

Committees: Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee <i>[for decision]</i> Projects and Procurement Sub <i>[for information]</i>	Dates: 19 November 2024 9 December 2024
Subject: 2 Aldermanbury Square Unique Project Identifier: 12359	Gateway 4: Detailed Options Appraisal (Regular)
Report of: Executive Director Environment Report Author: Andrea Moravicova	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Deliver changes to the public highway in the vicinity of the development at 2 Aldermanbury Square, also known as City Place House, through a Section 278 agreement that is fully funded by the developer.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £0.86M – £1.2M</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): The total estimated cost of the project remains within the range provided at Gateway 2 and Gateway 3 (£0.83M - £1.2M).</p> <p>Spend to Date: £59,864</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: None</p> <p>Slippage: None</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 5 (Authority to Start Work)</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the detailed design for the recommended option and draft construction package. • Finalise the Section 278 agreement with the 2 Aldermanbury Square developer to receive the funding necessary to procure material and works in readiness for implementation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Gateway 5 report requesting authorisation to start works for approval under delegated authority in Q1 2025. <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authorise officers to progress with detailed designs for the recommended Option 2 outlined below to be fully funded by Section 278 agreement with the developer of 2 Aldermanbury Square and undertake relevant consultations, including Traffic Management Orders if necessary. 2. Authorise officers to invoice the developer for additional staff costs, as outlined Table 1 in section 3 below, required to progress the project to the next Gateway (Authority to Start Works). 3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £926,023 based on option 2 (excluding risk). 4. Note that, as per the Projects Procedure and subject to approval of the recommended Option 2, and scope and costs remaining within the parameters agreed in this report, the approval of Gateway 5 report will be delegated to Director City Operations. 5. Approve the Risk Register in Appendix 6; and delegate approval of any future costed risk provision and its drawdown to Executive Director Environment should this be required at Gateway 5. 6. Delegate to the Director City Operations, in consultation with the Chamberlain, authority to further increase or amend the project budgets in future (above the level of existing delegated authority) provided any increase is fully funded by the developer, and the scope and timelines of the project remain unchanged.
<p>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</p>	<p>The total cost of the project for the recommended design (Option 2) is currently estimated at £926,023.</p> <p>Expenditure to date is £59,864. Activities completed include further liaison between City officers and the developer, and vehicle tracking studies to ensure the most suitable option is proposed to be taken forward to detailed design and implementation.</p> <p>Table 1 outlines the costs necessary to reach the next Gateway (Authority to Start Works).</p> <p>The staff costs will cover project management, detailed design and construction package completion, local stakeholder liaison, developer negotiations and report writing.</p> <p>Table 2 indicates an estimate of the overall costs of the project, including maintenance, for implementation of the recommended Option 2.</p>

Table 1: Revised budget to reach next Gateway

Item	Funds received to date (£)	Resource required to reach next gateway (£)	Revised budget to next gateway (£)
Staff costs	37,000	14,953	51,953
Fees	63,000	0	63,000
Total	100,000	14,953	114,953

Table 2: Estimated overall costs for Option 2

Item	Cost (£)	Funds/ Source of Funding
Staff costs	202,000	S.278
Fees	89,830	
Works	495,104	
Utilities	95,000	
Planting	10,000	
Maintenance	34,089	
Total	926,023	

Please see Appendix 3 for more information.

Legal fees are secured by undertakings and are therefore excluded from the Section 278 works payment.

Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: None requested at this gateway. Costed risk Provision will be requested at G5 for the construction phase.

4. Overview of project options

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

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

Three design options, all reflecting the scope of works outlined in the Section 106 agreement, have been progressed. All three options have the same design for Basinghall Street but differ in the proposals for London Wall as described below and shown in Appendix 2.

Basinghall Street design proposal

- Repave the north footway along the development between eastern end of the development site to Brewers Hall Gardens in York stone.

- Adjust the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction to help integrate a new pedestrian route through the development site.
- Raise carriageway to the footway level at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction to aid people walking and wheeling.
- Re-introduce trees to the north footway between Basinghall Avenue and Aldermanbury.
- Install seating to help improve the health and accessibility index.

London Wall design options proposal

Option 1 (the most ambitious changes to the London Wall area)

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

Option 2 (recommended) – moderate changes to the London Wall area)

- Reduce road width of London Wall to one lane westbound (using line markings, with no changes to existing pavement widths).
- Introduce a section of hatched lining to separate cycle lane from motor traffic lane along the westbound cycle lane to enhance safety for people cycling.

Option 3 (minimal changes to London Wall area)

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

Following further negotiations with the developer, it was concluded that Option 2 is the most proportionate, delivering what is required to mitigate the impact of the development and provide for a greater enhanced public realm in the vicinity of their development. These changes align with the City's Transport Strategy objective to improve the experience for people walking, wheeling and cycling on City streets. The Option 2 design also affords flexibility should

future changes be implemented in light of developing ambitions for London Wall corridor, with minimal abortive costs.

Traffic implications

The proposal includes narrowing the westbound carriageway on London Wall to one lane. This will allow improvements to the cycle provision in the area.

London Wall westbound has been operating with one lane only between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden since January 2022, without significant impact on traffic flows. Therefore, the recommended Option 2 is thought to be acceptable. Further observation will be undertaken as part of the next stage of design which will also include liaison with TfL regarding the junction with Wood Street and any needed changes to the signal timings here. The detailed design will address any findings as necessary.

Legal implications

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

Equalities implications

Tests of relevance assessing the impact of all three options on protected characteristics concluded that all options, albeit to varying extents, could potentially improve walking and wheeling experience for people with protected characteristics. However, removal of a lane of traffic may increase the travel times and costs, and therefore negatively impact some people with protected characteristics of age, disability, and pregnancy and maternity, who may be more reliant on a motor vehicle as a mobility aid. The test of relevance was shared and approved at the previous gateway and is attached for information at Appendix 4.

The Option 2 proposal has been assessed using the City of London Streets Accessibility Tool (CoLSAT), which enables street designers to identify how street features impact on the different needs of disabled people. The tool recognises that the needs of different groups of disabled people can be contradictory; that improving accessibility for one group may decrease accessibility for another. CoLSAT identifies trade-offs that may be needed to ensure no one is excluded from using the City's streets and provides the basis for engagement and discussions to maximise the benefits for all.

CoLSAT Summary Results Table for Option 2

	Total 0 scores – severe accessibility issue				Total 1 scores - significant accessibility issues			
	Basinghall Street		London Wall		Basinghall Street		London Wall	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Electric Wheelchair user	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Manual Wheelchair user	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
Mobility Scooter user	2	0	2	0	2	1	1	1
Walking Aid user	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Person with a walking impairment	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1
Person who uses cycle as their primary mobility aid	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	2
Long cane user	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	2
Guide Dog user	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	2
Residual Sight user	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1
Deaf or Hearing impairment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Acquired neurological impairment	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Autism/Sensory-processing diversity	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
Developmental Impairment	2	0	0	0	5	2	5	2
Total	10	0	3	0	29	9	22	9

The CoLSAT Summary table above shows the severe (0) and significant (1) issues identified through the CoLSAT assessments of the existing condition and the recommended design proposal. The proposed scheme has a potential to improve the walking and wheeling experience for all assessed characteristics. The recommended design would eliminate severe issues (0), and materially reduce the significant accessibility issues present in the area of Basinghall Street between Aldermanbury Square and Basinghall Avenue. The scheme, however, will be unable to resolve a small number of accessibility issues, these relate to: taxi drop-off locations, and distance to changing places toilets, which may have potential implications for people with walking impairment and / or guide dog users.

Healthy Streets assessment

A Healthy Streets Design Check was undertaken on the current arrangements in London Wall and Basinghall Street and the proposed Options 1 and 2. Basinghall Street score remains unchanged as the design remains the same in all options.

The minor changes to the London Wall design, which retains a reduction of the motorised traffic to one-lane, result in Option 2 scoring four points lower than Option 1, however this is considered acceptable.

Healthy Street score for London Wall comparing the existing situation (faded colour) and the proposed Option 2 design (bold colour)

	Existing Layout Score	Proposed Option 2 Score
Healthy Streets Score	43	48
Everyone feels welcome	51	60
Easy to cross	25	33
Shade and shelter	17	17
Places to stop and rest	67	73
Not too noisy	33	33
People choose to walk and cycle	51	60
People feel safe	49	56
Things to see and do	67	67
People feel relaxed	51	60
Clean air	25	25

Healthy Street score for Basinghall Street comparing the existing situation (faded colour) and the proposed design which remains the same for each option (bold colour).

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

	More detail of the CoLSAT and Healthy Streets assessments are shown in Appendix 5.
5. Recommendation	<p>It is recommended that the detailed design for the recommended Option 2 is progressed and implemented, subject to receipt of Section 278 funds from the developer.</p> <p>This option aligns with the objectives of the City's Transport Strategy to improve experience for people walking, wheeling and cycling on City streets. It also allows for further changes to London Wall, should these be needed following the outcome of the London Wall corridor feasibility study which looks at the long-term future of London Wall and will be reported on in due course.</p>
6. Risk	<p>The key risks of the project</p> <p><i>1. Programme delays.</i> Risk response: reduce Delays to the implementation of the Section 278 works may impact the developer's desired date for occupation and presents a reputational risk to the City Corporation. This has been mitigated by the inclusion of some out of hours working costs in the estimate and consideration to allocate additional resources to each phase of works.</p> <p><i>2. Increase in the overall project costs.</i> Risk response: reduce Any unforeseen circumstances are likely to increase the cost of the project. Although these costs will be covered by the developer under Section 278 agreement, officers are undertaking all reasonable steps, including ground investigations and other necessary surveys and assessment to ensure the cost estimates are as accurate as possible.</p> <p>Issues</p> <p><i>Developer disagrees with the upper cost estimate of the project.</i> Risk response: accept All options were designed to align with the scope defined within the S106 agreement to mitigate the impact of the development. Following further discussions with the developer, it has now been agreed that Option 2 is the most proportionate overall, ensuring the developer is meeting their obligations to the Corporation whilst also improving the public realm in the vicinity of the site. Accordingly, this report proposes to progress Option 2 to detailed design in readiness for implementation. Further information available in the Risk Register (Appendix 6) and Options Appraisal below.</p>
7. Procurement strategy	The design is being developed in-house by the Highways team, although a specialist consultant was appointed to propose new seating arrangements in Aldermanbury Square.

	All construction is expected to be implemented by the City's term contractor and nominated sub-contractor or statutory undertaker as necessary, under the supervision of the Environment Department, and in line with the developer's programme and considering other major works planned in the London Wall area.
8. Programme	<p>Key dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise S278 Agreement – December 2024 • Commence with drafting a construction package – December 2024 • Gateway 5 report (delegated) – Q1 2025 • Issue Construction package – April 2025 • Pre-construction planning – April / June 2025 • Project construction starts – summer 2025* • Construction completion – summer 2026* • G6 report – Q4 2026 <p>*Construction start and end dates will be aligned to the developer's programme.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project coversheet
Appendix 2	Design Options Plans
Appendix 3	Finance Tables
Appendix 4	Test of Relevance
Appendix 5	City of London Streets Accessibility & Healthy Streets assessments
Appendix 6	Risk Register

Contact

Report Author	Andrea Moravicova
Email Address	Andrea.moravicova@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3925

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
<p>1. Brief description of option</p>	<p>Section 278 highway works in the immediate vicinity of the new development at 2 Aldermanbury Square.</p> <p>All three options have the same design proposed for Basinghall Street but differ in the proposals for London Wall.</p> <p>Basinghall Street proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repave the north footway along the development between eastern end of the development site to Brewers Hall Gardens in York stone. • Adjust the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction to help integrate a new pedestrian route through the development site. • Raise carriageway to the footway level at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction to aid people walking and wheeling. • Re-introduce trees to the north footway between Basinghall Avenue and Aldermanbury. • Install seating to improve street's health and accessibility index. 		
<p>2. Scope and exclusions</p>	<p>Proposal consistent with the scope outlined in the Section 106 agreement. Design deemed to have the most positive impact on people walking, wheeling and cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue • Improvements to cycle provision on London Wall westbound. • Repaving surfaces in the City standard palette • Widening of the southern pavement on London Wall between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. • Widening the central reservation at the existing raised tables on London Wall. 	<p>Proposal aligns to the scope outlined in the Section 106 agreement, but with no changes to the southern pavement on London Wall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue • Improvements to cycling provision on London Wall westbound. • Repaving surfaces in the City standard palette <p>Exclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening the southern pavement on London Wall 	<p>Proposals meet the requirements of the Section 106 agreement but with minimal adjustments to the area of London Wall due to potential issues with loading on an underground structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue • Improvements to cycling provision on London Wall westbound. • Repaving surfaces in the City standard palette <p>Exclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening the southern pavement on London Wall • Widening the central reservation at the existing raised tables on London Wall.

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Project Planning			
3. Programme and key dates	<p>Expected completion: 2026*</p> <p>Key dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise S278 Agreement – December 2024 • Commence with drafting a construction package – December 2024 • Gateway 5 report (delegated) – Q1 2025 • Issue Construction package – April 2025 • Pre-construction planning – April / June 2025 • Project construction starts – summer 2025* • Construction completion – summer 2026* • G6 report – Q4 2026 <p>*Construction start and end dates will be aligned to the developer's programme.</p>		
4. Risk implications	<p>Overall project risk: Low</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delay to the Section 278 agreement sign-off 2. Programme delays <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>		
5. Stakeholders and consultees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers • Local businesses • City divisions and departments, including Planning & Development, Remembrancer, Chamberlain and Comptroller & City Solicitor; • Transport for London • Culture Mile BID 		
6. Benefits of option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the development upgraded to the standard palette of high quality materials. • The proposed design for the immediate vicinity of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the development upgraded to the standard palette of high quality materials. • The proposed design for the immediate vicinity of the development helps promote 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfaces in the immediate vicinity of the development upgraded to the standard palette of high quality materials. • Level crossings at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction improves the public realm for people walking

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	<p>development helps promote active travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level crossings at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction improves the public realm for people walking and wheeling. • A hatched area to separate the cycle lane from motor vehicles on London Wall could contribute to safer cycling experience. • Wider pavement on London Wall for people walking and wheeling between the access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. • Widened central reservation at two raised table points on London Wall to facilitate safer crossing of the road for people walking and wheeling. could also contribute to reducing vehicles speed in the area. 	<p>active travel, albeit to a lesser extent than Option 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level crossings at the Basinghall Street / Basinghall Avenue junction improves the public realm for people walking and wheeling. • A hatched area to separate the cycle lane from motor vehicles on London Wall could contribute to safer experience for people cycling. 	<p>and wheeling, which helps promote active travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a mandatory cycle lane.
<p>7. Disbenefits of option</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one lane available to westbound motor vehicles could potentially increase travel times for people using motor vehicles. • Risks to programme and cost associated with widening the pavement and the impact this may have on the underground car park structure and pipe subway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one lane westbound available to motor vehicles, that could potentially increase travel times for people driving. • Does not improve the current environment for people walking and wheeling when crossing London Wall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only minor improvements for people walking, wheeling and cycling are delivered. • Does not improve the current environment for people walking and wheeling when crossing London Wall.
<p>Resource Implications</p>			

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
8. Total estimated cost (including maintenance)	£1,222,596	£926,023	£865,060
9. Funding strategy	The project will be fully funded by external contribution from the developer through Section 278 agreement.		
10. Investment appraisal	None required – scheme is fully funded by Section 278 with the developer.		
11. Estimated capital value/return	N/A		
12. Ongoing revenue implications	The cost of the scheme includes the commuted sum which accounts for the anticipated replacement of the materials and street furniture for 20 years.		
13. Affordability	The recommended options offers good value for money and has been agreed with the developer.		
14. Legal implications	A Section 278 agreement will be entered into with the developer to secure payment for the works and comply with an obligation of the Section 106 agreement.		
15. Corporate property implications	None.		
16. Traffic implications	Space for motorised traffic reduced to one lane westbound on London Wall between access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. This will mirror the arrangements on the eastbound carriageway. Wider pavement and central reservation are likely to improve the permeability in the area for people walking and wheeling.	Space for motorised traffic will be reduced to one lane westbound on London Wall between access road to 1 Coleman Street and Brewers Hall Garden. This will mirror the arrangements on the eastbound carriageway.	No changes to the traffic movement as two lanes will be maintained as per existing arrangements.

Option Summary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
17. Sustainability and energy implications	Use of high-quality standard pallet materials specified within the will contribute to the longevity of the surfaces post construction and better maintenance. The project will endeavour to re-use suitable materials wherever possible.		
18. IT implications	N/A		
19. Equality Impact Assessment	<p>The proposal aims to improve accessibility for people walking, wheeling and cycling.</p> <p>The test of relevance assessment concluded that the design of this option will have the most positive impact on people with the following protective characteristics: age, disability, pregnancy and maternity. It shows neutral impact on people with other protected characteristics.</p> <p>However, removal of a lane of traffic on London Wall may increase the travel times and costs, and therefore negatively impact some people with these protected characteristics, who may be more reliant on a motor vehicle as a mobility aid.</p>	<p>The test of relevance assessment concluded the proposed changes will have either positive or neutral impact on people with protected characteristics, although to a slightly lesser degree, particularly in the London Wall area, when compared with the Option 1 design.</p> <p>The potential of increased travel times and costs for people with protected characteristics who may be more reliant on a motor vehicle as a mobility aid will remain the same as per Option 1.</p>	Despite minimal changes proposed as part of this option to the area of London Wall, the Test of relevance concluded that the changes will have either positive or have neutral impact on people with protected characteristics.
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	N/A		
21. Recommendation	It is recommended that Option 2 is progressed to detailed design and implemented, subject to receipt of Section 278 funds from the developer. This option aligns with the objectives of the City's Transport Strategy to improve experience for people walking, wheeling and cycling on City streets. It also allows for further changes to London Wall, should these be needed following the outcome of the London Wall corridor feasibility study which looks at the long-term future of London Wall and will be reported on in due course.		