

Committees:	Dates:	
Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee Projects Sub-Committee Planning and Transportation Committee Policy and Resources Committee Resource Allocation Sub-Committee	21/05/2018 13/06/2018 19/06/2018 05/07/2018 05/07/2018	
Subject: Bank on Safety: experimental safety scheme conclusion	Issue Report: Regular	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Gillian Howard		For Decision
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Project Status: Green Total estimated Project Cost: £1,437,207. Spend to date: £ 1,342,015 Overall Project Risk: Green Approved Budget: £1,401,207.</p> <p>• Last Gateway approved: Gateway 4/5 December 2016</p> <p><u>Summary:</u> This report seeks a decision on the future of the current Bank on Safety experimental scheme.</p> <p>This is a major safety scheme which was designed to meet the Court of Common Council demands to see road danger reduced at Bank following the fatality of June 2015.</p> <p>The experimental scheme was approved for implementation by the Policy and Resources Committee in December 2016. The agreed success criteria were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A significant safety improvement at Bank; 2. Maintain access for deliveries; 3. Improve air quality at Bank; 4. Not unreasonably impact on traffic flow, whilst preferably improving bus journey times. <p>Performance monitoring against the success criteria was reported and has confirmed that, to date, each of the success criteria has either been met or exceeded.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of performance, a consultation exercise was carried out which was responded to by almost 4,300 people.</p>		

Of the consultation survey, 45% of respondents supported the experiment as implemented. A further 29% generally supported the scheme but would like to see changes (see paragraphs 33-34) and 25% of people did not support the experiment. In total 75% of respondents support or generally support the experiment.

Other considerations resulting from the consultation exercise and the Equality Analysis include:

- Disabled access;
- Traffic in the surrounding area;
- Enforcement and signage;
- Pollution in the surrounding area; and
- Taxi passenger impacts

Commentary on the above is set out later in the report.

• Proposed way forward

Officers are recommending that the experimental scheme is made permanent, and that complementary measures to further improve the performance of the scheme are investigated.

Total Estimated Cost:

£1,437,207. (£1,401,207 approved)

Recommendations

Streets and Walkways

1. To note the content of this report for information and make comment.
2. To agree that if the experiment is approved to be made permanent by Planning and Transportation and Policy and Resources Committees, officers be instructed to develop proposals to further improve compliance, behaviour and performance within the vicinity of the junction.
3. Agree the inclusion of £36,000 into the budget to investigate measures to further mitigate issues raised through the consultation and equalities analysis in the above recommendation.

Planning and Transportation

4. To agree to make the experimental traffic orders at Bank Junction (to restrict traffic to bus and cycle only, Monday to Friday 0700-1900) permanent and to delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment to take all steps necessary to put the relevant orders into effect.

Project Sub Committee

5. To note the contents of this report for information.
6. Agree the inclusion of £36,000 into the budget, if recommendation 2 and 3 are agreed.

Policy and Resources

7. To agree to make the experimental traffic orders at Bank Junction (to restrict traffic to bus and cycle only, Monday to Friday 0700-1900) permanent.

Resource Allocation Sub

8. If recommendations 2, 6 and 7 are approved, then additional funding of £36,000 is requested to be approved from the On Street Parking Reserve.

Main Report

1. Issue description	The experiment is reaching conclusion, and the evidence for a decision to be made is set out in this report. A decision is now required to make the scheme permanent and consider any minor modifications, or plan to revoke the experimental order and return to the previous operation of the junction.
2. Last approved limit	£1,401,207
3. Background	<p>Why was this project commenced?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Bank junction was highlighted as an issue of concern in the Bank Area Strategy which was adopted by the Court of Common Council in May 2013. Shortly after in November/December 2013 the Bank Junction improvements project was initiated by the Planning and Transportation and Projects Sub committees. Work on this longer-term project was underway when a fatality occurred at Bank in June 2015.2. The Court of Common Council discussed (25/06/15) the need to bring forward safety measures at Bank. The Chairman of Planning and Transportation of the time committed to presenting options to Members in the Autumn.3. Road Safety was recorded as a corporate red risk, with Bank junction a key focus following the fatality. Officers were tasked with proposing options to deliver safety improvements more quickly than the existing All Change at Bank project. A report was submitted for final consideration to the Policy and Resources Committee in December 2015, where approval was given to investigate the feasibility of making Bank bus and cycle, possibly taxi, only, Monday to Friday 7am to 7pm. This was the time when 75% of the collisions were occurring.4. The Coroner's investigation in July 2016 into the 2015 fatality considered written evidence from the City around the work that was being done to make changes at Bank (including developing the experimental scheme). On this basis the Coroner concluded that nothing constructive could be added by way of a preventative death report on this occasion. There was however an expectation that measures to improve safety in this complex location would be brought forward.

5. Final approval to implement the experiment as bus and cycle only, Monday to Friday 7am to 7pm, was given on 15 December 2016 by the Policy and Resources Committee.

What is the experiment?

6. The Bank on Safety scheme focuses on restricting the number of vehicles that cross Bank Junction during the working day to significantly reduce the number of collisions. The top causation factors for accidents in the area were pedestrians walking into/in front of vehicles and vehicles making turns. This scheme reduces the probability of both.
7. Between the hours of 7am-7pm Monday to Friday, only buses and pedal cycles are permitted to cross the junction and travel westbound from Leadenhall Street into Cornhill. The scheme was implemented on 22 May 2017 using experimental traffic orders.
8. The experiment also saw the addition of two new taxi ranks close to the junction, on Princes Street and Queen Victoria Street (adjacent to the Magistrates Court). An extension of hours of the existing taxi rank on Cornhill was also made so that there were nine spaces available close to the junction during operational hours of the scheme. Previously there were two spaces overnight on Cornhill.
9. In addition, there were some changes to loading and disabled parking bays in the vicinity of the junction (see maps in Appendix 1) to help ease the traffic flow on the alternative routes away from Bank.

Has it been successful?

10. The four agreed key success criteria areas are:
1. A significant safety improvement at Bank
 2. Maintain access for deliveries
 3. Improve air quality at Bank
 4. Not unreasonably impact on traffic flow, whilst preferably improving bus journey times

These criteria are consistent with meeting our statutory duties. See Appendix 2

11. All of the success criteria have been met or exceeded. The results were reported to the Streets and Walkways Sub, Projects Sub and Planning and Transportation Committees in April/May 2018.
12. This report summarises the previous report and, where appropriate, updates information.

Criteria 1: A significant safety improvement at Bank


13. The last report, received in April and May 2018, contained provisional casualty information from the City of London Police. This indicated that in comparison to the previous five-year average for the same time period, (22

May to 31 December 2017), there were casualty savings of -40% at the junction during operational hours (6 casualties vs 10 average).

14. Provisional data to the end of March 2018 has recently been received and this indicates that for the 10 months of operation there has been a -52% reduction in the number of casualties when compared to the five-year average (7 casualties vs 14.4 average). The minimum success criteria had been set at -25% but with an anticipated -50-60% saving forecast.

15. In the Bank monitoring area, the most recent report indicated that there had been a -33% decrease (34 casualties vs 51 average) in the number of reported casualties during operational hours to the end of 2017, which was significantly above the minimum agreed success criteria of -5%. The provisional data for 2018 continues to support this reduction in casualties in the Bank monitoring area.

Figure 1: Percentage casualty reduction during scheme operating hours to the end of 2017. (Each area is excluded from the other areas)




16. For completeness, the previous reports have shown the changes to casualties in the wider City area (outside the Bank monitoring area). This shows that there has been a reduction of -23 %. Officers do not believe that this casualty reduction is a result of the Bank on Safety scheme. Whilst not able to specifically attribute the cause, it should be noted that there has recently been the introduction of two cycle superhighways, the Aldgate gyratory removal and the changes at Holborn Circus; which may have all contributed to this improvement.

17. As shown in Figure 2, it should be noted that both the monitoring area and Bank junction see reduced casualty savings during operational hours of the scheme. The saving, if any, is minimal outside of the operational hours.

(The data in Figure 2 is based on the 22 May-31 December 2017 vs the previous five- year average for the same time period.)

Figure 2: Casualty reduction during operational hours (7am to 7pm Monday to Friday) and outside of scheme hours (7pm to 7am Monday to Friday).




Criteria 2: Maintain access for deliveries.

18. As previously reported, officers had engaged with 46 businesses regarding their ability to service and deliver to develop the design for the restrictions. In the Autumn of 2017 officers contacted the same businesses again to ensure that they were satisfied that they continued to be able to service their premises conveniently. Following some clarifications on loading changes in the area, all businesses were content. This exceeded the success criteria of 75%.

Criteria 3: Improve Air Quality

19. This measure is difficult to capture accurately because of the number of things that can impact on the readings including weather, traffic diversions and missing diffusion tubes. However, the first six months of data was available in the latest performance report and showed that on average NO₂ had decreased at Bank and in the surrounding area compared to the 2016 readings. It should be noted that this data cannot be split between scheme and non- operational hours.

Figure 3: Changes in NO₂ between 2016 and 2017 at Bank Junction



2017 data has not yet been validated and as such this data is subject to change

20. The continuous monitoring sites within the City also showed that there appears to be a trend across the City of a reduction in NO₂ comparing 2016 and 2017 data (see Figure 11 in Appendix 3).

21. The success criteria for this element was to see a measured reduction at Bank and not to make the wider monitoring area worse overall. This appears to have been achieved so far, even if we cannot be certain what contribution the Bank on Safety scheme has made to this reduction.


Criteria 4: Not unreasonably impact on traffic flow, whilst preferably improving bus journey times

22. The City has numerous statutory duties which it must comply with. These are set out in more detail in Appendix 2, and arise under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. This criteria seeks to monitor the impact on some of these duties.

General traffic

23. Journey times are shown below in Figure 4, and have, on average, largely remained the same on the four key corridors (London Wall, Bishopsgate/Gracechurch Street, Cannon Street, New Change/St Martin Le Grand).

Figure 4: Average peak period journey time differences for general traffic 22 May 2017 to 28 February 2018



Please note: The above excludes the Bishopsgate southbound closure September to November 2017.

24. Journey times have been assessed for general traffic by using IBus data (collated by TfL using GPS data); which is a reliable proxy for general traffic. The IBus data for this purpose excludes time spent at bus stops and there are no bus lanes on these corridors. These IBus results have since been verified using the outputs of the Traffic Master data (derived from satellite navigation data) for the first four months of operation of the scheme. The results are broadly aligned indicating that the methodology adopted for the using the IBus data is robust for this purpose as a proxy.
25. Traffic Master data is currently not available beyond September 2017. So, the IBus methodology and the extensive data set has been used to indicate general average traffic journey times on the four key corridors to the end of February 2018 as shown in Figure 4.
26. The data collected suggests that the success criteria has been achieved for general traffic.

Bus Journey times

27. All 21 routes that pass through the traffic modelled area have been monitored. The average bus journey time reduction has been significant. Table 1 shows the average journey time savings for the groups of buses that serve Bank, and those which do not but pass through the modelled area, for different times of the day. This is compared to their previous recorded average journey times.

Table 1: Average bus journey time savings between 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday (22 May 2017 to 28 February 2018 vs 1st October 2015 – 21st May 2017)

	AM peak hour	PM peak hour	During the hours of scheme operation
	8am-9am	5pm-6pm	7am to 7pm
Bank Services (9)	-(3-5 mins)	-(1-2 mins)	-(3-5 mins)
Non-Bank Services (12)	-(0-1 mins)	-(0-1 mins)	-(0-1 mins)

28. It should be noted that bus journey times are analysed across the modelled area unlike the key corridor information above, which is why the journey times are different. Given the journey time savings are regular and reliable, London Buses have already reprofiled some bus routes and others are expected. This in turn contributes to reducing City congestion.

29. It should also be noted that the traffic modelling work that identified the journey time forecasts did so on the presumption that the four key corridors for reassignment were fully operational. There has been very little of the experimental period where both directions of all the key corridors have been fully open. Therefore, the viability of the experiment has been tested to its fullest in terms of network resilience and the impacts of having Bank restricted as well as other key corridors closed, both for planned and emergency work.

Scheme success criteria summary


30. With regard to the four key success criteria, all of the data so far indicates that the experiment has been successful and that these criteria are being met or exceeded.

What do people think?

31. There was a large consultation response with almost 4,300 responses received. The online consultation survey accounted for 90% of all respondents to the consultation. Of the consultation survey results, 75% of respondents supported or generally supported the experiment when directly asked the question.

Figure 5: Consultation support split.

3 IN 4 ARE SUPPORTIVE OF THE SCHEME



Base: (All respondents) n=3,730

Q4: Given your experiences, since the Bank on Safety scheme became operational, do you support these changes to becoming permanent?

- Yes
- Generally support the scheme but would like to see changes
- No

This was reported in an information report submitted to Planning and Transportation, Streets and Walkways and Projects Sub Committee during April and May 2018.

- 32.** In particular, there was strong support from pedestrians and cyclists (over 90%); who were the main people passing through the junction in its previous operation and involved in a large number of the collisions.
- 33.** As can be seen in Figure 5, 29% of respondents generally supported the scheme but wanted to see a variation. The variations were a mixture of both progressive responses of people who wanted to see the scheme introduce greater restrictions and those who wanted to see the scheme operate in a less restrictive way. For example, increasing the operational hours or allowing more types of motor vehicles through. Respondents also suggested enhancements that would not change the technical detail of the traffic order but would improve the look and feel of the junction; such as better enforcement and wider pavements.
- 34.** The most cited variation was to allow black cabs into the junction and was supported by 12% of all survey respondents. Of the 12% supporting this variation, 70% had identified themselves as a taxi or private hire driver.
- 35.** There were also groups and representative organisations that responded to the consultation; which were largely in support of the scheme (see Appendix 4). These, along with the other emailed comments received, were reviewed as part of the previous consultation report.
- 36.** Overall the consultation showed low levels of support for removing the experiment and strong levels of support for accepting the scheme as trialled. There has been a relatively low level of public support expressed for taxis to access the junction (which has been a concern raised by some Members).

Statutory consultation responses

- 37.** Alongside the public opinion consultation, there were also statutory consultations undertaken on both of the experimental traffic orders, as explained in the previous consultations findings report. There were 23

representations received to the main restriction experimental traffic order #1 which closed on 24 November 2017.

38. Of these 23 representations, 16 were messages of support, 3 made comment but were not classed as objections and 4 were objections. Of those responses which do not constitute an objection, their responses were included in the analysis in the previous public consultation report.

39. The objections and the City's response are set out in full in Appendix 5 but in summary, the four objections focus on:

- traffic displacement,
- the penalty charge notices and publicity,
- the operation of a specific property (new business in the area – the Ned Hotel); and
- servicing premises within the zone from a maintenance perspective.

The responses explain what can be undertaken during the experimental hours, that access to properties is maintained, but direction of travel to the properties has been reduced. The responses also cover network planning, publicity and enforcement.

40. The issues raised within the objections should be considered alongside the requirement to comply with the City's statutory duties and in context of the mitigation work already undertaken.

41. There were no representations received for the second experimental traffic order; which was associated with the loading changes in the area.

Other issues raised informally

Finch Lane access

42. A concern raised informally was the need for the westbound closure of Cornhill from Leadenhall Street and whether Finch Lane could be accessed by vehicles from this direction. This restriction is strongly recommended to avoid large vehicles attempting to u-turn in Cornhill once they realise that they cannot proceed straight ahead across the junction. This could be dangerous, particularly if they overhang the footway. It could also encourage the use of Finch Lane as a rat run. Finch Lane is very narrow and heavily used by pedestrians and has previously been agreed to be enhanced as an accessible walking route. It is therefore not appropriate to encourage the use of this lane for westbound traffic from Leadenhall Street. To compensate for the restriction into Cornhill, the banned right turn from Leadenhall Street into Bishopsgate has already been revoked to ease the flow of traffic from Leadenhall Street and provide an alternative route to travel westbound.

Taxi access through the junction

43. Officers were asked to conduct preliminary investigations into the journey time impact across the modelled area, of permitting the limited access to the junction by taxis. A total of nine scenarios have been considered as part of this assessment. Each scenario permits taxi movements on specific

approaches through the junction, in addition to the buses and cyclists already moving through. The scenario routings can be found in Appendix 6. Officers were asked to consider the idea of straight ahead movements just for taxis, with cycle and bus movements permitted as now. This is not something which is which is easy to sign or enforce. For this piece of work the focus has been on restricting entry to the junction by taxis only. The work also concentrates on the PM peak, when there are more taxis in circulation.

44. Of the nine scenarios, bus and general traffic journey times have provisionally been forecast. There were indications of some journey time savings that could be made on some routes, but which often resulted in losses in other areas. One scenario indicated the possibility of neutral to positive benefits more holistically which could warrant further investigation should Members wish to pursue this matter. This would allow access from one east and west arm to taxis.

45. However, any increase in traffic could increase the risks of road danger and may make it difficult to achieve full compliance (due to the possibilities of other vehicles following the taxis through). One particular movement of concern is a probable increase in vehicles along Lombard Street (see Figure 21 in Appendix 6), particularly during the peak hours, when there are high levels of pedestrians and cyclists (travelling in both directions). It is considered that the potential dis-benefits outweigh the benefits of this proposal and therefore, this report does not recommend further investigations into the reintroduction of taxis.

U-turning vehicles

46. U-turning vehicles, and taxis in particular, on Poultry and Princes Street have been raised as an issue of concern. The safety risk this poses has been assessed by external safety auditors both pre and post scheme implementation. The advice received is that the greatly reduced traffic flow during the hours of scheme operation adequately mitigates this risk. There have been no reported collisions to date (end of March 2018), during scheme operating hours, due to u-turning. However, this will continue to be monitored.

Considerations/Issues raised

47. A number of considerations and issues have been raised through the consultation and the equality analysis. These consist of:

- Disabled access;
- Traffic in the surrounding area;
- Enforcement and signage;
- Pollution in the surrounding area; and
- Taxi passenger impacts;

NB: the percentages used from the consultation survey may refer to different base numbers as these issues may have come from different questions which not everyone would have answered. The number of respondents is shown for clarity.

48. A full Equality Analysis has been undertaken based on the operation and experience of the experiment and can be found in Appendix 7. In Summary there are three protected characteristics which are deemed to have ‘a neutral with possible negative impacts’ as a result of the Bank on Safety Scheme. These are: Age, Disability, and Pregnancy and Maternity. The possible negative impact of the scheme on these groups results from potentially increased vehicle journey time and costs, removal of one disabled parking bay and removal of the zebra pedestrian crossing on Threadneedle St.

49. Overall it is felt that there are continued mitigation measures which can be undertaken to improve the situation such as raising awareness through publications and continued monitoring of key performance data; However, there are also positive impacts experienced, particularly as a bus passenger or pedestrian experienced within these characteristics. Further, future monitoring and mitigation measures may reduce the negative impacts as the scheme progresses.

Disabled access:

50. Access for disabled passengers was raised as a concern under the question ‘what do you think is not working well’ of the consultation survey. This was raised most by taxi/private hire passengers (58 respondents) and taxi/private hire drivers (131 respondents).

51. This particular topic should be considered under the Equalities Act 2010 and our public-sector duty (which can be found in Appendix 2).

52. Under the scheme taxis and other private vehicles are able to pick up or drop off passengers close to the junction. The map in Appendix 8 shows:

- The doors to the buildings surrounding the junction and whether they are step free;
- Where the existing barriers (prior to the experiment), such as guardrails are and which would prevent the ability to pick up and set down; and
- The location of the stop lines at the junction. (Vehicles should not in any event stop to set down and pick up within the junction)

The ability to pick up or set down safely to these locations at Bank has not been significantly impacted during the operational hours of the scheme.

53. Some drivers may not understand what they can and cannot do in the area. We have provided information to try and combat this. Maps are available for download and have been distributed to local businesses. With continued experience the understanding of regular drivers will improve; mitigating this issue further. We have seen improved compliance over the experimental period. Officers will continue to monitor in the event that evidence suggests that the provision of information relating to the scheme needs to be improved.

Traffic in the surrounding area

- 54.** Through the consultation in answering the question 'what is not working well' (answered by 3684 people), 37% (1363 people) identified that traffic had worsened since the scheme had become operational.
- 55.** The two routes that have often been cited by Members as being more congested are Cannon Street and Gresham Street. Cannon Street as a key corridor has been monitored closely and on average journey times are 1-2 minutes greater than before the scheme went in. Work has been undertaken, and is continuing, to better enforce parking and loading activity on the street.
- 56.** In terms of Gresham Street, increased enforcement resources have been deployed. Discussion with TfL to improve the operation of the signalised junctions is taking place.
- 57.** It should be noted that Gresham Street has also been affected by the development on the corner of Wood Street with the introduction of temporary traffic lights and one way working. These works are scheduled to be completed by July 2018.

Enforcement and Signage

- 58.** Enforcement and signage were both cited as elements that 'did not work well' in the consultation survey (base of 3684 people) with 23% of respondents to that question (847 people) citing that banned vehicles were still going through the junction and 12% (442) citing signage needed improvement.
- 59.** Current signage has been independently audited for suitability and compliance and has been found to be fit for purpose. The current signage has delivered up to 97% compliance. However, officers have developed alternative signage and are consulting with the Department for Transport to explore whether this could be used, with a view to further improving compliance.

Pollution in the surrounding area

- 60.** Pollution increasing away from Bank was raised by 8% (295 responses) of respondents to the question 'what is not working well' (base of 3684 people).
- 61.** NO₂ levels have shown an average decrease across the Bank monitoring sites (see Figure 8 in Appendix 3) compared to the 2016 values. There is therefore little evidence that this perception has been realised in practice.

Impact on taxi passengers

- 62.** In agreeing the experimental scheme, it was recognised that there would be some journey time increases as well as some savings across the area; however, overall these should not be 'unreasonably increased'.

63. Unreasonable has not been defined in this instance and is a judgement. Data was collected in two 'after surveys' based on 80 journeys each time. The average journey time changes in terms of time and cost are set out below in Table 2.

Table 2: Change in average Taxi Journey time and price (80 journeys per survey).

	Pre-Scheme (May 2017)	Post Scheme 1 (July 2017)	Post Scheme 2 (November 2017)
Time (minutes)	12:06	13:21	15:30
Cost	£8.85	£9.80	£11.35

64. In addition, the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA) data has also been provided, based on a smaller sample size of approximately 100 journeys per survey over seven routes. It should be noted that other data from the LTDA has been excluded as it was not considered to be robust (given street closures in Bishopsgate and Threadneedle Street during their 'after comparison' survey which was considered to affect those results). In addition, the LTDA did not undertake any cost comparison exercise.

65. There is a technical note in Appendix 9 which combines the LTDA data sets with the City's, for all reasonable comparable sets. The data shows a good level of correlation. This indicates that the methodology of the mystery shopper technique was consistent for before and after and gives a reasonable indication for journey times between set destinations in each survey.

66. Overall, the information gathered on the average journey times and cost increases suggest that there has been some impact on the monitored taxi routes. However, this must be considered against the wider benefits of the scheme and Officers are satisfied that the wider benefits outweigh these smaller impacts and that these impacts do not appear unreasonable.

Taxicard users

67. The City has used anonymised Taxicard data to look particularly at the impact of the scheme on people with disabilities. A Taxicard is given to people with severe mobility or visual impairments. The journeys analysed were those starting or finishing in the City.

68. Anonymising the data is necessary but prevents like for like analysis. It is however still possible to review average journey times. The data used covered the 8 months prior to the scheme and the following 8 months (excludes May 2017 as the scheme started operation on the 22 May).

69. It was a concern, from some, that the number of taxi journeys, particularly for disabled passengers would reduce because of the experiment; This has not been found to be the case for Taxicard users. In fact, there has been an increase (+6%). This is based on 4,464 trips before and 4,734 post the scheme.

70. Table 3 shows the changes in average journey time and cost, although it should be noted that these are indicative figures only as pre and post scheme precise journey origins and destinations will vary.

Table 3: Taxicard comparisons for journey starting or finishing within the City

	8 months prior to the scheme	8 months after the scheme
Average Journey time (minutes)	17.31	16.00
Average Cost	£12.30	£12.40
Number of trips	4,464	4,734

71. A particular concern prior to the scheme was that people with a disability might not be able to access buildings at Bank. This has been specifically monitored and it is confirmed that there has been a small increase in the number of Taxicard journeys to, or from, the buildings surrounding Bank junction. This increased from 42 to 45 trips in comparing the eight months before and after.

Whilst there has been some impact on the average journey times these need to be assessed against the overall safety and other benefits of the scheme. It should also be noted that we have provided nine new taxi rank spaces in the vicinity and a comprehensive change to traffic light signal timings to facilitate safe movement.

Conclusion of the experiment.

72. A lot has been discussed so far in this report. In summary,

- The performance of the scheme so far has to date met or exceeded the agreed minimum success criteria.
- Consultation was largely positive and showed a level of support for the changes at Bank, but also raised some concerns.
- These concerns have been looked into and some do not appear to be borne out by the available data, such as pollution in the surrounding areas, and to a certain degree the concerns of traffic levels in surrounding areas.
- Of those issues where improvements may be made, such as signage, enforcement and compliance some suggestions are made in the next section of the report should Members approve the first recommendation.
- The issue of potential impacts on some people with a protected characteristic around journey time and cost to disabled/taxicard users is acknowledged. There has been no evidence shown of unreasonable impact and any impact has been partly mitigated through the design to date. Considerations for further improvement, if required, are set out below if the recommendations are accepted.

73. In conclusion, the evidence satisfies that the scheme has had due regard to the City's statutory duties including: maintaining reasonable access to

	<p>premises, improving amenity, having regard to the national air quality strategy, facilitating bus traffic (and not unduly negatively impacting on taxis) and securing the safety and convenience of passengers, and that due regard has been paid to the interests of those with protected characteristics. This report recommends that the experiment should be made permanent as trialled.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><u>Way forward</u></p> <p>74. If Members are minded to agree the recommendation, the following actions will be undertaken to make the scheme permanent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicating the intention to make the scheme permanent; • Advertising the notice to make the traffic orders permanent; and • Sealing the Orders. <p>This will take approximately 2 months to complete.</p> <p>75. Also, a further report on the procurement options for the enforcement cameras and likely costs will need to be prepared. In the meantime, Officers will seek to extend the existing enforcement camera contract to cover the period between the existing contract expiring in November and the contract for the long-term solution being concluded.</p> <p>76. The above work will be undertaken within the existing agreed project budget. The proposed budget line changes are in Table 7 in Appendix 10. Not all of the fees line budget has been utilised as planned. The emergency gas work at Monument left the network in a disrupted state. Therefore, the remaining surveys, such as taxi availability to hire and the junction vehicle count spot checks (to verify the traffic model forecasts for the reassignment routes), have not been undertaken. These surveys will not be required moving forward, as they would have been used in this report as additional evidence for Members. There has also been a saving of approximately £35,000 on the works line. It is proposed that both of these savings are moved to the staff costs line to cover the work required, after this report has been decided, to make the scheme permanent, or for it to be removed.</p> <p><u>What can be done to make it better?</u></p> <p>77. There are additional elements that Members may wish to consider, to assist in mitigating some of the concerns raised through the consultation and equalities impact assessment discussed above.</p> <p>78. The items that could be considered include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improving compliance (Cue's and clues) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement gateway build outs; • Lining changes at, and in, the junction (lane compliance); • Opportunity to extend the pedestrian crossing time; • Some footway build-outs (increasing formal space for pedestrians); • Colourful crossings/ coloured surfacing treatments.

	<p>All of the above would help to either improve compliance of the scheme by motorists or improve behaviour within the junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Increased enforcement on alternative routes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be covered by a further report on the use of the congestion officers in the City. c. Taxi rank visibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving signage to, and the visibility of, the taxi ranks. <p>79.It is suggested that Members agree to items a) and c) above to be investigated in more detail within the project, and report back to Streets and Walkways Sub and Projects Sub Committees outlining what could be done and how much this would cost to implement.</p> <p>80.This investigative and design work is estimated to require additional funding of £36,000 for staff costs. It is recommended that this be taken from the On-Street Parking Reserve.</p> <p><u>King Street/Cheapside banned right turn</u></p> <p>81.The right turn from King Street into Cheapside has been in operation on a temporary basis since January 2018 to facilitate the southbound closure on Queen Street and has been monitored for performance and safety. It is intended that to provide additional westbound travel options for reassigned traffic, that this will be looked to be made permanent using existing delegated authority if the experiment is approved. This is not essential for the Bank on Safety scheme operation; but will provide additional routing opportunities to complement the scheme.</p>
--	--

Background Documents

- Bank on Safety: Second report on the performance of the experiment (Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee 10 April 2018)
- Bank on Safety: Consultation Findings (Streets and Walkways Sub Committee 10 April 2018)

Appendices

Appendix 1	Loading and disabled parking bay maps
Appendix 2	Statutory duty extracts
Appendix 3	Air Quality graphs
Appendix 4	Representative groups and businesses: summary response to consultation
Appendix 5	Statutory Objections and response to Order #1
Appendix 6	Taxi modelling: scenario routings
Appendix 7	Equality Analysis
Appendix 8	Access to the junction map

Appendix 9	Taxi journey time data
Appendix 10	Finance Table

Contact

Report Author	Gillian Howard
Email Address	Gillian.howard@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3139