

Committees: Streets & Walkways Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Projects & Procurement Sub <i>[for information]</i> Planning & Transportation <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 14 May 2025 19 May 2025 8 July 2025
Subject: Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan Unique Project Identifier: 12240	Gateway 5: Regular Authority to start work
Report of: Executive Director Environment Report Author: Tom Noble, Transport & Public Realm Projects	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status Update	<p>Project Description: The Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) will provide a framework for improving air quality and the experience for people walking, wheeling and spending time in the area. This will initially be achieved through traffic management changes, leading to opportunities for public realm improvements.</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): £283,500</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): None.</p> <p>Spend to Date: £243,117</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: Not applicable</p> <p>Slippage: No slippage against parameters reported at previous Gateway.</p>
2. Requested decisions	<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise maps and produce a PDF version of the HNP which will be published on the City Corporation website; • Establish a Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane (BBGL) programme to coordinate project delivery; • Coordinate bids for funding as required to implement the programme.

	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <p>Members of Streets & Walkways Sub Committee are requested to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Adopt the Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan, as shown in Appendix 3;2. Approve a budget of £40,383 for staff costs to manage the programme during the next reporting period, as shown in the table in Section 3, with the adjustment shown in Appendix 4;3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £283,500 (excluding risk). <p>Members of the Planning & Transportation Committee are requested to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Adopt the Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan, as shown in Appendix 3.												
3. Budget	<p>3.1 A total of £40,383 is requested for the ongoing management of the BBGL programme. This will allow for continued liaison with stakeholders and the coordination of funding bids to implement the delivery plan. It is proposed to fund this activity from the underspend on the current HNP project as set out in the table below and in Appendix 4.</p> <table><tr><th>Item</th><th>Reason</th><th>Source of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Management of the BBGL programme</td><td>Stakeholder liaison, reporting, coordinating funding bids</td><td>CIL (underspend from HNP development)</td><td>40,383</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>40,383</td></tr></table> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: None.</p> <p>3.2 The progression of projects that are currently uncommitted are subject to funding being secured. As part of the BBGL programme management, funding opportunities will be explored; any bids for funding will be reported to Resource Allocation Sub Committee and Policy & Resources Committee at the appropriate stage.</p>	Item	Reason	Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Management of the BBGL programme	Stakeholder liaison, reporting, coordinating funding bids	CIL (underspend from HNP development)	40,383	Total			40,383
Item	Reason	Source of Funding	Cost (£)										
Management of the BBGL programme	Stakeholder liaison, reporting, coordinating funding bids	CIL (underspend from HNP development)	40,383										
Total			40,383										
4. Design summary	<p>Project update</p> <p>4.1 The Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane HNP sets out potential changes to how motor vehicles use streets in both</p>												

	<p>the City of London and LB Islington to access and move around the area. It also outlines potential improvements for people walking, wheeling, cycling and spending time on streets within the area.</p> <p>4.2 The proposals would support the delivery of various City strategies including the Transport Strategy and Climate Action Strategy and would support the Destination City initiative. The proposals would also support the placemaking aspirations of the Culture Mile BID.</p> <p>4.3 Since the Gateway 4 report was presented to committees in October 2024 a public consultation exercise has been carried out; the results of this engagement are summarised below and the full feedback report is included at Appendix 2.</p> <p>Public consultation</p> <p>4.4 A public consultation exercise on the HNP was undertaken over a six week period during November and December 2024. The consultation was open to anyone with an interest in the area (individuals and groups) and was advertised through a range of media including email, resident newsletters, letter drops, on-street posters and social media.</p> <p>4.5 The consultation was hosted on the Commonplace engagement platform, enabling respondents to comment on individual proposals within the HNP as well as giving overall feedback. Four in-person drop-in sessions were held at various locations across the HNP area, including one session in LB Islington. People were also able to submit feedback via email or telephone.</p> <p>4.6 Over 4,000 responses were recorded on the Commonplace platform and by email, from just over 1,000 individuals (people were able to make multiple contributions).</p> <p>4.7 People who work in the City of London accounted for 41% of respondents; residents accounted for 38%; and leisure visitors accounted for 32%. More than one type of connection could be specified, hence the total being greater than 100%.</p> <p>4.8 Responses to each proposal in the HNP are summarised below. A full engagement feedback report is included at Appendix 2 of this report.</p>
--	--

Beech Street

4.9 Two options were proposed for reducing through traffic in Beech Street. For both options access would be maintained for buses, people cycling and local access to premises directly adjoining the street:

- Option 1: traffic restrictions in both directions to widen pavement on both sides;
- Option 2: traffic restriction in the westbound direction (only) with pavement widening on south side.

4.10 Of 949 responses to these proposals, 71% supported Option 1; 8% supported Option 2; and 21% did not support either option.

Chiswell Street

4.11 The draft HNP plan proposed to explore improvements to the zebra crossing near Bunhill Row, and localised pavement widening enabling the introduction of trees, greenery, seating and cycle parking. These measures would need to be progressed in conjunction with LB Islington as the street sits on the borough boundary.

4.12 Of 838 responses, 78% indicated support; 17% were unsupportive; and 5% were neutral.

Golden Lane

4.13 The draft HNP plan proposed exploring the closure of Golden Lane to through motor traffic at the junction with Beech Street. It is expected that people cycling, emergency services and school buses (serving Richard Cloudesley and Prior Weston schools) would be permitted through the closure. This could allow for pavement widening and other enhancements around the junction.

4.14 Of 508 responses, 80% indicated support; 18% were unsupportive; and 2% were neutral.

4.15 This approach would also require introducing a banned right turn at the eastern end of Fortune Street, at the junction with Whitefriars Street. This would mean any traffic taking a different route due to closures elsewhere (i.e. Beech Street, Golden Lane and / or Bridgewater Street) would not use Fortune Street as an alternative. Any changes to Fortune Street would be led and delivered by LB Islington.

Fann Street

	<p>4.16 The draft HNP plan proposed to explore improvements to the existing traffic gate at the junction of Fore Street and Viscount Street.</p> <p>4.17 Of 488 responses, 82% indicated support; 10% were unsupportive; and 7% were neutral.</p> <p>4.18 Sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) planters are already planned to be introduced further west on Fann Street and so were not included in the consultation proposals.</p> <p><u><i>Bridgewater Street</i></u></p> <p>4.19 The draft HNP plan proposed exploring the full or partial of Bridgewater Street to through motor traffic at the junction with Beech Street. The final arrangement will reflect servicing needs of properties and the need to stop vehicles using this as an alternative route should changes at Golden Lane and / or Beech Street be implemented.</p> <p>4.20 Of 462 responses, 79% indicated support; 14% were unsupportive; and 7% were neutral.</p> <p><u><i>Brackley Street</i></u></p> <p>4.21 The draft HNP plan proposed to convert Brackley Street to one-way westbound for motor vehicles. This would improve vehicle circulation in the area and allow for small areas of pavement widening.</p> <p>4.22 Of 448 responses, 76% indicated support; 12% were unsupportive; and 12% were neutral.</p> <p>4.23 These changes are now expected to be delivered as part of the Section 278 works for the 1 Golden Lane development.</p> <p><u><i>Moor Lane</i></u></p> <p>4.24 The draft HNP plan proposed four options for Moor Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: make Moor Lane one-way southbound for motor vehicles between Silk Street and Fore Street, and remove the existing timed gate restriction; • Option 2: introduce a closure to through motor traffic at the junction with Fore Street, with access retained from Silk Street; • Option 3: introduce a closure to through motor traffic at the junction with Silk Street, with access retained from Fore Street;
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 4: retain existing traffic movements, including the existing timed gate restriction. <p>4.25 The 419 responses were broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: 8% • Option 2: 33% • Option 3: 44% • Option 4: 15% <p>4.26 Based on the response rates it is proposed that a design be progressed for Moor Lane based on a closure to through motor traffic, with the exact location of the closure being subject to further consultation.</p> <p>4.27 A separate report on the existing Moor Lane project, setting out more detail on the next steps, is being presented to Streets & Walkways Sub Committee.</p> <p><u>Moorfields</u></p> <p>4.28 The draft HNP plan proposed to explore traffic changes on Moorfields, north of Moor Place, to make it one-way southbound for motor traffic. These changes could allow pavements to be widened and for seating, greening and cycle parking to be introduced.</p> <p>4.29 Of 308 responses, 83% indicated support; 14% were unsupportive; and 3% were neutral.</p> <p>Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>4.30 The HNP has been updated following public consultation; the final draft is included at Appendix 3.</p> <p>4.31 Given the levels of support for the proposals there are no major changes proposed. A summary of the main changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals where more than one option was presented (i.e. Beech Street and Moor Lane) have been amended to specify that the preferred option from the consultation responses will be taken forward; • Updates to some proposals where progress has been made in the interim period (e.g. introduction of a dockless cycle and e-scooter parking bay on Fore Street); • Minor adjustments to the description of proposals that may be impacted by nearby development sites
--	---

	<p>or other changes in local context (i.e., Golden Lane, Bridgewater Street, Milton Street, Silk Street).</p> <p>4.32 A ten-year delivery plan has been appended to the HNP which includes projects already underway or which have existing approvals. The delivery plan reflects the level of complexity of projects and takes into account interdependencies with other projects and developments in the area.</p> <p>4.33 Each proposal will be progressed independently through the project procedure and will be subject to further consultation at the appropriate stages. Funding bids and other approvals will be coordinated through the BBGL programme and will be subject to approval by Resource Allocation Sub Committee and Policy & Resources Committee.</p>
5. Delivery team	The programme will be managed by the Transport & Public Realm Projects team. Individual projects emerging from the programme will also be managed by this team, supported by colleagues across the Corporation where appropriate.
6. Programme and key dates	The implementation plan for the programme is appended to the updated HNP shown in Appendix 3.
7. Risks	<p><u>Risk:</u> schemes involving cooperation with London Borough of Islington are delayed due to lack of support or engagement. <u>Approach:</u> reduce – continue engagement with LB Islington and ensure they are involved from an early stage in individual scheme development where appropriate.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Funding for individual schemes is not secured. <u>Approach:</u> reduce – identify opportunities for funding as part of the BBGL programme management.</p> <p>A full programme risk register is shown at Appendix 5.</p>
8. Success criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number of pedestrian priority streets in the area (measured by length) delivered during the lifetime of the HNP; Improved air quality (i.e. reduction in NO₂) on certain streets in the area over the lifetime of the HNP; Increased public amenity (e.g. seating and greening) across the area over the lifetime of the HNP.
9. Progress reporting	An annual programme update report will be presented to committees. Individual projects will be progressed through the project procedure and gateway approval process.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Public engagement feedback report
Appendix 3	Draft final Healthy Neighbourhood Plan (including delivery plan)
Appendix 4	Finance tables
Appendix 5	Risk register

Contact

Report Author	Tom Noble
Email Address	tom.noble@cityoflondon.gov.uk