

<b>Committees:</b> Streets & Walkways Sub-committee - For Decision Projects & Procurement Sub-committee - For Information	<b>Dates:</b> 01 October 2024 21 October 2024
<b>Subject:</b> City Cycleways Programme  <b>Unique Project Identifier:</b> Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway 12079	<b>Gateway 3/4:  Options  Appraisal  (Regular)</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Executive Director of Environment  <b>Report Author:</b> Albert Cheung, Street Space Planning, City Operations	<b>For Decision</b>
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

<b>1. Status update</b>	<b>Project Description:</b>  1.1 The Transport Strategy identifies a core network of cycling routes in the City. To be delivered in phases, it's aim is to make the Square Mile a safe, attractive, and accessible place for people to cycle by applying a minimum standard for cycling provision.  1.2 In July 2019, the Streets & Walkways Sub-committee and Projects Sub-committee approved a Gateway 2 report for the Cycleways Programme. The programme consisted of three separate cycle route projects detailed in the Transport Strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quietway 11 Upgrade (Upper Thames Street to Chiswell Street) – Completed</li> <li>• Monument to Sun Street (formally known as Phase 2)</li> <li>• Aldgate to Blackfriars (formally known as Phase 3)</li> </ul> <u>Monument to Sun Street (Cycleway 1)</u> 1.3 Alongside TfL's improvements to London Bridge and Monument junction this route connects the city with both Cycleway 1 and Cycleway 4.
-------------------------	--

1.4 Two options were originally considered for the Monument to Sun Street route:

- Option 1: King William Street – Princess Street – Moorgate – South Place – Wilson Street.
- Option 2: King William Street – Threadneedle Street – Old Broad Street – London Wall – Blomfield Street – Eldon Street – Wilson Street.

1.5 Option 1 is now being progressed as this offers the most direct connection and makes effective use of other planned projects.

1.6 The delivery of this route is almost exclusively through current and planned projects including All Change at Bank, Moorgate (north of London Wall) and the Pedestrian Priority Programme at King William Street. Moorgate between London Wall and Lothbury is the only remaining section that requires improvement and is not covered by existing projects. The measures on this section are minor interventions such as cycle lanes (where possible) and are expected to be implemented under existing delegations in 2025/26, following completion of building works.

#### Aldgate to Blackfriars

1.7 The remainder of this report relates to the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycleway.

1.8 The Aldgate to Blackfriars route aims to provide a high-quality east-west cycle route which links with Cycleway 2 at Whitechapel High Street, Cycleway 6 at New Bridge Street and Cycleway 3 on Victoria Embankment.

1.9 The route includes St Botolph Street, Aldgate Square, Leadenhall Street, Cornhill, Bank Junction and Queen Victoria Street. This will connect key destinations such as the City Cluster with the London wide cycle network.

1.10 The whole route has been assessed and designs developed to meet current design standards, which aim to ensure that no one feels excluded from cycling due to safety concerns.

1.11 To date, the evaluation and design development has been funded by TfL through grants made available to the City. TfL confirm and release funding for cycleways in stages. For this financial year they are providing funding for public engagement and consultation. Future funding for detailed design and modelling will be confirmed once the outcome of the consultation is known

	<p>and there is confirmation that the project will progress to Gateway 5.</p> <p>1.12 While TfL have indicated that they will continue to fund the project through to delivery it is expected that the City Corporation will need to provide match funding towards the delivery of the project. A capital funding bid for OSPR and/or CIL will be submitted once the split between TfL and City funding is known. In the event that sufficient funding is not available, then this project can be placed in abeyance and progressed at a later date once funding has been identified.</p> <p><b>RAG Status:</b> Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Medium (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> Aldgate to Blackfriars: £4.0M - £4.5M</p> <p><b>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> No cost change since last report to Committee</p> <p><b>Spend to Date:</b> £207,815 (fully funded by TfL)</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</b></p> <p><b>Slippage:</b> The pace of the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycleway project has been determined by the availability of TfL’s funding grant and their oversight requirements. The project was substantially delayed due to the financial impact on TfL’s finances caused by Covid-19. The original programme for completion was by 2025, however, the latest completion date is now estimated to be in 2028.</p>
<p><b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b></p>	<p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 5: Authority to Start Work</p> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <p>Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-committee are asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree the recommended design option (Option 1) for the Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway Project as detailed in Section 5</li> <li>2. Agree for officers to commence the public consultation. The outcomes of the public consultation will be reported back to the Streets and Walkways Sub-committee for a decision and Projects and Procurement Sub-committee for information.</li> <li>3. Approve a budget increase of up to <b>£375,000</b> (excluding costed risk) subject to the receipt of funds from TfL for</li> </ol>

the Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway project to reach Gateway 5.

4. That a Costed Risk Provision of up to £150,000 subject to the receipt of funds from TfL is approved (to be drawn down via delegation to the Director of City Operations).
5. Authorise the Executive Director of Environment, 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.

Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-committee and Projects & Procurement Sub-committee are to note:

- The current approved project budget is £233,701, a budget increase of £375,000 is requested for approval and therefore a total proposed budget of £608,701 (excluding risk) is required for the project to reach Gateway 5,
- The estimated total project cost of £4.0M-£4.5M (excluding risk). The project is not yet fully funded due to TfL funding arrangements and the need to submit a capital bid for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or On-street Parking Reserve (OSPR) at the appropriate time.
- £120,000 of this funding is confirmed with the remainder expected to be provided by TfL following consultation.
- Note that detailed traffic modelling and design would be progressed subject to the public consultation outcomes report being agreed by the Streets and Walkways Sub-committee.

**Next Steps:**

- Stakeholder engagement including with Ward Members and public consultation preparation: Sept – Nov 2024
- Public consultation: Dec 2024 – Jan 2025
- Progress report: consultation outcomes reported to committee: May 2025
- Detailed traffic modelling and submission to TfL for approval: May - Oct 2025
- Detailed design: Apr 2025 – Dec 2025
- Confirmation of additional TfL funding for delivery and submission of capital funding bid: 2025
- Report G5: Spring 2026
- Works commence: Summer 2026

**3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway**

*For recommended option 1 Aldgate to Blackfriars :*

Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
Resource required to reach next report			
Staff time Transportation	Project management / stakeholder liaison / design	TfL	£35,000
Fees	Consultation Consultants Manage / host consultation Consultation materials Design assessments	TfL	£85,000
Remaining resource required reach Gateway 5			
Staff time Transportation	Project management	TfL	£30,000
Staff time Highway	Detailed Design	TfL	£75,000
Fees	Traffic modelling consultant, design surveys, TfL auditing Structural bridge and tunnel assessments	TfL	£150,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>£375,000</b>

Staff costs represent approximately 600 hours of Transportation staff time and 750 hours of highway staff time to complete the consultation, project management and detailed design to reach the next gateway.

	<p><b>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway:</b> No costed risk is required to complete the consultation and reach the next report. £150,000, subject to the receipt of funds from TfL, is required reach the next Gateway (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 3). To allow for any cost increases in external fees and unforeseen staff time for detailed design and project management.</p>
<p><b>4. Overview of project options</b></p>	<p>4.1 The Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway is designed to create a high quality and safer route for people cycling between Cycleway 2 (Whitechapel High Street), Cycleway 6 (New Bridge Street) and Cycleway 3 (Victoria Embankment). It will connect key destinations such as the City Cluster with London’s wider cycle network. The scheme will also improve conditions for people walking and wheeling in some locations by providing improved crossing facilities, pavement widening, new seating and trees. An overview of the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycleway route is shown in Appendix 4.</p> <p>4.2 To meet current design standards (and qualify for TfL funding), people cycling must be separated or protected from motor vehicles on streets where traffic exceeds 500 vehicles per hour (two-way flow) during peak times. Queen Victoria Street (between New Bridge Street and Queen Street) and those around Aldgate are above this threshold and require protected cycle lanes in order to provide a safer and more attractive route for people cycling. Bank junction, Cornhill, Leadenhall Street and Queen Victoria Street (between Bank and Queen Street) have traffic flows that are below the threshold for protected space for cycling.</p> <p>4.3 Protected cycle lanes have some notable implications including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the lane separators, direct access from a motor vehicle to the kerbside would not be available.</li> <li>• Requiring more time/resources for road cleaning/sweeping and winter maintenance.</li> <li>• Require the reallocation of carriageway space, making it challenging to retain or provide parking or loading provisions.</li> <li>• Less convenient for people crossing particularly at bus stops.</li> </ul>

#### Options for Aldgate section

4.4 The cycle route diverts around Aldgate High Street via St Botolph Street and Aldgate Square to connect with Leadenhall Street as it is not feasible to introduce protected cycle lanes on Aldgate High Street. This is due to the road width constraints, busy bus operations, bus stop locations, kerbside loading activity, closely spaced side road junctions and road network capacity.

4.5 The Botolph Street section is short and has good, existing cycle lanes protected with traffic wands in both directions. The traffic wands were introduced as part of the Bevis Mark cycle improvement corridor in May 2022 which formalised the reallocation of road space for pedal cycles originally introduced as part of the pandemic's transport recovery measures.

4.6 The cycleway now plans to further improve the provisions for people walking, wheeling and cycling where possible. There is only one viable option due to the road width constraints, road alignment, bus stop locations and the need to connect with TfL's existing cycling provisions on Mansell Street. Appendix 5 shows the improvements for the Aldgate section and the measures include:

- Introduce raised table crossings over Duke's Place and Houndsditch to help people walking, wheeling and cycling cross informally over the road.
- Replacement of the traffic wands with traffic island separators along the eastbound cycle lane.
- Introduce an eastbound bus stop by-pass for people cycling where the road widens at the bus stop.

4.7 The traffic wands on St Botolph Street along the westbound cycle lane have been retained due to road width constraints making it not feasible to introduce traffic island separators and the road width at the westbound bus stop is too narrow to accommodate a bus stop by-pass for cycling. As a result, the existing westbound cycling provisions are retained and the only practicable design is to upgrade the eastbound cycle lane.

#### Options for Queen Victoria Street between New Bridge Street and Queen Street

4.8 On Queen Victoria Street (between New Bridge Street and Queen Street), there are three options. All of these include measures which physically separate people cycling from motor vehicles. At the main signal junctions improved cycling provisions include:

- Dedicated traffic signal stage, people cycling proceed through the junction at a different time to general traffic.
- Cycle gate, this facility ensures people cycling are always in front of traffic at the stop line. By using traffic signals so that people cycling can by-pass queuing traffic but only when it is safe to do so.
- Cycle early release, people cycling are given a green traffic signal a few seconds before general traffic to give a head start to travel through the junction.

Option 1 – Bi-directional protected cycle lanes on the northern side and protected cycle lanes elsewhere (recommended)

4.9 This option provides a two-way cycle lane along the northern kerbside between Puddle Dock and Friday Street, separated from traffic using a central island. This side has been selected because it has the least number of side streets and vehicle accesses and therefore is considered most optimal for safety and quality. Parking for disabled and coach users are retained but the bays on the northern kerbside are displaced to the southern side of Queen Victoria Street (2x disabled bays / 2x coach bays) and to Friday Street (2x coach bays). Motor vehicles accessing the northern kerbside would need to be removed. The design layout for this option is shown in Appendix 5 and is summarised below:

- Between New Bridge Street and Puddle Dock, a Protected eastbound cycle lane would be provided. People cycling westbound would travel in a dedicated pedal cycle stage (free of motorised vehicles) at the junction with Puddle Dock to allow them to safely position themselves accordingly on the approach to New Bridge Street. But there is no physical protection
- At the Puddle Dock junction, the bi-directional cycle lane ends/starts. People cycling westbound transit from the northern to the southern kerbside.
- Between Puddle Dock and Friday Street - fully protected bi-directional cycle lanes are provided on the northern kerb.
- At Friday Street the bi-directional cycle lane starts/ends. People cycling westbound transition from the southern to the northern kerbside to access the cycle lane.
- Between Friday Street and Cannon Street fully protected cycle lanes on each side of the carriageway are provided.



- Between Cannon Street and Queen Street, protected westbound cycle lane and people cycling eastbound would travel in front of traffic (controlled by a traffic signal gate) and also receive a few seconds head start over traffic at the Cannon Street traffic signals which will allow people cycling to clear the junction safely and stay in front of traffic on the approach to Queen Street due to the short distance to travel and narrowed road space.
- Between Queen Street and Bank Junction, no measures are proposed as traffic volumes are below the design threshold and conditions for cycling are good.
- Two eastbound bus stop by-passes for cycling on Queen Victoria Street at Puddle Dock and Godliman Street are proposed. The bus stops will be designed in line with guidance and best practice, including the lessons that have been learnt during the design process for St Paul's gyratory. We will engage directly with disabled people as part the design process.

Option 2 – Bi-directional cycle lanes on the southern side and protected cycle lanes elsewhere

4.10 This option is similar to Option 1, but with the protected two-way cycle lanes provided along the southern kerbside between Puddle Dock and Friday Street. With this option, there are more vehicle accesses (including to the Baynard House car park) and side roads required breaking the protection for people cycling. This makes this option less beneficial than Option 1. The design layout for Option 2 is shown in Appendix 6.

Option 3 - Protected cycle lanes on both sides

4.11 This option provides conventional cycle lanes with physical protection (mostly through traffic islands) on both sides of the carriageway. Kerbside activity would be limited / removed on both sides of the street, leading to the removal of all coach, disabled and taxi parking / ranking on Queen Vicotria Street. As with Option 2, this option provides fewer benefits due to the vehicle accesses and side roads which would impact the quality and safety of the cycle lane on the southern side. In addition, between Lambeth Hill and St Peter's Hill, it would not be possible to provide cycle lanes protected or separated from motor vehicles, because there is insufficient space whilst retaining the police check point. However, unlike the two-way cycle lane options, there is no need to transition people cycling to the opposite kerbside and back again, which removes

	<p>the need to make complex traffic signal modifications. The design layout for Option 3 is shown in Appendix 7. This option would create a lot of displaced activity from both the north and south kerbside whilst not achieving the greatest level of protection for people cycling and is not recommended.</p>																		
<p><b>5. Recommended option</b></p>	<p>5.1 It is recommended that Option 1 is approved to proceed to consultation. This option has two-way protected cycle lanes on the northern kerbside for both eastbound and westbound travel with the remainder of the route having protected with-flow cycle lanes. This design provides a high-quality cycle route whilst minimising conflicts with motorised vehicles at side streets and the vehicular access.</p> <p>5.2 Preliminary traffic modelling undertaken for the recommended option shows that the design would operate within the junction capacities as all vehicles queuing at a red traffic signal would clear through the junctions in one green traffic signal cycle. Although, some minor delay is expected for general traffic and buses to accommodate dedicated traffic signal provisions for pedal cycles. A more detailed traffic impact assessment will need to be undertaken during the detailed design and approved by TfL.</p> <p><u>Healthy Streets Design Check (refer to Appendix 8)</u></p> <p>5.3 The current condition of the streets was assessed using the Healthy Streets Design Check, to understand and provide a baseline condition of the street and to assess the recommended option. The cycle route has been split into four sections to provide a manageable and accurate Healthy Street Design Check.</p> <p>5.4 The summary tables below show the Healthy Street scores. The proposed layout provides a good score increase for each section and no 'zero' scores. This is due to enhanced cycling facilities, raised table crossings, potential tree planting, cycle parking, and seating provisions.</p> <p>5.5 The Healthy Streets assessment will be updated as the preferred design is progressed.</p> <p>Table 5.1: Queen Victoria Street – Blackfriars Pub to College of Arms</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="528 1832 1382 2029"> <thead> <tr> <th>Healthy Street Indicators</th> <th>Existing</th> <th>Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pedestrians from all walks of life</td> <td>44</td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Easy to cross</td> <td>63</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shade and shelter</td> <td>33</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Places to stop and rest</td> <td>47</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not too noisy</td> <td>33</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Healthy Street Indicators	Existing	Proposed	Pedestrians from all walks of life	44	58	Easy to cross	63	67	Shade and shelter	33	50	Places to stop and rest	47	53	Not too noisy	33	40
Healthy Street Indicators	Existing	Proposed																	
Pedestrians from all walks of life	44	58																	
Easy to cross	63	67																	
Shade and shelter	33	50																	
Places to stop and rest	47	53																	
Not too noisy	33	40																	

People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport	44	58
People feel safe	47	70
Things to see and do	33	42
People feel relaxed	44	59
Clean air	33	42
Overall Healthy Streets check Score	45	59
Number of 'zero' scores	3	0

Table 5.2: Queen Victoria Street – College of Arms to Bread Street

Healthy Street Indicators	Existing	Proposed
Pedestrians from all walks of life	53	63
Easy to cross	67	70
Shade and shelter	50	50
Places to stop and rest	67	67
Not too noisy	47	47
People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport	53	63
People feel safe	61	79
Things to see and do	50	50
People feel relaxed	53	64
Clean air	50	50
Overall Healthy Streets check Score	55	65
Number of 'zero' scores	2	0

Table 5.3: Queen Victoria Street – Bread Street to Bucklersbury

Healthy Street Indicators	Existing	Proposed
Pedestrians from all walks of life	54	65
Easy to cross	63	63
Shade and shelter	50	50
Places to stop and rest	60	60
Not too noisy	53	53
People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport	54	65
People feel safe	53	68
Things to see and do	50	50
People feel relaxed	54	66
Clean air	58	58
Overall Healthy Streets check Score	55	64
Number of 'zero' scores	3	0

Table 5.4: Aldgate – Mitre Street to Middlesex Street (via Aldgate Square)

Healthy Street Indicators	Existing	Proposed
Pedestrians from all walks of life	57	63
Easy to cross	63	67
Shade and shelter	67	67
Places to stop and rest	73	73
Not too noisy	47	47
People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport	57	63
People feel safe	60	70
Things to see and do	58	58
People feel relaxed	58	64
Clean air	50	50
Overall Healthy Streets check Score	58	64
Number of 'zero' scores	3	0

City of London Street Accessibility Tool (CoLSAT) (refer to Appendix 9)

5.6 The recommended design has undergone the CoLSAT assessment to ensure that it optimises street design for walking and wheeling accessibility, including crossings, tactile paving, pavements, and facilities for taxis, disabled parking, and bus stops.

5.7 The cycle route has been split into four sections for the assessment and the summary tables below show remaining '0' and '1' scores have reduced between the existing and proposed layouts which validates the cycleway scheme will significantly improve accessibility for people.

Table 5.5: Queen Victoria Street – Blackfriars Pub to College of Arms

	Total 0 scores* severe accessibility issue		Total 1 scores** significant accessibility issue	
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
Electric wheelchair user	0	0	1	1
Manual wheelchair user	0	0	1	0
Mobility scooter	0	0	0	0
Walking aid user	0	0	3	0
Person with a walking impairment	1	0	3	3
Long cane user	4	0	0	0
Guide dog user	1	0	3	1
Residual sight user	0	0	2	0
Hearing impairment	0	0	1	0
Acquired neurological impairment	0	0	4	0
Autism / sensory processing diversity	0	0	0	0
Developmental impairment	1	0	5	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>

Table 5.6: Queen Victoria Street – College of Arms to Bread Street

	Total 0 scores* severe accessibility issue		Total 1 scores** significant accessibility issue	
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
Electric wheelchair user	0	0	1	0
Manual wheelchair user	0	0	0	0
Mobility scooter	0	0	0	0
Walking aid user	0	0	1	0
Person with a walking impairment	0	0	9	4

Long cane user	2	0	0	0
Guide dog user	1	0	2	1
Residual sight user	0	0	1	0
Hearing impairment	0	0	1	1
Acquired neurological impairment	0	0	2	0
Autism / sensory processing diversity	0	0	1	0
Developmental impairment	0	0	4	0
TOTAL	3	0	23	6

Table 5.7: Queen Victoria Street – Bread Street to Bucklersbury

	Total 0 scores* severe accessibility issue		Total 1 scores** significant accessibility issue	
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
Electric wheelchair user	0	0	0	0
Manual wheelchair user	0	0	0	0
Mobility scooter	0	0	0	0
Walking aid user	0	0	1	0
Person with a walking impairment	0	0	6	6
Long cane user	1	0	0	0
Guide dog user	0	0	2	1
Residual sight user	0	0	0	0
Hearing impairment	0	0	2	1
Acquired neurological impairment	0	0	1	0
Autism / sensory processing diversity	0	0	3	0
Developmental impairment	0	0	1	0
TOTAL	1	0	16	8

Table 5.8: Aldgate – Mitre Street to Middlesex St (via Aldgate Square)

	Total 0 scores* severe accessibility issue		Total 1 scores** significant accessibility issue	
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
Electric wheelchair user	0	0	0	0
Manual wheelchair user	0	0	0	0
Mobility scooter	0	0	0	0
Walking aid user	0	0	0	0
Person with a walking impairment	0	0	0	2
Long cane user	3	0	0	0
Guide dog user	1	0	3	1
Residual sight user	0	0	2	0
Hearing impairment	0	0	0	0

Acquired neurological impairment	0	0	0	0
Autism / sensory processing diversity	0	0	0	0
Developmental impairment	1	0	4	1
TOTAL	5	0	9	4

\* This score means most people in this segment would be excluded by the street characteristic in the selected configuration.

\*\* This score means some people in this segment may be able to negotiate the street characteristic in the selected configuration, but it would significantly deplete their levels of confidence and energy, and they would be likely to give up on the journey if they had to negotiate it more than once or twice.

5.8 The scheme has resolved all severe accessibility issues however, it will be unable to resolve several significant accessibility issues. These relate to including tactile paving at crossing points, taxi drop-off locations being over ten metres away and level crossovers, which may have potential implications for people with walking impairment and / or guide dog users.

Early engagement

5.9 The recommended design has been developed in collaboration with TfL.

5.10 The City of London Police has also been consulted on the proposed changes to the Queen Victoria Street police check point and the designs amended to incorporate their requirements.

5.11 Initial engagement with local occupiers, whose servicing needs may be affected by the proposals has been carried out in advance of this report. There will be further engagement through the consultation period and the design process.

5.12 Local ward members have been made of aware of the proposals with further engagement to follow.

**6. Risk**

**Overall project risk: Medium**

6.1 The following key risks have been identified for the Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway as it progresses towards Gateway 5:

Cost

6.2 The detailed design cost may change due to the scope of the traffic modelling expected by TfL and their cost to carry out audit is still to be confirmed, indicative costs for structural assessments for tunnels and bridges has been allowed for but costs may change, the cost of any unforeseen surveys to complete the detailed design and the impact of these risks may have on staff time to complete detailed design.

6.3 At this early stage, the construction cost is indicative and subject to change. Once detailed design is completed, more accurate cost estimates will be available, particularly for underground utility diversions, traffic signals, and drainage.

#### Design

6.4 The proposed measures may be affected by engineering difficulties related to structures beneath the highway such as London Underground/Network Rail tunnels, bridges, and pipe subways. These impacts will be assessed during the detailed design stage and where necessary, design changes will be made. Alternatively, some measures may no longer be considered feasible to deliver due to physical constraints or the cost implications. Any significant departure will be report back to Members.

#### Funding

6.5 Officers have had positive discussions with TfL who are fully supportive of the design proposals and have funded City Cycleways programme so far. TfL has expressed willingness to continue funding the project. However, the funding will be allocated in stages (consultation, detailed design, construction) for each financial year, which allows TfL to better manage its cycling portfolio across Greater London. Currently, funding is confirmed only for the 2024/25 financial year, meaning there is a risk, although low, of future funding being unavailable, despite TfL's support for the project.

6.6 As part of the funding discussions, TfL has also advised that they expect the City to also contribute funding towards the delivery of the project. To address this, a capital bid for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or On-street Parking Reserve (OSPR) funding will be submitted in 2025.

#### Public Consultation Support

6.7 The cycleway may receive mixed support from the public consultation. While the proposed measures offer substantial benefits for people walking, wheeling and cycling, they also involve significant changes to the

	<p>highway, particularly on Queen Victoria Street. These changes include restricted kerbside access, modifications to traffic signal junctions, reallocation of road space to prioritise walking, wheeling and cycling, and changes to parking, taxi ranks, and bus stops. These changes may lead to varying levels of public support and potential concerns.</p> <p><u>Programme Delay</u></p> <p>6.8 The detailed design phase for the project will require coordination with external parties, such as utility companies and TfL. Their involvement is essential for tasks like utility diversions, reviewing traffic models, and designing traffic signal equipment at junctions. Despite allowing adequate time in the project schedule, previous experiences indicate a risk of delays from external parties in completing these tasks. To mitigate this risk, regular progress meetings will be scheduled to ensure timely collaboration and keep the project on track</p> <p>6.9 To maintain the project timeline, public consultation preparation must begin immediately after this report's approval. This will ensure an adequate consultation period and provide a sufficient time gap between the consultation's completion and the City's election on 20 March 2025. Therefore, capital project budgets need to be made available within two weeks of this report's approval. This timeline is crucial for procuring consultants and materials in time for the consultation. Any delay in budget availability could adversely impact the consultation programme and the overall project timeline.</p> <p>6.10 Further information available in the Risk Register (Appendix 3) and Options Appraisal.</p>
<p><b>7. Procurement approach</b></p>	<p>7.1 The project will be managed by the Street Space Planning team in City Operations, in collaboration with key stakeholders such as TfL, colleagues in Highways and City Gardens, City Police, and the City's highway term contractor. This will ensure that all aspects of the project are coordinated and integrated</p> <p>7.2 An external consultant will be commissioned to facilitate the public consultation, including hosting an online platform, analysing feedback, and producing a comprehensive outcomes report. In addition, various external suppliers will be used to develop and provide necessary materials and services for the public consultation.</p>



	<p>7.3 The detailed design of the highway works will be completed by officers. For traffic modelling, external consultants will be commissioned to carry out the assessments. TfL will audit the traffic models and will be responsible for designing traffic signal equipment, as part of their traffic signal authority duty for London.</p> <p>7.4 The highway works would be carried out by the City's highway term contractor, working in collaboration with City Gardens for any tree planting. Works to traffic signals and utility equipment will be undertaken by TfL's traffic signal contractor and utility companies respectively.</p> <p>7.5 Appointment of external consultants will be carried out in line with the City's procurement guidelines for capital projects.</p>
--	--

## **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Coversheet
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Finance Tables
<b>Appendix 3</b>	Risk Register (for recommended option)
<b>Appendix 4</b>	Cycleway Route Overview Plan
<b>Appendix 5</b>	Option 1 Layout Plan
<b>Appendix 6</b>	Option 2 Layout Plan
<b>Appendix 7</b>	Option 3 Layout Plan
<b>Appendix 8</b>	Healthy Street Assessment Summary
<b>Appendix 9</b>	CoLSAT Assessment Summary
<b>Appendix 10</b>	Equalities Impact Assessment (DRAFT)

## **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Albert Cheung
<b>Email Address</b>	albert.cheung@cityoflondon.gov.uk

## Options Appraisal Matrix

<i>Option Summary</i>	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
<p><b>1. Brief description of option</b></p>	<p>Bi-directional cycle lanes along the northern kerbside</p> <p>People cycling would be fully protected along Queen Victoria Street between New Bridge Street and Queen Street. People cycling would either be physically segregated from general traffic or people cycling would be separated by time, controlled by traffic signals.</p> <p>The cycle lanes between this section has no side roads and therefore avoids conflict with other vehicles need to cross the cycle lanes.</p> <p>No net loss of coach parking, four coach parking bays along the northern kerbside of Queen Victoria Street would be displaced. Two bays relocated to the southern kerbside and two bays moved to Friday Street</p>	<p>Bi-directional cycle lanes along the southern kerbside</p> <p>People cycling would be protected for most sections along Queen Victoria Street between New Bridge Street and Queen Street. People cycling would either be physically segregated from general traffic or people cycling would be separated by time, controlled by traffic signals.</p> <p>The cycle lanes between this section has junctions with two side roads and a public car park entrance / exit. Consequently, there would be some conflict with other vehicles needing to cross the cycle lanes for access.</p> <p>No net loss of coach parking, four coach parking bays along the southern kerbside of Queen Victoria Street would be displaced. Two bays relocated to the northern kerbside and two bays moved to Friday Street</p>	<p>Conventional with flow cycle lanes</p> <p>People cycling would be mostly protected along Queen Victoria Street between New Bridge Street and Queen Street. The people cycling would either be physically segregated from general traffic or people cycling would be separated by time, controlled by traffic signals.</p> <p>The cycle lanes between this section has junctions with two side roads and a public car park entrance / exit. Consequently, there would be some conflict with other vehicles needing to cross the cycle lanes for access.</p> <p>A net loss of up to 6 coach parking bays. Two bays would be relocated to Friday Street</p>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
<b>2. Scope and exclusions</b>	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The same measures are proposed for all design options on Queen Victoria Street between New Bridge Street and Puddle Dock.</li> <li>• The design options are only different on Queen Victoria Street between Puddle Dock and Friday Street, as described in (1.).</li> <li>• The same measures are proposed on Queen Victoria Street between Friday Street and Queen Street</li> <li>• The same measures are proposed for all design options at Aldgate (via Aldgate Square and St Botolph Street)</li> </ul> <p><u>Exclusions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes are proposed at the junction of Queen Victoria Street / New Bridge Street / Blackfriars Bridge as the junction cannot accommodate additional dedicated cycle facilities</li> <li>• No changes are proposed at Bank Junction, Cornhill, or Leadenhall Street. The traffic volumes on these streets are within the threshold and therefore measures to separate people cycling from traffic are not required.</li> <li>• No changes are proposed at Aldgate High Street, the cycle route by-passes this section via Aldgate Square and St Botolph Street</li> </ul>		
<b>Project Planning</b>			
<b>3. Programme and key dates</b>	<p>Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway - expected completion date: Spring 2028</p> <p><u>Key dates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholder engagement including with Ward Members and public consultation preparation: Sept – Nov 2024</li> <li>• Public consultation: December 2024 – January 2025</li> <li>• Internal bid funding submission: 2025</li> <li>• Consultation feedback analysis report: Feb – Mar 2025</li> <li>• Progress report: consultation outcomes reported to committee: Apr 2025</li> <li>• Detailed traffic modelling: Spring 2025 – December 2025</li> </ul>		

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed design: Spring 2025 – December 2025</li> <li>• G5 Authority to start work: Spring 2026</li> <li>• Highway work commences: Summer/Autumn 2026</li> <li>• Highway works completed: Spring 2028</li> </ul>		
<p><b>4. Risk implications</b></p>	<p>Overall project option risk: Medium</p> <p><u>Cost</u> The detailed design cost may change due to the scope of the traffic modelling expected by TfL and their cost to carry out audit is still to be confirmed, indicative costs for structural assessments for tunnels and bridges has been allowed for but costs may change, the cost of any additional surveys to complete the detailed design and the impact these risks may have on staff time.</p> <p>All three options require significant highway changes and therefore the actual total cost of the works including diversion of underground utilities, drainage and traffic signals equipment may vary significantly to the current estimated cost. Accurate cost estimates would be calculated as part of the detailed design process.</p> <p><u>Design</u> The proposed measures may be affected by engineering difficulties related to structures beneath the highway such as London Underground / Network Rail tunnels, bridges, and pipe subways. These impacts will be assessed during the detailed design stage and where necessary, design changes will be made. Alternatively, some measures may no longer be considered feasible to deliver due to physical constraints or the cost implications.</p> <p><u>Funding</u> Funding has not been secured to deliver the project to completion. TfL has advised that funding allocations will be confirmed and made available in stages as the project progresses. TfL also expects the City Corporation to match fund TfL's sponsorship to deliver the works. The City's funding strategy is to utilise CIL and/or OSPR funding, a future bid application will be made at the appropriate time.</p>		

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<p><u>Public consultation support</u> The significant highway changes are required to accommodate protected cycle lanes in each option and therefore may receive mixed support from the public consultation.</p> <p><u>Programme delay</u> The detailed traffic modelling and detailed design of the highway changes requires significant assistance from external parties such as utility companies, TfL traffic model auditing team and TfL traffic signal design and therefore the programme to an extent is reliant on external parties to complete their tasks without delay.</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 3).</p>		
<b>5. Stakeholders and consultees</b>	<p>Key people who will need to be consulted during the evolution of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ward Members, Chair/Deputy Chair of S&amp;W Sub</li> <li>• Various internal teams including Highways, City Gardens, Engineers</li> <li>• Various TfL stakeholders</li> <li>• Statutory consultees</li> <li>• BIDs and interested groups</li> <li>• Local residents, building occupiers, churches, etc.</li> </ul>		
<b>6. Benefits of option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No net loss of coach parking</li> <li>• The protected two-way cycle lanes do not have any junctions with side roads which sever the cycle lane. Side road junctions along cycle lanes are a collision risk when motorised vehicles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No net loss of coach parking</li> <li>• Opportunity to provide footway widening along certain sections</li> <li>• Safer crossings have been provided by tightening the junction geometry to shorten crossing distances for people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conventional cycle lanes running with flow</li> <li>• No cycle lane transition between opposing kerbsides required</li> <li>• Opportunity to provide footway widening along certain sections</li> <li>• Safer crossings have been provided by tightening the</li> </ul>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<p>cross over the cycle lane for access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to provide footway widening along certain sections</li> <li>• Safer crossings have been provided by tightening the junction geometry to shorten crossing distances for people walking and slow vehicle turning speeds. Also, where possible crossings will be raised to encourage low vehicle speed and improve accessibility for people walking and wheeling</li> </ul>	<p>walking and slow vehicle turning speeds. Also, where possible crossings will be raised to encourage low vehicle speed and improve accessibility for people walking and wheeling</p>	<p>junction geometry to shorten crossing distances for people walking and slow vehicle turning speeds. Also, where possible crossings will be raised to encourage low vehicle speed and improve accessibility for people walking and wheeling</p>
<p><b>7. Disbenefits of option</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bi-directional cycle lanes require complex junction changes at the start / end of the section to transition people cycling safely from one kerbside to the other.</li> <li>• Due to the lane separators, direct access from a motor vehicle to the kerbside would not be available. This would impact servicing on the northern kerbside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bi-directional cycle lanes require complex junction changes at the start / end of the section to transition people cycling safely from one kerbside to the other.</li> <li>• Due to the lane separators, direct access from a motor vehicle to the kerbside would not be available. This would impact servicing on the southern kerbside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the lane separators, direct access from a motor vehicle to the kerbside would not be available. This would impact servicing on the northern and southern kerbside.</li> <li>• Loss of coach parking and disabled parking bays</li> <li>• Westbound cycle lanes would have potential conflict with other vehicles at junctions with White Lion Hill and Lambeth Hill.</li> </ul>

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires more time / resources for road cleaning/sweeping and winter maintenance than the current road layout</li> <li>• Requires the reallocation of carriageway space, making it challenging to retain or provide parking or loading provisions.</li> <li>• Less convenient for people crossing informally and particularly at bus stops by-passes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle lanes would have potential conflict with other vehicles at junctions with White Lion Hill and Lambeth Hill. There would be an increase likelihood of a collision involving a person cycling than Option 1.</li> <li>• Requires more time / resources for road cleaning/sweeping and winter maintenance than the current road layout.</li> <li>• Requires the reallocation of carriageway space, making it challenging to retain or provide parking or loading provisions.</li> <li>• Less convenient for people crossing informally and particularly at bus stops by-passes.</li> </ul>	<p>There would be an increase likelihood of a collision involving a person cycling than Option 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires more time / resources for road cleaning/sweeping and winter maintenance than the current road layout and Options 1 and 2.</li> <li>• Requires the reallocation of carriageway space, making it challenging to retain or provide parking or loading provisions than Options 1 and 2.</li> <li>• Less convenient for people crossing informally and particularly at bus stops by-passes.</li> </ul>
<b>Resource Implications</b>			
<b>8. Total estimated cost</b>	<p>Total Estimated Cost: £4.0M - £4.5M</p> <p>£150,000 costed risk provision at this stage.</p>		

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
<b>9. Funding strategy</b>	<p>Sources of funding for the whole Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spend to date: £208K fully funded by TfL</li> <li>• TfL secured funding 2024/25: £120K</li> <li>• TfL future funding is not secured but allocations are expected to be made available in stages as the project progresses (estimated amount: £1.9M - £2.1M)</li> <li>• CIL funding to match fund TfL's sponsorship. CIL funding bid will be submitted for approval at the appropriate time. (estimated amount: £1.7M - £2.0M)</li> </ul>		
<b>10. Investment appraisal</b>	Not applicable		
<b>11. Estimated capital value/return</b>	Not applicable. The project delivers intangible benefits such as encouraging more people to cycle and improving accessibility for people walking and wheeling.		
<b>12. Ongoing revenue implications</b>	There are no ongoing revenue implications. Maintenance of the scheme would be covered by business-as-usual activities		
<b>13. Affordability</b>	<p>The funding strategy is the same for all three options. Funding is not secured to deliver the project to completion. However, TfL funding allocations would be made available in stages as the project progresses. City Corporation's CIL and/or OSPR funding is expected to supplement TfL sponsorship and would be applied for at the appropriate time.</p> <p>At this early design stage, the estimated cost to deliver Option 1, 2 or 3 is expected to be in the region of £4.0 - £4.5M.</p>		
<b>14. Legal implications</b>	<p>The City is under a duty to "secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians)" so far as practicable (S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984).</p> <p>Statutory legal processes will be followed to undertake the Traffic Management Order changes for changes to parking and waiting and loading restrictions, and for the public notices for the raised carriageways.</p>		



<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
<b>15. Corporate property implications</b>	Not applicable		
<b>16. Traffic implications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At traffic signal-controlled junctions minor delays to general traffic and buses are expected to accommodate high quality cycling provisions.</li> <li>• The measures would make the road safer for all road users including people walking by minimising conflict between road users and providing safer crossings</li> <li>• Bus stop by-passes require bus passengers to cross the cycle lane when boarding and alighting at the bus stop. However, TfL monitoring evidence has shown that overall, there is no road safety issue with the design and operation of bus stop by-passes.</li> <li>• Direct access from a motor vehicle to the kerbside would not be available due to the protected cycle lanes. Alternative kerbside locations may need to be used for kerbside servicing or boarding and alighting vehicles.</li> <li>• Parking bays, bus stops, taxi rank and waiting and loading restrictions changes would be introduced impacting road users.</li> <li>• Road and lane closures would be required to deliver the highway changes. However, the traffic impacts and duration of the works would be minimised by works carrying on at weekends when possible.</li> </ul>		
<b>17. Sustainability and energy implications</b>	Material specification would be in accordance with the City Public Realm Toolkit and standards from the City's term contractor. Works on site will be managed to minimise disruption and make efficient use of materials to reduce waste.		
<b>18. IS implications</b>	<i>Not applicable</i>		
<b>19. Equality Impact Assessment</b>	An equality impact assessment has been carried. The cycleway aims to have positive impact to people of all ages, including pregnant people, parents with young children, and disabled people and people with limited mobility by providing safer and accessible travel facilities and encouraging cycling. The proposal will create more space for walking and wheeling, especially for those with accessibility needs such as wheelchairs users.		

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
	<p>There is no evidence that the scheme would negatively impact race, religion, sex, sex orientation/gender reassignment and marriage/civil partnership.</p> <p>The assessment, however, recognises there may be some negative impacts resulting from the scheme proposals, in particular for older people and disabled people with mobility impairments due to limited access to the kerbside and the inclusion of bus stop by-passes resulting from the protected cycle lane. Therefore, alternative and direct kerbside access may need to be used. To help mitigate against the potential conflict with people crossing the cycle lane at bus stop by-passes, mini-zebra crossings are proposed across the cycle lane to provide people walking priority to cross the cycle lane and highlighting to people cycling that they need to give way at this point. The cycle lane would be raised at these crossings to create a level surface, improving accessibility. Tactile paving would also be provided on either side of the mini-zebra crossing to enable anyone with a visual impairment to find this point for crossing the cycle lane.</p> <p>However, it is not anticipated that this will result in any unlawful discrimination against these groups with protected characteristics.</p> <p>The draft assessment is shown in Appendix 10 and will be reviewed and updated, if required, following consultation of the scheme.</p>		
<b>20. Data Protection Impact Assessment</b>	<i>Not applicable</i>		
<b>21. Recommendation</b>	Recommended	Not recommended	Not recommended