

**STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION)
COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 14 May 2025**

Minutes of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held at Committee Rooms - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Wednesday, 14 May 2025 at 2.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy John Edwards (Chair)
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE
Shravan Joshi MBE
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Tom Sleigh
Matthew Waters
Jacqui Webster
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Katie Stewart	- Executive Director, Environment
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Daniel Laybourn	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department
Zoe Williams	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies were received.

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

A non-pecuniary declaration of interest was made by Jacqui Webster in relation to items 7 and 9.

3. ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

The Sub Committee proceeded to elect a Deputy Chair in accordance with Standing Order No. 26(6).

Jacqui Webster, as the only Member expressing their willingness to serve, was duly elected as Deputy Chair for the ensuing year.

RESOLVED – That, Jacqui Webster be elected Deputy Chair of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED — That, the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 4 February 2025 were agreed.

Matters arising

A Member requested that Officers update the Sub Committee as to when the meeting about bus stop bypasses would be held. Officers informed Members that they were in the process of arranging this, and invitations would be sent out for mid-June.

A Member asked whether a cycling liaison had been appointed following the discussion detailed in page 18 in the minutes of the previous meeting. Officers responded that they had not made progress on this, but it was a matter to be addressed.

The Chairman introduced new Members to the Sub Committee and Officers provided a brief introduction to the key matters considered by the Sub Committee.

5. 65 GRESHAM STREET S278 (G3)

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 3: Options Appraisal report which sought Members' approval for the additional budget required to progress to the next gateway; authorisation for officers to invoice the developer for this cost in advance of the full Section 278 payment; and authorisation for officers to proceed with detailed designs of the recommended options, subject to receipt of the requested funds.

A Member noted that there would need to be adequate provision for trade vehicles in the nearby area. They also asked whether there would be provisions for the current amount of Lime Bike parking in the vicinity of the area, and for the potential expansion of the Lime Bike parking bays. Officers responded that the work in this report was assessing the feasibility of the options, and more engagement would take place to develop the needs of the design. With regards to the provisions for service vehicles, Officers believed they would be able to reallocate parking locally around Gresham Street, Wood Street, and Love Lane. They noted they would need to do further investigations into the cycle parking and how space could be maximised. The Member also noted that Officers should ensure that Aldermanbury Street was still accessible to vehicles for the Lord Mayor's Show.

Another Member asked where the disabled parking would be reallocated. Officers responded that they had not yet finalised where this would go and acknowledged the importance of keeping the parking as local to the building as possible.

Regarding the recommended options, the Member cautioned that the quality of the design should not be impeded by the preferred option of the developer. Officers responded that they were recommending proceeding both options 1 and 4 to the next stage of the design, to offer both a minimum and maximum cost option in case the expected cost of the design was more than what the developer expected. They noted that the developer indicated support of what had been developed so far.

Responding to clarification sought by a Member, Officers explained how the scoring City of London Streets Assessment Tool (CoLSAT) measured the impacts of a street feature on the different needs of disabled people.

A Member raised a query about whether the developer was funding the whole maintenance life cycle of the project. Officers responded that in a S278, any uplifted materials were put on a commuted sum as part of the agreement.

In response to a Member's query on the space available for trees in the area, Officers responded that some of the trees in the design were already existing, and they have conducted surveys to confirm there would be room for the proposed new tree. The Member also queried what the contingency plan would be for traffic that needed access to service the Guildhall if there were to be road works on Wood Street. Officers noted that they would consider traffic resilience in the next design stage.

In response to a point of clarification raised, Officers confirmed that the additional trees would not be replacing the existing trees on Aldermanbury Street.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Approved additional budget of £135,000 to reach the next Gateway as set out in Section 3 of this report.
- Authorised officers to invoice the developer a sum of £135,000 as a reasonable cost necessary to progress to the next gateway (Detailed Options Appraisal), in advance of the full S278 payment to avoid delays to the programme, noting that any underspend from this additional sum would be carried forward and put towards the full S278 works implementation payment, as agreed with the developer.
- Authorised officers, subject to receipt of the requested funds, to progress with detailed designs of recommended options 1 and 4, fully funded by Section 278 agreement with the developer of 65 Gresham Street, and to undertake public consultation.
- Noted the revised project budget of £235,000 (excluding risk).
- Noted the total estimated cost of the project up to £4,169,878 for Option 1 (excluding risk).

6. 40 LEADENHALL STREET (S278) (G6)

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 6: Outcome Report which sought authorisation for Officers to finalise the account for the 40 Leadenhall Street S278 project, the 52-54 Lime Street Phase 1 project, and the 10 Fenchurch Street S278 project; authorisation for the Chamberlain's department to return any unspent S278 funds to the Developers; and agreement to close the three projects.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted and approved the content of this outcome report.
- Authorised Officers to finalise the account for the 40 Leadenhall Street S278 project, following the completion of the approved carriageway resurfacing on Leadenhall Street, Billiter Street and Fenchurch Avenue.
- Authorised Officers to finalise the accounts for the 52-54 Lime Street Phase 1 and 10 Fenchurch Street S278 projects.
- Upon verification of the final accounts, authorised the Chamberlain's department to return any unspent section 278 funds to the Developers as stipulated in their respective legal agreements.

- Agreed to close the three projects.

7. **BARBICAN GOLDEN LANE HEALTHY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (G5)**

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 5: Authority to Start Work report which requested that Members adopt the Bunhill, Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan and approve the budget required for staff costs to manage the programme during the next reporting period.

Officers introduced report, raising the matter of the emails received from Avison Young, Aviva and Brookfields Properties that were circulated to Members before the meeting.

To clarify that the Healthy Neighbourhood Plan was to be used as a framework, Officers suggested amending the recommendation in the report.

The Chair noted congratulations to Officers for their successful collaboration with the other Local Authorities in this project.

A Member suggested that the Sub Committee visit the site to understand the various aspects of the project. Officers supported this suggestion, noting they would arrange for this to be held before the next meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

The Deputy Chair sought to reassure residents in the affected neighbourhood that adopting the framework would still allow for a thorough level of consultation on issues that remained under consideration. The Deputy Chair also noted that she and the Chair would like to meet with the working group and residents of the area affected by this project.

A Member sought clarity whether there would be enough funding to deliver this project. Officers responded that the £40,383 budget for staff costs was to reach the next gateway and was not the total budget for the project.

With regards to safety, the Member asked if there should be a differentiation between electric and regular bicycles in the cycle paths. Officers clarified that they were not proposing any shared walking and cycling spaces in this plan. They noted that pedal-assisted bicycles, such as Lime Bikes, were classified as pedal cycles from a traffic management perspective so there could not be a differentiation between the two types of bicycles.

The Member also asked how zero-emission vehicles and vehicles with blue badge permits requiring pick up and drop off zones would be included in this project. Officers responded that they would always seek to retain or increase disabled parking zone where it was appropriate, and this would be considered as the individual projects were considered in detail. They also noted there were no proposals around zero-emission zones, but they could look at opportunities for this if it were necessary. With regards to electric vehicle charging, Officers responded that they were considering installing rapid electric chargers on streets, and longer-term chargers would be located in car parks.

The Chair noted that a connection for the walking public through Fann Street would need to be addressed through public consultation. Officers responded that this would be considered as part of another project as it was on private land. They noted that through the greening project, they were considering how they

could improve wayfinding to make the location of the leisure centre clear to the public.

Referring to a matter raised at the Planning and Transportation Committee about the sequencing of construction, the Executive Director, Environment assured Members that this issue was under review. They also indicated that a session would be arranged for Members to explain the process in more detail.

With regards to the plan delivery, a Member requested that the Sub Committee be provided with an annual update on the progress of the plan. Officers responded that at the Planning and Transportation Committee, there was an annual report and a delivery plan for the transport strategies, but this did not capture the forward-looking programme. Officers noted they would consider how they could include wider reporting around the Healthy Streets Plans into their reporting in the future.

A Member noted that Transport and Planning Officers should be working together in pre-application meetings to ensure that considerations for onsite service delivery were included in proposed developments. Another Member, also the former Chair for the Planning and Transportation Committee, responded that this was not a planning issue but rather up to the leadership of Officers to deliver a well-thought-out streetways plan. The Member emphasised that individual sites should not be viewed in isolation as the programme was wide reaching across multiple potential development sites. They noted that the Healthy Streets Plan should be endorsed to allow for the individual details to be addressed over time. The Executive Director of Environment responded that the plan would give Officers the framework to engage with the planning team on these issues. They assured Members that they would work with the planning Officers to ensure they were engaged in the plan.

The Executive Director raised with Members that emails were received earlier in the day expressing concerns about proposal 13 in the draft plan. These emails were circulated to Members at the beginning of the meeting. The Executive Director assured Members that responses had been sent, clarifying that the current document serves as a framework for the development of detailed proposals, and that they would discuss their concerns before the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting in July. The Executive Director further explained that there would be further consultation and engagement on each of the proposals.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Approved the Bunhill, Barbican & Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan, as shown in Appendix 3 as the framework for the future development of proposals in the area.
- Approved 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 of the report, with the adjustment shown in Appendix 4 in the report.
- Noted the total estimated cost of the project at £283,500 (excluding risk).

8. LEADENHALL STREET IMPROVEMENTS – CITY CLUSTER VISION PROGRAMME (G4)

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 4: Detailed Options Appraisal report which requested Members to approve; the scheme design for Leadenhall Street, the progression of the Traffic Management Orders for the scheme and the submission of the Gateway 4b report to the Court of Common Council in July. The Chair queried how close the traffic volumes were to being at the cut off level with regard to the traffic limits for a shared carriageway between vehicles and cyclists. Officers responded that the traffic was close to the cut off level at the time of the survey. However, the survey was conducted at a time where there were multiple projects occurring on Leadenhall Street, resulting in high volumes of construction traffic. Officers noted that they were confident that in the long term, traffic volumes would decrease.

A Member raised concerns about the ongoing deterioration of the road due to construction vehicle traffic. They asked how assurances could be provided that developers would be responsible for funding the road's resurfacing. Officers acknowledged this issue and stated that they would explore how this requirement could be incorporated into the planning conditions. They noted that at 1 Leadenhall Street, they were planning for their resurfacing as part of the S278 project. Resurfacing at 40 Leadenhall Street had been deferred as it was a difficult area of the street to close due to the high level of activity in the area. Another Member queried whether the entire route that construction vehicles take through the City was addressed by the resurfacing. Officers noted that they would respond to this in due course, however within an extended perimeter it may be more difficult to determine where damage was caused by construction vehicles.

In response to a Member's query about what could be done to give cyclists more space in the shared carriageway, Officers noted that there was a challenge in deciding what could fit into a street and what should be prioritised. They explained there was not the space in this project to include cycle ways as they wanted to give pedestrians priority. They also noted it would have been challenging to get cycle ways up to standard in the space that was available.

The Member also expressed concern about the condition of the trees within the area, particularly those under the canopy of 122 Leadenhall Street, and near 40 Leadenhall Street. The Member emphasised the importance of selecting tree species that were appropriate for the environmental conditions at Leadenhall Street. Officers responded that before trees were planted for the project, the City Gardens Officers assessed what trees best suit the environment, depending on the wind. They noted that a sunlight study has been conducted on the street to help with this assessment.

The Member noted that trees outside 122 Leadenhall Street were not owned by the City Corporation and queried whether the owner could be asked to replant them. The Executive Director, Environment responded that discussions would be held with Planning Officers regarding engaging with the building owners about the condition of the trees. A Member suggested that there should be a provision in which building owners must cover the costs for replacing a tree if it had failed within 20 years of being planted.

With regards to the redevelopment of 1 Undershaft, a Member expressed concern about the high volume of vehicles involved in the demolition and whether these vehicles would be moving through Leadenhall Street. The Member also

queried whether logistics had been taken into account, particularly concerning the access to the area and the delivery vehicles that use Saint Mary Axe. The Chair noted that there was a construction logistics plan that the developer must provide as part of the planning conditions. Officers responded that the construction project was in its early stages, so they had not considered the finer detail of these logistics yet. They noted that some parts of the Leadenhall Street project such as 40 Leadenhall Street had already been built to design. They emphasised that the various needs for the street had to be considered and balanced while working with the developer. Officers noted that they would include the impacts that the development of 1 Undershaft could have on that section of the street in the Gateway 5 report.

With regards to the charging of electric taxis, a Member suggested that more rapid charging points in this area should be considered to encourage electric taxis in the City. Officers responded that there was a charging hub in the Baynard House Car Park for taxis, but they would consider if there were an opportunity for more to be included. They noted that the area may not be the ideal location for rapid chargers as the bay was already serving multiple functions. Officers acknowledged that the need for more electric vehicle charging points in the City was known and this was something that the Transport Officers were considering.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the Public Consultation results, summarised in Section 4 of the report and contained in full in Appendix 2 of the report.
- Approved the scheme design for Leadenhall Street as shown in Appendix 3 of the report.
- Approved the progression of the required Traffic Management Orders required for the scheme up to the end of the 'Notice of Intent' stage.
- Approved the submission of a Gateway 4b report to the Court of Common Council in July 2025.

9. MOOR LANE ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on project progress since the previous report to the Sub Committee in February 2025.

The Deputy Chair emphasised the importance of conducting consultation on this matter to ensure public input was gathered, and particularly from Willoughby House residents.

Another Member queried the long period of consultation for the concept design and detail design of the project. Officers explained that part of this allocated time was for the engagement with consultants to develop the design.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

10. POLICY AND PROJECTS DELEGATED DECISIONS - JANUARY TO MARCH 2025

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment which summarised the decisions relating to Transport and Public Realm projects

that had been taken between 1 January and 31 March 2025 under either existing or agreed authorised powers by responsible Officers within the Environment Department.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

11. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk which provided Members with an update on outstanding references.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

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

A Member raised a query about the shared space between pedestrians and cyclists at Queen Victoria Street. They expressed concern as the space was very busy with both pedestrians and cyclists and there was a perception from the public that there was a high potential for collisions in the area. Officers responded that there had been no reported collisions in this area from 2019 to 2023. They noted that they were looking into doing video surveys over the summer in this space and the shared space at Moorfields outside the new Monument Station entrance. They explained that these surveys should indicate how busy the area was at peak times, and from this information they could consider possible interventions. The Member requested that the Sub Committee be updated on the results of these surveys at a meeting later in the year.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no matters of urgent business.

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Sub-Committee decided not to exclude the public.

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

There were no non-public questions.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There was no non-public urgent business.

The meeting ended at 3.38pm.

Chairman

Contact Officer: Zoe Williams
Zoe.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk