

Committees: Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee <i>[for decision]</i> Projects & Procurement Sub-Committee <i>[for information]</i>	Dates: 19 November 2024 09 December 2024
Subject: Leadenhall Street Improvements – City Cluster Vision Programme Unique Project Identifier: 12295	Gateway 3: Outline Options Appraisal (Complex)
Report of: Executive Director, Environment Department Report Author: Daniel Laybourn, Transportation & Public Realm Projects, City Operations	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Improvements on Leadenhall Street to enhance the experience of walking, wheeling and cycling. To include pavement widening, new and improved crossings, public realm enhancements, greening and seating. This project will also help mitigate the impact of new developments on the City’s Street network and aligns with the City Cluster Vision, Transport Strategy, and Climate Action Strategy,</p> <p>RAG Status: Amber (no change from previous)</p> <p>Risk Status: Medium (no change from previous)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £7-8.5m <i>total outturn cost</i></p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): None</p> <p>Spend to Date: £286,586 as of 14 October 2024.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: None.</p> <p>Slippage: None since the last programme-level report in September 2023. In May 2022, the project’s scope was increased to focus on transforming Leadenhall Street rather than smaller changes to the street. The City Cluster Area programme update in September 2023 detailed the revised</p>
-------------------------	---

	next steps and included the concept design for the street and the proposed approach, which was approved.															
<p>2. Next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 4/5: Detailed Options Appraisal/Authority to implement.</p> <p>Next Steps: Conduct a local consultation and engagement exercise, refine the design and required utility diversions, cost estimate and costed Risk Register so that they can be presented for approval in the next Gateway report.</p> <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <p>Members of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee are requested to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve an additional budget of £295,000 to reach the next Gateway funded from S106 budgets as detailed in Appendix 2; 2. Note the revised project budget of £686,000 (excluding risk); 3. Approve the principles of the highway and public realm design and the proposed way forward detailed in this report to further develop this; 4. Approve a Public Consultation and Engagement exercise be undertaken based on the design and principles set out in section 4, paragraph 4 of this report, and for the final detail of this to be agreed with the Director of City Operations; 5. Agree the reporting approach as detailed in section 5, paragraph 12 of this report, including the proposal to combine the Gateway 4 and 5 reports; and 6. Note the project's total estimated cost range of £8m-£9.5m (inclusive of costed risk and any maintenance sums) and the funding strategy in Appendix 2. 															
<p>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="528 1480 1390 2047"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="528 1480 762 1626">Item</th> <th data-bbox="762 1480 1007 1626">Reason</th> <th data-bbox="1007 1480 1198 1626">Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th data-bbox="1198 1480 1390 1626">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="528 1626 762 1843">Environmental Services (Highways) Staff costs</td> <td data-bbox="762 1626 1007 1843">To enable Highways staff to undertake design and supervision work to reach the next Gateway.</td> <td data-bbox="1007 1626 1198 1843">S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)</td> <td data-bbox="1198 1626 1390 1843">£25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="528 1843 762 2047">Planning and Transportation (P&T) Staff costs</td> <td data-bbox="762 1843 1007 2047">To enable P&T staff to project manage the scheme to reach the next Gateway and undertake</td> <td data-bbox="1007 1843 1198 2047">S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)</td> <td data-bbox="1198 1843 1390 2047">£85,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Environmental Services (Highways) Staff costs	To enable Highways staff to undertake design and supervision work to reach the next Gateway.	S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)	£25,000	Planning and Transportation (P&T) Staff costs	To enable P&T staff to project manage the scheme to reach the next Gateway and undertake	S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)	£85,000
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)													
Environmental Services (Highways) Staff costs	To enable Highways staff to undertake design and supervision work to reach the next Gateway.	S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)	£25,000													
Planning and Transportation (P&T) Staff costs	To enable P&T staff to project manage the scheme to reach the next Gateway and undertake	S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)	£85,000													

		further public consultation/ engagement.		
	Fees	To fund work by external parties required to reach the next Gateway, including those associated with public consultation/ engagement.	S106 (See Appendix 2 for the funding breakdown)	£185,000
	Total Additional Funding requested			£295,000
	<p>Detailed financial information is shown in Appendix 2.</p> <p><u>Environmental Services (Highways) Staff Costs</u> Approximately 250 hours of additional staff time are needed for planning, managing, and refining the scheme design to reach the next Gateway.</p> <p><u>Transportation & Public Realm Projects Staff Costs</u> An additional 850 hours are needed for project management and oversight tasks, including design, public consultation, and stakeholder engagement, to reach the next Gateway.</p> <p><u>Fees</u> An additional £185,000 is needed for (but not limited to) external specialist design support, public consultation materials and costs, engagement support, independent design reviews and the 3rd party design work for any required utility diversions.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: None. No funds have been allocated for the Risk Register in Appendix 3. The risks for the next phase of work are minimal and will be addressed through regular project activities.</p>			
<p>4. Overview of project options</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified as a high priority in the City Cluster Vision, the project aims to provide an enhanced street environment with widened pavements and a narrowed carriageway alongside public realm, greening and accessibility improvements. The existing street is in a poor condition and has narrow pavements in places that are very crowded at busy times. There is a significant amount of development activity along the street with high profile office buildings that will lead to a large increase in people walking, wheeling and cycling. 2. A single outline design option for the street has been developed to meet the project objectives and align with stakeholder and policy aspirations to create a world-class street. The recommendation for a single option to 			

be taken forward is based on the following considerations:

- There are limitations on carriageway widths, due to the need to widen the pavements and accommodate the bus route and people cycling.
 - There is a need for optimised pedestrian crossing positions that reflect desire lines and the impacts of new developments.
 - There is a need to accommodate access requirements to off-street premises.
 - There is a desire to introduce trees and planters in line with stakeholder requests and climate resilience aspirations.
 - This single design option aligns with the City Cluster Vision, Transport and Climate Action Strategies.
3. While Leadenhall Street's lower levels of traffic volumes in the peak hour periods (weekdays between 8-9am and 5-6pm) lend themselves to mixing cycles and vehicles in the same lane(s) under London Cycling Design Standards, national Department for Transport (DfT) guidelines suggest separate cycle lanes should be provided due to the average daily traffic flows. Given the constraints arising from the existing road widths and the need to prioritise people walking along this corridor, widening the pavements is necessary. This means that providing cycle and traffic lanes in both directions, in addition to wider pavements, is not viable. Therefore, it is proposed to have a 3.2m-wide traffic lanes in both directions mixing vehicles and cycles. This approach ensures more space for pedestrians and provides a suitable width for traffic lanes which discourage unsafe overtaking of people cycling, whilst maximising the potential for pavement widening.
4. Pedestrian crossing and vehicle waiting and loading surveys have been carried out to understand where activity is currently taking place. An assessment of the additional impacts of the planned developments has also taken place. From this information, the highways layout in **Appendix 4** has been created. It includes the following elements which have been provisionally set based on the information gathered and design standards:
- Kerb alignments & carriageway widths;
 - Raised crossings that create a flush surface between the carriageway and footways, where high levels of pedestrian crossing activity were noted;
 - Subject to statutory consultation, inset loading bay

positions that suit the waiting & loading activity on the street; and

- Revised bus stop locations and sizes to suit the proposed highway changes subject to further discussions with TfL.

Several workstreams are now underway to refine this outline design:

Greening, Sustainable Drainage System (SuDs) and Public Realm design

5. The design has been developed in line with the City's public realm toolkit. It is proposed that Yorkstone paving will be used on the pavements and asphalt on the carriageways as standard.
6. Officers recommend prioritising the introduction of new street trees, followed by planters (with integrated seating) and additional seating if required. Officers have reviewed utility information to identify potential tree planting locations, whilst avoiding expensive utility diversions where possible. In the next stage of work, trial holes will confirm the feasibility of trees, with planters as an alternative, depending on what's most suited to any given location. Areas currently being further assessed for tree planting and planters can be seen in **Appendix 4**.
7. Some of these trial holes will also be used to assess the suitability of Sustainable Drainage Systems (or 'SuDs'). If viable, SuDS options will be explored further.

Planter Design and Historical & Cultural Interpretation

8. LDA landscape architects were commissioned to design planter and seating options with integrated historical & cultural interpretation for Leadenhall Street. Their work, presented in **Appendix 5**, has been well-received by stakeholders, as explained below. Once trial hole data is analysed so the locations of trees and planters is better determined, a consultant will be commissioned to continue the development of this work.

Stakeholder Engagement and Public Consultation

9. Officers have been regularly updating stakeholders on the project via the City Cluster's Programme Board meetings and engagement with the EC BID. While feedback has been positive, there's a strong desire for faster delivery of measures.

10. It is proposed to undertake a public consultation and engagement exercise on the emerging designs to seek feedback on the proposals and to ensure that our assessment to date is reflective of the wider community needs. This exercise will include drop-in sessions, on-street information totems, a project webpage and a leaflet drop to gather stakeholder opinions on the latest highway, greening and public realm design.

Transport for London applications

11. Requests for traffic signal changes at the St Mary Axe junction and bus stop changes along the street have been submitted to TfL. Initial feedback on traffic signal changes is positive, and some design clarifications have been requested by TfL buses.

Healthy Streets and CoLSAT

12. To aid the development of the design, Officers undertook CoLSAT and Healthy Streets assessments. The CoLSAT results, detailed in **Appendix 6**, show that the street already scores well, and the proposed improvements will enhance it further.

13. The current street's Healthy Streets assessment score is poor at 25 out of 100, where a few zero scores have been noted. In particular, the current 'mix of vehicles' zero score is due to the percentage of large vehicles using the street, but this should improve as the private construction activities along the street complete. Also 'cycle safety at junctions' and 'space for cycling' both score zero as the average daily traffic levels on Leadenhall Street require light segregation for cyclists based on national guidance. As mentioned earlier in this report, Officers believe that 3.2m traffic lanes in both directions where cyclists and vehicles mix, is a reasonable and feasible design solution.

14. The current proposals are expected to increase the healthy Streets score significantly, with an early assessment indicating a score near 50 out of 100. A full assessment of the developed scheme design will be included in the next Gateway report following the consultation feedback and the continued investigatory work.

	<p><u>Section 278 schemes along Leadenhall Street already underway.</u></p> <p>15. Section 278 works outside 40 Leadenhall Street and 6-8 Bishopsgate are complete, already aligning with the new kerb lines proposed in Appendix 4. These wider footways will accommodate increased footfall attributable to these new developments. Section 278 works at 1 Leadenhall are delayed by their construction activities, and are expected to begin in late 2024, completing by Summer/Autumn 2025.</p> <p>16. In total, these schemes' have contributed approx. £440k to improvements on Leadenhall Street (£140k from 40 Leadenhall S278, £210k from 1 Leadenhall Street S278 and £90k from 6-8 Bishopsgate S278).</p>
<p>5. Recommendation</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If approved, Officers will continue their preparation for the public consultation and engagement exercise and a consultation report will be included in the Gateway 4/5 report in mid-2025. 2. Once available, trial hole results will help to determine tree planting and any SuDS locations. Planter and street furniture locations will be provisionally determined at the same time. Utility companies can then be contacted for diversions and cost estimates. Planter options and historical interpretation will also be further developed, incorporating public consultation feedback. The detailed scheme design and estimate will then be submitted to members in the next Gateway report. 3. At the same time, more formal elements of the design process will begin. A TMAN (Traffic Management Act Notification) will be submitted to Transport for London for construction-related discussions, and Equalities Impact Assessment and Road Safety Audits will be commissioned. <p><u>Upcoming Section 278 schemes and developments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The 1 Undershaft development is expected to make a further submission in respect of its planning application. Work on this section of Leadenhall Street may need to be deferred to accommodate their development activities. This will be closely monitored. 5. It is understood that construction activity at 100 Leadenhall Street is unlikely in the short-medium term.

Estimated Construction Start date

6. Section 278 works at 1 Leadenhall Street are due to complete in Autumn 2025. Subject to network availability and traffic management requirements the aim is to follow on with works to the remainder of Leadenhall Street as part of this project as soon after 1 Leadenhall street as possible. Officers will develop the detailed programme in the next stage of work.

Funding Strategy

7. The project is funded from a mix of different sources, as follows:
8. There is S106 funding from recent developments in the area that has been allocated to the City Cluster programme;
9. The ECBID have contributed to this project alongside two other projects from the programme (Creechurch Lane and Jubilee Gardens), with a focus on providing greening, seating and cultural design elements; and
10. An application for CIL funding for the City Cluster programme was approved in November 2023 which has enabled the project's funding strategy to be finalised as detailed in **Appendix 2**.

Legal implications

11. In exercising the City Corporation's functions as traffic authority and taking a decision, the City are required to comply with the duty in Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act which requires the traffic authority, in exercising its traffic authority functions, to secure the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians), so far as practicable having regard to:
 - (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
 - (b) the effect of amenities of any locality.
 - (bb) national air quality strategy.
 - (c) public service vehicles.
 - (d) any other relevant matters.

Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 the public sector equality duty requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity and
- Foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic (i.e., race, sex, disability, age, sexual

	<p>orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership and gender reassignment) and those who do not.</p> <p>As part of the duty to have “due regard” where there is disproportionate impact on a group who share a protected characteristic, the City Corporation should consider what steps might be taken to mitigate the impact, on the basis that it is a proportionate means which has been adopted towards achieving a legitimate aim.</p> <p><u>Next Reporting Steps</u></p> <p>12. The ambitious basis of the next reporting steps is the consolidation of the required Gateway 4 (Detailed Design), and Gateway 5 (Authority to start work) reports due to there being a single design option subject to the consultation feedback not requiring any significant change in the design. If Members approve this approach, Officers will aim to submit the consolidated Gateway 4/5 report to the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee in May 2025. If approved, the report would then be resubmitted to the Planning & Transportation Committee in July 2025. If possible and time is available, the required Gateway 4b report would then be submitted to Court of Common Council in July 2025 for approval (as the project is over £5m) that would allow work to begin on site in Autumn 2025.</p>
<p>6. Risk</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the project moves forward to construction, the risk profile is expected to be like other City highway projects. However, due to the project's size, the eventual risk sum based on previous projects is expected to be around £1 million. This will need to be accommodated within the available funding and so a Costed Risk Register will be developed alongside the highways design to ensure it is affordable. This register will then be submitted for approval as part of the next Gateway report. 2. No funds have been allocated for the Risk Register in Appendix 3. The risks for the next phase of work are minimal and will be addressed through regular project activities. Looking forward, the construction stage will carry the highest risk profile of the entire project as is normal for highway projects. The top three risks are most likely to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrect budget estimates/ increased costs arising from the current financial climate that results in contractual cost uplifts and other supplier costs increases,

	<p>particularly if there is a delay in delivering the proposals after estimation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional utility diversionary works being required despite trials holes and radar survey work having been undertaken; and • Unforeseen technical/ engineering issues occurring that require additional costs to rectify.
7. Procurement approach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design and project management will continue to be handled by the internal team of officers and engineers in the City Operations division. The city's current term contractor (FM Conway) will undertake the eventual construction work. 2. Any other third-party engagement will follow standard procurement rules as appropriate, or the Transport and public realm framework contract.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Project Financial Information
Appendix 3	Risk Register
Appendix 4	Latest Highways Design
Appendix 5	Public Realm concept work by LDA
Appendix 6	Current CoLSAT and Healthy Streets assessments

Contact

Report Author	Daniel Laybourn
Email Address	Daniel.laybourn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option Summary	Single Option proposed for the reasons set out in the main report
1. Brief description of option	Widening of the footways along Leadenhall Street to narrow the carriageway to 6.4m. This will improve accessibility and the experience of those walking, wheeling and cycling through the street. Also proposed are greening and public realm improvements.
2. Scope and exclusions	The scope of work is primarily Leadenhall Street itself. The project scope will also include some entrances to side streets and covered walkways
Project Planning	
3. Programme and key dates	<p>Overall project: Subject to city road network availability and the project progressing to programme, construction start in Autumn 2025. Duration of construction has yet to be determined but its more than likely to be 18+ months.</p> <p>Key dates: (If approved) Consolidated Gateway 4/5 report submitted to Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee in May 2025 and Planning & Transport Committee in July 2025. Gateway 4b to be submitted to Court of Common Council in July 2025.</p> <p>If achieved, all required project governance approvals would be approved by Summer recess 2025 and enable a construction start date in Autumn 2025.</p>
4. Risk implications	<p>Overall project option risk: Medium</p> <p>The risk profile is expected to be like other City highway projects. However, due to the project's size, the eventual risk sum is expected to be around £1 million.</p>
5. Stakeholders and consultees	City Officers (Planning, Highways, Chamberlains, Destination City, Policy & Strategy, Transportation & Public Realm projects)

Option Summary	Single Option proposed for the reasons set out in the main report
	City Members (Aldgate, Langbourn, Lime Street and Bishopsgate wards) EC BID City Property Association Transport for London Residents Occupiers City workers
6. Benefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved Pedestrian Comfort Levels due to the widened footways • Improved accessibility for people walking and wheeling because of the raised crossing sections and widened footways • Improved shade due to the planned trees and seating • Improved greening within the planned planters • With the wider footways, a highways environment more able to accommodate the increase in footfall arising from nearby upcoming and future developments • If Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems are installed, a more sustainable street where surface water could be used for irrigation purposes and reduces surface water runoff into the sewer system. • Lower vehicles speeds usually result from narrowed carriageways, improving safety • A world-class street is planned, in line with stakeholder and policy aspirations
7. Disbenefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's unlikely to be any reduction in the amount of motor vehicle traffic on the street. Vehicle and bus access is required for the street and highway network to function effectively. However, vehicle numbers are relatively low compared to other main streets in the City. • The reduction in the carriageway width could make the street less resilient in network terms. In the wider current street layout, it's possible to have on-carriageway activities such as utilities or construction works taking place whilst maintaining bi-directional vehicle flows. With a narrowed

Option Summary	Single Option proposed for the reasons set out in the main report
	carriageway, this is unlikely to be possible and either lane or road closures would be required to permit these activities which would result in traffic diverting elsewhere on the City network.
Resource Implications	
8. Total estimated cost	£8-9.5m inclusive of Costed Risk and any required maintenance sums. £7-8.5m excluding the estimated costed risk sum Project is to be delivered within the approved funding set out below.
9. Funding strategy	£610,000 – Contribution from the EC BID. This is restricted to trees, planting, seating and historic and cultural interpretation design elements. £3,467,340 – S106 funding from developments in the area £22,600 – ReVeAL EU funding £5,400,000 – Confirmed CIL funding following a successful bid last year TOTAL – ~ £9.5m
10. Investment appraisal	N/A
11. Estimated capital value/return	N/A
12. Ongoing revenue implications	The commuted maintenance for any greening and trees will need to be accommodated within the available budget. Once the details are confirmed, the sum required can be calculated.

Option Summary	Single Option proposed for the reasons set out in the main report
13. Affordability	All funding is confirmed
14. Legal implications	The proposed scheme would require changes to the street's Traffic Management Order(s) and it is considered that the City would be acting within its authority under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. This sets out circumstances in which a local authority must hold a public inquiry if it receives an objection which is not considered frivolous, irrelevant or withdrawn. As any changes to the Traffic Management Orders are likely to fall within these circumstances, the risk of a public inquiry is present.
15. Corporate property implications	N/A
16. Traffic implications	In exercising its traffic authority functions, the City is under a duty to “secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians)” as far as practicable (S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984). Temporary and revised permanent traffic orders will be required for this project, and regard will be had to this duty in making them. The current scheme proposals would alter the current on-street waiting & loading bay positions for vehicles and will deliver improvements for people walking, wheeling and cycling. Vehicular access to off-street premises would remain unchanged.
17. Sustainability and energy implications	The highways materials to be used are from the City's Public realm design toolkit and they have been assessed to reduce their carbon footprint. Should the opportunity present itself, the opportunity of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems will be considered, alongside other climate resilience measures. The water collected by these systems can be used for irrigation purposes on any greening and tree planting, as well as reducing pressure on the sewer system.
18. IS implications	N/A

<i>Option Summary</i>	<i>Single Option proposed for the reasons set out in the main report</i>
19. Equality Impact Assessment	As a Public Authority, the City must have due regard to equality considerations when exercising its functions (section 149 Equality Act 2010). With three out of the nine protected characteristics (Age, Disability and Pregnancy and maternity) likely to see some change, an independent Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) will be undertaken at the next two stages of the project to assess any impacts.
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	N/A at this stage. Standard data protection requirements will be followed during the public consultation and engagement exercise.
21. Recommendation	Recommended