



Planning Applications Sub-Committee

ADDENDUM

Date: THURSDAY, 9 MAY 2024
Time: 11.00 am
Venue: LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

3. **MINUTES**

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 40)

4. **ALBAN GATE, 125-130 LONDON WALL**

For Decision
(Pages 41 - 42)

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 17 April 2024

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Wednesday, 17 April 2024 at 9.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi MBE (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Ian Bishop-Laggett
Deputy Anne Corbett
Deputy Simon Duckworth OBE DL
Deputy John Edwards
Deputy John Fletcher
Dawn Frampton
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Steve Goodman OBE
Jaspreet Hodgson
Amy Horscroft
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Deputy Charles Edward Lord
Antony Manchester
Deputy Brian Mooney BEM
Deputy Alastair Moss
Alderwoman Jennette Newman
Deborah Oliver
Alderwoman Susan Pearson
Deputy Henry Pollard
Alderman Simon Pryke
Hugh Selka
Luis Felipe Tilleria
William Upton KC
Deputy Dawn Wright

Also In Attendance:

Deputy Ann Holmes, Chief Commoner

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Gemma Delves	-	Environment Department
David Horkan	-	Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	-	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	-	Environment Department
Joanna Parker	-	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	-	Environment Department
Bob Roberts	-	Environment Department
Amy Williams	-	Environment Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Brendan Barns, Mary Durcan, Judith Pleasance, Ian Seaton and Shailendra Umradia.

At Mary Durcan's request the following statement was read out by the Town Clerk.

"I participated in a meeting of Policy and Resources in 2022 where an item about the London Wall development was on the agenda. I was not at that time a member of the Planning & Transportation Committee. Therefore, there was no reason to recuse myself because at that stage there was no conflict of interest. It was only on the resignation of a Member of my Ward from the Court of Common Council that I took the Ward place on the Planning & Transportation Committee. Since becoming a Member of this Committee I have correctly recused myself from all discussion about the London Wall site and the planning application at Policy and Resources and all other committees. However, to avoid any misunderstanding I have decided not to participate in today's Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting and the decision on London Wall following advice from the City Solicitor."

The Town Clerk stated that the membership of the Sub-Committee had changed since the agenda was published, with Deputy Brian Mooney being reappointed in place of Alderman Alastair King. She also stated that there were a number of new Members on the Sub-Committee since it last met, namely Deputy Anne Corbett, Steve Goodman and Deputy Dawn Wright. The Town Clerk confirmed that they had all received the necessary training to enable them to take part in the consideration of planning applications.

The Town Clerk stated that the Chief Commoner was in attendance.

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

Jaspreet Hodgson stated she had a non-pecuniary interest as a resident on the Barbican Estate but was not affected by this application.

Deborah Oliver and Steve Goodman stated they were Barbican residents and the aspect of their flats was away from the site under consideration. They had received dispensations to speak on the London Wall West item.

3. **DEMOLITION OF 140 AND 150 LONDON WALL**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning:

- 23/01304/FULEIA:
Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new

scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.

- 23/01277/LBC:
External alterations to existing highwalks at the Barbican Estate including to the John Wesley Highwalk and Mountjoy Close to allow for the integration of new highwalks, hard and soft landscaping, and works associated with the construction of new buildings with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftsbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).
- 23/01276/LBC:
Demolition of Ferroners' House alongside external alterations to the facade and roof level of Ironmongers' Hall, internal reconfiguring to cores and back of house areas and associated works in association with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftsbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).

The Chairman stated that a late representation had been received shortly prior to the start of the meeting. The meeting would therefore be paused until Members had received it.

At this point, at 9.05am, the Chairman adjourned the meeting. The meeting briefly resumed at 9.07am.

The Chairman stated that the addendum had now been sent electronically to Members and hard copies would be printed and circulated.

At this point, at 9.08am, the Chairman adjourned the meeting to facilitate this. The meeting resumed at 9.17am.

The Chairman stated that the legal officer had advised that the officer presentation could continue and there would be a further pause in proceedings to enable the hard copies to be read once they were provided.

The Chairman stated that Agenda Items 3 and 4 would be considered together.

As a point of order, a Member asked for clarification on the background to the second addendum which had been received the previous afternoon, and how this affected the Sub-Committee's decision. The Chairman asked Officers to clarify this matter. An Officer stated that the addendum report set out that Article 31 was a standard procedure by the Secretary of State to prevent a local authority from issuing a planning permission. He added that the Sub-Committee could determine the application and resolve to grant or refuse but planning permission could not be issued until the London elections had passed in early May. The Officer stated that this was a procedural matter and was

commonplace. It did not preclude the sub-committee considering the application.

The Chairman asked Officers to present the application. An Officer stated that prior to the meeting Members were provided with a copy of the presentation. The presentation being shown was a summary of that provided. The Officer stated that the existing site was located at the western end of London Wall with the Barbican Estate to the north, Monkwell Square to the east, commercial development along London Wall to the south and commercial and residential development along Aldersgate Street to the west.

Members were shown an aerial view of the site looking east and were informed that Bastion House could be seen in relation to the lower scale Museum of London development, the Barbican Estate and the commercial buildings along London Wall. An Officer stated that the existing site was made up of the Museum of London, the highwalk connections to the museum, the 1970's office block Bastion House, Barber-Surgeons' Gardens, the western end of the London wall car park and its associated access ramp, the Mountjoy House truncated highwalk connection, the 1970's extension to Ironmongers' Hall, known as Ferroners' House (the extension was not part of the listing) and the Thomas More car park ramp.

The Officer outlined the designations that were relevant to the site. She stated that the northern portion of the site and Barber-Surgeons' Gardens were within the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area. Postman's Park and Foster Lane Conservation Areas were to the South. The listed buildings were outlined. Members were informed that the northern portion of the site was part of the Grade II listed Barbican Estate and the site surrounded the Grade II listed Ironmongers' Hall. The Officer stated that a full assessment of the impact of the scheme on the listed buildings and the conservation areas was set out in the report. She also stated that the northern portion of the site and Barber-Surgeons' Gardens were part of the Grade II registered Historic Park and Garden and part of the Jewish cemetery boundary overlapped the site, as set out in the report. Members were informed that special consideration had been given to this area and it would be ensured that there would be no digging in the area that was within the cemetery domain.

Members were shown a number of existing images including an image looking north along St Martin's Le Grand towards the museum and were informed that this was a key arrival point to the site from the south and the Museum of London could be seen with the Barbican Tower in the background. Members were shown the existing view looking west along London Wall towards the museum and Bastion House. The Officer stated that the ground level of the existing site was considered to be poor with limited active frontage and dominated by the London Wall carriageway. She added that opportunities for formal crossing were limited. Members were shown a view of the Rotunda roundabout from Aldersgate Street which included a covered walkway which was a particularly poor pedestrian route. Members were shown a view of the Rotunda Garden which the Officer stated was not accessible to members of the public. She added that this was mainly used by the museum. This view also

showed some of the highwalk areas. Members were shown an existing view of Ironmongers' Hall which was surrounded by the Museum of London development. Members were also shown an image of the existing Thomas More car park and the truncated Mountjoy House highwalk plus images of Bastion House, the scheduled ancient monument and the access ramp to the London Wall car park. The Officer stated that the scheme involved the demolition of Bastion House and the Museum of London. She added that a full optioneering exercise had been undertaken in respect of the demolition.

Members were shown a slide of 10 scenarios which were considered, ranging from refurbishment to full development and were informed that six of these scenarios were taken forward for whole life carbon analysis. The Officer stated that the full details of the exercise were set out in the Officer's report and that the exercise was undertaken in accordance with the City of London guidance. It had been independently assessed and was considered to be a sound basis for the decision making.

The Officer outlined the proposal in more detail. Members were shown the ground floor layout and were informed that three new buildings were proposed; a new Bastion House on the site of the former Bastion House, the Rotunda building with its associated cultural development to the southwest, and the North building to the north of the site. The Ferroners' House extension would be demolished and the buildings would be set amid extensive public realm.

Members were shown the proposed ground floor uses and were informed that it was considered that the layout made the best use of the site through the provision of an uplift in office space with complementary retail and cultural space. Active uses would be located to the south with more tranquil public realm areas located to the north, closer to residents. The Officer stated that the proposal would transform the site and as part of this transformation, fundamental changes were required to the highway network. The existing Rotunda roundabout would be removed and a new peninsula layout would be formed that would allow the creation of improved pedestrian crossing arrangements and the formation of new cycle lanes. The pedestrian comfort of the proposed footways had been analysed and was considered to be acceptable and policy compliant. These highway works would align with the St Paul's Gyratory project. As part of the highway changes, some stopping up would be required and some new areas of highway would need to be dedicated as set out in the Officer's report.

Members were shown an image of the site layout at lower ground floor. They were informed that new loading bay areas would be provided along with further cultural space. The cultural space would connect to the London Wall car park where remains of the Roman Fort Gate would be opened up to be publicly accessible. The remains were currently located within a locked room within the car park and therefore the opening up of this area was considered to be a considerable heritage benefit of the scheme. Enhancements would be made to Barber-Surgeons' Gardens and the setting of the new scheduled monument through new landscaping. The removal of the access ramp would allow more pedestrian-friendly access to the gardens. The car parking at the western end

of the London Wall car park would be removed which was favourable in sustainability transport terms and the western end of the car park would be transformed into a cycle hub accommodating 250 publicly accessible parking spaces and five accessible parking spaces. Following the removal of the existing access ramp, changes would be required to the entry and exit of the car park. The impacts of this change had been assessed and were considered to be acceptable in highway terms.

Members were shown an image of the lower ground floor plan which showed the cultural spaces and the connection with the Roman Fort Gate. Members were also shown a CGI of the Roman Fort Gate viewing area.

Members were informed that the lower ground floor level loading bays that would be created for the servicing of the proposed buildings, would be accessed via the Thomas More car park ramp. At present the ramp was used by residents to access the car park and also for the egress of servicing vehicles for Bastion House and the Museum of London. Members were informed that as part of the proposal, servicing vehicles would enter and exit the ramp. The impact of this on the ramp and the use of residents using the car park had been carefully considered.

The Officer stated that there would be consolidation of delivery vehicles and caps on the number of deliveries from servicing vehicles. Members were informed that the existing servicing vehicle movements were not capped. Servicing would be limited to off-peak hours and entry and exit controls would be put in place with stringent controls secured through a delivery and servicing management plan. It was considered that the servicing arrangements would be acceptable.

Members were shown an image of the new basement areas which would be created as part of the proposal. They would accommodate cycle parking, shower facilities and back of house areas. The provision of cycle parking on the site in terms of long and short stay spaces was in excess of policy compliance and an additional basement area and new heat network expansion area would be provided in the basement of the Rotunda building.

Members were shown a plan which showed the site layout at highwalk level. Two existing highwalk bridges would be removed completely. New highwalk connections would be made through the development. There would be a connection into the truncated highwalk beneath Mountjoy House. Members were informed that at pre-application stage, the proposal showed that all the highwalk bridges would be removed and in response to consultation and feedback from Officers, one of the highwalk bridges would be retained. It would be demolished and rebuilt in a slightly higher position in order to enable the changes to the highwalk level and some recession of City walkway would be required. Members were shown an image of this and the new areas of City walkway that would be provided.

Members were also shown an image of the proposed use mix at highwalk level. There would be cultural space and office space. Members were informed that

there was an error on this plan. At highwalk level in the Bastion building, maker space would be provided, as part of the cultural offer, but on the slide it was shown as office space.

Members were shown a plan of the proposed second floor level and typical office floors and were informed that the buildings across the upper levels, much needed Grade A office space, was proposed. The Officer stated that the site was an appropriate location for office use and the scheme would contribute towards the 1.2 million square metres of new office space that the draft City Plan sought to deliver. The Officer stated that spaces were designed with flexibility in mind and would support a range of occupiers. An element of affordable workspace would be provided and details would be secured by condition.

Members were shown a proposed plan of the 11th floor level which showed the cultural space that would be provided within the Rotunda building and the 12th floor level which showed a new publicly accessible viewing gallery in the Rotunda building giving people access to new views of St Paul's Cathedral. Members were also shown a plan of the proposed roof level. Photovoltaic panels were proposed.

The Sub-Committee were shown a section which showed the use mix across the site. There were cultural uses across the lower levels of the site and the upper levels of the Rotunda building, along with the office use.

Members were shown images of the proposed south, north and elevations. The Officer stated that given the height of the buildings, they were considered to be tall buildings. In policy terms, the implications of this had been fully assessed in the Officer's report, particularly in respect of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area and it was considered that the impacts were acceptable and that the buildings would sit comfortably within the context of the surrounding development.

Members were shown an image of the design of the new buildings and the facades. They were informed that the Rotunda and Bastion buildings would form a dynamic pair with aluminium fins on the husk facades that would then transition to the interior facades where terrace areas and greening would be provided.

Members were shown an image of the North building which was designed to mediate between the larger scale development to the south of the site with the low scale buildings to the north. The design of this building drew on cues from the Barbican Estate and the Barbican Turret.

The Officer informed Members that the scheme would provide a significant amount of new public realm. Members were shown an axonometric showing the new public realm areas with the Central Plaza of London Wall, a new Rotunda Arcade linking onto Aldersgate Street, the Glade at podium level, the Roman Gate viewing area with connection to Barber-Surgeon's Gardens, a new area of public realm at the north of the site formed from the decking over part of the Barbican car park and a new plaza area formed to the front of

Ironmongers' Hall. Members were informed that the uplift would result in 4,539 square metres of new public realm being provided which equated to a 49.9% increase. The new public realm combined with the greening of the buildings would result in the scheme delivering an urban greening factor of 0.41 which would be in excess of policy requirements.

Plans were shown of the existing and proposed public realm. The Officer highlighted the new public realm off London Wall at ground floor level and then at podium level where there was new public realm to the north of the site. The Officer stated that along with the enhancements in public realm, there would be the provision of new routes. The Officer stated that the City's Access Officer had assessed the scheme and considered that the public realm that would be delivered was positive and that the new routes provided would help with the transition between the different levels of the site. Four new lifts would be provided and a new step-free east-west route would be provided to the north of the site.

Members were informed of the sustainability credentials of the scheme which were considered to be excellent. Buildings were designed to be highly energy efficient. They would contribute to the development of a heat network in the City. In accordance with the Local Area Energy Plan, BREEAM outstanding would be targeted and the scheme contributed significantly to biodiversity and greening.

The Officer advised that as set out in the Officer's report and presentation, there would be some impacts on daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential units but these impacts were considered to be acceptable.

Members were shown CGIs of the proposal including the view looking north along St Martin Le Grand to the Rotunda building and they were advised that the cultural offer was clearly defined at the top of the building and at ground floor, level access to the cultural office would be provided enlivening this area.

Members were shown an aerial view of the Glade and Plaza off London Wall. The thermal comfort conditions for the proposed public realm were considered to be positive and the scheme removed the safety exceedance in wind terms on St Martin Le Grand.

A CGI of the Central Plaza showed the staircase and lift from ground floor to podium level. Members were also shown an image looking south from the Barbican Estate and were informed that the scheme would change the outlook from the Barbican Estate and from residents' flats. The protection of views was not a material consideration. Measures had been taken through the design of the building e.g. through the positioning of the fins, some access restrictions to some of the terraces and fritting on the glass in order to prevent any undue overlooking and limit light spill.

Members were shown a CGI of the northern garden showing the step-free access and extensive greening and the Barber-Surgeons' Gardens where the enhancements to the setting of the scheduled ancient monument and improvements to planting and access improvements could be seen.

Members were also shown the view along St Martin Le Grand towards the site where the proposed Rotunda building could be seen. Members were also shown an image of Aldersgate Street near the junction with Little Britain and were informed that the positioning of the buildings with a separation between them would create a gate way through the site and would give views to the Barbican Estate.

The Sub-Committee were shown the existing and proposed view from Postman's Park within the Postman's Park Conservation Area. The Officer stated that the Officer's report acknowledged that the scheme would result in a degree of less than substantial harm to the church and the conservation area as a result of this view.

Members were shown the existing and proposed view of the London Wall south pavement between Alban Gate and 88 Wood Street which showed the scale of the development in conjunction with the scale of development along London Wall. They were also shown the existing and proposed view along Aldersgate Street and were informed the North building could be seen mediating between the higher commercial development to the south of the site.

Members were shown the view from Aldersgate Street to Ironmongers' Hall. The Officer highlighted that at present, only part of Ironmongers' Hall could be glimpsed in this view and as part of the proposal, views of Ironmongers' Hall would be opened up. This was considered to be positive in heritage terms.

Members were shown the view from the Andrewes Highwalk showing the existing and proposed view of Bastion House in conjunction with the church. They were also shown the existing and proposed view from the Thomas More Highwalk terrace towards the site and the existing and proposed view from Monkwell Square looking west. The Officer stated that the scale of the development could be seen in conjunction with the scale of the surrounding development.

Members were shown the proposed and existing views from Wallside. They were also shown an image from Golden Jubilee/Hungerford Footbridges with a view of St Bride's Tower. Members were also shown the cumulative impact showing there would already be some impact on this view from the Salisbury Square development. It was acknowledged in the Officer's report that there would be some less than substantial harm to the setting of St Bride's as a result of the scheme.

Members were shown images of the views of St Paul's Cathedral and were informed that it was not considered that the scheme would impact on the setting of St Paul's Cathedral in wider views. Members were shown an image from Bankside opposite the Tate Modern and the top of the existing Bastion House could be seen. The Officer stated that given that the proposed Bastion House was the same height as the existing one, it was considered that the impact was negligible, although the proposed building would be slightly wider.

Members were shown an image from Millenium Bridge. The Officer stated that the existing Bastion House was set below the Barbican towers. As part of the proposal the relationship would continue, although the proposed building would be slightly wider.

In conclusion, the Officer stated that the scheme represented a high-quality transformation and regeneration of the western end of London Wall. The scheme was acceptable in height and massing. The site already had a tall building with a tall building in the immediate vicinity. The scheme was appropriate in height and scale to its townscape with negligible impacts on wider strategic views. The Officer stated that the high-quality scheme would deliver over 67,000 square metres of much needed Grade A office space accommodating an estimated 3,000 jobs in a well-connected area which was proving very popular. The site already had part office use. The scheme included substantial cultural benefits with generous scaled flexible cultural space including an elevated cultural space offering exceptional public views over London Wall and St Paul's Cathedral. It would deliver on the aspirations of the City's Destination City initiative. The proposed provision of accessible public realm was exemplary resulting in a 49% increase on the site with a new south-facing public square bordered by cultural and retail uses with good microclimatic conditions. As part of the enhancements to the public realm, new prominent, clear and accessible routes would be provided across the site with significantly enhanced public access to the highwalk, better integrating the highwalk into the City's public realm network for all the public to enjoy. The new green spaces had exceptional urban greening with 100 new trees being planted and a focus on biodiversity. The proposal had been rigorously assessed in terms of whole life carbon and there had been a third-party review in line with the City's adopted carbon options planning advice note. The scheme had been subject to a rigorous transport assessment including emergency vehicle and car park access and the removal of a traffic underpass. The scheme incorporated consolidation and off-peak deliveries. Cycle parking provision exceeded the London Plan targets. The scheme would deliver significant heritage benefits through the opening up of the Roman Fort Gate as a public destination enhancement, enhancement to the setting of Ironmongers' Hall, enhancement to the setting of the scheduled ancient monument in Barber-Surgeons' Gardens and the provision of new views to St Paul's Cathedral. The amenity impacts of the scheme on local residents had been rigorously assessed and subject to the recommended conditions were acceptable. The Officer stated that as set out in the Officer's report, the scheme would result in some degree of minor harm to heritage assets but the setting of other heritage assets would be substantially enhanced. The scheme was considered to be high-quality, well considered and very substantially compliant with local plan policies and in some cases exceeding policy aspirations. The Officer stated that the proposal was recommended for approval.

As a point of order, a Member asked for Officers to provide more detail on servicing, the new road layout and floor plans. The Chairman stated that this could be covered during questions to Officers.

As a point of order, a Member raised concern about a second addendum being sent to Members the previous afternoon and Members now being informed there was a third and fourth addenda to be considered with Members to be sent these during the meeting. He asked for clarification on what the Sub-Committee should take into account. He also commented that in the second addendum there was an Officer comment about alternative schemes and he asked whether there was a cut off time for representations. The Chairman asked the legal officer to comment. She stated that whilst some planning protocols at other local planning authorities operated a strict cut off for submissions e.g. 24 or 48 hours before the committee meeting, this was not in the City's planning protocol. It had always operated more flexibly based on advice given historically about risk and last-minute submissions could include material planning considerations so if the local planning authority was not flexible, these could be missed. The legal officer stated that if Members were amenable, it would be best to put the last-minute submissions before the Sub-Committee and give Members the opportunity to consider them. She stated that there had been three rounds of consultation, a robust report had been prepared and it was unlikely that the new submissions gave rise to material planning considerations that had not already been taken into account, but it had not been possible to consider this level of detail. The legal officer advised that the Sub-Committee could take a decision on how they wanted to proceed.

The Chairman thanked the legal officer for her advice and stated that the Sub-Committee would now continue to hear the application.

The Town Clerk explained that there were two registered objectors to address the meeting and she invited the objectors to speak.

Ms Estelle Dehon stated that she was speaking on behalf of Barbican Quarter Action (BQA). She stated that the scheme was proposed in 2021 as a regeneration opportunity to help achieve the Corporation's most exciting aspirations including the challenge of climate change. She raised concerns that the scheme did not focus on climate change and had become an office-led overdevelopment, more than tripling the square metres of office floorspace in the north of the City, an area where the local plan did not envisage such distribution.

Ms Dehon stated that the Officer's report had found the scheme would cause heritage harm to two Grade I listed churches and a conservation area, triggering the presumption against permission which must be overcome by the benefits of the scheme. Ms Dehon added that the Officer's view differed from Historic England's assessment, which was a higher level of harm to the churches and the conservation area and additional harm to the significance of assets it emphasised were of the highest heritage significance: the Barbican Estate, its Grade II* Registered Landscape, St Giles and St Paul's. She added that the 20th Century Society and the independent heritage report found an even higher level of harm to more heritage assets. Ms Dehon stated that the Officer's report played down the level of heritage harm, both to individual assets and the cumulative harm. She encouraged the Sub-Committee to take a

conservative, prudent approach and rely on Historic England's assessment, resulting in a strong presumption against the granting of planning permission.

Ms Dehon raised concern that no design review had been carried out when the GLA strongly encouraged the use of the London Review Panel service. She added that none of the prevailing qualities of good design of replacement buildings in other parts of London Wall could be seen in the scheme. She stated that the position, proximity and imposing bulk and massing of the three blocks did not respect the local built environment. Ms Dehon stated that the BQA commissioned Anstey Horne to review of the assessment submitted in relation to daylight, sunlight, overshadowing and solar glare. They concluded that there would be a significant impact to a number of rooms with a living element.

Ms Dehon stated that Local Plan Policy CS15 applied a presumption against demolition, but this had been ignored. She stated that the first whole life carbon assessment, dated May 2022, only considered two options; part demolition and full demolition. She added that by then the applicant had been working closely with architects and designers since 2021 which suggested that a retrofit scheme had been ruled out early on, long before the carbon options and impacts were assessed. Concern was raised that the carbon optioneering study was dated just three days before the application was made. Peer reviews by leading carbon expert Simon Sturgis showed the study and the WLC assessment were flawed by failing to assess retrofit alternatives. She added that the peer review the Corporation obtained from Arcadis did not have the benefit of seeing Simon Sturgis's reports, despite them being available.

Ms Dehon stated that the applicant's own figures showed the scheme would result in the overall whole life-cycle carbon emissions of 98,674,620kg CO₂ being emitted over a 60-year period and that the scheme would release 40% of its total 60-year carbon within the first six years, the time of demolition and construction.

Ms Dehon stated that the optioneering study described the proposal as a carbon investment that would unlock the greatest amount of strategic and public benefits. She stated this was incorrect and pollution was not an investment, neither was a large and immediate carbon hit. She stated the proposal would cause harm, the force of which would be felt in this crucial decade when rapid decarbonisation was needed. The harm would be environmental harm, harm to people, economic harm from the high cost of climate impact and reputational harm.

Ms Dehon stated that the option favoured by the soft market test was major refurbishment, but this had not been assessed. She added that major refurbishment was viable from an engineering perspective and that this was addressed by structural engineers Conisbee & Associates and then abandoned by the applicant who considered it would be prudent to reinforce if there were alterations or extensions. Ms Dehon stated that Option 2, Major Refurbishment, performed far better than any other option in relative (per square metre) and overall terms. She stated that it would produce around 60 million kg CO₂, so

38.6 million kg CO2 less than the scheme and the scheme did not overcome the presumption against demolition.

Ms Dehon stated that the scheme lacked compliance with a large number of development plans policies, referred to in the letter from BQA's planning consultants, Carney Sweeney. She commented that the claimed benefits of the scheme were overstated, particularly the office, cultural and public realm benefits, and did not overcome the presumption against grant arising from heritage harm or the presumption against for overall lack of compliance with the development plan.

In conclusion, Ms Dehon stated that on the correct planning analysis, the application stood to be refused, for robust reasons and would re-establish the City of London Corporation as a responsible steward of world-famous heritage assets and an international leader in preventing climate change.

Mr David Rees stated that he was a long-leaseholder of a flat in Thomas More House and he was speaking for leaseholders, residents and families from the Barbican and the wider community whose properties and homes would be adversely affected by the development.

Mr Rees stated that the development was ill-considered and the Officer's report did not properly address the effect of the application on residential amenity. He stated that there was not adequate engagement on the numerous objections on this point. He added that the proposals would extend the height and footprint of Bastion House, and would introduce a new high-rise tower on the Rotunda site, taller than the surrounding parts of the Barbican Estate. Mr Rees commented that this would reduce the open sky visible from Thomas More and Mountjoy Houses with a corresponding reduction in sunlight. He raised concern that this would lead to flats being overlooked by offices and the 11th floor restaurant proposed for the Rotunda Tower facing directly into the living rooms of Thomas More House.

Mr Rees commented that the use of the Thomas More car park ramp and service yard to provide access for construction traffic was dangerous. He stated that the proposed alternative access route for residents was impractical and too small and narrow to be used by delivery vans or emergency vehicles. He stated that there was no other vehicle route into this part of the estate. Mr Rees raised concern that in practice, residents and visitors would be required to share the existing ramp with construction traffic. He stated that the applicants should be required to provide a viable and safe alternative route for construction access away from the existing ramp.

Mr Rees stated that the proposal to base the site offices during the construction period, close to flats in Mountjoy House, would affect residential amenity in this part of the estate and residents would be required to endure six years of construction noise and disruption.

Mr Rees raised concern about the proposals for access after the completion of the development. He stated that the Thomas More car park ramp and service yard was currently a shared space used by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

The car park attendant was the concierge and therefore residents collected packages from their cabin. He added that the ramp provided convenient step-free access to the flats and was regularly used by those with children and buggies. Concern was raised that the applicant had not properly studied the existing use of these spaces and yet was proposing that they should be the sole means of service vehicle access to the completed development. Mr Rees commented that limiting the servicing hours, as suggested in the Officer's report, would prove unenforceable in practice and did not adequately address the dangers inherent in the proposed arrangements.

Mr Rees stated that the removal of the roundabout would make access to the Barbican Estate significantly more difficult, increasing congestion and pollution. He stated that westbound vehicles on London Wall wishing to gain access to Wood Street and Andrewes House car park would not be able to do so without a significant diversion and similar issues would arise for vehicles leaving Thomas More House car park heading north.

Mr Rees raised concern about misinterpretation of impact. He stated that the Officer's report stated that the images in the Design and Access Statement were for illustrative purposes and were not accurate visual representations. He stated that carefully selected viewpoints made spaces look bigger and could minimise the impact of the scheme on the existing built environment and on wider views of the Barbican and St Paul's Cathedral. Mr Rees commented that the proposed planting would not thrive on northbound walls or at higher levels and the reality of the proposed development would be that its north faces would be unsoftened by any viable planting above ground level.

Mr Rees stated that the application contravened the vision set out in the existing Local Plan. He commented that his written objection identified a number of policies which were contravened by the application including CS5, CS12 and DM12. He stated that the application did not meet residents' needs, did not protect residential amenity and did not respect the significance, character, scale and amenities of the surrounding heritage assets.

Mr Rees stated that the application focussed exclusively on extracting maximum profit from the site and failed to give proper consideration to its best use or the Corporation's own planning policies. He suggested that the public benefits of the scheme had been overstated and could equally be secured within a less harmful retrofit scheme. He stated that the conditions of access to, and the use of, much of the proposed cultural space was left vague, while elements of this space would negatively affect the amenity of neighbouring flats. Mr Rees stated that there had been a failure to undertake a sequential assessment in relation to cultural floorspace and the Officer's report recognised that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that where an application failed to satisfy this sequential test it should be refused.

In conclusion, Mr Rees stated that the proposals would turn a meaningful public and cultural space into another high-rise private office development which would result in heritage harm, as recognised in the Officer's report, and a significant loss of residential amenity. He stated that great vision had been

shown in the commissioning of the Barbican Estate and the cluster of Powell and Moya buildings whose demolition was now sought. He asked that Members think critically about the development of the special site and reject the application.

The Chairman explained that Deputy Elizabeth King and Naresh Sonpar would address the meeting as Ward Members.

Deputy King informed the meeting that she had a disclosable pecuniary interest as she overlooked the site and she had consulted the City Solicitors and received a dispensation to speak as a Ward Member.

Deputy King stated that finding extra sources of income to fund operations was not a valid consideration in planning decisions and that the scheme should be considered on its own merits. She stated that the scheme would take 6-10 years to complete. It was at the heart of the cultural quarter and would in no way enhance, but would instead blight, the aspirations for Destination City for many years. Deputy King stated that the proposal failed to offer the option to retain some of the site and retrofit even though retrofit first was a key policy. Deputy King raised concern about the implications for carbon emissions of demolishing and rebuilding. She raised concern that alternatives had not been presented and added that retrofitting the site would save carbon, time, resources, risk and reputation.

Members were informed that the scheme aimed to create more than triple the office space target in the City Plan 2015. Deputy King stated that this was not a priority zone for tall office buildings. The application fell outside the Eastern Cluster and the proposed Holborn and Fleet Valley Cluster in the emerging City Plan and therefore Members should not be being asked to approve tall buildings here.

Deputy King raised concern that there had been no independent peer review contrary to London Plan Policy D4 and good practice in other London Boroughs. Deputy King referred Members to the comments of Professor Frampton CBE and stated that he was a renowned architectural historian for a peer critique of the design quality of this scheme. She stated that the Officer's report claimed that the application process had adhered to the intentions of the London Plan design policy however it also stated that there was non-compliance with the policy requirement to have an independent carbon review. Deputy King added that the applicant had admitted that a demolition and new build option would frontload in the next four years the release of almost 40,000 of the total of 56,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions. This was not consistent with local, London or national policy which all prioritised retention and retrofitting.

Deputy King stated that it was claimed that the structure of the building was not sound, however this was not the case and in the brief soft market test, several credible offers for retrofitting the existing buildings had been received. Deputy King considered that retrofitting could have saved significant disruption, carbon and money. She added that Simon Sturgis, leading advisor to the government, demonstrated that major refurbishment performed better than any other option

in relative and overall terms with only a small amount of embodied carbon released by a major refurbishment, there would be a radical reduction in operational carbon emissions.

Deputy King stated that demolition and construction would impact workers and residents over a minimum of a six-year period. She stated that demolition was estimated to take 19 months and piling a further 17 months that would make living and working nearby intolerable. Construction was then estimated to continue for a further 36 months until August 2033 with noise and a large increase in vehicle movements. Deputy King asked Members to reject the application.

Naresh Sonpar stated that he was a resident of Lauderdale Tower and his flat did not directly overlook the site. Mr Sonpar stated that this was a complex and contested application. He stated that the Officer's report acknowledged the application would cause harm and this was reinforced by the St Paul's objection. Historic England had stated that this harm would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal as part of the decision-making process. He added that the benefits were overstated and the application was caveated by over 100 conditions, and that many of these matters should have been resolved before the application was brought to the Sub-Committee.

Mr Sonpar stated that the public realm offer was weak and uncertain and could easily be value engineered out of the scheme at a later date, even with conditions. He stated that the scheme would cause significant harm to a number of the City's most important heritage assets including St Paul's Cathedral, St Giles and St Botolph's churches, Postman's Park and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area. Members were informed that the surveyor of the fabric of St Paul's stated the applicant's rebuttal of these concerns appeared to be unduly dismissive. He stated that these changes would cause a material degree of harm in the significance of the Grade I listed heritage asset. He also stated that there had to be a clear and evidenced demonstration that a no harm option had been drawn and evaluated. Mr Sonpar stated that there was no public benefit delivered as part of the scheme that could justify the damage to the heritage assets and he added that given the removal of the public benefit elements of the 81 Newgate Street development there was little guarantee that any public benefit conditions would remain.

Mr Sonpar stated that Bastion House and the Museum of London were on the 20th Century Society's top 10 at risk register. He stated that Bastion House would be more than 2.5-3 times the volume of the current Bastion House and the applicant stated that it was only slightly larger. Mr Sonpar also stated that the proposed Rotunda building would be more than twice the size.

Mr Sonpar stated that the scheme was not sympathetic to the surrounding area. He added that examples such as London Wall Place demonstrated that volume could be added to a site whilst remaining sympathetic. Mr Sonpar raised concern about the impact on local transport and traffic with neither the modelling nor the scheme agreed by TfL or the London Fire Brigade with the

Officer's report stating that at the time of writing, discussions were ongoing with the TfL modelling team.

Mr Sonpar stated that there were over 300 homes located within 15 minutes of the boundary of the London Wall West site plus Liveries, a nursery and the City of London School for Girls. He stated that the massing, height and vehicle access to the proposed new buildings would result in serious and permanent loss of amenity of these residents.

Mr Sonpar stated that all servicing to the proposed new buildings, which were 230% larger than the current buildings, would be via a single in-out route using the ramp from Aldersgate Street. He stated that this would lead to vehicles backing up on to Aldersgate Street, with an increase in noise, air pollution and danger to pedestrians and vehicles. In addition, this access route was used by the emergency services so emergency access would be impeded. Mr Sonpar stated that this could cause a danger to life and added that the fire brigade and ambulance service had not approved the proposed access to all residential areas. Mr Sonpar stated that no meetings had taken place between the applicant and the London Ambulance Service and questioned how the nearby school would be safeguarded. He stated that prior to building the school, the school did not consider safeguarding to be an issue but it subsequently revised its view and was aware of the issues the design had caused. Mr Sonpar asked Members to reject the application.

The Chairman asked if Members of the Sub-Committee had any questions of the objectors.

In response to a Member's question as to why concerns, apart from the embodied carbon concerns, could not be resolved by conditions, an objector stated that heritage, sunlight, daylight and glare were all impacts that could not be resolved by conditions. Another objector stated that overlooking could not be addressed by condition and highlighted overlooking issues with the building next to the Tate Modern where there had been overlooking from the viewing gallery. Also, currently the Thomas More House ramp was currently not used by the current occupiers of Bastion House or the Museum of London site. In the proposal, this would become shared and would be used by service vehicles and construction traffic as there was no other suitable vehicle access. The objector added that unless there was an entirely different means of access, associated dangers could not be addressed by condition.

A Member asked objectors to outline the reasons for justifying refusal. An objector stated that she had set out the potential reasons for refusal to Members drawn up in conjunction with the BQA and planning specialists Carney Sweeney. The first reason related to just the heritage assets that Historic England identified as harmed. The second reason dealt with the non-heritage assets of Bastion House and the Museum of London which the Officer's report stated were non-designated heritage assets but the 20th Century Society and the heritage expert for the BQA took a different view. The third reason was based on the design points, the scale and massing and the domination of the forms of the surrounding area and the tall buildings issue.

The fourth reason was the solar glare issue and the fifth reason was the whole carbon life cycle emissions issue. The objector stated that all of the reasons were within the context of their policy ramifications and the policies that were considered to be breached by the relevant harms.

In relation to a Member's question about scale and grain and context, an architect for the BQA stated that the area was bombed in World War II and an evolving master plan for the central Barbican area and South Barbican area was applied to the whole area with new buildings on a perpendicular grid. Four of the six original buildings had been replaced with newer office blocks of a much larger scale in density. One London Place continued on the perpendicular grid and the building was comparable in size to the Barbican building with the actual mass broken down into smaller segments which all related to the smaller scale and the finer grain proportion of the immediate neighbours. None of the elements were any larger than one of the six original towers so they all fitted into the context. 88 Wood Street was comparable to Bastion House in size however it was also broken down into smaller segments and it was tiered down towards the neighbour on Wood Street. The new buildings would not mediate and would not fit within the grain. They did not step down to the neighbours and were not specific to the site. He stated that this should be a main consideration being next to two conservation areas and so many heritage assets.

The Chairman stated that that the hard copies of the third and fourth addenda were currently being circulated to Members.

A Member referred to the second addendum and stated that he was not aware whether the objectors had seen this. He asked whether the objectors considered that the alternative schemes should be taken into account. In response, the objector stated that the short timescale made it difficult for Members to take the information into account. She also stated that unlike in other planning applications where planning policy did not require the consideration of alternatives, there was a combination of policies in the local plan with the carbon policy and the planning advice note which made it clear that in planning terms, when considering whether the presumption against demolition had been overcome, alternatives became relevant as a planning consideration. There was therefore a planning link between viable alternatives of major retrofit or major refurbishment and the planning policy that required the applicants to demonstrate that they had overcome the presumption against demolition and that they had properly addressed the whole life carbon impacts of the scheme and therefore there was a carbon optioneering process before the Sub-Committee. The objector stated that a significant difficulty for this scheme, as raised in her submissions, was that the main retrofit and Option 2 - Major Refurbishment that was indicated to be a market viable option, was not taken forward for full carbon assessment. The objector stated that she had not seen the second addendum.

The Chairman asked the Town Clerk to confirm that all the addenda had been uploaded to the public website. The Town Clerk stated she would check and report back.

A Member noted the large amount of documentation for this application. She asked for the objector to provide insight into why they considered the Officer's view differed from the views of Historic England, the 20th Century Society and other independent heritage experts.

An objector stated that Officers had fairly pointed out that it was possible for professionals to disagree in their judgement in relation to heritage harm. She stated that although the report covered in detail the various heritage assets, the difficulty was that it did not necessarily engage in a clear way with why the professional assessment differed in particular from that of Historic England. She added that with Historic England being the statutory body consulted with the greatest experience in relation to heritage harm, this was relevant. She also stated that it was unusual for there to be such a degree of difference in professional terms between the Officer's assessment and that of Historic England without a third-party peer review. She stated that there was a difference on many of the heritage assets and in particular, on some of the highest protected heritage assets that were relevant and in these circumstances, it seemed prudent to take into account Historic England's assessment. The objector also stated that there was cumulative harm and less than substantial harm covered the majority of heritage harm. Historic England had not stated it objected in principle to the idea of this type of development. She stated that she considered that Historic England and others would take the view that there were ways the site could be capable of redevelopment for an office use that might not cause the extent of heritage harm and stated that objectors would say that part of that, would be a proper assessment of a retrofit analysis.

A Member referred to an objector's points that the applicant and the application focused exclusively on extracting maximum profit for the site but failed to give the proper consideration to its best use in terms of planning policies and that the public benefits had been overstated. She asked the objector to expand on this and provide more detail and examples and their view on this in terms of grounds for refusal.

In relation to maximising value, an objector stated that the Corporation on a number of occasions throughout the process had emphasised that it was considered it was bound statutorily to achieve best consideration or best value. She stated that this applied if there was going to be a sale of land to obtain best value for the land. It was not a legal obligation to maximise financial return from a planning scheme and there was no analysis before the Sub-Committee about the extent to which major refurbishment would increase the land value in a way that was different from a scheme e.g. that would retain and majorly retrofit. She added that best value or best consideration was not a material planning consideration.

The Chairman stated that the Town Clerk had confirmed that all the addenda were online and he thanked Officers for circulating and uploading the papers.

Another objector stated that it was clear from the scale and massing of the buildings that were proposed and the size of the site, the amount of office

space that could be contained within the site was driving the proposal. He stated that in terms of the public benefits and the cultural space, there were areas that might or might not be galleries or studios and the proposals were vague as to the conditions of use or the access that would be granted in due course. He raised concern that if permission was granted and the development progressed, they might not remain in the plan. The objector also stated that the viewing gallery with free but limited access only for those with tickets would retain the views that everybody could currently see from Thomas More House highwalk. The objector stated that the restaurant in the Rotunda was stated to be a public benefit and was part of the cultural offering. He raised concern that this would overlook directly into the flats on Thomas More. He added that the City was not short of restaurants and therefore this was not a public benefit.

A Member referred to objectors' concern about access for emergency vehicles via the Thomas More access road and asked objectors to explain why they considered the proposal to be dangerous. An objector stated that what was currently proposed was that the Thomas More car park ramp should be used solely for construction purposes and that effectively, all other access should be down another side ramp into the Lauderdale car park from Aldersgate Street which went through a small roll up gate. An Objector stated that delivery vehicles, ambulances and fire engines would not be able to use it and if a fire engine did get down it, there was then a hair pin bend to get towards Thomas More or Mountjoy Houses. The objector stated this was impractical and even the Officer's report accepted this. The Officer's report suggested as a condition that there should be further engagement with Barbican residents as to how access during construction should be promoted but there was only one way in to Thomas More, Mountjoy and Seddon Houses and that was down the existing ramp and fire engines and ambulances would need to go down this ramp. In addition, it was stated that there were 73,000 tonnes of demolition to come up the same ramp by lorry at the same time as residents were going to school and work and with six years of substantial construction traffic there would be very real safety issues for residents. Members were informed that there had been no real study of the current use of Barbican residents of the service yard and the views and needs of residents had not been taken into account at any stage.

A Member stated that he had listened with sympathy and interest to the objections. He asked if the objectors were not fundamentally opposing the scheme because they lived in the crowded environment of the City. He stated that the City had always been crowded and in reference to objections about the six year construction period, he stated that nothing would have been built in the post war period if there had not been long and lengthy construction periods. He stated that there had been objections to views but there were no rights to a view, and on certain occasions views were lost or there were view degradations of historical and special sites and people had lived with this since the beginning of the major construction in the northeast of the City. He stated that these types of discussions were often a result of people feeling that development should not be taking place near them and added that this was inevitable in a crowded City.

An objector stated that the City forefathers built the Barbican as a residential area . He stated that it was therefore a special part of the City and residential amenity was a matter the Sub-Committee needed to consider. He added that his submission on residential amenity had not mentioned views, they had related to the disruption to residents' lives during the construction period and in the period thereafter. He accepted there had to be construction within the City but stated that these buildings could be retrofitted with the existing buildings being left on the site. He stated that the proposal sought to put new buildings on sites where tall buildings did not currently exist and these tall buildings would affect residential amenity.

A Member asked an objector for her professional opinion and clarification on Article 31 and whether the recent high court judgement on Marks and Spencer, Oxford Street had any bearing on this application.

The Objector stated that the Article 31 direction did not prevent the Sub-Committee from considering the application and indicating a view either opposing or granting permission, she stated that this was a holding position so the Secretary of State could consider whether to call in the application. The recent Marks and Spencer decision was not only based on embodied carbon. The refusal was recently quashed by the high court. The objector outlined the case and stated that the application being considered was very different as there was a local plan that in policy terms had a presumption against demolition and a planning advice note which required the applicant to undertake optioneering analysis and consider alternatives.

The Chairman stated that there would be a 20-minute break during which the third and fourth addenda could be read.

There was a 20 minute pause in proceedings between 10.40am and 11.00am.

When the meeting resumed, the Chairman invited the applicants to speak.

Paul Wilkinson, City Surveyor and Executive Director of Property at the City of London Corporation, stated he was representing the applicant team behind the London Wall West project. He stated that the Museum of London moving to a new home in West Smithfield and Bastion House being vacant, created an opportunity to consider the future of both purpose-built buildings, neither of which met the needs of modern occupiers. The Surveyors Department had therefore been set the objective to find a long-term solution for this site that would bring maximum benefit to the City of London, its businesses, residents and visitors. Mr Wilkinson added that the proposed scheme would deliver the required regenerative and transformational benefits that would positively respond to this objective and importantly the City Corporation's strategies and policies.

Members were informed that the planning application had been developed over five years by lead designers Diller Scofidio and Renfro and collaborating architects Sheppard Robson. During this time, feedback from the considerable pre-application process and formal public consultations had been listened to

and responded to where possible. Mr Wilkinson added that following continued dialogue with the Ironmongers' Company through presentations and discussions on the design and merits of these scheme, they were now able to support the scheme. Mr Wilkinson stated that the result was a scheme that was capable of delivering a world class destination for business and one that was rich in public and cultural benefits.

Mr Wilkinson stated that there were no other commercially led schemes coming forward in the City of London that had as much floorspace dedicated to culture and offer to improve public access to historic assets, such as the Roman Gate. Members were informed that the planning application would deliver approximately 12,500 square metres of public realm. Those who lived, worked and visited the area would enjoy a softer and greener environment, better connected to its surroundings.

In addition, Mr Wilkinson stated that the proposal would help with the ongoing demand for high quality offices by delivering approximately 56,000 square metres of office space, which would provide nearly 3,100 new jobs. He stated that these world class architectural buildings were designed to perform to the highest environmental standards and were the most efficient option in whole life carbon terms per square metre.

In conclusion, Mr Wilkinson stated that it was strongly believed that the application scheme would meet and deliver on the City's strategies and policies and would give the City Corporation a viable option, presenting a fantastic opportunity for this important site.

At this point, the Chairman sought approval from the Sub-Committee to continue the meeting beyond two hours from the appointed time for the start of the meeting, in accordance with Standing Order 40, and this was agreed.

Ben Gilmartin, stated that he was a partner at Diller Scofidio and Renfro, the London Wall West lead designers, who collaborated with Sheppard Robson. He informed Members that Diller Scofidio and Renfro brought deep experience creating transformational public realm and cultural projects such the Highline elevated park and the redevelopment of Lincoln Centre for the Performing Arts, while Sheppard Robson had a proven track record of mixed-use and office projects in the City.

Mr Gilmartin stated that the team knew the site's complex conditions and tremendous assets very well e.g. its history, the highwalks, nature, and proximity to the Barbican and stated that it also exhibited a legacy of 1960's vehicle-centric design that was hostile, inaccessible and disorienting for pedestrians.

Mr Gilmartin stated that the team acknowledged there were strong calls for the re-use of the existing buildings and that the whole-life cycle carbon optioneering study would be discussed separately. He stated that the applicant team believed that, through a redevelopment approach, there was a huge opportunity

to transform the site into a welcoming, inclusive environment with generous gardens and public spaces accessible for all.

Mr Gilmartin advised that the design had evolved considerably over five years through many dozens of meetings with Planning Officers, consultees and stakeholders. In particular, the massing was reduced through sculpting bulk and height relative to townscape views and consultation feedback. Mr Gilmartin stated that all inputs had improved the proposal. He commented that at the north end of the St Paul's gyratory project, the revised highway layout would create a safer pedestrian junction and allow for movements along desire lines, connecting key cultural institutions and public destinations. To ascend to the Highwalk, there would be multiple intuitive new stairs and lifts, plus a gently sloped garden route, while retaining a pedestrian bridge over London Wall. These would provide easy flowing vertical access while negotiating the transitional character of the site between the London Wall commercial corridor and the Barbican's quieter green courtyards. The unrealised Highwalk link to Mountjoy Close would be made good.

Mr Gilmartin stated that the design focused on the spaces buildings could make around them with the architecture creating a green valley and public spaces being at the heart of the scheme. He stated that the masterplan imagined a rich network of landscape, heritage, cultural and open spaces and that the active central plaza was bordered and animated by cultural and food offers. In addition, new and improved gardens provided quiet moments on the north and east edges of the site, expanding green space and biodiversity. Mr Gilmartin stated that the proposal would provide enhanced access and views to the historic City Wall, revealing the currently forgotten Roman Gate. He added that the setting of Grade II listed Ironmongers' Hall, currently hemmed in behind the museum, would be granted breathing room, with increased visibility from Aldersgate Street as would befit its importance. Mr Gilmartin stated that the scheme's prominent cultural offer at street level, would provide flexible and ample space, supplemented by the cultural cap and public rooftop terrace with new public vantages of St Paul's.

Mr Gilmartin stated that the architecture was developed around the public and cultural spaces. Flanking the plaza would be green terraced facades with the planting extending up the sides of the two main buildings and these facades had a deliberate residential scale and feel. He stated that, in contrast, the outer facades of the main buildings were calmer with a more vertical expression, related to the scale and character of London Wall. Mr Gilmartin stated that the material of the solid cladding elements and fins recalled the bush-hammered concrete and details of the Barbican Estate. He added that the smaller North building had a contrasting approach formally and materially, reinterpreting the brick arches present in Ironmongers' Hall and the Barbican Estate south-west turret.

In conclusion, Mr Gilmartin stated that the applicant team were very confident that the design solution would deliver the optimal transformation of the site and public realm, capitalising on the heritage and landscape assets, while offering flexible, grade A office space and amenity to meet the demands of modern

occupiers. He added that this was all a vibrant, rich and varied mix of uses that would bring together culture, public realm, workplace and historic fabric.

Ms Anna Woodeson, Director at Buro Happold outlined the optioneering process to look at whole life carbon. She stated that initially two options were analysed: 1) a refurbishment and extension; and 2) full demolition and new build. After the publication of the Planning Advice Note in 2023, the optioneering process was extended to include 11 options in agreement with officers and Arcadis who had independently reviewed the work and compliance with the Planning Advice Note and from the 11 options, 6 were chosen to be developed in more detail. One option was a minor refurbishment which incorporated a major refurbishment after 15 years, Options 3a, 3b, 5 and 6 were major refurbishment options with extensions, and Option 9 was a complete redevelopment proposal. The embodied carbon of each option was measured in detail alongside operational energy.

Ms Woodeson stated that the overall conclusions were that the full redevelopment option maximised the site potential and delivered in the region of double the floor area of the existing buildings so, as expected it would have a higher upfront carbon spend. However, over the 60-year evaluation period as prescribed by planning policy, the cumulative carbon emissions per metre squared were the lowest in Option 9 as overall, the redevelopment option provided superior operational performance. It was concluded that the carbon investment in the full redevelopment would unlock the greatest amount of strategic and public benefits from the site and broader opportunities for sustainability across the site.

Ms Woodeson stated that the application scheme, developed from Option 9, was designed to deliver an exemplar development, adopting industry leading embodied carbon and operational energy targets, which were all locked in through the robust planning conditions proposed by Officers. It supported a connection to the Citigen district energy network, which allowed it to actively contribute to the decarbonisation of the local network through its onsite energy centre. Ms Woodeson also stated that the development would be industry leading and planning policy compliant in terms of its approach to sustainability and circularity within the design aiming for BREEAM Outstanding and WELL platinum for its offices. Ms Woodeson stated that wider sustainability benefits included improved biodiversity, with new habitat types proposed including extensive green roofs, a rain garden, a new pond and 100 trees to be planted across the site.

Ms Woodeson stated the public realm would be increased by nearly 50% opening up the area, improving accessibility, removing roads and prioritising pedestrians and cycles. She added that the evaluation of urban thermal comfort concluded that the proposed development significantly improved the urban environment, mitigating discomfort and enriching the public experience.

The Chairman asked Members if they had any questions of the applicants.

The Chief Commoner asked why a third-party review had not been undertaken. The applicant asked for clarification on whether this was in respect of the carbon optioneering or the design. The Chief Commoner stated it was in respect of the entire scheme. The Chairman suggested that this question be asked of Officers during the questioning of Officers.

A Member asked for clarification on how the conclusion that the overall carbon intensity of Option 9 - Redevelopment was less than that of the refurbishment options over the lifetime of the building. The applicant stated there were a number of components to establishing the cumulative carbon intensity. There was an analysis of the upfront carbon emissions of all the options as outlined in the carbon optioneering report. In this, Option 1 was the lowest and Option 9 was the highest per square metre. Then, as the 60 years progressed, the operational energy of the building and the maintenance and replacement cycles had to be added in. New build options often ended up reducing in intensity as they were more efficient. Option 9 reduced in intensity over the 60 years and was overtaken by the other options which concentrated more on refurbishment and retrofit.

In response to a Member's question about the level of interest in the soft market test, the Chairman stated this was not a planning consideration.

A Member referred to the spatial distribution policy of the north of the city and the local plan which did not permit tall buildings in the proposed area unless they were suitable and had regard to the character and amenity of the surroundings, including the significance of heritage assets and their settings and the effect of historic skyline features. She asked the applicant how the proposals met these policies. The applicant stated that the buildings were carefully studied in relation to distant views and regulated views, monuments and townscape considerations. New Bastion House was the same height as the existing Bastion House, although larger in bulk and the Rotunda was three storeys shorter and was placed at the southern end of the site where its impact on the surroundings was minimised. The placement of views was intended to preserve a sense of openness through the heart of the site and for views to St Paul's Cathedral to be preserved to the maximum extent. In terms of the context and character of the buildings, the design took a significant amount of its architectural character and expression in thinking about a contemporary reinterpretation of elements and qualities that existed on the site at the Barbican Estate so that it picked up and was contextually sympathetic in a contemporary fashion.

A Member stated there appeared to be no public toilets and no changing places and asked if the applicant could provide these. The applicant stated that public toilets had been identified throughout the lower parts of the buildings and they would principally be associated with the cultural elements and the office receptions. A planning condition related to the identification of a changing places toilet. The precise location had not been identified but this would be delivered under condition. The Member stated that if toilets were only open during office hours, they would not be a public benefit outside of office hours. The applicant stated that the cultural provision was expected to operate beyond

traditional office hours and this was also where the applicant was looking to locate the changing places toilet so it was expected that both would be available into the evening.

A Member asked for the applicant to comment on how the Ironmongers' Livery who had written a strongly objection on 30 January 2024, had changed their mind. The applicant stated that the Ironmongers and the applicants had continued dialogue throughout the process and a conclusion had been reached.

The Chairman asked for more detail on the service arrangements in the car park and how these would interact with users of the car park on a regular basis. The applicant stated that a traffic light system would be introduced and would be operated to give priority to users of the car park as opposed to servicing access. The servicing vehicles were being reduced by using an offsite consolidation facility. There would also be a condition restricting when servicing could take place to limit it to daylight, normal hours. The service yards were designed to have extra capacity in case there was a need to hold vehicles in the service yards to avoid queues on the ramps. It would be a very managed facility when it was developed in the future.

The Chairman asked applicants to outline the discussions with TfL on the gyratory and their views on the new road layouts and the impacts on traffic. The applicant stated that the team had been liaising with TfL throughout the project. A highway design had been developed to accommodate the existing traffic flows through the site without undue delay or excessive queuing and provide significant improvements to pedestrian crossings, particularly for vulnerable pedestrians. The applicants were not aware of any objections from TfL in terms of their strategic road network.

A Member asked about the details around the provision of a banksman at the Thomas More ramp. The applicant stated this would be covered by condition but it was anticipated that there would be a person present there 24 hours a day and they would also have access to cameras and be operating the traffic light control system within the service yards so there would not be a need for a banksman.

A Member asked how the conclusion to have a tall building on the museum site had been reached if maximising profit had not been the driving force. She stated that if it was a lower building, it would not have impinged so much on views and residential amenity. The applicant's representative from the townscape heritage and visual impacts consultants for the scheme, stated they had been working with the applicant and had been in close dialogue with Officers throughout pre-application discussions. A detailed and thorough assessment of heritage assets within the surrounding area had been undertaken. This included those which were closest to the site such as the Barbican and the associated heritage designations which covered the area, St Paul's Cathedral and other key Grade I listed buildings. The height, massing and design had changed throughout the pre-application process to respond to those heritage assets e.g. the key views of St Paul's Cathedral from bridges

and the south bank of the river were a significant driver in maintaining the height of Bastion House and ensuring the roof line where visible would just be a small sliver and would not cause undue harm. The Cathedral had raised comments in relation to St Paul's and the views from the south bank but not an objection in terms of the Barbican. The height and scale of the new Bastion House and the Rotunda building were comparable with the established setting of tall commercial buildings to the south of the estate and amendments were made to the height and massing of both of these to mitigate impacts on the Barbican. The materiality drew on reference to the Barbican buildings such as the bush hammered concrete. The greening and staggered design of the elevations drew upon the balconies which were present in the Barbican. There were also heritage benefits of the scheme for the Barbican, in particular, repairing the highwalk connection with the truncated area of Mountjoy House which was never realised as part of the original master plan for the Barbican, as well as the opening up of the Fort Gate, the scheduled monument in the car park. There would be significant public realm enhancements to the settings of the listed buildings and scheduled monument. In terms of strategic policy, the London Plan policy required the maximisation of the potential of sites. This was undertaken having regard to the full suite of policies set out in the London Plan and the local plan, having regard to environmental, social and economic considerations.

In response to a Member's question about consultation and issues raised in consultation that had not been responded to, the applicant stated that developers' guidance that was published in May 2023 was followed and was exceeded throughout the consultation process. There had been an informative consultative and collaborative engagement process and the applicant took on board the feedback that was received and responded to this where possible. Consultation took place over a 31-month period. Prior to the application being submitted, there was a phase of understanding priorities and aspirations for the area and then there were two phases of consultation where plans were presented to the public. Feedback was invited throughout the period. Six public meetings were attended by 503 members of the public, 190 feedback forms were completed and 116 meetings were held across the scheme with local stakeholders and members of the community. A public consultation website was visited over 14,000 times and statistics were captured in the statement of community involvement document submitted as part of the application. This document stated the feedback that was received and how it had been taken on board.

A Member asked the applicant to state what would happen in relation to operational carbon savings if the district heating network was not decarbonised. The applicant stated that the energy strategy incorporated a Citygen plant room within the development which would help decarbonise the network by 4.2%. It was acknowledged that the district heat network would not be fully decarbonised for many years, however a fully electrified strategy would require much more plant to be installed within the development which would result in much more embodied carbon. By connecting the district heat network as outlined, less plant was required within the development and it would be used

more efficiently than it would be if designed to meet the peak demand of the building.

A Member asked if TfL had approved the traffic and access plans. The applicant stated they had been consulted and provided some initial feedback but they had not provided formal approval. The proposal had not yet been through the TfL model audit process which was undertaken in the detailed stage so TfL could understand the modelling.

A Member commented on the duration of the project being six years and lifetime of the proposal being 60 years. He asked how long refurbishment and renovation would take to reach a good outcome and how long it would last. The applicant stated they had not looked at this so were unable to comment. They had instead focussed on the construction and operational arrangements for the development scheme.

A Member asked for more detail on the servicing of the building and detail of the building in terms of capacity on each floor. She raised concerns that consolidation would not be enough, that traffic could back up and she also raised concerns about number of crossings being reduced with more concentrated crossing points. She asked what would happen if TfL did not agree to the traffic and access plans and the impacts on residential amenity.

The applicant stated that consolidation and possible land uses had been taken into account in terms of servicing vehicles and numbers and those had all be used in the analysis. Priority would be given to people accessing via the service ramp and therefore it was not anticipated that there would be a queue back onto Aldersgate Street. If a queue did start to build, leaving vehicles would be held back. Consolidation would allow controlled times for vehicles so they would have to book a time to arrive and peak times would be avoided. Robust conditions would limit the service vehicle movements to 60 in any 24-hour period restricted to a 5-hour window. The existing position provided for in the region of 83 service vehicle movements so it was expected that there would be a betterment over the existing situation.

Following a question from a Member, the applicant confirmed that the service vehicle movements would be 120 as the ramp would be two-way but there would be resilience in the service bays as they had space for vehicles to be held to allow the free flow of traffic.

The Chairman suggested that the Sub-Committee now move to any questions that they might have of Officers at this stage.

A Member, following on from the Chief Commoner's earlier question asked if the proposed design had been reviewed by an independent body. An Officer stated that there was a Mayor's design review panel for the GLA for any referable cases. This case was not a referable case. The GLA stated that it was of no strategic interest. Part of the site was within a conservation area and Officers considered this item could be considered by the Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC). This was an independent body set up by the City,

made up of architects, planners and conservation specialists. They reviewed the proposals on 7 March 2024 and concluded that there was a significant improvement in their view on the existing situation and they raised no objections. The scheme had therefore been reviewed by an independent body.

The Chief Commoner asked that, in consideration of the City of London Corporation being both the applicant and local planning authority, if there had been the type of independent review that objectors had requested. The Officer reassured Members that the CAAC was an independent body. He also stated the intense scrutiny that this application had been subject to from statutory stakeholders. He reminded Members that Historic England had not raised an objection to the scheme and neither had St Paul's Cathedral and added that the proposal had been subject to rigorous and comprehensive external scrutiny.

A Member asked Officers for clarification on the public toilets and changing places toilet and how this would be embedded into conditions and whether they would be 24 hour toilets. An Officer stated that as part of the condition, plans would be provided along with details of the changing places and accessible toilet and details on the hours of opening. Officers could look to secure 24-hour access for an accessible toilet through the condition and details would have to be approved in writing.

A Member asked Officers to outline how they came to recommend for approval a non-refurbishment scheme given the retrofit first policy. An Officer stated that the emerging City Plan had a retrofit first approach but did not include a presumption against demolition. It did require development to minimise whole life cycle carbon, to robustly explore retention and to seek the most suitable and sustainable approach. The City Plan 2040 was a material consideration but was not part of the adopted development plan. It was clear in the local plan that there was a need for robust consideration of sustainability matters in all development. Core Strategy Policy CS15 was about avoiding demolition but this had to be understood in the wider context of the policy and the plan as a whole which included detail on redevelopment proposals and the need for meeting the quality and quantity of new development, particularly office floor space. There was also the carbon options guidance which was adopted in 2023 and set out a process for considering different options for any scheme. This scheme had been through that process. Another Officer stated that six options had been assessed robustly and had also been third-party reviewed by an independent reviewer. The outcome was that there would be potential to retain Bastion House especially if there was a change of use e.g. to a hotel, due to the constraints of the building but the redevelopment option would have wider benefits. It was not just the building sustainability that had to be considered but also the wider context and the way the site would be accessible and connected to the rest of the City, support sustainable transport modes and support short distances so it was future-proofed as a sustainable location in the City. In the wider context of the region all these elements had to be considered. The redevelopment option provided the most benefits.

A Member asked for clarification on the carbon impact of the scheme. An Officer stated that the square metre figure for redevelopment was the lowest of

all the options and was used to assess compliance with GLA policies. It would achieve the aspirational benchmark of the GLA.

In relation to Members' questions about highways, an Officer stated that they considered the highway design to be a betterment to road users. The existing highways arrangements were considered unsafe when accident data was checked. TfL had not highlighted any concerns with the proposals. The detail of the highways work would be part of the Section 278 works. As part of this highways work, detail design work would be undertaken and there would be liaison with TfL regarding the final arrangements and the modelling.

A Member stated that there were early concerns that retrofit might not be viable due to the Bastion House structure but she understood these concerns had been clarified and a reuse or retrofit approach would be possible. The Member stated she did not understand there to be safety concerns for the former Museum of London site. The Member asked if any remaining safety concerns could be addressed and put into context. An Officer stated that as part of the carbon optioneering, structural problems were not part of the second optioneering exercise so no option had been discounted for that reason. The applicant had applied a carbon contingency to any works that would be required to adapt Bastion House or to remodel the buildings if they were reused and this had been reviewed by a third-party. Works could include new lifts, extensions and strengthening works. The Officer confirmed that none of the options presented structural safety concerns.

A Member also asked if Option 3 was classed as a major refurbishment and stated that in the case of 81 Newgate Street, public amenities such as retail space and public roof garden had been removed without this being considered by Committee. She asked for assurances this would not happen on this site. An Officer stated that Option 3A was a major refurbishment but it did replace the Museum of London buildings with a rotunda building that was smaller and also replaced the northern building but Bastion House would be retained along with a large part of the podium structure. The Officer stated that 81 Newgate House had two objections which was fewer than the threshold of nine the scheme of delegation required for an application to be considered by the Sub-Committee. There were also no policy non-compliance issues to that application and it was not considered there was broader interest in that case. The Officer added that in the application currently being considered, there were a significant number of objections which indicated very wide broad interest and even though the scheme was very substantially compliant with policy, there were policy non-compliance issues. For these reasons, any diminishment in the public benefit of any significant would be returned to the Sub-Committee.

A Member asked for clarification of the operating hours and maintenance of the new lifts. An Officer stated that there was an existing lift on the highwalk over London Wall which would be remodelled. There would be a new lift down to the scheduled monument and Barber-Surgeons' Gardens, improving access significantly. There would also be a lift adjacent to Ironmongers' Hall and there was a further lift at the base of the new Bastion House. Condition 94 would look

at the public realm including the lifts and accessibility regarding management and operations and this would include opening times.

A Member asked if the reports from Simon Sturgis were considered when the different options around carbon were considered. An Officer stated that although there were many graphs and tables about the refurbishment option, it was not known what the underlying assumptions were. She stated that the major refurbishment option outlined in the Officer's report was an amalgamation of scenarios one and two and that had been calculated and reviewed and although similar to the option from Simon Sturgis, the assumptions underlying these options were declared.

A Member stated that Bastion House was an example of important historical architecture and he asked Officers to outline the efforts made to try and retain the building and why Officers considered on balance that the wider benefits of the scheme meant that the proposal was appropriate. An Officer stated that in relation to aesthetic or architectural qualities of the existing Bastion House, the Officer report set out in detail why it was not concluded to be a non-designated heritage asset, chiefly on account of its simple elevation, simple cuboid form and underwhelming detail. From this basis it was deemed acceptable in principle to move to a new design aesthetic and one which took different design cues and employed different materials to arrive at a different kind of character and identity for this scheme.

A Member asked a number of questions and the Chairman asked Officers to address the material planning considerations. In relation to the suitability of the site for an office, the Officer stated that paragraph 111 of the Officer report detailed the adopted local plan and the emerging City Plan and the London Plan all supporting the delivery of new office floor space in the City. Paragraph 122 of the Officer report summarised the key policies. Strategic Objective 1 of the Local Plan was to maintain the City's position as a world leading financial and business centre. Policy CS1 of the Local Plan aimed to increase the amount of City's office floor space during the period of the plan. Local Plan Policy DM 1.2 promoted the assembly and development of sites for large office schemes in appropriate locations. The Officer stated that the local plan was not prescriptive about the specific uses that should come forward on this site. The plan identified at the north of the City area in which this site was located, there would be significant office growth of 10%-20% of the total office growth envisaged in the City Plan. There was an expectation set out that offices in the local plan would be acceptable development across the City. The Officer also stated it was important to note that the site was an existing office location alongside its current cultural use and the wider area that had a mixed character, parts of which were the large-scale office buildings that sat nearby. The Officer added that Point 2 of the emerging City Plan stated that office growth would be encouraged in all parts of the square mile.

In relation to a question about the level of debate amongst Officers, Members were informed that Officers considered that this was a very good planning scheme in all respects, it was very substantially policy compliant and Officers were completely behind the recommendations.

In response to a Member's question about the number of objections received, an Officer stated that the number received was not typical of many major applications in the City but it was not unprecedented. The Officer stated that the current Liverpool Street Station application and the previous Bury House scheme had comparable numbers of objections. Officers took into account all representations received. They set out the details in the consultation section of the Officer report with individual Officer responses to each and also addressed these through the main body of the report.

In response to a Member's question about the scheme being changed, an Officer stated that when schemes were granted permission, there was a general expectation that the scheme would be implemented as approved but there was scope to submit further amendments to any scheme. All subsequent applications were fully assessed on their merits and were subject to consultation. It was not known whether there would be any amendments to this scheme but if there was, they would be fully assessed and any material changes would be brought back to the Sub-Committee.

In relation to a Member's question about carbon release and what would happen in the next decade, an Officer stated that the development, if approved, would go through an extensive detailed design process during which all the details to satisfy the conditions would be worked up. This would take a number of years so it was not expected there would be significant carbon impact before the end of this decade. The main impact was likely to be in the 2030s.

In terms of a Member's concern about the climate, an Officer stated that the major refurbishment options would also result in two-thirds of the carbon emissions of the redevelopment scheme. In relation to policies including the National Planning Policy Framework approach, all environmental, social and economic sustainability issues had to be weighed and balanced against each other for each planning application. The Officer stated that this application had done this and this was the reason why Option 9 - the redevelopment option was proposed. This was important to deliver wider sustainability benefits. Sustainability could not just be reduced to carbon; biodiversity, greening and climate resilience all had to be considered and the City had to be future-proofed as a whole.

An Officer stated that the words climate emergency had been mentioned and he reminded Members that this was not the position of the City of London.

A Member stated she had a question relating to cyclists and the public realm. She stated that with the removal of the highwalk level and access points to the southern end, it would be necessary for pedestrians to use the street level. She asked who would be policing the dismount and conduct of cyclists and stated that this was already a problem on Aldersgate Street and across the City, especially in relation to dockless electric bikes and scooters being abandoned in the public realm. An Officer stated that dockless bikes would be considered during the detailed design. There was wider debate about the management of dockless bikes.

In relation to a Member's question about the figure of 3,000 jobs stated in the Officer report, an Officer stated that the figure was based on the floor space delivered on the site. There was substantial demand for new office floor space within the square mile. Evidence commissioned independently from Arup and Knight Frank last year, stated that a minimum of 1.2 million additional square metres of office floor space was required in the City to accommodate substantial job growth of upwards of 60,000 new jobs up to 2040 within the square mile so there was substantial demand for jobs. These job projections were taken from the GLA's figures which were long-term job projections based on robust assessment of the future long-term growth of the UK's economy so rather than being based on short-term economic cycles, they were based on the long-term projections. A site such as this one would take years to develop. Another aspect to the economic benefits were the cultural aspects and retail which would help with the seven day a week economic life of the City and contribute to Destination City.

In relation to a Member's question about traffic modelling and concern about u-turn movements, an Officer stated that this would be part of a thorough highways design which would take into consideration all road users. There was currently an outline design which had been verified and there were very few u-turn movements so this was not anticipated to be a problem. Members were informed that the removal of the roundabout would be a benefit to many road users. The project would address accidents and provide better routes for pedestrians. Surveys would be undertaken as part of the detailed design.

In response to a question about the Jewish cemetery, an Officer stated that the precise boundaries of the cemetery were subject to debate but had been rigorously looked at by scholars. Over the course of the application, several amendments were made to the design to remove any impacts from the zone of the Jewish cemetery. Conditions were secured to monitor work around the area to ensure that no further disturbance would be caused. The Officer confirmed that there would be no changes to the size or shape of the building.

A Member asked if it would be possible for Conditions 10, 12, 18 and 57 to be amended to state that details had to be provided prior to demolition and Conditions 14, 16, 22, 59 and 73 should trigger demolition after they had been approved. In addition, the Member asked that Conditions 88 and 89 should clearly state that no demolition would be undertaken before details were provided. She stated that it was important for Destination City that there were not years of having a demolished site. The Member also asked that there be further consultation with the residents on Condition 12. The Chairman asked Officers if it would be possible to amend these conditions. An Officer stated that any pre-commencement conditions should be discussed and agreed with the applicant. He also stated that in relation to the Jewish Cemetery proposed amendment to the conditions, the intention with the existing conditions was that no work would be carried out until those safeguards were in place.

A Member referred to Paragraph 822 of the Officer's report and asked for confirmation that there was a condition in place to the effect that no demolition

would take place before the London Wall West site had been marketed, a legally binding contract had been entered into with a successful developer and the developer had appointed a principal contractor. She stated that if not, she would like a condition on this to be included.

A Member asked for clarification on the peer review had been carried out by the City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) and the members present at the meeting where this item was discussed, including whether the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation as ex-officio Member were present.

A Member raised concern about the second addendum, circulated the afternoon before the meeting, with the amendment to a condition which extended the time limit for the development to begin from three years to five years and asked Officers for clarification on this.

A Member stated that the car park would be truncated as one of the entrances would be taken away. She raised concern about the difficulty of getting into and out of the car park and asked if this would mean it would be sacrificed as an income generator or would become infeasible.

MOTION: - A Member stated that the Sub-Committee had heard from the developers, the objectors and Officers and had had ample opportunity to ask them a series of searching questions. Whilst he recognised this would be advancing proceedings, he proposed that the Sub-Committee now move to vote on the recommendations.

As a point of order, another Member stated that as this was a City of London Corporation application and the Sub-Committee was the City of London's Planning Applications Sub-Committee, it had a duty to ensure that every Member had the ability to ask questions of Officers.

The Chairman asked if there was a seconder and a Member seconded the proposal to move to the vote.

The Chairman ruled the motion to be premature at this juncture and stated that the Sub-Committee would finish questioning Officers as there were still new points emerging, and then might reconsider this course of action should it be put again after this section.

The Officer stated that in relation to the question about CAAC membership, this was a mixture of ward club members, architects, planners, heritage specialists and other organisations by invitation. The Chairman and Deputy Chairman were ex-officio members but did not vote. The Chairman and Deputy Chairman stated they were not present at the meeting where this item was considered.

An Officer stated that the government advice was that written agreement of the developer must be secured in relation to pre-commencement conditions and he suggested that the Sub-Committee leave this with Officers to discuss with the applicant, if the planning permission was granted. In respect of the change to

the five-year time limit, the Officer stated that this was requested by the applicant following sight of the conditions. Officers considered this was reasonable in this instance, given the scale of the scheme and the number of details that would need to be given careful consideration prior to implementation. In respect of the details on the transport matters in Paragraph 822, there were conditions covering construction and deconstruction logistics and there was a scheme of protective works condition for the construction and demolition phases of the development.

A Member asked Officers for the proportion of applications within the City of London that received Article 31 holding directions. The Officer stated they were very common-place on high profile schemes. They were triggered by a third-party or other request to call-in and they normally enabled the Secretary of State some time to consider the request. The Officer stated that the advice given by the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities was not to issue a decision until after the political sensitives of the London Mayoral Elections.

In reference to a point made by an objector about the Tate modern viewing platform, a Member asked what implications this case would have for the viewing platform in this application. The Officer stated that the viewing gallery in the proposal was directed away from residents and looked southward so there would not be issues of overlooking. The design mitigated and avoided any sense of overlooking.

The Chief Commoner asked why the GLA recommended Mayoral Review Panel had not been used for this application. An Officer stated that this was not considered to be a referable case by the GLA as it was not considered to be of strategic interest, it did not impact on views of Londonwide significance and as such was considered to be a local issue. The panel was used in instances where the application was so substantial that it was referred to the Mayor and it then went to the Mayoral Design Review Panel but this was not triggered in this instance.

Seeing no further questions, the Chairman asked that Members now move to debate the application.

MOTION: - The Member who had earlier proposed that the Sub-Committee move to vote on the recommendation, proposed the motion again. This was seconded and the Sub-Committee therefore proceeded to vote on the motion.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 15 votes
OPPOSED – 9 votes
There was 1 abstention.

The motion to move to the vote was therefore carried.

[Deputy Dawn Wright who had left the meeting, did not vote.]

** In accordance with Standing Order No. 38, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Anne Corbett, Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Dawn Frampton, Steve Goodman,*

Jaspreet Hodgson, Deborah Oliver, Alderwoman Susan Pearson, having voted against the motion, asked that this be recorded in the minutes.

A Member raised a point of order. She asked for clarification on whether the holding notice affected Members voting on the application. The Officer stated that the holding notice did not preclude Members for making a resolution. The legal officer stated that often the Secretary of State would not make a decision on whether or not to call the item in until they were aware of the decision reached by the Local Planning Authority so the Secretary of State would be informed of the decision taken by the Sub-Committee and this would be taken into account.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 16 votes
OPPOSED – 8 votes
There was 1 abstention.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

[Deputy Dawn Wright who had left the meeting, did not vote.]

** In accordance with Standing Order No. 38, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Anne Corbett, Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Dawn Frampton, Steve Goodman, Jaspreet Hodgson, Deborah Oliver, Alderwoman Susan Pearson, having voted against the recommendations, asked that this be recorded in the minutes.*

RESOLVED -

1. That the Planning and Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice granting planning permission for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule, as amended by the addenda, subject to:
 - (a) The City as landowner giving a commitment (through a resolution or delegated decision) that it will comply with the planning obligations in connection with the development if it implements the planning permission (and that it will ensure that the obligations are binding on any future purchaser or development partner) and a Unilateral Undertaking being signed in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the commitment/resolution has been given and a Unilateral Undertaking has been signed.
2. That it is noted in principle that land affected by the building which is currently public highway and highway over which the public have a right of access, including Shaftsbury Place may be stopped up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers may proceed under delegated authority with arrangements for advertising and making of a stopping-up order for the various areas, to the extent that such stopping-up order is unopposed. If there were to be any unresolved objections to the stopping-up order, a report would be taken to the Planning and Transportation Committee for decision;

3. That your Officers be authorised to provide the information required by regulation 29 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (information to be provided to the developer post determination of the application), and to inform the public and the Secretary of State as required by regulation 30 of those regulations.

4. **LISTED BUILDING CONSENT REQUESTS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning and Development concerning the demolition of Ferroners' House alongside external alterations to the facade and roof level of Ironmongers' Hall, internal reconfiguring to cores and back of house areas and associated works in association with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).

The Sub-Committee also considered a report of the Director of Planning and Development concerning external alterations to existing highwalks at the Barbican Estate including to the John Wesley Highwalk and Mountjoy Close to allow for the integration of new highwalks, hard and soft landscaping, and works associated with the construction of new buildings with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).

The Sub-Committee voted on these recommendations alongside those set out under Agenda Item 3.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 16 votes
OPPOSED – 8 votes
There was 1 abstention.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

[Deputy Dawn Wright who had left the meeting, did not vote.]

** In accordance with Standing Order No. 38, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Anne Corbett, Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Dawn Frampton, Steve Goodman, Jaspreet Hodgson, Deborah Oliver, Alderwoman Susan Pearson, having voted against the recommendations, asked that this be recorded in the minutes.*

RESOLVED -

That Listed Building Consent be granted for the above proposals in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule as amended by the addenda.

5. **VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director detailing development applications received by the Department of the Environment since the report to the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

6. **DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director detailing development and advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

The meeting ended at 12.37 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis
zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Addendum report to Agenda Item 4: Alban Gate, 125 – 130 London Wall	
Committee	Date
Planning Applications Sub Committee	09 May 2024

Update to Conditions

Condition 8 to be updated to include:

(h) Submission of an updated Access Statement to include details of the new internal lift (1:20) and a lift operation and maintenance plan, lighting, directional signage and wayfinding, surface materials and contrasts for all hard surfaces and entrances and planting having reference to sensory and allergen requirements.

REASON: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the detail of the proposed development and to ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to ensure that the development will be accessible for people with disabilities in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM3.2, DM10.1, DM10.5, DM12.2, DM10.8 and emerging policies DE2, DE6 and HE1 of the Draft City Plan 2040.

One additional condition should be inserted, and the subsequent condition numbering amended accordingly:

Condition 12

The existing Barbican Wayfinding Board at podium level shall be carefully removed prior to the demolition commencing, safely stored for the duration of building works, reinstated, and retained as part of the new feature wall at podium level in accordance with detailed specifications including fixing details which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the works affected thereby.

REASON: In the interest of wayfinding, visual amenity and to maintain the historic interest of the site in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM12.1, DM10.1.

This page is intentionally left blank