

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

Tuesday, 1 October 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, 1 October 2024 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Mary Durcan
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Ian Seaton
Hugh Selka
Brendan Barns (Ex-Officio Member)
John Foley (Ex-Officio Member)
Eamonn Mullally (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Albert Cheung | - Environment Department |
| Gillian Howard | - Environment Department |
| Ian Hughes | - Environment Department |
| Bruce McVean | - Environment Department |
| Sam Lee | - Environment Department |
| Stephen Oliver | - Environment Department |
| Callum Southern | - Town Clerk's Department |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Committee received apologies from Chairman Graham Packham and Shравan Joshi MBE.

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

No declarations were received.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That, the public minutes of the previous meeting held on 09 July 2024 were agreed as an accurate record of proceedings.

4. MATTERS ARISING

No matters were raised for discussion.

5. BUNHILL, BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE HEALTHY NEIGHBOURHOODS PLAN

The Sub-Committee received a Gateway 4 report on the Neighbourhood Plan that sought to identify opportunities to improve air quality and the experience of walking, cycling and spending time in the Barbican and Golden Lane area and increasing greening. The plan also sought to develop and test the feasibility of traffic management changes.

Members received a presentation from Officers who noted that the Bunhill, Barbican and Golden Lane scheme had received a positive response and had worked with the London Borough of Islington on a series of proposals. Officers reported they had engaged with local stakeholders and their comments were being incorporated into the Plan. Traffic data collection had also been done on usage of the Barbican car park and an ANPR count that measured how many vehicles were driving into the area. Officers indicated there were around 10,000 vehicles a day, with around 70% of the traffic being through-traffic. Officers explained they were exploring two options for Beech Street both which maintained access to resident car parks, buses and cycles travelling through. Four options had also been put in for Moor Lane, including three to change it and another option for it to remain as is. Officers were also exploring the idea of closing Golden Lane and Islington had agreed they would ban the right-hand turn out of Fortune Street which meant issues with speeding and traffic could be dealt with on that Lane.

The Sub-Committee expressed approval that Officers were working with London Borough of Islington to reduce through-traffic on Beech Street and the ban of the right-hand turn on Fortune Street.

A Member considered whether traffic may decide to turn down Silk Street once it realised it could not go down Chiswell Street when the right-turn ban on Fortune Street came into effect and expressed the need for improved signage. Officers suggested that, in time, residents would realise they could not go down Beech Street and Google Maps would begin to re-direct them.

Committee Members noted that people were still not being encouraged to avoid Beech Street to access the Barbican Centre and reiterated the need for access points to be better explained with improved signage.

A Member suggested they had directly consulted with residents and received a less positive response than was suggested and warned there was a perception that the consultation process would not be real and there was a bias toward motorised vehicles over the pedestrian experience. It was also noted that it was important to express that genuine change could take place through consultation process. The Chairman indicated the public could affect change, proof being the last public consultation which shut down the Beech Street experiment based on a 51/49% return against it. Officers suggested everyone they had spoken to had anecdote of almost being hit by a cyclist on the southern pavement of Beech

Street and explained the only way to widen pavements was to restrict through-traffic through there.

A Member indicated that previous consultations had not been effective, referencing the Neighbourhood Scheme around Carter Lane, and suggested something needed to be done differently to improve them. Officers explained they used the same consultation software as the London Borough of Camden and noted it was an effective platform that provided multiple options during consultations clearly. Officers were also looking at contacting residents' groups and holding drop-in sessions.

One Member of the Committee expressed the need to reduce the 10,000 vehicles using Beech Street every day due to the unacceptable level of pollution being produced and accepted it may inconvenience road users and residents.

Another Member expressed concerns about raising the carriageway to pavement height and considered whether studies had been done on the benefits and cost implications of that. Officers explained they were exploring raising the carriageway at junctions and crossings to improve accessibility and provide a level surface but indicated that curbs would be desirable on Beech Street. The Member responded that there were already gradients where crossings were. Officers noted some areas had dropped kerbs and others had raised entries; benefit would be that there was a continuous surface.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

1. Approved the draft Healthy Neighbourhood Plan in Appendix 3 and 4 to form the basis of a public consultation exercise.
2. Authorised Officers to proceed to public consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan.
3. Approved a £33.5k increase in the project budget to £283,500.
4. Noted that the Director of City Operations, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, will approve the final content of the public consultations materials.

6. CITY CYCLEWAYS PROGRAMME

The Sub-Committee received a Gateway 3/4 report which provided a brief update on the Monument to Sun Street cycleway and sought agreement for a recommended design option for the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycleway.

Members received a presentation from Officers on the three options for consideration for the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycleway. Officers explained that Option 1 provided a two-way cycle track on the Northern curb side, Option Two provided a two-way cycle track on the southern curb side, and Option Three provided cycle lanes on both the northern and southern side. Officers noted it had been necessary to provide protected cycling facilities on Queen Victoria Street due to the volume of motorised traffic at over 500 vehicles an hour. Protected cycle facilities had also been provided at Aldgate, but they were

consistent with all three options which is why they had not been displayed. Officers argued that the benefit of Option One was due to the cycle tracks being on the northern side so cyclists would not be in conflict with the side roads and Baynard House Car Park and would be safer. Both Option Two and Option Three would force cyclists to meet conflict points.

The Committee expressed concerns regarding traffic flowing down the road during the Lord Mayor's Show and sought assurances there would be no pinch points. Officers indicated this had been discussed internally and informed amendments could be made to ensure carts could get through during the Show. Officers also committed to ensuring the Pageant Master was involved in the planning.

A Member considered whether cyclists would use the cycle crossing to access the north lane. Officers noted it was becoming more common to have two-way cycle tracks on one side in London and two big ones were already in operation on Farringdon Street and Upper and Lower Thames Street. Initial observations indicated some cyclists used the crossings, but Officers acknowledged there would always be those who did not. Another Sub-Committee Member noted it was impossible to get 100% compliance but emphasised effective signage would ensure it was easier for cyclists to take an easier route.

Members raised questions over how the split in funding of £4.0 - 4.5m for the project would operate between the City Corporation and Transport for London (TfL). Officers indicated they had some initial engagement with TfL who asked for part-funding of the scheme to match TfL funding; Officers confirmed it was a 50/50 split.

A Member indicated their preference for Option 3 as complaints had been received regarding Farringdon Street and pedestrians had experienced issues during rush hour with crossing the road. The Member also expressed concern with bus islands having to be installed with Option 1 and 2 and suggested that following the flow of traffic was the better solution. Officers explained that more space would be required to have cycle lanes on both sides of the road to protect cyclists which would also mean less additional space for on-street servicing to take place without blocking the carriageway. Officers also noted that the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycleway would not have the same level of usage as the Farringdon Street cycleway. Officers noted there was a lot of research done by TfL and that bus stop bypasses were, at the moment, the most appropriate way for cyclists to get around bus stops. Officers also believed that, should Option 3 be approved, they would struggle to justify securing the TfL funding due to the safety risk of turning vehicles to cyclists.

One Member explored the possible provision of dockless cycles as part of the project. Officers reported that they had a separate project looking at installing dockless cycles and warned that tying that scheme to the Cycleways Programme could extend how long it took to complete the project.

Information was requested by a Member on the Aldgate end of the cycle lane, particularly with regard to cyclists being directed around the back of Aldgate

Square to get onto Fenchurch Street. Officers explained that the complexity of the bus operation on Aldgate High Street meant an inability to incorporate protective cycle lanes and noted this alternative was there as an option for less-confident cyclists and for cyclists who will only use cycle paths if they have physical separation barriers between them and vehicular traffic. .

A Member queried what the capacity was for cyclists on Aldgate Square and considered whether the number of cyclists would increase the risk to pedestrians in that location. Officers indicated that there was an existing cycle track there and were confident there was a lot of capacity before it overflowed.

It was recommended by a Member that going up St. Bevis Marks, to St. Mary's Axe and into Fenchurch Street would be a better option as the Option advocated by Officers was a main route for children who would have to cross the cycle lane if it was running from north to south. Officers indicated it was about providing a choice of routes rather than forcing cyclists down one route.

RESOLVED – That, Members, by a majority:

1. Agreed the recommended design option (Option 1) for the Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway Project as detailed in Section 5.
2. Agreed 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.
3. Approved a budget increase of up to £375,000 (excluding costed risk) subject to the receipt of funds from TfL for 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. Authorised 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.

7. **1 BROADGATE S278 G5**

The Sub-Committee received a Gateway 5 report that sought to undertake the required Section 278 highway works in the vicinity of the development at 1-2 Broadgate. The proposed works were fully funded by the developer, British Land, and will involve a land exchange using Section 256 of the Highways Act.

A Member sought clarity on whether Section 278 monies would be returned to the developer should they not be used and could only be used on Section 278 works as that money was ringfenced. Officers confirmed this was correct.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

1. Approved the General Arrangement design shown in Appendix 2.

2. Approved an additional budget of £842,569 to fund the detailed design and implementation of the works.
3. Agreed that any unspent funds from the existing approved budget of £50,000 are carried forward to this Gateway.
4. Approved a costed risk provision of £5,000 with approval for drawdown delegated to the Director of City Operations.
5. Subject to the outcome of an officer review of the best use of the kerb site along the whole length of Eldon Street, modifications to the design relating to the S278 area are approved by the Director of City Operations (paragraphs 4.6)
6. Authorised undertaking the statutory consultation on the Traffic Orders/Notices connected to the works and, subject to no or minor objections, for the Director of City Operations to make the orders.

8. VISION ZERO PROGRAMME

The Sub-Committee received a Gateway 2 report which outlined a programme to investigate and deliver safer streets proposals at priority locations as identified in the Vision Zero Plan 2023-2028.

Officers noted that collision data was reviewed on a regular basis and had deduced that Ludgate Hill needed to be included in the Programme due to a higher collision rate. Officers also indicated they were looking to investigate five priority locations, with three being taken through to completion within the next two financial years. The other two to be taken through for more feasibility work included more complicated locations like Holborn Circus and Beech Street/Aldersgate Street.

The Committee noted that the Healthy Streets Initiative also applied to the Ludgate Hill site as there was no signalised crossing linking the lanes Pageantmaster Court with Old Bailey.

Members queried when work on Aldersgate Street and Beech Street would commence. Officers reported there was a programme which set out the timelines and they would be looking to carry out initial feasibility work which may include traffic capacity reduction, between now and the end of the current financial year.

The Committee queried whether the £15,000 quoted was related to the whole scheme and whether it was sufficient. Officers indicated the cost was related to the initial feasibility work of the schemes rather than cost of implementation.

A Member indicated it would be helpful for the report to have a high-level summary on the first page of project objectives and predicted outcomes. Officers noted it was a corporate template that was required to be used.

Another Member suggested the need for a review of the Fenchurch Street and Mincing Lane area if there was going to be a significant increase in footfall from surrounding tall buildings, particularly in consideration of fire evacuation procedures from those buildings. Officers indicated they were looking to do minor

interventions there as there was a larger Healthy Streets plan for Fenchurch Street that would look at how growth in footfall could be accommodated.

Ludgate Circus was raised as an issue by a Member due to significant numbers of collisions there and attention was drawn to the successful Holborn Circus scheme. With regard to Holborn Circus, Officers indicated there were public benefits with the scheme but issues still persisted with collisions and agreed to flesh out statistics for this in the next report. Officers also noted that works were not currently being carried out at Ludgate Circus as the highway was controlled by TfL who decided when works would commence, not the City Corporation.

It was considered by a Member whether funding would be made available for Holborn Circus works from the tunnel funding planning application and whether Section 106 funding could be used for that development.

The Committee sought clarity on how a left turn was blocked on Ludgate Hill onto New Bridge Street, as well as the pedestrian footway being pushed out and pedestrian signalling being changed. Officers explained that they needed agreement for TfL to exercise their powers to conduct a traffic order change, but the physical works were implemented by TfL. Officers confirmed that changes could not be made to the Ludgate Circus junction as they were not the responsible highway authority, and that TfL were currently focused on improving Monument Junction.

The Committee considered whether it would be possible to acquire a list of junctions that TfL were looking to carry out works on as it expressed concern about priorities. Officers indicated the Chairman of Planning and Transportation Committee was meeting with TfL staff once a quarter and Monument Junction had been on the list for works for 10 to 15 years. Officers emphasised it was important the City Corporation was looking at TfL's accidents and collisions statistics to ensure they were critically assessing the safety on their own network in the City and agreed to share that information with Members.

RESOLVED – That, Members –

- Approved a budget of £175,000 to reach the next Gateway, as well as to deliver the minor measures (to be delivered through existing delegations and outside this programme) at Mincing Lane.
- Noted the total estimated cost of the programme is between £2.8M to £6.4M (excluding risk).
- Noted that £2.4 million has been secured to date from the OSPR for this programme.
- Noted that, to complete the programme, additional bid for capital funding will be submitted. If funding is not available, remaining projects can remain in abeyance and progressed when funding has been identified.
- Noted that the initiation of this programme included the initiation of the forthcoming projects under its umbrella.
- Approved a Costed Risk Provision of £100,000 (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer)

9. **COMBINED SECTION 278 PROJECT INITIATION REPORT**

The Sub-Committee received a Gateway 2 report that highlighted a number of projects that were approved by the Planning & Transportation Committee in recent months of which are conditioned to require the developer to enter into a Section 278 agreement with the City of London Corporation.

RESOLVED – That, Members of the Sub-Committee:

1. Approved budgets for each project, subject to receipt of funds, as set out in the tables in Section 2;
2. Noted the total estimated costs of the projects (excluding risk) as set out in the Project Briefings;
3. Authorised ability to negotiate and entry into individual Section 278 (or equivalent) agreements;
4. Authorised advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders where required, noting that any objections will be dealt with in the usual way.

10. **TRAFFIC ORDER REVIEW - OUTCOME OF DETAILED REVIEWS AND UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report that requested Members' approval to proceed with recommended changes to six pedestrian zones. It also provided an update on progress with reviewing the remainder of the traffic orders in the programme.

The Sub-Committee received a presentation from Officers which noted it would be a change to the existing motor vehicle restrictions, mostly from 8:00am to 6:00pm to 7:00am to 9:00pm, which matched the pedestrian activity in the area. Officers reported that the results of the consultation would be received toward the end of the year, possibly early next year, before delivery toward the end of the financial year.

A Member indicated support for the change in restrictions to more hours but questioned how the areas may be serviced without causing issues for residents. Officers explained that the study had looked at levels of activity taking place accessing those streets including for deliveries and servicing. Where consultants had recommended extending the restricted hours, the level of impact on servicing was small.

The Sub-Committee queried what the consultation would look like. Officers explained that, should the recommendations be agreed upon, a statutory consultation would have been undertaken with the businesses in the area notified. Officers also noted they would bring another paper to the Sub-Committee should significant issues arise.

A Member sought clarity on what was meant by 'no motor vehicles' and considered what impact that would have on deliveries. Officers confirmed it meant all motor vehicles and they had an ability to provide permits to those who needed to operate outside those hours. Officers indicated it would usually take

three working days to issue permits and acknowledged these issues would form part of the consultation process to see where intricacies may need to apply.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the detailed study of six timed road closure restrictions (pedestrian zones) and agree in principles to the recommended changes to the associated traffic orders to amend their hours of operation, as shown in paragraph 6, subject to the completion of the statutory consultation process.
- Agreed that the resolution of any objections received will be considered by the Director of City Operations, but if appropriate, a separate report be prepared for the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee, to make the necessary traffic Orders.
- Noted the any proposed changes to the remaining traffic orders (not covered by existing projects) will be progressed under delegated authority.
- Noted there is £287,000 remaining in the approved budget, which should be sufficient to cover the cost of the proposed changes required so far to the traffic orders.

11. **BEECH STREET TRANSFORMATION AND PUBLIC REALM PROJECT**

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 6 report that sought to close the Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm project.

The Sub-Committee indicated it appreciated the financial discipline of closing projects and returning the money, but argued as the Healthy Streets Initiative was essentially trying to accomplish the same objective, it questioned the logic of returning the money to then withdraw more money further down the line. Officers reported that Policy & Resources Committee and Resource Allocation Sub-Committee (RASC) agreed an in-principle budget for a specific scope and money could not be moved from one project to another.

Officers reported that some the residents from the Barbican felt the Beech Street scheme was not ambitious enough. The Chairman indicated that some of the opposition to the scheme during the consultation reflected this view, so the opposition included both outright opposition and very strong support.

A Member queried whether closing the project would result in the loss of the funding for Beech Street. Officers expressed their understanding of the project governance process and indicated they were happy to clarify their understanding of the project governance process with the Chamberlain but noted that money unspent during a project was ringfenced and could only be released by a new Gateway process through RASC.

It was queried by a Member as to whether lessons had been learned with regard the two grounds undefended during the statutory challenge to the High Court. Officers explained the undefended grounds were due to availability of documents

for the public to view and the quality of the statement of reasons not being clear enough. Officers reported processes had been added to ensure that did not occur again.

RESOLVED – That – Members delegate authority of the closing of the project to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, subject to confirmation of project governance process.

12. **QUEENSBRIDGE HOUSE HOTEL SECTION 278 PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS AND HIGHWAY WORKS**

The Sub-Committee received a Gateway 6 report on the project which aimed to deliver new highways changes and public realm improvements in the vicinity of the new Queensbridge House Hotel to accommodate and integrate the hotel operations into the surrounding City of London highway. It contained a request to approve the closure of the project upon completion of outstanding signage changes and accounts verification.

A Member queried what had happened to the planting and considered who was responsible for cleaning the area now the public were able to access the inlet. Officers indicated that the City's cleansing team were aware of it and they were in contact with the Port London Authority to raise awareness of the issues with plastic bottles and driftwood washing up. Officers informed the Sub-Committee that planting was outside the scope of the Section 278 as it was privately owned.

A Member noted that a fridge had been removed from the inlet by the Port Health Authority, but it was a matter for the Port of London Authority (PLA) and noted that a permit was needed from the PLA to go on the foreshore.

The Sub-Committee explored how signage in the area could be fixed to ensure pedestrians did not get lost. Officers indicated they were using the Legible London as their wayfinding system to fill in gaps where they existed and indicated the signage could be looked at in the area. Officers also noted they would, with Planners through Section 106 and 278 agreements, to secure funding to change signing that may be affected by recent developments.

A Member sought clarity over issues with the cost-risk provision as aspects of the project seemed to have been removed to ensure it remained within budget. Officers noted it was a difficult negotiation with the developer over what was required which meant key requirements had to be squeezed into the budget available and removed the ability to complete additional tasks, particularly due to delays around drainage. Officers indicated they would not proceed with a project at the Gateway 5 stage against without costed risk to ensure there was an ability to manage risks more effectively.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the conclusions of the report.

- Approved the closure of the project upon completion of outstanding signage changes and accounts verification.

13. **DELEGATED REPORTS: OVERVIEW APRIL TO SEPTEMBER 2024**

The Sub-Committee received a report with a summary of decisions that had been undertaken relating to Transport and Public Realm projects between 1 April and 31 July 2024 under either existing or agreed delegated powers by responsible Officers within the Environment Department.

RECEIVED.

14. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Update on Bank Junction

Officers provided an update to the Sub-Committee noting that over the summer, work had continued to prepare the various stages of the traffic modelling exercise ready for TfL to audit as part of their agreed model audit process and the City's Base traffic model was currently with TfL being audited. Consultants were currently working on the second stage for submission.

Officers reported further that meetings with TfL colleagues both at officer level and political level had taken place to discuss the process, resources and expectations for the programme to look at running an experimental traffic order to reintroduce taxis at Bank Junction during Monday to Friday from 7:00am to 7:00pm.

Officers informed the Sub-Committee that a report was being prepared for the November meeting which would provide a review of the route options that taxis could take across the junction and the likely impacts/benefits of those route choices. Officers were looking to get to just one option to take forward for the final design and the final traffic modelling submission. The report would also set out the broad principles for what the success criteria for the experiment might be and set out the broad principles for what might be contained within the monitoring strategy. The report would give Members an opportunity to discuss and ensure that the development of the success criteria and monitoring met the needs of the experiment and would give Members the information and evidence they would need at the end of the experiment to be able to take a final decision on whether the experiment has been a success.

A Member requested that the Officer statement on Bank Junction be circulated to the Committee following the meeting, Officers agreed on that action.

Another Member requested that the evidence base, rationale and criteria when the Corporation entered the Bank Junction project be included as background information in the Bank Junction report going to Sub-Committee in November. Officers confirmed background papers would be included with the report.

Sporting Events on the Highway

A Member indicated the need to ensure programmes were in place early enough for sporting events to ensure advertising could be done for events held on the highway from the Easter period onwards.

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

There were no questions raised on matters relating to the work of the Sub-Committee.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

Cheapside Planters

The Chairman drew attention to a question that had been raised with Officers from a Ward Member which asked Officers to reconsider the orange planters currently installed on Cheapside.

Officers reported that restrictions were currently in place to only allow bus, cycles and, under experimental order, taxis to use Cheapside. The orange planters had been in place since Summer 2020 and Officers had progressed a revised scheme for that space, with a Gateway 4 report being heard at Sub-Committee in May 2023 and a Gateway 5 report expected to go to Sub-Committee early next year with proposals. Officers indicated they did not disagree that the orange planters had not weathered well and felt it was due process to consult the Sub-Committee due to the scheme being Member-approved.

Officers reported they had looked at accident data which illustrated there had been five collisions, two serious, three slight, between January 2017 and June 2020 before the scheme was installed. Since the scheme had been installed, there had been one slight accident between June 2020 and April 2024. Officers noted that while a number of things had changed on Cheapside itself, including the restriction itself, it was not felt by Officers that it was down to the orange planter. Officers indicated they intended to leave them in place but removal could be done without significant increase in risk given concerns were being raised about visual appearance and sight lines.

Officers sought approval from Committee to Delegate Authority to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Sub-Committee for the orange planters to be removed. Officers indicated they would have a site meeting to determine that and look at the data as to whether that would be the best way forward if that approval was granted.

The Committee indicated it would be reluctant to change something that had appeared to be safer, especially as it had provided a visual barrier for drivers travelling through Cheapside and noted that it was a hugely improved environment since the scheme had been put into place.

A Member noted there was an issue with signage on Cheapside as it was not always obvious to visitors to the City of London that the highway was a bus gate.

The Committee noted that there was a move toward a permanent scheme for Cheapside in process and the removal of the planters, followed by installation of a permanent scheme soon afterward may confuse the public.

The Committee indicated that it wished to retain the orange planters as they were and concluded that a Delegated Authority to the Town Clerk was not required.

The meeting ended at 3.42 pm

Chairman

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