affected as any local authority changes impacting a strategic road are required to prove these can operate alongside TfL's requirements.

A Member considered how the success of the project would be measured and raised concerns about how disabled pedestrians would travel around the Junction, as well as the streets connecting onto the Junction and the potential increase in the number of private hire taxis in the area. Officers advised that

they still needed to define the experiment, and this would be reported back to Sub-Committee once a proposal had been established, along with how it would be monitored. The Sub-Committee noted that not everything could be monitored, but immeasurable factors could still have an impact.

A Member suggested that the response to the written question regarding the fixed penalty notices and those who were abusing the current restrictions be shared with the Sub-Committee once circulated. Officers confirmed they were happy to do that.

RECEIVED.

15. **\*UPDATE ON ACTIONS FOR IMPROVING DOCKLESS E-BIKE HIRE IN THE CITY**

The Sub-Committee received a report providing an update on actions agreed at Sub-Committee in January 2024 for improving dockless cycle hire operations in the Square Mile. It noted that several agreed actions had been undertaken, including providing operators with clarification of requirements in writing, updated internal and external resources of reporting inappropriately parked dockless bikes, ensuring operators would enforce against poor user behaviours and finalising micromobility-related studies. It was also noted in the report that other actions were ongoing, including delivering dockless vehicle parking bays and working with operators to improve their warning, fining and banning procedures.

Members received a presentation on the report and were informed that 300 spaces for dockless e-bikes had been identified for installation by March 2025, with an ambition for a further 600 in December 2026. Officers also reported that the web page had been updated with a more specific framework for reporting dumped e-bikes directly to the operators and additional data collection was underway through the Corporation's Street Enforcement Officers. They also informed the Sub-Committee that operators had been asked to provide more information on operational enforcement and monitoring. No-parking zones had been established with the operators, with them being geo-fenced and Officers had asked operators to prove what their finding procedures were and their operational arrangements. Officers indicated that they had considered whether a Memorandum of Understanding would be appropriate and establish a better working relationship with operators and were currently lobbying central government for a change in legislation.

The Sub-Committee expressed surprise at a request for TfL funding as the operators had committed toward funding some docking bays and queried why operators were not being approached more. Officers highlighted that TfL had offered all authorities funding toward this but had agreed that grants would be accepted from operators, who had committed to funding feasibility work. The Sub-Committee also strongly suggested that the Corporation should insist that the operators pay to install dockless bays rather than TfL.

A Member expressed disappointment at the number of docking bays that were to be installed and felt there were a lot more spaces for docking bays for e-bikes, as well as expressing a problem with the dumping of bikes at St Andrew's Hill. Officers responded that space in the City was at a premium and work had been done to identify available curb side space and would work through the process to deliver those bays funded by either TfL or through operators.

The shortfall of dockless bays was discussed, with Officers acknowledging that there would be a shortfall, but would continue to find more spaces and would work through operational agreement to ensure operators would move bikes out of bays there were oversubscribed. Officers indicated that they could not enforce bikes being moved currently.

A Member indicated that it took around five hours for operators to recover bikes that had been dumped and highlighted it was particularly problematic near Tower Hill and Trinity Square. They also suggested this was not occurring when other operators were in the City when a strict Memorandum of Understanding was in place.

Another Member of the Sub-Committee indicated they would like to volunteer themselves for mystery shopping to gather information. The Member also enquired why data for e-scooters was available to be collected, but not for bikes. Officers explained that e-scooters were very heavily regulated in comparison and the purpose of contracts was to align the ability to receive data from operators on e-scooters and bikes without parliamentary regulation.

The Sub-Committee queried whether operators would prefer to be regulated to ensure there is a competitive playing field. Officers agreed and informed that operators agreed informally with that statement.

The Chairman encouraged Officers to go back to operators and insist on the sharing of data and if the operators were unhelpful the obvious assumptions of this stance would be made, he suggested that the new Member of Parliament for the Cities of London and Westminster might support a private members' bill to introduce regulation more quickly.

Questions were raised as to whether the Corporation received any revenue for bikes being abandoned. Officers responded it did not and explained that primary legislation would be required to change that. Officers were in the process of reaching out to the new Member of Parliament for the Cities of London and Westminster to share feedback.

The Committee asked whether data could be shared from operators on how long it takes to move a bike once it had been recorded as this could be substantiated by geolocation.

RECEIVED.

16. **\*DAUNTSEY HOUSE, FREDERICK'S PLACE - PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS (S278)**

The Sub-Committee received a report on public realm improvements related to the redevelopment of Dauntsey House, 4A & 4B Frederick's Place, including works to Ironmonger Lane, new lighting around the development, works necessary to accommodate pedestrian movement south of the development, works to accommodate waiting and loading restrictions and works that the City of London Corporation considers necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

A Member suggested that one of the buildings that are serviced from King Street may need to be serviced slightly differently following the proposed change of use as they would not be able to service from Cheapside or Poultry and may need to be serviced from Ironmonger Lane alone.

RECEIVED.

17. **\*RED BADGE HOLDER SURVEY**

The Sub-Committee received a report on responses to the Red Badge Holder Survey which received 54 completed surveys at a response rate of 35%. It reported that general satisfaction was found with the current parking provision whilst also highlighting specific challenges or opportunities for improvement.

RECEIVED.

18. **\*OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Old Jewry

The Chairman requested an update on the re-opening of Old Jewry. Officers informed that Old Jewry had reopened and there was formal monitoring in place as it was an experimental traffic order and to ensure it was functioning safely. Officers would eventually determine whether it stayed that way or came out as part of a normal experimental traffic order process.

Bus stop at Monument

The Chairman requested the bus stop at Monument be added to the Outstanding References.

Sporting events on the highway

The Sub-Committee agreed that an outstanding reference on sporting events on the highway should be added.

The Chairman clarified that he would like the Bank Junction Improvements Project to be a standing item at future meetings of the Sub-Committee. Officers indicated this would be delivered as a verbal update.

*At this point, the Chairman sought approval from the Sub-Committee to continue the meeting beyond two hours from the appointed time for the start of the meeting, in accordance with Standing Order 40, and this was agreed.*

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

There were no questions.

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

Sunken garden at Cheapside

The Chairman sought clarity on when the sunken garden project on Cheapside would be completed and why the planting currently looked underwhelming. Officers confirmed it would be completed in July 2024 and had been delayed due to lighting equipment that had taken longer than planned to be received. Officers informed that the plants were currently very small as smaller younger plants adapted more successfully to solely rain-fed irrigation and assured that in a year the garden would no longer appear underwhelming.

Traffic Congestion

The Chairman noted that the City of London appeared gridlocked. Officers noted that London Wall being closed was the trigger for the traffic problems which had been deliberately timed with summer holidays; traffic would be lighter now than it usually was. The Chairman requested a chart to outline major works taking place in the City; Officers agreed to provide that. A Member of the Sub-Committee noted the downside being a lack of buses through London Wall now.

Splitting PDF files

The Chairman requested that the Town Clerk explore a way of agenda packs being provided as one whole file rather than split up. Officers assured they would look into it.

**The meeting ended at 3.53 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Callum Southern**  
**Callum.Southern@cityoflondon.gov.uk**