

Committees: Streets & Walkways Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Planning & Transportation <i>[for decision]</i> Projects & Procurement Sub <i>[for information]</i>	Dates: 9 December 2025 19 January 2026 28 January 2026
Subject: Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan	Gateway 5: Regular Authority to start work
Report of: Executive Director Environment Report Author: Stephen Oliver, Transport & Public Realm Projects	For Decision
PUBLIC	

1. Status Update	Project Description: The Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan (HSP) will provide a framework for improving the streets and public realm in the area. The proposals will reflect the aspirations of stakeholders, including the Aldgate Connect Business Improvement District (BID) and the Eastern City BID. RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee) Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £195,202 Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): None. Spend to Date: £132,202 Costed Risk Provision Utilised: Not applicable Slippage: No slippage against parameters reported at previous Gateway.
2. Requested decisions	Next Steps: • Finalise maps and produce a PDF version of the HSP which will be published on the City Corporation website; • Coordinate project delivery via the established City Cluster Programme Board and annual progress reports to committee; • Coordinate bids for funding as required to implement the programme.

	Requested Decisions: Members of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee are requested to: 1. Approve the Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan as shown in Appendix 3. 2. Approve a revised total estimated cost of £195,202. As set out in Appendix 4 table 2. 3. Approve an additional budget of £25,202 from the Mariner House S106. Members of the Planning & Transportation Committee are requested to: 1. Adopt the Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan, as shown in Appendix 3.												
3. Budget	3.1 An additional £25,202 is requested for the ongoing management of the Fenchurch Street Area HSP programme for the next reporting period. This will allow for continued liaison with stakeholders and the coordination of funding bids to implement the delivery plan. <table><tr><th>Item</th><th>Reason</th><th>Source of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Management of the Fenchurch Street Area HSP programme</td><td>Stakeholder liaison, reporting, coordinating funding bids</td><td>Mariner House S106</td><td>£25,202</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>£25,202</td></tr></table> Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: None. 3.2 The plan is a long-term strategy and similar to other adopted Healthy Streets Plans its delivery plan is not fully funded at this stage. The progression of projects that are currently uncommitted are subject to funding being secured. As part of the Fenchurch Street Area HSP programme management, funding opportunities will be explored including S278 agreements and other funding programmes. Any bids for funding will be submitted when appropriate and reported to Resource Allocation Sub Committee and Policy & Resources Committee at the appropriate stage. The adopted plan	Item	Reason	Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Management of the Fenchurch Street Area HSP programme	Stakeholder liaison, reporting, coordinating funding bids	Mariner House S106	£25,202	Total			£25,202
Item	Reason	Source of Funding	Cost (£)										
Management of the Fenchurch Street Area HSP programme	Stakeholder liaison, reporting, coordinating funding bids	Mariner House S106	£25,202										
Total			£25,202										

	will set a framework to support funding conversations with external partners.
4. Design summary	Project update 4.1 The Fenchurch Street Area HSP outlines potential improvements for people walking, wheeling, cycling and spending time on streets within the area and minor changes to how motor vehicles move around the area. 4.2 The proposals support the delivery of various City strategies including the Transport Strategy and Climate Action Strategy and the Destination City initiative. The proposals also support the placemaking aspirations of the Aldgate Connect BID and the Eastern City BID. The plan also provides a framework within which current and future development can be coordinated and ensure that the public realm benefits appropriately. 4.3 Since the Gateway 4 report was presented to committees in July and August 2025 a public consultation exercise has been carried out; the results of this engagement are summarised below and the full feedback report is included as Appendix 2. Consultation 4.4 Prior to the consultation commencing Members briefings were held for both ward members and Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee members. Members were sent Emails notifying the start of the consultation. Presentations were also made to the Aldgate Connect BID and the Eastern City Partnership and the Eastern City Public Realm Steering Group. The proposals were well supported at these external meetings. 4.5 A public consultation exercise on the HSP was undertaken initially for a four-week period during September and October 2025 but was extended for an additional week to enable more responses to be submitted. The consultation was open to anyone with an interest in the area (individuals and groups). Promotion included: • A letter drop to all properties inside the plan area and nearby. • 50 on street posters. • A 2-metre-high graphic on a tower installed by Aldgate Connect on Vine Street. • A 6m wide promotional panel on America Square displaying images of the proposals.

	• Emails were sent to all the hospitality businesses and churches in the area and the planning agents representing developers for recent planning applications. • Emails were sent to an existing consultation database of statutory and advisory consultees including TFL and the train operator c2c. • The BIDs promoted the consultation to their members and requested they circulate the consultation to staff. • A series of social media promotions were carried out by Commonplace who hosted the consultation platform on our behalf. • Four in-person drop-in sessions were held. Three of these were at lunch time and one in the evening in different locations across the HSP area. To maximise exposure two were held on street. 4.6 The Commonplace consultation platform enabled respondents to comment on individual proposals within the HSP area as well as giving overall feedback in the form of free text. The portal was visited by 2856 people. Over 522 responses were recorded on the platform, from 167 individuals (people were able to make multiple contributions). People were also able to submit feedback via email. 4.7 The consultation portal divided the project area into seven neighbourhoods. Respondents had the choice to comment on as many neighbourhoods as they wished. For each neighbourhood there were questions on: • Pedestrian priority Improvements: giving more priority to people walking and wheeling and improving accessibility and safety. • Public realm improvements: to make streets and spaces more attractive, comfortable and enjoyable to spend time in. • Cycling improvements: to improve the comfort and safety for people cycling. • There were also questions about proposals that were particular to a street or the neighbourhood. To accompany each question there was an opportunity to make further written comment in detail. 4.8 Responses to each proposal in the HSP are summarised below. A full engagement feedback report is included at Appendix 2 of this report.
--	--

	Consultation responses 4.9 Responses via the Commonplace portal consistently demonstrated strong support for all proposals in the plan, but the number of responses varied between the neighborhoods. 4.10 Support for proposals to improve the public realm and pedestrian priority was predominantly over 80%. Cycling specific proposals scored lower but were still supported by 70% of respondents. 4.11 Full details of the responses to each question can be found in the Public Engagement Feedback Report in Appendix 2. The neighborhoods and proposals that had the most responses are summarised below. 4.12 Proposals in the draft plan for Fenchurch Street and Aldgate had the most responses from participants. • Exploring improvements to the public realm and the crossing points each received 167 responses of which 150 were supportive (90%). • Exploring formalising loading arrangements received 163 responses of which 105 were supportive (82%). • Exploring improvements for people cycling received 165 responses with 90 supportive (70% supportive and 13% unsupportive). • The free text responses to these proposals were generally supportive for the public realm improvements and improved crossings but there were concerns for and against changes for people cycling. 4.13 The draft plan has proposals to be explored for Vine Street, America Square, Crescent and Hammett Street. • The proposals for new public spaces on Vine Street received 84 responses of which 80 were supportive (96%), and on the Crescent 82 responses of which 78 were supportive (96%). • The proposal to extend the existing America Square public space received 84 responses 76 were supportive (91%). • Potential pedestrian priority improvements include making America Square, Crescent and Hammett Street one-way for motor vehicles, which received 83 responses of which 74 were supportive (90%). • Proposals for creative lighting under the railway viaduct were also well supported with 85 responses of which 78 were supportive (97%).
--	--

	• The free text responses for these proposals were generally supportive particularly for the new and improved public spaces. 4.14 For Eastcheap and Great Tower Street responses were received from 75 participants for this neighbourhood. • Exploring improvements to the public realm and the crossing points received 72 responses of which 65 were supportive (90%). • Exploring formalising loading arrangements received 70 responses of which 62 were supportive (89%). • Exploring improvements for people cycling received 73 responses with 52 supportive (71% supportive and 13% unsupportive). • Reviewing the amount and location of kerbside parking received 70 responses to this question with 60 supportive (85%). • The free text responses showed strong support for widened pavements and improved crossing points. There were several comments about the need for improved facilities for cyclists. 4.15 The draft plan has proposals to raise the carriageway at the junction of Cooper's Row with Crutched Friars, Lloyds Avenue and Crosswall to improve pedestrian priority (including the entrance to Fenchurch Street station) and improve the lighting or add feature lighting under the railway viaduct. These proposals received 44 responses with 39 supportive (90%). • Submissions were also received by email from TFL, London Cycling Campaign, c2c and the planning agent for the developers of 50 and 130 Fenchurch Steet, and representatives for 30 Fenchurch Street. • TFL made a series of comments. Overall, these were supportive of the proposals. Comments that were made related to issues that would be considered in the detailed design stages of individual projects. • The London Cycling Campaign made submissions identifying a series of issues. In general, they considered that the "plan failed to grasp the opportunity to reduce private motor traffic and journeys and enable significant further 'mode shift' to cycling". In response to particular proposals in the plan they considered that:
--	--

	▪ On Fenchurch Street – if segregated cycle lanes are not installed then measures should be made to reduce vehicular traffic. ▪ On Eastcheap and Great Tower Street – its designation as a cycle route for improvement was welcomed but it should be part of a wider scheme from Byward Street to Bank designed in conjunction with TFL. ▪ Rood Lane should be closed to through traffic all the time and the carriageway raised to pavement height its entire length. ▪ On Mark Lane and Trinity Square – the junctions with Great Tower Street should be improved for cyclists. ▪ On America Square and Hammet Street, the changes to traffic management welcomed. 4.16 A submission was made on behalf of the developers of 50 Fenchurch Street who requested that the proposals in the plan did not hinder the S.278 works that would form part of the planning application. However, the draft S278 has not yet been completed, but will shortly be submitted to the developer. The objectives of the agreement are in keeping with the proposals in the draft Plan, and these have been previously discussed with the developer. 4.17 The developers of 130 Fenchurch Street fully supported the plan. A very supportive submission was made by Urbanest who are seeking to increase their student accommodation in the area. They highlighted the benefits of the plan particularly for people walking, wheeling and cycling and the need for improved lighting on America Square and the Crescent. 4.18 Representatives of 30 Fenchurch Street raised concerns about access to their service bay and other businesses on Rood Lane. The proposal will however maintain local access for these businesses. They also expressed concerns about additional cycle parking on Rood Lane as existing dockless cycle parking frequently blocked the emergency access to their building. This issue will be considered in more detail if the proposal is explored further. 4.19 c2c submitted a brief response to the consultation regarding Fenchurch Street station in which they confirmed that they had no current proposals to change access and security arrangement to Fenchurch Place.
--	--

	4.20 Transport for All were commissioned to carry out an accessibility audit between Tower Hill underground station and Aldgate Square (The full audit is attached as appendix 6). The audit made the following recommendations in response to issues experienced on the walkabout in the project area: a) Introduce consistent tactile paving with a slight lip for better navigational support. b) Raise pavements and create level, continuous surfaces across junctions. c) Enhance lighting and contrasts to improve visibility and safety. d) Integrate public art or design features to enhance the area's visual appeal and user experience, making the area more approachable. e) Widen pathways to at least 2 metres where possible. f) Ensure paving is smooth to avoid trips and falls, reduce disorientation for those who use tactile paving for navigating, as well as avoiding pain when navigating across cobblestone paving using a mobility aid. g) Lengthen time traffic lights allow for pedestrians to cross the road and add audible signals on Aldgate High Street. It is considered that all these recommendations are addressed in the plan proposals will be explored in greater detail during the design stages. Fenchurch Street Area Healthy Streets Plan The HSP has been updated following public consultation; the final draft is included at Appendix 3. 4.21 Given the levels of support for the proposals there are no changes proposed. 4.22 A ten-year delivery plan has been appended to the HSP 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. 4.23 Each proposal will be progressed independently through the project procedure and will be subject to further consultation and approvals at the appropriate stages. Delivery will be coordinated through the City Cluster Programme Board. Funding bids will be subject to
--	--

	approval by Resource Allocation Sub Committee and Policy & Resources Committee.
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 HSP shown in Appendix 3.
7. Risks	<u>Risk:</u> Funding for individual schemes is not secured. <u>Approach:</u> reduce – identify opportunities for funding as part of the Fenchurch Street Healthy Streets Plan programme management. A full programme risk register is shown at Appendix 5.
8. Success criteria	• Increased number of pedestrian priority streets in the area (measured by length) delivered during the lifetime of the HSP. • Increased public amenity (e.g. seating and greening) across the area over the lifetime of the HSP.
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 Streets Plan (including delivery plan)
Appendix 4	Finance tables
Appendix 5	Risk register
Appendix 6	Transport for All accessibility audit

Contact

Report Author	Stephen Oliver
Email Address	Stephen.oliver@cityoflondon.gov.uk