bankside urban park
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executive summary

Bankside Urban Forest is a co-ordinated and strongly characterised urban design framework for the public realm within the area extending from the river edge down to the Elephant and Castle, bordered by Blackfriars Road and Borough High Street. The work has been commissioned by Better Bankside in collaboration with a broad group that comprises the London Borough of Southwark, Tate Modern, The Architecture Foundation, Transport for London, Land Securities, Cross River Partnership and Native Land.

Centuries of overlapping development patterns have created a pronounced ‘urban interior’ within the Bankside and Borough area that is less intensively developed and used than the more active edges - Blackfriars Road, Borough High Street and the river edge. The construction of the viaducts and Southwark Street have further served to isolate this urban interior from more diverse uses and activities. This quieter interior area is characterised by its scattered small open spaces and strong local identity, and it acts as a counterbalance to the increasingly international, corporate, large-scale developments that are being constructed and planned around its edges.

Bankside Urban Forest responds to these conditions with five principal proposals:

1. *Increasing the opportunities for ‘sharing’* - that the existing social and physical relationships between the local ‘urban interior’, and the rapidly developing edges within Bankside and Borough, are supported and reinforced through significant improvements to the public realm and local amenities, and by increasing the opportunities for social engagement.

2. That the Urban Forest is the characterisation of this distinctive area of London, based upon the existing spatial qualities that underpin the area’s identity; meandering streets, multiple routes, clearings, clusters of vaulted and canopied spaces.

3. That evolutionary change takes place in a coordinated (not piecemeal) way, meshing existing projects and initiatives with new opportunities. Bankside Urban Forest must engage and sustain the commitment of the diverse individuals and groups in the area to take ownership of the projects over the long term.

4. That an ecological approach to urban regeneration based on networking, self-sufficiency, and ‘economies of small-scale’ will create a new sense of urban equilibrium between contrasting economic, social and cultural groups.

5. A collective project based on shared principles - that the Bankside Urban Forest establishes a new model for regenerating the public realm in London to attract significant public and private partners and investment.

We have identified a number of existing places which bring different people who use the area into contact with each other - ‘places of exchange’. These places and the activities that they support suggest sociable uses of the public realm. The framework supports these sociable places by drawing together many existing initiatives by Bankside Open Spaces Trust (BOST), LB Southwark, Transport for London, the Peabody Trust and private developers. We have proposed several projects that incorporate new trees, vertical planting, public art, hard landscaping and lighting in order to illustrate how the Bankside ‘forest’ could be realised.

It is intended that the Bankside Urban Forest framework can shape a common imagination between the many different interest groups in the area. This will help to negotiate, informally influence and, in some instances, directly inform projects and secure funding for enhancing the public realm and built environment. It is intended that this framework will be embedded in LB Southwark’s emerging Supplementary Planning Document for the area, which is currently out for consultation.
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the challenges

The client group; London Borough of Southwark, Tate Modern, The Architecture Foundation, Transport for London, Land Securities, Cross River Partnership, Native Land, and co-ordinated by Better Bankside, selected a team led by Witherford Watson Mann Architects from amongst 11 competitors. The commission focused on the development of a strongly characterised design strategy and framework for the development of the public realm that extends from the river edge down to the Elephant and Castle, bordered by Blackfriars Road and Borough High Street, although it also incorporates important spaces and connections that stretch across these edges.

The original remit included encouraging investment from the profusion of developments around the edges of the area into the more concealed urban interior. This investment will be coordinated through local stakeholders to improve the network of pedestrian and cycle routes, public spaces and developments, in order to enhance the quality of life for people living and working in the area. Among the opportunities suggested by the client group were the improvement of the pedestrian environment through road closures, inferred pedestrian priority and the greening of existing north-south routes. A unified reappraisal of existing public space was to be put before the creation of new spaces. Other suggestions included the provision of public art throughout the area. The client group also asked that the Bankside proposal relate to the Mayor of London’s ‘urban renaissance’ public space strategy and complement studies and projects already planned or underway in the area. The framework was required to coordinate and strongly characterise Bankside’s public environment to influence and direct the diverse landowners and developers to contribute to a common ambition.

The winning team was asked to develop design principles, identify specific proposals and draw up a framework to plan action, source funding, and inform responses to future development proposals in the area. Witherford Watson Mann Architects proposed the creation of a new ‘urban forest’, incorporating extensive tree planting, quiet gardens and a new public space, which together would form a distinct urban quarter and improve perceptions of the area.
Witherford Watson Mann Architects assembled a multidisciplinary team to explore the Bankside Urban Forest, a concept developed during a workshop with Fred Manson. Ken Worpole supplemented Witherford Watson Mann Architects' urban design analysis with a wealth of knowledge about the social and historical dynamics of public space. The photographer Philipp Ebeling documented residents' and visitors' personal routes through the area. Alexandra Rook of PRP Architects led the public consultation through the collection of comments on project postcards, distributed at popular community events such as the Frost Fair and the Bankside Open Spaces Trust carol hour. This consultation was complemented by in-depth interviews by field researcher Shibani Bose, which provided insights into how local people use Bankside’s public spaces.

In addition to regular conversations with the client steering group, the Witherford Watson Mann Architects team conducted interviews with key stakeholders, including community organisations such as the Bankside Open Spaces Trust, property developers and local politicians. These interviews helped to inform a list of projects that are proposed or currently underway throughout the area. A number of additional key projects were proposed and scoped up by Witherford Watson Mann Architects in conjunction with the client steering group and other stakeholders.

Peter Brett Associates analysed the transport feasibility of the proposed key projects, in particular the pedestrian and cyclist priority schemes. Intelligent Space’s modelling of pedestrian movement and way-finding patterns further helped to shape Witherford Watson Mann Architects’ priorities for intervention. Finally and crucially for the implementation of the forest strategy, quantity surveyors Bucknell Austin developed a schedule of estimated costs and identified funding sources for the key projects.

The Witherford Watson Mann Architects team reviewed relevant documents, including previous studies of the Bankside area and broader London-wide policy guidance. The framework was developed in parallel with, and informed by, the emerging Supplementary Planning Document and Cleaner Greener Safer Initiative.

Projects Mapping
The project map and schedule on pp 57-62 collects together all projects known to be currently underway or proposed within the study area. It is a live document that will be updated by a projects officer appointed by the client group. In addition to enabling the tracking of individual projects, the project map will help community groups to finance public projects by strategically targeting Section 106 funds anticipated from larger private developments. It will also encourage private initiatives that, although they may not create traditional public space, nevertheless contribute to the forest. The projects officer will also act as a liaison between interested parties, communicate the strategy to the wider community, and oversee the implementation of the key Forest projects. In consultation with Tate Modern the project officer will develop and facilitate the Forest’s public art commissioning and outreach strategy.

The scoped up key projects provide opportunities to secure short term under-spend or long lead-in funding as their initial design principles, technical issues, constraints and costs have been considered. Different local stakeholders should be responsible for delivering these key projects over the longer time period based around the funding, ownership and management criteria.

Exhibition
A series of public exhibitions were held over the period of a month in April 2007 at four venues: the John Harvard Library on Borough High Street, the Jerwood Space on Union Street, the London College of Communication at the Elephant and Castle and Tate Modern on Bankside. These venues allowed as many people as possible to see the approach and proposals, and encouraged their comments and ideas in order to be feed them into the framework. It was intended that the exhibition would provide an opportunity for people to commit their support by joining the ‘Friends of the Forest’; the next step in ensuring that the ownership of the Forest is entrusted to the local community and stakeholders.
“Bankside needs more green spaces and places for kids to play. If the children didn’t have Mint Street Park and Red Cross Gardens, they would have nothing. Places like this should be preserved.”
the urban interior

The social and physical characteristics of Bankside and Borough reflect the area’s historical location in relation to the City of London. The foot of London Bridge was a place of great intensity, but no formal structure, being a meeting place for travellers and pilgrims upon leaving or entering the City. St Saviour’s offered a place of sanctuary (earlier St Mary Overy and later to become Southwark Cathedral) and the monastery, St Thomas’s, developed into a hospital. The market that originally occupied London Bridge was relocated to the ‘Triangle’, once the churchyard of St Margaret’s. Development in the area was not based on any formal models and was broadly linear, following the approach to London Bridge and the river edge. In 1769 the completion of Blackfriars Bridge led to a more formal urban model of tenement blocks and squares. The middle ground or ‘urban interior’ remained free from any identifiable structure or development, being ‘loosely’ occupied by tenter grounds and vinegar yards.

The marginal use of the urban interior and its separation from the river edge was cemented by the construction of the viaducts and Southwark Street. This physical disconnection was reinforced by the change of use along the river edge through the 1980’s and 90’s. Large scale commercial, institutional and leisure uses rapidly replaced the grain of the wharfs. This pattern of development has continued with increasing intensity and is evident in the latest planning applications for large scale, high-rise office, residential and cultural buildings.
Pedestrian movement is not always a reflection of the most direct route between places. It reveals complex, often sub-conscious, decisions; where other people are, things of interest, noise levels, presence of vehicles, what can be seen ahead and so forth. A few hours spent in Bankside and Borough demonstrates that for local residents and workers many of the quieter or less trafficked roads are favoured.

Visitors’ experience of moving around Bankside and Borough however, reflects the distinct change between the busy activity around the edges and the more secluded urban interior. Truncated views, reduced activity at ground level, narrow pavements and the dark viaducts that criss-cross the area give the sense of having moved ‘off track’, raising feelings of anxiety and fear that prevents many people from exploring the area’s rich heritage and open spaces.

Understanding and supporting people’s natural wayfinding is therefore more than an issue of signage. It is how the layout of the streets and spaces affect what people see when exploring the street network, as well as the buildings and spaces that they see during their journey and which attract them along specific routes. Visibility analysis is a measure of how much space pedestrians can see as they move around at ground level.

For Bankside, the visual field open to pedestrians as they move around the street network has been measured using a computer programme. This calculates the visual field available to pedestrians for wayfinding at every step of any possible journey within the network, creating an overall measure of visibility of pedestrian space for the entire centre. A map of visibility in the study area is shown on this page. The visibility of the individual pavements is shown as a spectrum, where the areas in red have the longest views and the areas shown in dark blue are the most secluded.
Bankside and Borough’s urban interior remains notably distant from the activity that characterises its edges. The severance caused by Southwark Street and the railway viaducts serves to isolate the interior from colonisation by external uses. This interior is mostly occupied by businesses. The lack of more diverse activities over different times of the day adds to the sense of it being concealed or ‘buried’. The meandering road layouts and larger plot sizes within the interior present an inherent resistance to comprehensive redevelopment and formal urban planning. This resistance to larger-scale change has however resulted in some noticeably beneficial conditions, particularly in that it has supported a strong sense of local identity through the community’s long-standing commitment to the area. This is reflected directly in the high proportion of residents that have lived here for all, or most, of their lives and the number of local initiatives that to some degree characterise this area.

The adjacent diagram includes some of the recent planning applications that have either been granted or submitted, where this will significantly affect land-use. It is therefore assumed that either these schemes, or alternatives with similar land-uses to them, will be constructed.
evening and night time land-use

A study of building use allows us to understand how the area functions and indicates how particular types of pedestrians will inhabit the area and the type of activities that will transpire.

An overview of the land-use in the area helps to gauge the broad mix of activities that take place and indicates how particular pedestrian users might inhabit the public spaces at different times.

Between 4pm and 9pm there is a significant amount of pedestrian activity to and from public transport, particularly London Bridge, Southwark and Waterloo Stations. With the exception of the residential areas, there is generally a slow progression of movement away from the river. The riverside continues to attract footfall well into the evening, but later activity is confined to the residential areas and the early hours of business at Borough Market.

1. From 4-6pm the area is diversely used by residents, workers and visitors. There is a particular concentration along the riverside and around London Bridge Station.

2. From 6-9pm the riverside continues to be a popular area and there is a high level of movement along Borough High Street. In general, however, there is a shift away to the south and west as office workers return home. To the north, movement is focused on the routes to the rail stations and river crossings. Activity in the Borough area becomes concentrated within the residential areas.

3. From 9pm-12am the activity levels drop significantly with the exception of Borough High Street, Borough Market and Guy’s Hospital.

4. From 12-6am there is little general movement and activity is localised to residential areas, Borough Market, hotels and Guy’s Hospital.
institutional players

The area and its urban interior must serve a number of primary functions to ensure its long-term endurance and identity within competing London districts. The railway stations, Guy’s Hospital, Borough market, Southwark Cathedral, London South Bank University, Tate Modern and the Globe Theatre represent a diverse range of cultural and business interests. Between them, these ‘institutional players’ have the potential to support an active public realm over long periods of the day and week, a necessity not just in social and economic terms, but also in contributing significantly to the passive surveillance and use of small open spaces. It is important to resist seeing these highly specific and self-interested institutions as autonomous, and to understand how they can each contribute to a ‘common’ programme for the public realm and social engagement.

‘Any primary use whatever, is by itself relatively ineffectual as a creator of city diversity. If it is combined with another primary use that brings people in and out and puts them on the street at the same time, nothing has been accomplished. In practical terms, we cannot even call these differing primary uses. However, when a primary use is combined, effectively, with another that put people on the street at different times, then the effect can be economically stimulating: a fertile environment for secondary diversity.’

Jane Jacobs The Death and Life of American Cities
local networks

Throughout the course of this project we have sought to understand something of the relationship between the urban interior and the developments around the perimeter. We employed a photographer, Philipp Ebeling, for a week, and asked a wide range of local people to show him around, and to take him to the places they value. We also employed an interviewer, Shibani Bose, who conducted around 30 extended interviews with local residents, councillors and committed individuals. This work has provided us with an insight into the web of relationships that exist between residents, businesses and visitors. It is this network that the framework seeks to build on. As Richard Sennett has said; ‘the city’s diversity of urban life becoming a source of mutual strength rather than a source of mutual estrangement and civic bitterness’.

Some of the spatial relationships between residents and the local places they frequent have been taken from the interviews and visualised on the adjacent drawing. The red dot locates the person interviewed and the lines connect them to places they mentioned where they often went. What was surprising was the number of local people who mentioned the importance of the river edge as a place where they liked to go, despite the increasingly ‘international’ character of it. Shibani Bose’s summary and analysis of interviews with local residents and workers is on page 19.
hidden places

“To lose oneself in a city—as one loses oneself in a forest—that calls for a quite different schooling. Then, signboard and street names, passers-by, roofs, kiosks or bars must speak to the wanderer like a cracking twig under his feet in the forest, like the startling call of a bittern in the distance, like the sudden stillness of a clearing with a lily standing erect at its centre.”

Walter Benjamin, A Berlin Chronicle

The columned canopy of Borough Market, flickering lights of the trains, ruins at All Hallows, golden deer, Cross Bones Graveyard, long shadows from latticed bridge structures, shrine of the Most Precious Blood, hanging vegetation in Playhouse Court, Clink skeletons and deep viaduct arches all contribute to the sense of ‘losing oneself in the city’. The scattered ‘special places’ or clearings make manifest the long history of informal development in an area beyond the laws of the City; an incremental series of individual aspirations and isolated opportunities. The presence of this condition is so strong within Bankside that it is reasonable to say that it is characteristic of the area. It forms part of Bankside’s identity.

‘This stretch of the Thames...is to other watersides or river ports what a virgin forest would be to a garden. It is a thing grown up, not made. It recalls a jungle by the confused, varied, and impenetrable aspect of the buildings that line the shore, not according to a planned purpose, but as if sprung up by accident from scattered seeds. Like the matted growth of bushes and creepers veiling the silent depths of an unexplored wilderness, they hide the depths of London’s infinitely varied, vigorous, seething life’.

Joseph Conrad, The Mirror of the Sea
spatial types: rides, streams and clearings

Through our walks and analysis of Bankside we have defined three identifiable spatial characteristics or ‘types’ as a way of characterising the diversity of spaces and places. The east-west streets are mostly routes across the area: we have termed these ‘rides’ after the straight routes often cut through the Royal hunting forests. Scattered spaces, widened streets, small gardens and historic places we have likened to ‘clearings’, since they are recognisable places, by which people navigate the area or chose to meet and sit, to play, reflect, eat a sandwich or read. These ‘clearings’ often have a relationship to some of the more sociable places and activities in the area which we discuss later in the report as ‘Places of Exchange’ (see page 27). The rides and clearings are bound together in an intricate, subtle network by the more meandering north-south ‘streams’ – the oldest pathways and roads of the area.
“I don’t want Bankside to turn into Manhattan. Height is the main issue. There are more and more housing towers and office towers coming up here, which spoil the view and the sunlight for everyone. I feel like soon we won’t be able to see the sky!”

public engagement
by Shibani Bose

Bankside is ordinary, Bankside is exotic
Bankside is not grand to most that live there. In spite of the area’s rich and varied history and its place in London’s plans for growth, there persists a sense of normality about everyday life in Bankside. Some have described this in terms of scale, saying that small enterprise and ownership characterise the place. This is seen to be under threat from large, monolithic built envelopes of housing and corporate office space, which would disenfranchise smaller, traditional stakeholders.

The small businesses have an important place in the daily lives and paths of many local residents, and seem to be touchstones of a ‘community’. While there cannot be said to be only one community in all of Bankside, a sense of kinship with fellow residents is greatly valued. Most residents are sympathetic to one or other ‘community organisation’, regardless of their level of participation. Many cite this level of community engagement as their favourite thing about Bankside.

Others have noticed the absence of a ‘theme’ in Bankside. Living there is a ‘real’ activity, and not a role playing exercise to fit into a grand narrative about the city. Ordinary lives are lived out here, complete with families, children, schools, churches and jumble sales. This is however seen as poised to change with upcoming development. In fact there is already a nostalgic vein in residents’ conceptions of Bankside’s character – old pubs have reportedly been ‘jazzed up’, and fish ‘n’ chip shops turned into bars, where children cannot be taken for a fry up on Sundays.

While ‘small’, ‘community’, ‘real’ are qualities threatened, by default, wherever regeneration is market-led, it may be useful to privilege these stated values while framing the public realm strategy for this particular area. The worst case scenario for local residents in any development site is a complete takeover of all forms of decision-making by economic forces. Even as they express a need to preserve certain eccentric and unusual places (such as the garden in the Church of the Precious Blood) by creating awareness about them, residents are very wary of exposing them completely for public consumption. Putting them on a map, for instance, with directions to find them and tour guides to show one around them, would change the very quality of these place that make them special. A public realm strategy for this area would therefore need also to avoid the trap of ‘Disneyfying’ what is hidden, historical, secretive or quaint about Bankside. Also, these places are not inanimate objects of beauty; each ‘treasure that you trip over’ quietly belongs to someone and is cared for on a daily basis. It is therefore a huge challenge for the architects of the forest to avoid alienating these small and sometimes silent stakeholders, even as they strive to save and enhance the spaces themselves.

Diversity

The word diversity often arises in these conversations about Bankside, in three senses – diversity of form, population and experience. Along with a mix of uses and sizes, built forms of many different types are found here and this is a much appreciated characteristic of the place. Speculative development in the area is seen as a hazard to this diversity, tending towards monotonous facades and large monolithic built forms that fail to engage one at ground level. The forest should strive to allow and promote physical diversity, and possibly preserve much of the existing diverse form of Bankside.

The diversity of people that live in it is part of the essence of Bankside. Benefiting from historical waves of change and migration, the presence of different skin colours, tongues, occupations, lifestyles and bank balances may be the reason why so many residents feel accepted here. There is a definite sense of tolerance between very different kinds of people, be they long term residents or more transient populations. A resident gives direct evidence of this tolerance in the form of her account of a confrontation with drug abusers in Nelson Square, saying that the fact that the square wasn’t gated gave her the confidence to approach the wrongdoers and argue with them about their use of this shared open space, instead of simply calling the police or avoiding the square altogether. Similarly, another resident specifically says that the upcoming Tate community garden shouldn’t be gated off, or operated on a registration basis, so that other people other than registered local residents can use it. All residents have their own little worlds in Bankside – their own particular life styles and daily routes, often varying widely from each other, but overlapping each other spatially. Coupled with the fact that in general people in Bankside have shown extraordinary levels of non-insularity, it may not be too big a leap of faith to pre-empt causality; i.e., to say that the visibility of different life histories being played out in close proximity to their own, makes the residents especially tolerant of each other. Development in this area must not be allowed to take away this daily visibility of differences between different groups, which is likely the basis of this easy tolerance. Different groups should not be segregated from each other, and chance contact should be promoted, to maintain the camaraderie between social groups which may otherwise, and in a different setting, antagonise each other.
Diversity of experience in Bankside largely stems from its mix of populations, and is represented in the interviews as widely divergent views on everything from food to street lighting. A public realm strategy for Bankside would need to recognise that there are actually several different publics here, several different points of view, and that they are all valid.

People are mostly fair

The people interviewed have consistently shown a very balanced view towards development. Most have accepted that progress and change are necessary and good, even as they lament the loss of old forms. As they have shown themselves to be sensible, largely unbiased people, with well-formed opinions, the forest strategy would benefit from openness to their views.

Specifically, the aesthetic aspects of development along the riverside are well appreciated, as is the connectivity between the different riverfront locations – both of which are relatively recent changes. Development is also welcome when it adds facilities to the area, such as shopping, better lighting and paving.

The specific, widely-criticised threats are those of uncontrolled height, loss of view lines, loss of old buildings and a general loss of solitariness, as more and more people throng to Bankside.

Bankside image

It is interesting and instructive to see the image of Bankside borne by those who know it best. As development has a continuous impact on this image, knowledge of residents’ image of Bankside would sensitize the public realm strategy as to how it can preserve, change or enhance parts of this image.

The boundary of the Bankside Urban Forest matches closely that of the Cathedrals Ward, and a few residents do recall these boundaries when imagining ‘their’ Bankside. But on the whole the Bankside triangle is not a widely accepted definition, or a coherent entity in people’s minds. Most residents automatically relate the name of ‘Bankside’ to the strip of walkway next to the river between Blackfriars and London Bridges. Others cite Southwark Street as the southern edge of Bankside, while a few extend the definition to Union Street, saying that everything south of that is the ‘Borough’. In order to effect change over the entire area, the boundaries of ‘Bankside’ need renegotiation, which can be achieved by spatial decisions made in the public realm strategy. The Bankside triangle can be demarcated and amalgamated through strategic design interventions.

The elements of Bankside’s image vary between respondents. Tate Modern, the railway infrastructure, and the River Thames are the most popular icons. An important element of some interviewees’ mental picture is the fact that the area is strewn with historical artefacts – in the form of architecture, old establishments or even in some small physical component of a building or park – the presence of the past in the present of Bankside is thus greatly valued. A surprisingly large number of residents cite a vision of historic Bankside as their ‘image’ of the place, while a few fondly describe the area’s theatrical tradition as the outstanding picture in their mind. Diversity of forms, sizes and populations comes up again here.

Local initiative, local politics, and a complete picture

The interviews have shown that there are many small local initiatives in Bankside which fall under the mantle of public realm works. Being mainly bottom-up efforts, these are limited in scope, funding and outreach. But they are a valuable resource for a public realm strategy to incorporate, as well as actionable projects to take forward.

On the flip side, as it is such an interesting area, there have been many attempts at ‘urban designing’ Bankside. However, they have all come to nought but paper. Residents resent this, and some are even cynical about consultation now, feeling that they have been milked for their opinions time and time again, on whose basis no action has ever been taken. Also, the amount of interest in and onus on development in Bankside has exponentially multiplied the number of actors involved in it at any level. Managing the interests of stakeholders at so many levels, in different sectors, with several overlapping remits is a great challenge.

A public realm strategy for Bankside can be truly effective only if it has knowledge of local initiatives, a vision to unite them fruitfully, an understanding of the fragmented politics involved in the area, as well as an awareness of previous, unsuccessful attempts at strategising development here, and possible reasons for the same. As residents repeat, ‘This place is great, there are some great ideas; it just needs someone to tie it all together’.
There are several special places and points of interest—but interesting bits of this area tend to be quite isolated from each other.
the bankside urban forest

an introduction to the concept by ken worpole

An ecological approach to public realm strategies

‘If forests appear in our religions as places of profanity, they also appear as sacred. If they have typically been considered places of lawlessness, they have also provided havens for those who took up the cause of justice and fought the law’s corruption. If they evoke associations of danger and abandon in our minds, they also evoke scenes of enchantment. In other words, in the religions, mythologies and literatures of the West, the forest appears as a place where the logic of distinction goes astray.’ Robert Pogue Harrison, Forests: The Shadow of Civilization, 1993

This proposal imagines the Bankside public realm strategy based on the vision of an urban forest rather than a park. There is an important difference. The term park originates with the Latin parricus or French parc, both meaning enclosure. The early English deer-parks were royal hunting grounds and strictly policed, whereas the forest has always been regarded as a place of liberty and without distinct boundaries.

Since then ‘forest space’ has acquired a set of architectural and topographical associations with a sense of open-endedness and permeability, a place that can be entered or exited at any point at its edges, and which visually changes and re-configures itself as the traveller moves through it. Because of their organic origins, forests offer a multiplicity of paths, routes, changes of direction, as well as clearings, copses, streams, rides and allees. ‘A person should be able to walk through a forest on the way from home to work,’ the architect Alvar Aalto once said.

Thus there are great strengths in respecting the existing labyrinthine set of streets and settlements, which inspired the idea of the Bankside forest. Local residents interviewed for this study have confirmed the importance to them of the distinctive irregular street patterns of the area.

‘Walking around in Bankside, you get glimpses of far off buildings through narrow alley and cracks. They aren’t much, but these occasional eccentric views should be preserved.’

‘I go to Nelson Square by the back-doubles – past the greengrocer, past the betting shop, I cut through all the little back alleys.’

Though the forest idea introduces elements now associated with ‘greening the city’, and largely determined by ecological imperatives – to counter CO2 emissions, to lower ambient temperatures, to increase surface water retention and avoid flooding – there are equally important social and economic imperatives in the forest strategy too. By adopting a more ecological approach to public realm strategies, there are greater opportunities to support local economies and conserve historic street patterns and connectivities. The forest idea is not based on centre-periphery spatialities and economies, but on equitable networks of livelihood and exchange.

The Bankside Urban Forest proposal is not primarily a tree-planting or soft-landscaping scheme, though it has elements of both. In essence it is a long-term programme of modest interventions in the connectivity of Bankside and the fine grain area south of Southwark Street, attempting to stitch together the larger neighbourhood through a series of pedestrian-friendly changes to the road pattern. It will also act as a cohesive device, quietly signalling to residents, visitors and others that they are entering and inhabiting a distinctive urban realm, characterised by diffuse elements of greening, a network of low-key pocket parks, courtyards and sanctuary spaces, historic meeting places, as well as significant places of economic, social and cultural exchange (Tate Modern, Borough Market, Southwark Cathedral, Guy’s Hospital, local schools and shopping streets, London South Bank University).
This is to be accompanied by improvements to the buildings, courtyards, and streetscape through the creation of new pocket parks, more naturalised school playgrounds, plantings, window boxes – many of them to be undertaken by existing community groups and small businesses – and other street improvements which will give the area a sense of place-integrity whilst retaining the very mixed economy and social nature of the area. It builds on the pioneering work of the Bankside Open Spaces Trust. A new programme of artists’ commissions is also envisaged.

Such improvements build on the history and character of Bankside, which has often resisted comprehensive redevelopment in the past. As Gillian Tindall has written in her recent history of the area, ‘The House by the Thames’ (2006):

‘Plans (for large government buildings) have indeed been mooted for sections of London’s south banks at various times, and one or two of them have actually been built a little further up the river, but Bankside itself has remained untouched by grandiose urbanism.”

This accords with Shibani Bose’s conclusion, that ‘Bankside is not grand to most that live there.’ The scheme has grown out of a strong sense that local residents perceive the area described in the scheme as being ‘calm’, ‘safe’, and enjoying a strong sense of local identity already. It also draws on historical precedents, when Bankside’s early growth still possessed many rural qualities, when it was, according to Tindall, ‘a popular, if marshy place for clandestine encounters (where)... it was said that the tree-cover was so dense that even on moonlit nights ‘one man cannot see another’.

It is not the case, however, that labyrinthine means dangerous, as local residents confirm. Conventional public space strategies are often informed by safety concerns which suggest that large open spaces, and long straight vistas, must invariably feel safer. Yet many people find large, hard surfaced landscapes threatening by their sheer lack of incident and anonymity. Local residents around Bankside find no contradiction between describing the area as feeling safe, along with praising the irregular network of streets and back doubles. What they do fear, however, is the ‘Manhattanisation’ of Bankside north of Southwark Street, and the forest concept is one which it is intended will weave human scale and engaging pathways and networks linking old and new Bankside together.

In addition to strengthening the historical jigsaw of spaces and places, the forest concept also introduces a slowing down of time, based on the experience of irregular pathways and frequent engagement with visual incident. Straight lines and open vistas can evoke time as something to be endured, whereas a public space strategy based on creating the conditions for exploration, diversion, meandering and discovery, can aid a sense of timelessness or absorption in the flow of time as a pleasure in its own right. Indeed the pocket parks such as Paley Park in New York offer precisely this unexpected, and therefore much appreciated, hideaway.

The Bankside Urban Forest therefore:

• Creates a distinctive new urban habitat based on elements of greening and the creation of a multiplicity of small scale spaces and place, for residents, workers and visitors alike;

• Supports and connects existing key places of exchange to each other, strengthening local economies and educational opportunities, and breaking down ‘threshold’ barriers between corporate and community partners;

• Helps ameliorate harshening environmental conditions such as air pollution, ambient air temperatures, creation of more shade;

• Supports a whole range of small scale community and business initiatives to create their own little sections of the forest, so that in the end people will be able to tell the wood from the trees;

• Knits together old and new, high and low rise, major and minor throughways, through a distinctive urban livery of self-generated green initiatives;

• Softens the divide between day and evening economies by avoiding an over-concentration of eating and drinking activities in one area;

• Introduces an element of playfulness to the public realm, being child-and family-friendly in its approach to street safety, and integration of pocket parks and play spaces into the streetscape;

• Creates a new sense of urban equilibrium between contrasting economic, social and cultural elements, through a distinctive place-making programme

• Pioneers an ecological approach to urban regeneration based on networking, self-sufficiency, and ‘economies of small-scale’.

Lessons from Docklands

It has been salutary to observe how the City of London responded to the challenge presented by the growth of Docklands, what at the time was deemed to be the new model for large-scale urban regeneration. Rather than emulating its big, brash, broad brush scale of operations, the City chose instead to invest in its pocket parks, in beautifying alleys and courtyards, in cultivating good relations with family businesses and local pubs. It realised that office-workers and residents appreciated living in an environment that still seemed human scale, and offered continuing surprises and discoveries in its street pattern and local economy.

Urbanists have for some time now been drawing attention to the ‘over-scripting’ of public space in many modern urban regeneration schemes, so that all conflicts and loose ends are designed out of the development, and the public are organised into patterns of use and timetables decided...
elsewhere. This disallows for that sense of wandering, of going off-piste, and of discovering a
neighbourhood or district by serendipity. The very qualities for which we admire historic European
towns and cities have often been designed out of new urban quarters in the UK. The Bankside
Urban Forest resists this over-inscription of public space. The notion of the city as a forest is not
a new idea, but it has always been retrospective. The idea of creating forest-like conditions as the
basis for a new kind of urban public realm, builds on the past, but also embodies the new ecological
imperatives for making cities more sustainable environmentally, economically and socially too.

Great buildings gain strength from fine-grain settings
At the heart of the Bankside BID is Tate Modern, though the area also provides a home for
Southwark Cathedral, Borough Market and Shakespeare’s Globe. The development of Bankside 1,
2 & 3 may have the effect of consolidating the institutional feel of the area. It could be argued that
the area is top-heavy with national and international attractions which would benefit in the long
term from being integrated into a more close-grained urban quarter, where thousands of people
also live and work and support local amenities and services. If Tate Modern is a 21st century
cathedral, then it could benefit from more cathedral-like surroundings consisting of fine grain
streets, small squares and stopping places – in the tradition of French and Italian cathedrals,
integrated into a finely woven urban fabric. This, the concept of the forest can help make happen.

Administrative boundaries rarely coincide with historic, topographical or cultural boundaries in
urban zoning or governance questions. This raises issues of long-term economic and cultural
sustainability. Popular attachments run long and deep in matters of place and history, and even
developments of two or three generations previous can still be felt as having destroyed the organic
unity of a particular district or urban quarter, which regeneration projects may over time wish
to restore. The Bankside BID area needs to avoid the dangers of exacerbating the divide between
the riverside area and its historical hinterland south of Southwark Street.

At present Southwark Street resembles an urban canyon (not unlike Farringdon Road, or even
the scale of More London compared to the scale of Tooley Street on the opposite side). There are
bridges across this canyon for railways but not for pedestrians. Residents interviewed south of
Southwark Street expressed fears that further development at Bankside may unwittingly destroy
the historic urban fabric of the area.

‘I don’t want Bankside to turn into Manhattan. Height is the main issue. There are more and
more housing towers and office towers coming up here, which spoil the view and the sunlight for
everyone. I feel like soon we won’t be able to see the sky!’

‘The buildings are getting higher and higher. They just keep going up and up they may well end up
taking away the skyline soon.’

The urban forest strategy addresses this issue directly by weaving a series of threads across
Southwark Street, bringing the historic urban grain of alleys, courtyards, pocket parks, community
gardens, grottoes into the BID area.

The Bankside BID designation raises such issues. On the map the boundaries are clearly and
tightly drawn by three principal roads – Borough High Street, Southwark Street and Blackfriars
Road - and to the north by the River Thames. Yet such boundaries have the effect of enclosing what
is largely a collection of industrial, commercial, corporate buildings, along with large swathes of
public housing.
The BID area can surely only gain in strength by making connections to this rich historical hinterland, where there are many fascinating streets and alleys, courtyards, pocket parks, taverns, religious settlements, and workshop buildings, which offer a counterpoint to the larger scale development of Bankside, which tends to be on a block basis. There is also a danger that were the BID area to be regarded as now constituting a new cultural quarter, within its present boundaries, then the intensification of the evening economy in this small area alone could lead to problems now seen in other tightly bounded cultural districts such as Dublin’s Temple Bar.

For while there is much to be drawn on in the long history of Bankside itself as a place of entertainment, theatre, and pleasure gardens, immediately south of Southwark Street, there are additional stories to be told of social reform – Octavia Hill’s cottage housing programme at Red Cross Way and Ayres Street, for example – as well as educational reform in the work of Joseph Lancaster in Borough Road, whose name is also commemorated in Lancaster Street.

Today this larger area is becoming a place with a renewed identity, as fringe theatre spaces are being developed, parks and green spaces (badly needed) are being restored, and many former industrial buildings are being converted into small business units.

One of Bankside BID’s most successful initiatives to date has been working with local businesses on developing green travel plans. The area is sufficiently well-connected to main line railway stations, bus services and pedestrian routes to become a model of a safe, permeable pedestrian district. This can only be strengthened by extending pedestrian and cycleway connections into surrounding areas, to gain a critical mass of walkable space, eventually connecting up to the Elephant and Castle, another area of considerable investment and development.

The concept of regeneration has been at the heart of urban policy for several decades now – but what does it mean, and what are its limitations? The conventional notion is that historic urban areas affected by planning blight, economic failure or community fragmentation can be brought back to life again by large building programmes, whether of new industries, offices, housing developments or cultural facilities. It is assumed that social and economic benefits will immediately flow outwards from a new investment in property and institutions. However, this is not always the case. Rather like an organ transplant, the host environment can sometimes reject or turn its back on the new development, leaving it isolated, or requiring it to take the form of an enclave community.

The urban forest is based on the idea that those responsible for regeneration schemes have to appreciate the very real benefits which flow the other way, from the host community to the new development and its inhabitants and users. Thus the forest slowly encroaches on the new development and integrates it by degrees into the historic ecology of the terrain. So rather than Southwark residents feeling that their fine grain pattern of urban living and community is going to be crushed by high-rise development bestriding the whole area, the urban forest strategy builds on the richness and intimacy of the existing communities integrating the new developments at Bankside into the wider urban fabric.

This is why the concept of ‘Places of Exchange’ is crucial to the urban forest: these are meeting places where Bankside workers and visitors inter-act with local residents and the workers and owners of the many small businesses which thrive elsewhere in the district. Such places of exchange include Tate Modern, Southwark Cathedral, Borough Market, South Bank University, as well as local schools, shopping streets, and pockets of evening activity such as pubs and restaurants which create new local economies in the forest. Places of exchange allow not just trading, but also opportunities for different groups living, working or visiting the community to interact. There is evidence already of new local connections, as in the Borough Market food-training programme which will impact on local schools by providing fresh ingredients as well as culinary expertise.

Not only do these ‘places of exchange’ need a spatial presence, but they need a temporal presence too. Borough Market now successfully crosses the time boundary between weekdays and weekends, operating as it does each Friday and Saturday. Below Southwark Street, churches, pubs and cafes maintain an evening and weekend timetable.

A cultural quarter with historical depth

One of the lessons from Jan Gehl’s work in Copenhagen on increasing the social life of historic areas, is to avoid over-concentration, and to encourage the spread of bars and restaurants across a wider area. Gehl’s own report on London’s public spaces and public life, Towards a fine City for People (June 2004), noted an absence of children or elderly people in the streets, compared with other European cities, possibly linked to the fact that ‘until now the pedestrian has been largely invisible in the planning process.’

What has been evident – and to a degree unique – from the surveys of residents, is that all age groups feel generally safe in the area, though children may be disallowed from crossing the major boundary roads such as Borough High Street, Southwark Street and Blackfriars Road. The forest concept is at heart a child-friendly strategy, over time creating a streetscape that is interesting, human scale, safe and – most importantly – initiated and managed at a local level by the participating schools, businesses, churches, community groups.

The idea of playfulness as a key ingredient of contemporary urban life is now established – indeed Tate Modern’s large Turbine Hall installations seem to have been designed for family playfulness in mind. The idea of locating parks and dedicated play areas close to great art galleries and museums – as a way of signalling cultural democracy and popular accessibility – is now common too. This is why we are keen to see a significant and original play environment incorporated into the large forest element immediately south of the Tate Modern. This could humanise the approach to Tate Modern from the south for children and their families living south of Southwark Street, and indeed act as a major encouragement to ‘cross the threshold’ from the urban interior on to the riverfront itself.

The Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam opens its southern doors on to the large Museumpark, which has extensive play facilities for all ages which are used daily by visitors and the children of local residents. Great works of public art such as the ‘Mikado’ construction at Malmo by Adriaan Geuze, create a powerful sense of history and occasion, meaningful to both adults and children alike. Crossing boundaries involves both spatial and typological forms.

This offers real funding opportunities, as it is known that the larger arts and cultural funding agencies, including the Heritage Lottery Fund, are looking for evidence of strategic co-operation across boundaries, rather than supporting ‘islands of consumption’ which leave areas of inner residential London untouched.
places of exchange

supporting and extending existing places of exchange

There are a number of existing places within Bankside and Borough which in differing ways have the capacity to bring people who do not know each other into contact, places which ‘suggest’ social engagement between different racial, ethnic and class communities, where people can express differences of opinions and find mutual support, where civility can flourish – Places of Exchange.

The Places of Exchange Southwark that we have observed are:

- Southwark Cathedral, which hosts its religious community and many public events including those based on liberal politics.
- Borough Market not only provides a shopping environment but also an important social one, generated by the enthusiasm and commitment that comes from specialist high quality producers.
- Cathedral and St Joseph’s Schools necessitate social contact between parents through the dropping off and collection of children, and after school events. Little Dorrit Park and Redcross Gardens provide critical support to this type of contact, forming informal open spaces that are frequented after school as a counterpoint to the formality of the school’s programme.
- The Great Suffolk Street local precinct provides local business shops which include a florist, green grocer, butcher, cafe and chip shop.
- London South Bank University supports a significant educational community and hosts a spectrum of debates and lectures.
- The emerging night-time economy around the railway viaducts at Blackfriars Road supports the increasing number of new workers and residents in the area. This activity is likely to increase further with the construction of large scale offices, residences and hotels nearby.
- There is a significant opportunity to create a completely new ‘place of exchange’ on the south side of Tate Modern. The necessity for a place that has this capacity to bring people in contact with one another is particularly important here as this area is going to be shared by both the existing community and a significant number of new residents and workers.

Places of Exchange are often supported by, and indeed support, the scattered network of small open spaces, parks and gardens. The public realm must therefore contribute further to underpinning these more diverse and sociable places by improving the connections between them to form a more coherent and pedestrian orientated ground.
the seeds of the framework

eexisting clearings and special places intensified

The columned canopy of the market, flickering lights of the trains, ruins at All Hallows, golden deer, Cross Bones Graveyard, long shadows from latticed bridge structures, shrine of the Most Precious Blood, hanging vegetation in playhouse court, Clink skeletons and deep viaduct arches all contribute to the sense of ‘losing oneself in the city’. The nature of this labyrinthine terrain establishes the roots the Forest. The scattered ‘special places’ or clearings are buried deep within the network of East-West rides and long meandering North-South streams. The framework weaves these fragments of the forest into a co-ordinated but loose structure. To these existing fragments we have added a number of illustrative projects (pp38-48) to demonstrate the spectrum of interventions that can be made within this structure. These are the ‘seeds’ of the forest and although they include elements of tree-planting and soft-landscaping, there are important social and economic imperatives too.
spreading roots

the existing spaces and new projects begin to connect

As the current initiatives and seedlings become visible, new developments can begin to respond to the forest. This is an evolutionary and fragmentary process that works as much by influence as it does through more formal mechanisms (such as planning and section 106 negotiations). A series of more complex interventions can progress, such as detailed proposals to embed Southwark Street into the Forest, negotiations to open access and develop the railway viaducts, re-configuring parts of the University, agreeing key thresholds with emerging designs for Borough High Street and Blackfriars Road and extending Borough Market. These developments do not aspire to creating another Covent Garden. Their focus lies in supporting a working part of London, where the market, Tate Modern, the Jerwood Space and London College of Communication are pursuing cultural programmes amongst the stations, hospital, University and local businesses. The emphasis is not on beautification, but rather how the public realm can “work harder” and be occupied and shared by more different players, more ages.
maturing of the framework

active edges and urban interior are meshed

As the forest begins to mature as an idea, significant new areas and spaces are ‘unlocked’ and brought into life, for example, Tate Modern playground, Cross Bones Graveyard, a quarter of a million square feet of viaduct arches, Mint Street Park and London South Bank University Square. The roots and social influence of the key players begin to extend and embed themselves into the urban interior of the forest. The thresholds suggest exploration, the rich history and local identity are embedded and intertwined, streams and rides improve access to new facilities, jobs, clubs and spaces. The intertwining of the roots serves to make a robust and resilient quarter of the city.
tools of the forest

The spatial typologies that form the public realm in the Bankside Urban Forest can be responded to with a variety of 'tools' that support their spatial identity and the overall characterisation of the area.

**Rides** – formal man-made cuts through the forest
- More formally planted large tall trees in lines that define edges and opening to the sky.
- Absence of low-level planting.
- Linear lighting in sequence to work with trees to form an orderly edge.
- Clay ground (dry).

**Streams** – naturally formed, meandering and varied
- Informal planting with clumps of multi-stemmed trees of a shorter species.
- Presence of low level and vertical planting.
- More varied spacing and types of light fitting.
- Presence of bedrock, stone paving with special polished surfaces (wet).

**Clearings** – places marked by special conditions, fallen trees, confluence of rivers
- Places of orientation in the forest, where information is available.
- Special and specific conditions that needed to be respond to differently.
- Openings defined by taller trees, vertical planting or occupied by lower trees.
- Huts, shelters and places of rest are located.
- Places where the sky is more present.
- Places where artists can realise their work, places of reflection and pause within forest.

**Pathways** – local routes, passages, alleys
- Linear more intimate spaces with a pedestrian and cycle focus.
- Cut across and connect different spatial types.
- Trees and low level planting, but not formally structured.
- Lower level lighting to mark out the path.
- Places to sit and rest.
Central to the Forest Framework is a map of all the projects which are either currently underway or proposed within the area. These projects include creating and enhancing green spaces, street planting and lighting.

We have worked closely with Better Bankside, Bankside Open Spaces Trust (BOST), The London Borough of Southwark, Cross River Partnership, Transport for London, local schools, businesses, residents’ associations and Borough Market to locate all of the forest projects which are either proposed or about to happen, and to identify possible funding sources. We have added six projects of our own in key areas of the forest and we have illustrated and developed them in more detail.

The project map and accompanying spreadsheet are live documents which will evolve and develop as projects are added, and will enable anyone who is interested to follow their progress. It is also a resource for those who need finance for forest projects, enabling them through the project bank to target Section 106 funds from the numerous large private developments scheduled for the area.

The project map also documents and encourages private initiatives that, while they may not create public spaces, will nevertheless contribute to the overall forest; for instance, landscaping on roofs and terraces of residential and office towers and tree-planting initiatives on housing estates. The project map will be posted on the web and updated regularly.

As well as helping to bring together funders and initiators of projects, the project map will also help to champion the Forest Framework across the wider community.
“This place is great, there are some great ideas; it just needs someone to tie it all together.”
the planted arch

illustrative project 1

One of the main East-West pedestrian and cycle routes into the area runs from The Cut into Union Street. This is directly opposite Southwark Underground and runs alongside the Palestra Building. The first viaduct arch marks a very important threshold to the forest and sits just off an important crossing with Great Suffolk Street. The space is occupied by a café built into the viaduct wall, the Union Jack pub and the emerging night-time economy in and around the viaducts as far as the White Hart Pub.

We have proposed a planted or ‘furry’ arch to mark this threshold. This takes the form of a series of planted vertical panels and trays that line the arch, enabling us to trail creepers around the vault. These would need to be fed from an irrigation system behind the panels and growing lights, adding to the sense of artificiality and strangeness. The pre-growing time for the trailed creeper would be approximately 18 months and the creepers may have a 10 year life (this is a technique being used more and more for green hoardings to building sites, for instance Land Security’s New St Square site). These panels can also be used to reduce the resonance within the viaduct arches as they are used as acoustic walls on Autobahns in Germany. We have proposed planting clumps of Ash trees along Great Suffolk Street in response to areas of more generous corners and sections of footway claimed back from the road. These trees have been planted along Park Street. They have a light canopy and stunning autumn colour. This is something that we think could happen this year. The footway surface along the North-South streams could be characterised as river bed with the use of stone, or perhaps pre-cast concrete slabs with secondary aggregates. The area in front of the White Hart pub and along Dolben Street would be connected with a shared surface, linking to the residents’ public space and arches, again enabling the highway to be used more efficiently in the evening.

For more detailed traffic/highway proposals see pp71-76.
Viaduct arch lined with planting in special panels enabling creepers to trail up and over the vault. Plants are sustained with growing lights and an irrigation system integrated within the panels.

Clumps of ash trees planted along Great Suffolk Street on wider sections of the footway.
The small traffic island, where Union Street crosses Southwark Bridge Road, occupies an important position within the framework. As well as the Island Cafe there is a thriving row of small shops and cafes and, opposite, the refurbished community centre and training school at 56 Southwark Bridge Road.

We have sought to enhance the sense of this as a ‘grove’ and important sociable space. Both the local community and workforce use the cafes and newsagents and will shortly use the training school. Cyclists, parents and drunks all congregate here. We have proposed a more efficient use of the highway space by closing one of the two wide one-way roads and reconnecting the island to the shops on the north side. We suggest that the short section of Union Street adjacent to the training school should be closed to traffic (except perhaps ambulances) and that the two sides of Union Street should be connected with a raised table. The two mature Plane trees are embedded in the island cafe by a new planted canopy and roof and additional semi-mature Planes are planted to make the grove. A new surface, possibly of porphyry setts and pre-cast slabs or stones, establishes a connected pedestrian ground, evoking qualities of the forest floor. Section 106 money has already been allocated towards the cost of an art piece for the square. The existing ventilation column is proposed as the support for a large ‘moon’ clock. Green Oak benches take shelter throughout the square.

For more detailed traffic/highway proposals see pp71-76.
new semi-mature plane trees

new semi-mature plane trees

new semi-mature plane trees

new semi-mature plane trees

new semi-mature plane trees

new surface, possibly of porphyry setts and pre-cast slabs or stones to reclaimed road surface

new surface, possibly of porphyry setts and pre-cast slabs or stones to reclaimed road surface

green oak benches

new green roof to cafe

lighting to arch

fountain by artist

‘moon’ clock

refer to pp77-83 for cost analysis by bucknall austin
redcross way

illustrative project 3

The Cathedral School of St Saviour and St Mary Overie, St Joseph’s School, Redcross Garden and Little Dorrit Park cluster around Redcross Way and provide a local ‘place of exchange’ for parents and children.

We are proposing to strengthen the connection between the Cathedral school and Redcross Gardens and to intensify this place of exchange in several ways. The road between the garden and the school is to become pedestrianised and landscaped. Ornamental fruit trees will be planted on the reclaimed road surface and also within the school grounds. Benches will enable parents to sit among the trees as they wait for their children to come out of school, and workers and residents to enjoy the new green space on sunny days. A shared surface on Redcross Way to the north and south of the landscaped area will improve pedestrian access to the school.

We also suggest a change to the traffic management of the section of Redcross Way between the school and the junction with Union Street, from one-way northbound to two-way, which is how it is currently being used (illegally) in any case. We also aim to provide a junction table at this junction to reinforce the already strong north/south pedestrian route across Redcross Way.

For more detailed traffic/highway proposals see pp71-76.
new ornamental fruit trees

road surface pedestrianised and landscaped

shared surface to the north and south of landscaped area

Redcross gardens

Cathedral school

Redcross way

Refer to pp77-83 for cost analysis by Bucknall Austin
tate modern playground

illustrative project 4

Tate Modern presents a rare opportunity to create a significant new public space within the framework. It could also be the kind of place that London has not seen before, a place of exchange that weaves together something innocent and everyday with something more profound.

The Herzog and de Meuron structuring of the Tate imagined two sections that define the Turbine Hall. The character of the environment either side of the Turbine Hall will become increasingly different. To the north the landscape is expansive, with reflections of the sky, mud and river and is occupied by the movement of thousands of people. The new developments to the south will create a dramatic change in scale and character. This southern space is shared between all of the new developments. It receives a lot of sunlight and is shared by the new businesses, residents, students and shops; it is more like an external room. The proposal to increase the difference either side of the Turbine Hall, and embed Tate Modern and the new developments into the forest, would serve to reinforce the primary structure and would allow the Turbine Hall to be discovered as a ‘clearing’ in the forest.

In order to maximise the extent of the new public space and embed it as much as possible, we have discussed a number of measures that maximise the efficiency of the highway space. By using Hopton Street as the only access to the existing residences and Bankside 4, we can reduce the vehicles moving through Sumner Street while maintaining taxi access through this area on a shared surface. We can close a short section of Sumner Street to all vehicles, except for the bus and access only to LSE. Opening up Sumner Street to one-way movement eastwards would reduce the vehicles exiting along Great Guilford Street and enable this to become a shared surface. The area created would comfortably accommodate a playground the size of the Diana Memorial playground in Hyde Park, allowing for the possible new Design Museum.

The Playground is characterised by three things, disfigured Scots Pines establishing a visual field within which are placed copies of the Turbine Hall commissions and a series of diagonal pathways. The commissions have engaged adults and children alike and each forms an extraordinary memory of how the public reacted to it. The playground takes this desire to explore the pieces further and unlike many gallery installations, allows you to touch, climb, and crawl through. The ground is proposed as clinker brick and crushed granite. The trees would need to be procured over 3 to 5 years. It is most likely that they would be sourced from the Black Forest or west of Bordeaux (Napoleon’s reclaimed salt marshes grown in sea-dredged sand) in order to find specimens that are multi-stemmed or more twisted. These would be planted at approx 13m in height (40 ft) and 8-10m centres. The clear stems and high canopies allow for an open aspect but some shelter from the sun, creating dappled light.

For more detailed traffic/highway proposals see pp71-76.
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multi-stemmed scots pines

clinder brick and crushed granite ground

refer to pp77-83 for cost analysis by bucknall austin
The viaduct that extends between Borough Market (Southwark Street) and Southwark Underground Station (Blackfriars Road) has contributed to the segregation of the urban interior at Bankside from the active river edge. This section of arches, which totals approximately 250,000 sq ft, is mostly closed off from the public, occupied by car parking and storage, both of which are likely to be placed under increasing economic pressure to survive as the congestion charging extends. This viaduct now provides the opportunity to connect the urban interior into the broader area, in the way that the Westway has come to support the knitting together of the area around Ladbroke Grove. This type of 'knitting together' goes much further than providing improved pedestrian access through previously closed or poor quality areas, more importantly, it supports the intense occupation of them.

The small scale, low rent floor space, available in the viaducts can accommodate a multitude of diverse businesses. In the last few years, the arches in Southwark and Lambeth have been in demand, lending themselves ideally to different types of businesses, including independent artists' showrooms, architecture studios and design-conscious restaurants and bars. The Union Gallery occupies two arches which are accessed off Ewer Street, and the recent planning permission for development on the adjacent sites along Union Street, includes the provision of café, restaurant and retail space within the viaduct. These initiatives demonstrate the way that the urban interior can provide an important counterpoint to the high-value, increasingly large floor-plate developments around its edges. The diversity of trade and making that these smaller independent businesses and organisations provides is extremely important to the long term urban experience in Bankside.

Cross River Partnership and Spacia – (the UK's largest provider of small and medium-sized business accommodation and property arm of Network Rail) have worked in partnership to restore derelict railway arches south of the river and convert them into modern premises. The Bankside area requires a strong strategic approach from these two partners to ensure that the development of the viaducts progresses in a way that supports the broader social and economic ambitions of the Bankside Urban Forest.
viaducts between great suffolk street and ever street
forest connections

This map shows how well the schemes link together visually. The locations in red are those that are in direct sight of the forest areas and those in orange are those that are within a single change of visual direction, in other words, the spaces that can be seen from the areas shown in red.

This highlights the good connections between the schemes, especially the local schemes to the south of the Tate. It means that people walking around the local area will start to connect the elements of the Forest visually, as it begins to create a network of active spaces for those walking around. It will also help to draw people between these spaces as they will be able to see the aspects of the Forest.
These maps show the natural wayfinding routes from each of the schemes to the rest of the site. The locations shown in dark red can be directly seen or reached from the site; those shown in orange within one visual change of direction; those in yellow, within 2 visual changes of direction, and so on.

What this shows is how well the schemes connect into the neighbouring streets and spaces. For instance, from the new entrance to the Tate, the routes which are shown are routes which, visually, lead most directly to this entrance, and therefore where wayfinding can be supported to make these routes even easier to navigate.

For the more local spaces, this shows how well the new forest spaces connect into the neighbouring residential and community spaces, highlighting where people are likely to access the spaces from, and where they might discover the new spaces.
the way forward

The Bankside Urban Forest framework sets out a strategy for the long term regeneration of the public realm through an evolving process, which needs to be endorsed and owned by the local community and committed stakeholders. The illustrative projects suggest how the intensification of the public realm might be achieved, the tools for doing this, highways considerations, budget costs and possible funding sources. The scale of the area and diversity of the committed stakeholders demands that the framework is taken forward by a representative group. This group will need the support of a ‘project champion’ whose role it will be to manage the overall framework on a weekly basis and, along with the group, to be responsible for coordinating the following actions:

To communicate, consult and promote the Bankside Urban Forest projects within the wider community and liaise with the Community Council.

To liaise with related regeneration bodies such as Design for London, the South Bank Employers’ Group, Elephant and Castle, More London BID district, Lambeth Council, City of London and Westminster City Council.

To maintain and update the project map.

To act as a liaison between interested parties, including the different project owners.

To liaise with developers and their design teams at an early stage to identify how individual developments can contribute to the public realm and to social improvements within the framework.

To target Section 106 funds anticipated from larger private developments scheduled for the area through the project bank (see below).

To oversee the implementation of the key public projects identified within the framework.

To initiate and run forest events, the Friends of the Forest and the annual Forest Festival.

To commission feasibility testing, detailed briefs and run competitions for the design and implementation of Forest projects.

To develop and facilitate the area’s public art commissioning and community outreach strategy in consultation with Tate Modern.

To be successful, the Bankside Urban Forest needs to be owned by the Community. Following initiation by Better Bankside, it will be necessary for the community to be involved in finalising the strategy and for it to be endorsed by the Borough and Bankside Community Council.

It is unlikely that the Bankside Urban Forest will capture large scale mainstream regeneration funding. To ensure that the strategic vision is achieved, and sufficient resources are identified, requires a more complex approach involving Better Bankside’s own resources, Transport for London’s annual spending programme, S106 contributions and monies from Southwark’s Capital Programme (see cost analysis pp77-80).

To help drive the implementation of the strategy, Better Bankside should also consider resources to support the community’s capacity to help deliver the programme.

The Beginning of the Bankside Urban Forest:

Public Exhibition (Friends of the Forest scheme launched).

Presentation of the Bankside Urban Forest to the Community Council.

Public Launch of the Draft Framework (Forest Charter announced at Tate launch).

Bankside Urban Forest Framework completed following public feedback.

Forest charter agreed.

Symposium on the Bankside Urban Forest to be held at Tate Modern - summer 2007.

Commission feasibility testing, detailed briefs for initial projects.

Commence project funding applications for financial year 2008 spend.

Events in the forest (we suggest initial Tate-sponsored events in the future Tate playground so as to begin to inhabit that space).
We like the viaducts. People think they make the area unsafe, but I don’t think so. They’re nice and familiar. Some of them have been converted into restaurants and nightclubs and many of us go to these. It’s nice to have something besides housing and offices around here.
supporting information
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# Projects Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Owner</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>Falcon Piazza and Hopton Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Landscaping to Falcon Piazza and Hopton Street</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>Falcon Point Riverside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Landscaping to open space in front of Falcon Point</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS1</td>
<td>Holland Street Development</td>
<td>Native Land</td>
<td>New residential towers-surrounding public space to implement Forest strategy.</td>
<td>In discussion with Native Land</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS2</td>
<td>Holland Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing tower roof terrace to incorporate Forest Strategy.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP1</td>
<td>Tate 2 Open Space</td>
<td>Tate/LBS/BB</td>
<td>New Tate playground with Scots Pines and copies of Turbine Hall sculpture. Traffic changes to enable this as follows; change to Hopton St profile, widening pavement on east side; reworking Holland St traffic flow/street profile to incorporate changes to Sumner Street; Sumner St W-shared use street taxi and bicycle only; Sumner St E-shared use street accessible for deliveries and emergencies; Sumner St N-shared use street taxi and bicycle only.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Public open space/highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP2</td>
<td>Passage east of Tate</td>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>Improve existing path to the east as part of Tate 2 Extension.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>Tate Community Garden</td>
<td>BOST/TATE</td>
<td>Work in progress to finish the garden. Next stage is expansion of garden.</td>
<td>BOST is working on the garden with volunteers</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG1</td>
<td>Bear Gardens</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Improve lighting and quality of passage.</td>
<td>Part of LBS Lighting Strategy</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuB1</td>
<td>Sumner Buildings</td>
<td>Corp of London</td>
<td>Intensify open space in front of the estate, parallel to the street</td>
<td>Discuss with Corporation of London</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabod Ext1</td>
<td>Southwark Street</td>
<td>Peabody Trust</td>
<td>Peabody Trust aims to interpret / implement the national, London wide / local legislation and policy frameworks on open / green spaces.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS1</td>
<td>Park Street Garden</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Improve Park Street garden and passage</td>
<td>BOST to work with local residents</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS2</td>
<td>Park St Cycle Route</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Intensify tree planting and improve cycle access and signage along the road.</td>
<td>For further details on cycle strategy see pp?</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clink Street</td>
<td>Clink Street Tunnel Lighting</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Improvement to lighting levels and adding ‘creatively’ to the arch.</td>
<td>Awarded £30,000 LBS</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Cathedral Grounds</td>
<td>Montague Close</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Improve connection to the river</td>
<td>Awarded £40,500 part funding LBS</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoS1</td>
<td>Southwark Street</td>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>Improve street quality, and north south connections across Southwark Street</td>
<td>Travel Planning Group with local businesses</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Market</td>
<td>Stoney Street</td>
<td>LBS/BM</td>
<td>Pedestrianisation between Southwark Street and Park Street</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM2</td>
<td>Bedale St/Stoney St/Park St</td>
<td>LBS/BM</td>
<td>Introduction of ?? vehicle strategy from junction of Bedale St and Southwark St, via Winchester Walk back to Stoney St.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM3</td>
<td>Vinopolis</td>
<td>LBS/BM</td>
<td>Establishing public access and retail activity to viaducts and around small ?? court</td>
<td>High?</td>
<td>Public open space/retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM4</td>
<td>Borough Market Extension 1</td>
<td>LBS/BM</td>
<td>Establishing public access and extension of Borough Market to Redcross Way, viaducts and connection to Park St.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Public open space/retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Owner</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM5</td>
<td>Borough Market Extension 2</td>
<td>LBS/BM</td>
<td>Establishing public access and extension of Borough Market between Stoney St and Southwark St.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Public open space/retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough High Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS1</td>
<td>Borough High Street</td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>Improvements to street and footway quality across Borough High Street.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnham Place</td>
<td>Link with Southwark Street</td>
<td>Allies&amp;Morrison</td>
<td>Open link between Southwark and Lavington Streets, through A&amp;M and hotel.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewer Street</td>
<td>Link between Farnham Place and</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Guildford Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGS1</td>
<td>Great Guildford Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Reworking the street profile to accommodate extra car flows from closing Union Street junction.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFR1</td>
<td>Blackfriars Road</td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>Improve street and footway quality across Borough High Street.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG1</td>
<td>Christ Church Garden</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Improvements to the perimeter wall of the church grounds</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG2</td>
<td>Colombo Street</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Close of the street, new landscaping</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG3</td>
<td>Paris Gardens</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>The corner of Paris Gardens; open up the path as part of the new development alongside the 'all weather path' and potential dog free area</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG4</td>
<td>Christ Church Garden</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Works to complete – woodland edge wildlife garden, new play equipment. Major works around edges, detail will depend on new surrounding developments. Woodland wildlife garden only cost £8,000.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG5</td>
<td>Crossing to Blackfriars Road.</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Re-siting of crossing to Blackfriars Road and improvements to pavement around Christ Church Gardens.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES1</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Improve lighting and resurface access route near Blackfriars adjacent to Rochester Estate. Planting to green walls and installation of new gate to assist in defining a threshold to the estate. Develop various hard works to improve Rotherham Walk.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancel Street</td>
<td>Chancel Street Tree Planting</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Tree planting to green the street.</td>
<td>Awarded £3,000 LBS</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia Street</td>
<td>Gambia Garden</td>
<td>LBS/BOST</td>
<td>Remove granite whales and replace with raised beds for community use. Max £5,000. BOST facilitates an active Steering Group.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolben Street</td>
<td>Dolben Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>As part of reworking the traffic flows Dolben Street could become shared use street. See GSS1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viaducts</td>
<td>Scoresby Street Viaducts</td>
<td>Cross River Partnership</td>
<td>Arches currently being refurbished for mixed use business/leisure/retail use with public access.</td>
<td>CRP initiative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Viaduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Owner</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi2</td>
<td>Grand Vitasse Industrial Estate</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>Long term aspiration to achieve change of use from car parking to mixed business/leisure/retail use with public access</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi3</td>
<td>Ewer Street Car Park</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>As V2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi4</td>
<td>America Street Viaducts</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>As V2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi5</td>
<td>Flat Iron Viaducts</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>As V2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi6</td>
<td>Precious Blood Viaducts</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>As V2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Suffolk Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS1</td>
<td>Great Suffolk Street north of Union Street</td>
<td>LBS/CRP</td>
<td>Intensification of planting and treatments to underside of viaduct arches</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS2</td>
<td>Great Suffolk Street south of Union Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Intensification of planting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS3</td>
<td>Great Suffolk Street Parade</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Intensification of planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Bone Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RXG1</td>
<td>Red Cross Bone Garden</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>To be developed when Thameslink works finished. BOST keen to keep (south)part as open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT1</td>
<td>Styles House Greening</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Green demolished area and adjacent garages. Define threshold to estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Low Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Row</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur1</td>
<td>Surrey Row</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Intensify open space in front of the estate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS1</td>
<td>Nelson Square Garden</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>More housing land improvements needed, replanting of some of the beds.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS2</td>
<td>Nelson Square SE corner</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Improve quality of the open space to link Nelson Square with Surrey Row</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS3</td>
<td>Nelson Square Corner</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Improvements to the open space needed; eg more seating</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoS1</td>
<td>Open space in front of Youth and Community Centre</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Intensification of planting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US1</td>
<td>Corner of Union Street and Blackfriars Road</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Planting to the Northwest corner of the estate adjacent to Blackfriars Road and Union Street</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2</td>
<td>Rowland Hill House</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Intensification of open space in front of the estate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US3</td>
<td>Viaduct arch</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Planting to underside of viaduct arch as a threshold into the forest</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US4</td>
<td>Union Street between 160 - 194</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Union Street is part of the conservation area. Intensify activities on the streets.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US5</td>
<td>Public space around new development</td>
<td>AZ Urban Studio/CRP</td>
<td>New residential units. The public open space will be part of the forest. The adjacent arch as forest project with Cross River Partnerships</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US6</td>
<td>Ewer Street</td>
<td>AZ Urban Studio</td>
<td>Improvements to the arches and public open space. Funded (£130,000) by s106 money from the Union Street Development</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Iron Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS1</td>
<td>New Square for Union Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Close the street on the south side of the square to link it with the local shops, provide temporary parking.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS2</td>
<td>Art Commission for New Square</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>A sculpture scheme as part of the improvements to public open space on Flat Iron Square.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Art commission</td>
<td>Low Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Owner</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT1</td>
<td>Styles House Greening</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Green demolished area and adjacent garages. Define threshold to estate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RXG1</td>
<td>Red Cross Bone Garden</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>To be developed when Thameslink works finished. BOST keen to keep (south)part as</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS2</td>
<td>Art Commission for New Square</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Sculpture scheme as part of the improvements to public open space on Flat Iron Square</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS1</td>
<td>New Square for Union Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Close the street on the south side of the square to link it with the local shops, provide</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US6</td>
<td>Ewer Street AZ Urban Studio</td>
<td>Improvements to the arches and public open space. Funded (£130,000) by s106 money from the</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US3</td>
<td>Viaduct arch</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Planting to underside of viaduct arch as a threshold into the forest</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS3</td>
<td>Corner of Union Street and Union Street</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Improvements to the open space needed; eg more seating £1,000 funding secured</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS2</td>
<td>Nelson Square SE corner</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Improve quality of the open space to link Nelson Square with Surrey Row</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS1</td>
<td>Great Suffolk Street north of Great Suffolk Street</td>
<td>LBS/CRP</td>
<td>Intensification of planting and treatments to underside of viaduct arches</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS2</td>
<td>Flat Iron Viaducts</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>Medium Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi5</td>
<td>America Street Viaducts</td>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>Medium Viaducts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG1</td>
<td>Copperfield Gardens</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Preserve integrity and size of garden alongside developments.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH1</td>
<td>Pattison Gardens</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Raised beds were created and planted up with a selection of drought - tolerant plants. Experimental project for the area. BOST aims to do similar projects in the area.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP1</td>
<td>Mint Street Park</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Rethink cut throughs and remove hammerheads to facilitate bicycles and pushchairs. Greening and tree planting</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP2</td>
<td>New Community Centre ‘The Mint’</td>
<td>BOST/LBS/Land Sec</td>
<td>Complete rebuild of the building for a new community centre, including new access and changes to external spaces</td>
<td>High (£3million)</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP3</td>
<td>Marshalsea Road and Southwark Bridge Street</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Extend the presence of the park on to the street by opening up the perimeter wall.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC61</td>
<td>Red Cross Garden</td>
<td>LBS/BOST</td>
<td>Work to complete with BOST from HLF works: planting, interpretation boards, publicity leaflet. Continue gardening clubs for children and adults and guided tours.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC62</td>
<td>Red Cross Way</td>
<td>LBS/BOST/Cathedral School</td>
<td>Intensify planting in the School front garden and make the street in front of the school pedestrian use only.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG1</td>
<td>Marlborough Gardens</td>
<td>LBS/BOST</td>
<td>Works to be carried out: Trees, further perimeter greening, seats, (c.£15,000), repairs to wall adjoining St Joseph’s School and access gate, small building to be discussed staffed sports activities.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP1</td>
<td>Peace Garden</td>
<td>LBS/BOST</td>
<td>Peace garden access and improvements to south end of Little Dorrit Court.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP2</td>
<td>Babington House</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>BOST want to work on the landscaping around the house. Cost approx £15,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP3</td>
<td>Little Dorrit Court</td>
<td>LBS/BOST</td>
<td>Intensify the entrance to the park from Borough High Street</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP4</td>
<td>Little Dorrit Fencing</td>
<td>LBS/BOST</td>
<td>Widening the path - replace existing fencing , include display cases for local school .</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s Garden</td>
<td>St George’s Garden</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Tidy up gravestone corner, open northern access, add more seating. Major works to improve safety and increase usage.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGG2</td>
<td>Closing Tabard Street between Borough High Street and Long Lane.</td>
<td>LBS/TfL</td>
<td>St George’s Gardens are disconnected from St Georges Church by Tabard Street. By closing of this street we can relink both parts and make a new public open space.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabod Est2</td>
<td>Marshalsea Road</td>
<td>Peabody Trust</td>
<td>Peabody Trust aims to interpret / implement the national, London wide / local legislation and policy frameworks on open / green spaces.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lant Street</td>
<td>Lant Street Community and School Garden</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Turning a neglected site into play area with sensory garden.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lant2</td>
<td>Lant House planting and greening</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Planting areas to green the space and entrance area</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lant 3</td>
<td>Planting to Redman House grounds</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Consult with residents, agree plan, carry out planting.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open space for residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Gardens</td>
<td>HG1</td>
<td>Network of open spaces between social housing.</td>
<td>LBS/Peabody/Corporation of London/BOST/others</td>
<td>Bring together landowners and residents and develop projects to enhance these spaces. Cost approx £200,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Garden</td>
<td>DG1</td>
<td>Diversity Garden</td>
<td>BOST/LBS</td>
<td>Development brief has garden as main focus for housing. Major improvements to the garden in need after housing is built, including encompassing facilities for new residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peabod Est3</td>
<td>Gateway, Mathieson Court</td>
<td>Peabody Trust</td>
<td>To be discussed when proposals for buildings are put forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Road</td>
<td>BR1</td>
<td>Borough Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible open space to improve the crossing under the viaduct. Discuss with LBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London South Bank University</td>
<td>LSBU1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LBSU</td>
<td>LSBU are preparing the next stage of the estates strategy which will inform their public realm strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Street</td>
<td>GS1</td>
<td>Gladstone St and ColnbrookSt paving improvements</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Continue with works funded through last years by CSS, where money has been spent removing concrete and asphalt and reinstating with reclaimed stone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Road</td>
<td>HR1</td>
<td>Harper Road and Swan Street Park</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Clean up space to increase use with new planting, repair/replacement of fencing and path to link it to Newington Gardens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Estate</td>
<td>RoEst1</td>
<td>Rockingham Estate Street Lighting</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Enhance street lighting to Rockingham Estate. Awarded £30,000 for lighting (subject to survey) and £5,000 for noticeboard LBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Gardens</td>
<td>NG1</td>
<td>Newington Gardens</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Playground improvements and resurfacing of ball court. Awarded £30,000 LBS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickens Square</td>
<td>DS1</td>
<td>Dickens Square and Butterfly Walk</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Develop Peace Garden in association with REPA and the Mosque.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS2</td>
<td>Rockingham Estate Play Association</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Surface improvements and recycling, composting for kitchens and resurfacing of play area paths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
projects map
consultation

We consulted a wide cross section of local residents and organisations. We sent out 2500 of postcards inviting views of the area and suggestions for the development of the forest. These were distributed through local bodies such as Bankside Open Spaces Trust, The Corporation Of London, Peabody Estates LBS, Community Councils Walkabouts and Living Streets meetings and the BOST and Frost Fair Christmas events.

We employed the photographer Philipp Ebeling as part of our consultation strategy. He was shown around by local residents so that he could view the area from their perspective. His images, sometimes accompanied by quotations from local people, illustrate this report.

We went on a walkabout of the area organised by Tim Cutts, Principal Planning Policy Officer at LBS, as part of the supplementary planning document for the area SPG, on 01.12.06. Representatives from a variety of local resident and interest groups, including BOST attended, along with council officers.

The three walks which were undertaken were by three groups are as follows:
• Park Street – Redcross Way – Mint street Park
• Sumner street – Great Suffolk Street – Southwark Bridge Road
• Hatfields – Blackfriars Road – Nelson Sq Gardens – Rushworth Street – Webber Street

Each group discussed aspects of the route which they liked and where improvements could be made. Findings were collected and represented on large maps of the area.

On 28.11.06 we attended a presentation by Living Streets and Transport for London of a Community Street Audit for Borough High Street. Local residents were invited to respond.

We presented the Forest to the Borough and Bankside Community Council on 10.01.07 where again local residents were invited to respond.

BOST and the Blackfriars Over 50s organised a Christmas event in Redcross Gardens on 08.12.06. This gave us the opportunity to discuss the Forest with parents, children and teachers from the local schools and older people of long standing in the local community. We installed an exhibition of photographs of the area taken by Philipp Ebeling, accompanied by quotes from local people. The photographs helped to spark a lively debate.

Several themes emerged from this discussion. Something very positive was the feeling that this is still a very safe area for children as well as adults, especially the elderly and that there is still a “very lovely sense of community”. “You wouldn’t believe that there could be such diversity in such a small place. And it still feels like a safe place to walk around.” What was of greatest concern to those with children was the lack of green spaces, particularly play spaces. “This area needs more parks. I would also appreciate more sports facilities, especially for younger children. In general, this area needs more greening.”
John Melmoe of Willerby’s Landscapes designed a Mobile Forest which we took to the Frost Fair on Bankside on 15.12.06 to publicise the Forest.

Perhaps most significantly of all, our interviewer Shibani Bose conducted 26 extended interviews with local residents, councillors and committed individuals, identified through, among others, the London Borough of Southwark, BOST, and local councillors. This process has helped us to identify recurring themes and has been summarised on pp 19-20.

A series of public exhibitions were held over the period of a month in April 2007 at four venues: the John Harvard Library on Borough High Street, the Jerwood Space on Union Street, the London College of Communication at the Elephant and Castle and Tate Modern on Bankside. These venues allowed as many people as possible to see the approach and proposals, and encouraged their comments and ideas in order to be feed them into the framework. At the end of this period we again presented the Forest at the Borough and Bankside Community Council on 16.04.07 and held a lively discussion with residents afterwards.

This form of consultation has been integral to our concept for transforming the area: we have aimed to engage people as co-producers, facilitating multiple authors of the public realm. The conversations have been an iterative process, drawing out the meaning and interest that places hold for different people, and revealing the character which form the key to our project ideas. They have not been an exercise in the legitimation of the idea, but a way to explore the full possibility of it.
meetings

We also engaged with extensive consultation with key stakeholders and statutory authorities who are identified in the meetings schedule on these pages.

Bankside Open Spaces Trust straddles residents and stakeholders. The organisation works promotes inclusive action and carries out consultation to ensure that local needs are met for each green space in the area. It works in partnership with local people, Southwark Council, businesses, other partners and funders through park steering groups to facilitate local improvements to parks and open spaces. A large number of the mapped project have been initiated by BOST. In addition to this they have played a key role in helping to identify potential projects.

Bankside Residents’ Forum

We have met Southwark Borough Council Officers several times both to discuss the development of the Forest Framework and, later, how best to incorporate the Framework into the SPD. We also carried out detailed consultations with Southwark Transport Officers when developing our scoped up projects.

Transport for London was also consulted, particularly on the traffic management elements of our projects where they take place on TFL land.

Native Land

We presented the forest idea to Richard Lee, director of the Jerwood Space and received some searching questioning which helped us to focus both images and text.

Cathedrals and Ward Councillors were interviewed at length by Shibani Bose (whose essay is on pp 23-4) for their views and knowledge of the area.

We gave a presentation of the forest idea to the Better Bankside Environment Group followed by a discussion of the concept.

Simon Hughes MP.

John Bluett, Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor, walked around the area of the proposed projects with us. He commented that: “from my point of view all your proposals will certainly impact on the Bankside area, giving people a sense of well being and making the area brighter. There should also be a less fear of crime factor.”

The forest idea was presented to and discussed with Simone Crofton, chief executive of Borough Market.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Company/group</th>
<th>Attended by WWM and</th>
<th>Purpose of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.12.06</td>
<td>Ward Councillors</td>
<td>Adele Morris, David Noakes</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.12.06</td>
<td>Better Bankside BID Team</td>
<td>Peter Williams, Alistair Huggett, Donald Hyslop</td>
<td>Core client progress meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.12.06</td>
<td>SOST</td>
<td>Helen Firminger, schoolchildren and parents, Cathedral school head</td>
<td>BOST Christmas Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12.06</td>
<td>SOST</td>
<td>Helen Firminger</td>
<td>Project discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12.06</td>
<td>PBA</td>
<td>David Dewar</td>
<td>Road Layouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12.06</td>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>Donald Hyslop</td>
<td>Progress meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.01.07</td>
<td>Mayor of London’s Advisor for Urban Heat Islands</td>
<td>Alex Nickson</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.01.07</td>
<td>Architecture Foundation</td>
<td>Rowan Moore</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.01.07</td>
<td>Cross River Partnership</td>
<td>Savas Sivetidis</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01.07</td>
<td>Borough and Bankside Community Council</td>
<td>Cathedrals and Chaucer Ward Clrs</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.01.07</td>
<td>MP for Southwark</td>
<td>Simon Hughes MP</td>
<td>Project discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.01.07</td>
<td>Cathedral School</td>
<td>Sylvia Morris Head Teacher</td>
<td>Redcross project discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.01.07</td>
<td>Transport for London,PBA,SBC</td>
<td>Stephen Miles, Lee Campbell (for Camilla Ween), David Dewar, Tim Cutts, Nabil Basri</td>
<td>Coordination with Transport for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.01.07</td>
<td>Better Bankside BID Team</td>
<td>Peter Williams BB, Alistair Huggett SBC, Donald Hyslop Tate</td>
<td>Core client progress meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.01.07</td>
<td>Borough Market</td>
<td>Simone Crofton, Chief Executive</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.01.07</td>
<td>Southwark Police</td>
<td>John Bluett Crime Prevention Design Advisor</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.01.07</td>
<td>Client Body</td>
<td>Nick Serota, Rowan Moore, Stephen Miles, Savas Sivetidis, Peter Williams, Donald Hyslop</td>
<td>High level client meeting: Presentation of Forest Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.02.07</td>
<td>Core Client Body</td>
<td>Peter Williams, Alistair Huggett</td>
<td>Core client progress meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.02.07</td>
<td>Southwark Police</td>
<td>John Bluett</td>
<td>Update meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.02.07</td>
<td>George Nicholson</td>
<td>Resident also involved with Borough Market</td>
<td>Introductory meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02.07</td>
<td>Borough and Bankside Community Council</td>
<td>Cathedrals and Chaucer Ward Clrs</td>
<td>Section 106 workshop by LBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also contacted: Denise Barnes, Corporation of London, Mathew Firth Peabody Trust and local residents.
wayfinding

Natural Wayfinding

ISP have been looking at how pedestrians currently move around the Bankside area and how the changes to the street layout with the building work around Tate Modern as well as the proposed Forest elements are likely to affect pedestrian movements and routes through Bankside.

To do this, they have collated existing information from the work that ISP has been undertaking with Transport for London on and around Borough High Street, as well as scoping studies undertaken as part of this work. We have further modelled the pedestrian networks to show how the street network supports pedestrian routes.

Natural wayfinding is more than just signage. It is how the layout of the streets and spaces affect what people see when exploring the street network, as well as the buildings and spaces that they see during their journey and that attract them along specific routes.

Natural wayfinding can be modelled to show how the visual complexity of routes from a given origin such as a train station, or to a key destination such as a park, school or gallery.

To show how the natural wayfinding links to the actual routes that people take, an example of London Bridge Station is shown alongside. The first map shows the actual paths that people took from the station, from a random selection of pedestrians who were followed from the station entrance and shows the distribution into the neighbouring street.
The second map shows the natural wayfinding from the station entrance with the locations shown in red directly in view, those in orange visible with a single change of direction, yellow within two changes, through to spaces in blue which are directly visible within six or more changes of direction.

As can be seen, there is a very good relationship between the routes that people take and the accessibility of the pavements from the station.
Visibility analysis is a measure of how much space pedestrians see as they move around at ground level. In dense urban areas, where there are many possible origins and destinations for pedestrians, there are a huge number of small pedestrian journeys between different locations. However, pedestrians are highly sensitive to the complexity of routes and they tend to choose the simplest path. This means that overall, movement flows tend to become concentrated on those streets that can offer the simplest visual links through the street grid.

For Bankside, the visual field open to pedestrians as they move around the street network has been measured using a computer programme. This calculates the visual field available to pedestrians for wayfinding at every step of any possible journey within the network, creating an overall measure of visibility of pedestrian space for the entire centre. A map of visibility in the current site is shown above. The visibility of the individual pavements is shown as a spectrum, where the areas in red have the longest views and the areas shown in dark blue are the most secluded.
This map shows the visibility of the Bankside area with the proposed forest projects and the new building schemes that are currently planned or in progress. It uses the same spectral range as the current site.

As can be seen, there are substantial changes to the visibility of the street network in the area south of the Tate, with large increases in the visibility of the spaces and routes for pedestrians – in part due to the large public space.
Union Street / Southwark Bridge Road

1. Union Street has been temporarily closed to general traffic for some time between the junctions of Southwark Bridge Road and Great Guildford Street. It is proposed to retain this road closure and provide a pedestrian / cycle only area in order to improve pedestrian / cycle amenity and connectivity.

2. A shared surface treatment is proposed across the junction of Union Street / Southwark Bridge Road to improve pedestrian / cycle connectivity.

3. It is proposed to close the southern part of Flat Iron Square to general traffic to improve the cycle route along Union Street and public realm.

4. The closure of Union Street to general traffic between Southwark Bridge Road and Great Guildford Street will have traffic management implications. It is proposed to retain Great Guildford Street operating two-way between American Street and Southwark Bridge Road. America Street is proposed to operate one-way westbound and Great Guildford Street, north of America Street, is proposed to operate one-way southbound.
1. Reallocation of the road between the Redcross Gardens and St Saviour and St Mary Overie Primary School to be landscaped to connect the two areas.

2. Provision of shared surface on Redcross Way to the north and south of the landscaped area to improve pedestrian access to the school.

3. Change the traffic management of the section of Redcross Way between the school and the junction of Redcross Way/Union Street from one-way to two-way.

4. Provision of a junction table at the junction of Redcross Way/Union Street to reinforce the already strong north/south pedestrian route along Redcross Way.
tate modern playground

illustrative project 4 – existing traffic management
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Illustrative project 4 – proposed traffic management
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illustrative project 4 – overall scheme

**Tate Modern**

- reallocate road space for pedestrians
- retain existing access for service vehicles
- Junction table at Southwark Street / Hopton Street to improve pedestrian connectivity
- Part of NCN Route 4 – lightly trafficked road with sufficient space for vehicles to pass cyclists.

**Holland Street**

- Part of NCN Route 4: shared surface to improve pedestrian / cycle realm and encourage reduced vehicular speeds (in line with Southwark 20mph scheme)
- Restrict access to southern part of Holland Street (immediately to north of taxi rank) to taxis, emergency vehicles, cycles only
- Bankside 4 to access via Hopton Street in order to reduce vehicular activity in the vicinity of Tate Modern

**Summer Street**

- Summer Street (between Southwark Street and Holland Street) is an advisory cycle route. Proposed shared surface to improve pedestrian / cycle realm and encourage reduced vehicular speeds (in line with Southwark 20mph scheme)
- Access / egress at Southwark Street / Summer Street restricted to taxis, emergency vehicles and cycles only
- Cycle advance area proposed at junction of Southwark Street / Summer Street as part of the TfL proposals for Southwark Street

**Great Guildford Street**

- Shared surface between Southwark Street and Summer Street to improve public realm whilst maintaining necessary vehicular access. Great Guildford Street is an advisory cycle route and therefore shared surface, pedestrian / cycle only access and entry treatment should improve cycle environment

**Sumner Street**

- Proposed to make Sumner Street between Holland Street and Park Street a restricted street (bus only with a bus gate) in order to improve pedestrian connectivity and public realm in the vicinity of the Tate Modern whilst maintaining necessary vehicular access.
- In order to restrict vehicular movement around the Tate, it is proposed to reintstate vehicular access at the junction of Summer Street / Great Guildford Street and allow one way movement eastbound.

**Park Street**

- Park Street currently operates as a shared street despite it being a conventional road with footways – proposed to make it shared surface to reinforce existing user behaviour
- It is proposed to retain the existing traffic management on Park Street and the existing contra-flow cycle lane.
Cycle Routes Improvements

1. The National Cycle Route will not be affected by the proposed changes to traffic management around the Tate Modern.

2. The proposed London Borough of Southwark 20mph scheme for the area will improve conditions for cyclists.

3. This scheme will retain the contraflow lane on the one-way section of Park Street.

4. Cyclists will be provided two-way access through all road restrictions to ensure a continuous and legible cycle route.

5. Unfamiliar users may find this section of National Cycle Route confusing to navigate due to the convoluted nature of the road network. This will be addressed with improved signage to direct cyclists to destinations at places along the route.
cost analysis

1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to consider potential sources of funding which could be available to assist in the delivery of the Urban Forest Strategy which is the key outcome of the design work completed by Witherford Watson Mann Architects.

In identifying potential sources of funding, this report considers the socio-economic context of the Business Improvement District (BID), the wider funding environment and possible sources of funding. In addition, it makes key recommendations to the client group about the ways to engage with a wider audience in a way which maximises the potential to secure funding that could be available.

Attached to this report is a schedule of illustrative projects which look in more detail at the cost, programme and risks relevant to the early implementation of parts of the Urban Forest.

2.0 The Better Bankside area in the wider context

The geographic area of coverage of the Better Bankside BID is from Blackfriars Station Railway Viaduct in the West, to Southwark Street (both sides of the road) in the South and through to Borough High Street in the East (both sides.) It is bounded by the River Thames to the North. The BID boundary does not follow other administrative boundaries in the area. The following plan shows the broad area of the BID (lined in red) in the context of deprivation in Southwark. The darker areas are the most deprived parts of the Borough.

What this map shows is that in terms of deprivation, the Better Bankside area is not an area which shows the greatest need in the Borough. The hot spots of deprivation are to a greater extent found within the central band of the Borough and this is consistent with some of the major regeneration projects which the London Borough of Southwark is currently undertaking. These include Bellenden, Peckham, the Aylesbury Estate and Elephant and Castle.

Many of the potential funding sources will be driven by the regeneration needs of local communities. In this context, it could be argued that the community needs of some of the other areas of Southwark are greater than the Bankside area. These are the areas where a variety of regeneration and renewal funding has been directed including the Single Regeneration Budget, Neighbourhood Renewal Funding and New Deal for Communities Funding.

The London Development Agency has its single pot (or single programme budget) funding. This pot, which is applicable to London as a whole, is focussed on job creation, business start-ups, brownfield land reclamation and learning opportunities. We consider it unlikely that this is a major source of funding for the Urban Forest, unless it was tied to a comprehensive regeneration scheme in the Bankside area which required significant public intervention.

The reality is that the major sources of regeneration funding are likely to be directed elsewhere in Southwark.

To develop a strategy which provides the opportunity to secure funding on a scale which reflects both the vision and the strategic nature of the Urban Forest approach, requires a mixture of smaller and more focussed funding sources.

From our discussions with a number of public agencies, regeneration partnerships and environmental practitioners in the area, we would recommend that in developing a strategy for resourcing and implementation...
of the proposals, that Better Bankside concentrates its efforts on those opportunities which we set out below.

3.0 Better Bankside Budget

“Environment and Greening” is one of seven service centres (including core costs) which the Better Bankside Company is concentrating on, in the use of its business levy and other partnership funding. Forecast projections by the Company indicate that some £115,000 may be available in future years to implement environmental works. It is essential that Better Bankside provides some resources on an annual basis to complement other funding which is drawn into the overall funding strategy. We would encourage the current allocated resource to operate as a minimum over the medium term.

4.0 London Borough of Southwark Capital Programme

The Borough’s Capital Programme is not able to meet the capital requirement aspirations of its individual service departments. It is therefore important that expectations that this funding route are managed.

Depending on the annual capital programme sum, bids are prioritised into three categories:

- unavoidable schemes due to existing contractual and statutory obligations;
- schemes which deliver existing policy commitments; and
- schemes that fulfil Council priorities but require a policy decision.

The Urban Forest project is likely to require a Council policy decision to support it and it is therefore premature at this stage to consider the prospect for the strategy appearing in the programme. Timescales will need to lead into final budget decisions prior to the start of the financial year.

We would encourage Better Bankside to engage with the Council over the summer of 2007 with a view to promote projects in the budget planning cycle during Autumn 2007 for inclusion in the financial year 2008/2009. There may be some limited opportunities for capital support in the coming financial year (2007/2008), through under spend or deferral of other capital projects.

We also see the need for further engagement with individual Council departments with responsibility for parks and open space, regeneration, transport, estates, leisure and tourism to discuss whether specific projects could receive match funding support through the programme.

5.0 The Borough and Bankside Community Council.

The London Borough of Southwark provides a framework and resources for local people to determine priorities and investment in their local areas through eight designated Community Councils across the Borough. Made up of local people and elected councillors, the councils have a scrutiny and decision making role in a number of areas of local government including land use planning, leisure, cultural services and crime and disorder. The local community council relevant to the Better Bankside area is the Borough and Bankside Community Council.

Each of the Community Councils is invited on an annual basis to present bids for grant funding under an initiative titled “Cleaner Greener Safer”. This initiative is coordinated by the London Borough of Southwark and the funds are available to carry out environmental and community safety improvements within the local area. Any local person or community organisation can apply for funding with decisions made by the Community Council.

The resources available year on year will vary, but for information, the 20 local projects which were approved by the Borough and Bankside Community Council in 2006 totalled £297,300 in total. This is not a resource which is going to deliver significant parts of the Urban Forest in its own right, but it is completely relevant to the philosophy behind the Forest concept where community ownership and buy-in through a variety of different partners, will contribute to the overall approach. It is very much the responsibility of the Community Council to decide how the Cleaner Greener Safer money is spent.

We see no reason why Better Bankside should not be considered as a community group (representing the business community) and should seek to promote some of the individual projects which have been and will be developed within the Urban Forest Concept as potential annual bids for Cleaner Greener Safer funding.

We will refer to the method by which this may be achieved in more detail later in this report.

6.0 Section 106 Contributions

There is potential for ensuring that private sector investment, through Planning Obligations, finances major elements of the Urban Forest.

Planning obligations (or section 106 agreements) are an effective way of securing measures to overcome the negative impacts of generally acceptable development proposals on the environment, economy and community. Agreements are reached, prior to the formal grant of planning permission for the developer to invest in a range of environmental, transport and community facilities which reflect the needs that arise from the development off site.

The Bankside area has potential to lever in significant S106 contributions when the development potential of the area is considered. Bankside has been an area of dynamic change over the last ten years. The catalyst of the Tate and growth of commercial development south of the river generally, has led to the area becoming a major commercial centre - particularly north of Southwark Street. Major new space such as Bankside 1,2,3 will increase the commercial footfall in the area and act as a driver for further new development. Major planned new developments such as 80 Park Street and the Great Suffolk Industrial Estate (Bear Lane) are examples of a number of projects already in the pipeline. There are also a number of outdated office units on the south side of Southwark Street which are also potential areas of change.

The development of the Urban Forest Strategy is timely, as the London Borough of Southwark is reviewing its strategy for the management of Section 106 contributions.

The proposed approach is linked strongly to the Community Councils referred to previously. Local priorities for each of the community council areas have been agreed and it is the current intention - subject to consultation - to concentrate the allocation of some of the monies secured through obligations on these priorities. Obligations for affordable housing, transport upgrade improvements, health, leisure, play and education provision are determined separately.
The top five priorities identified by the Borough and Bankside Community Council are set out below. However this is not an exclusive list and other priorities may be appropriate for certain applications.

- increasing the quality and quantity of open spaces;
- improving public transport, cycling and walking facilities;
- increasing access to employment through training and other schemes;
- reducing crime and improving community safety; and
- encouraging provision of waste reduction and recycling facilities.

The intention is that the London Borough of Southwark will consult with the Community Council to agree a list of Community Projects which meet the above objectives (a project bank) which will be the beneficiary of S106 funds. Clearly, the first objective of increasing the quality and quantity of open spaces is one where there is significant synergy with the Urban Forest concept.

It must be remembered that it is the Community Council which is the forum which identifies the priorities for the project bank. It is therefore essential that the Urban Forest Strategy and its component parts is understood and endorsed by the local community and the Community Council. We see local ownership of the strategy wider than just Better Bankside as essential.

7.0 Transport for London (TFL) - Local Transport Programme

Many of the initiatives identified as part of the Urban Forest are proposed on the public highway. TFL have a five-year programme of funding across London to support local transport improvements on London roads which are not its direct responsibility. Annual spending is agreed for a local implementation plan and for the projects agreed for 2007/2008, the London Borough of Southwark is receiving £5,341m.

There are a number of objectives within this programme which we consider to highly relevant to the objectives of the Urban Forest. These are:

- sustainability;
- walking (this budget has supported improvements to the arches south of Southwark Street via the Cross River Partnership);
- cycling;
- local area accessibility; and
- area based regeneration schemes.

We understand that annual funding discussions take place annually from July with decisions made in November. Funding submissions will be lead by the London Borough of Southwark, so early engagement in with transport managers will be necessary. We also understand that the Cross River Partnership has the potential to secure some of this money for delivery.

8.0 Transport for London - Area Based Schemes

Area Based Schemes is a TFL investment programme which seeks to bring a significant change to people’s quality of life and their travelling patterns. It aims to reduce the use of cars by improving conditions for walking and cycling, and making public transport more accessible. The programme recognises that streets act not only as transport corridors but also as places where people meet, shop and socialise. Again, we see this funding stream as relevant to the Urban Forest Approach.

The programme is competitive in nature and TFL determines applications which should be made in June each year.

9.0 Other Opportunities

The Urban Forest approach is not about one single organisation implementing the strategy. Its success will be achieved through collaboration, partnership and individual buy-in within the community to implement ideas within the overall strategic framework.

Better Bankside should look to work with the community to identify ways in which they can help contribute to delivery. Community involvement in delivery will open up potential other funding routes from organisations and trusts which are focussed on supporting community-led environmental projects. It is premature to identify which of funding routes will be relevant to the Urban Forest approach, but we include as an appendix to this report a number of potential grant which could be accessed.

10 Conclusion

It is our view that the Urban Forest is not a project which is going to capture large scale mainstream regeneration funding. To ensure the strategic vision is achieved, and sufficient resources are identified, requires a more complex approach involving the Better Bankside’s own resources, Transport for London annual spending programmes, S106 contributions and possibly some monies for Southwark’s Capital Programme.
To be successful, this scheme needs to be owned by the Community. Following initiation by Better Bankside, it will be necessary for the community to be involved in finalising the strategy and for it to be endorsed by the Borough and Bankside Community Council. In particular, it should aim to become a strategy which underpins the priorities for S106 funding and Cleaner, Greener, Safer funding projects. A key theme is enhancing the urban and rural environment, to make public places safer, and better designed and maintained. It also aims to enable communities to tackle local environmental problems.

Esmee Fairbairn Foundation
Up to £29m per annum, £5.9m ring fenced for Environment projects. The aim is to improve the quality of life for people and communities, both now and in the future.

People’s Millions
90 grants of £50,000 awarded this year. The aim is to transform local communities by making the environment cleaner, safer and greener. Funds will improve the local natural environment and design, appearance and accessibility of local amenities. The public votes for which scheme should win lottery funding on televised People’s Millions programmes. This programme is managed by the Big Lottery fund.

Changes Spaces
£234m available from 2008-09. Grant size is decided by individual award partners. This Big Lottery programme aims to improve local environments and open spaces, helping projects that are accessible to all and relevant to people’s needs.

Environmental Action Fund (EAF)
Grants awarded to groups range from £25,000 to £250,000 per year (£75,000 and £750,000 over the three year grant period). The Environmental Action Fund (EAF) is a Defra funding scheme which helps voluntary and community sector groups to further the Government’s sustainable development objectives within England.

Bridge House Estates Trust Fund
Grants to registered charities for projects benefiting the inhabitants of Greater London. Priorities must fall into one of five priority areas: transport and access for older and disabled people; environmental conservation; children and young people; assistance to elderly people to stay within the community and technical assistance to the voluntary sector.

Groundwork National Office
Works in partnership with community groups, local authorities and the private sector to bring about physical, social and economic improvements in deprived areas through school programmes, youth activities, training for the long - term unemployed, derelict land reclamation and helping business improve its environmental performance.

We set out below our vision of how the Urban Forest Should be resourced.
## scoped up project cost summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Programme key points to delivery</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding recommendations</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Project owner/ champion</th>
<th>Land ownership</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TP01 Tate Modern Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 26 Semi-Mature Scots Pines approx 13m high</td>
<td>To be acclimatised and grown on off site for 6 years, for installation 2012</td>
<td>624,000</td>
<td>TFL Transport Programme Area based scheme, Streets for People, Tate Modern contribution</td>
<td>Support for scheme from Tate Growth of Scots Pines</td>
<td>Tate Modern CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>Tate Better-Bankside London Borough of Southwark (LBS)</td>
<td>Cross River Partnership and LBS to receive who will take funding application to TFL forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of Play Equipment based on Turbine Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>S106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and installation of Playground Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup paving</td>
<td></td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional paving areas outside Bankside 1,2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,257,000</td>
<td>funding from Bankside 1,2,3 already exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change profile of Hopton St, widening pavement on the east side, using Hopton Street as the only access to the existing residences and Bankside 4 maintain taxi access through the area on a shared surface</td>
<td>Area based scheme (min 3 years to implementation could be appropriate)</td>
<td>314,208</td>
<td>TFL Area based scheme, S106</td>
<td>Local consultation required</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Early liaison with Bankside Residents’ Forum advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reworking the traffic flow / street profile of Holland St to incorporate restricted changes made to Summer Street.</td>
<td>Area based scheme (min 3 years to implementation could be appropriate)</td>
<td>559,332</td>
<td>TFL Area based scheme, S106</td>
<td>Subject to consultation process</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Early liaison with Bankside Residents’ Forum advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer St west - make this shared use street only with taxi and bicycle use.</td>
<td>Area based scheme (min 3 years to implementation could be appropriate)</td>
<td>55,116</td>
<td>TFL Area based scheme, TFL cycle theme funding, Sustrans,S106</td>
<td>Road closure process may delay project</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Early liaison with Bankside Residents’ Forum advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer St east - make this a shared use street accessible for deliveries and emergencies.</td>
<td>Area based scheme (min 3 years to implementation could be appropriate)</td>
<td>946,116</td>
<td>TFL Area based scheme, S106</td>
<td>Road closure process may delay project</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Early liaison with Bankside Residents’ Forum advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Guildford Street – shared surface with necessary vehicular access.</td>
<td>Area based scheme (min 3 years to implementation could be appropriate)</td>
<td>281,584</td>
<td>TFL Area based scheme, TFL cycle theme funding, Sustrans,S106</td>
<td>Public consultation</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Early liaison with Bankside Residents’ Forum advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street – making it a de facto shared surface to reinforce existing use behaviour</td>
<td>Area based scheme (min 3 years to implementation could be appropriate)</td>
<td>316,297</td>
<td>TFL Area based scheme, TFL cycle theme funding, Sustrans,S106</td>
<td>Public consultation</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GSS1 Great Suffolk Street north of Union Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting of clumps of Ash trees along Great Suffolk Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>S106 Better Bankside Levy budget,Cleaner Greener Safer</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections of footway claimed back from the road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TFL Transport Programme (Walking)</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Greening Treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Landowners consent required</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary walls on footway and under viaduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross borough funding for regeneration of the viaduct via Cross River Partnership</td>
<td>CRP/LBS Better-Bankside</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Possible Early Win</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Funding Authority</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS2 Great Suffolk Street south of Union Street</td>
<td>Potential early win</td>
<td>£270,000</td>
<td>CRP, LBS</td>
<td>This takes the form of a series of planted vertical panels and trays that line the arch, enabling creepers to be trailed around the arch. Minimum 18 month lead in to grow prepurchased trailing creepers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US3 Viaduct Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRP, LBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS1 Flat Iron Square for Union Street</td>
<td>Potential early win</td>
<td>£638,455</td>
<td>Cross River Partnership, Tate</td>
<td>New planted canopy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Café roof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross River Partnership, Tate</td>
<td>New Café roof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove of semi mature Plane Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross River Partnership, Tate</td>
<td>New surface to surface.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross River Partnership, Tate</td>
<td>FIS1 Flat Iron Square – New Art Work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS3 Green Facades for Flat Iron Square</td>
<td>Potential early win</td>
<td>£453,922</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Initiating planting linked to school front garden and BOST scheme in Red Cross Garden. Bids can be submitted immediately funding possible April 2008.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC6 Red Cross Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Link to School Transport plan (Cathedral school to St Mary. Early commencement of street closure process required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS2 Park Street Cycle Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>Bids can be submitted June 2007 funding possible April 2008.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- CRP: Cross River Partnership
- LBS: Local Borough Strategic
- TFL: Transport for London
- S106: School
- BOST: Better, Safer, Cleaner
- Tate: Tate
- Network Rail
- OR: To agree who would take funding application forward.
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