

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 2 June 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Michael Welbank (Chairman)	Sylvia Moys
Marianne Fredericks (Deputy Chairman)	Graham Packham
Randall Anderson	Judith Pleasance
Alex Bain-Stewart	Deputy Henry Pollard
Deputy Bill Fraser	Alderman William Russell
George Gillon	Graeme Smith
Deputy Brian Harris	Angela Starling
Gregory Jones QC	Patrick Streeter
Oliver Lodge	

In attendance

Jeremy Simons

Officers:

Simon Murrells	Assistant Town Clerk
Christopher Braithwaite	Town Clerk's Department
Natasha Dogra	Town Clerk's Department
Richard Chamberlain	City Surveyor's Department
Alison Hurley	City Surveyor's Department
Deborah Cluett	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Philip Everett	Director of the Built Environment
Gemma Delves	Department of the Built Environment
Annie Hampson	Department of the Built Environment
Elisabeth Hannah	Department of the Built Environment
Stuart McGregor	Department of the Built Environment
Richard Miller	Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	Department of the Built Environment
Steve Presland	Department of the Built Environment
Alan Rickwood	City of London Police

Before commencing the business of the meeting, the Chairman invited Jeremy Simons, immediate past Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to provide Members with a presentation regarding the improvements that had been made to the Holborn Circus area and the restoration of the Prince Albert statue in the area.

The Chairman also reminded Members that following the meeting they would be provided with a presentation in relation to the Considerate Contractor Scheme.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Reverend Dr Martin Dudley, Emma Edhem, Alderman Peter Estlin, Sophie Anne Fernandes, Christopher Hayward, Deputy Henry Jones, Paul Martinelli, Brian Mooney, Deputy Alastair Moss, Tom Sleigh and Deputy James Thomson.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 May 2015 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the following inclusions:

- The inclusion following the final sentence of minute item 10.2 of the sentence “There was also a concern that the proposal had not changed since referral back in regard to the mass of the structure. The concerns stated by the Committee in this area had not been addressed.”

Matters Arising

Cycle Superhighway - The Director of the Built Environment the Committee that the Chairman had written on their behalf to Transport for London in relation to this scheme.

Sugar Quay - The Chairman advised the Committee that an appeal had been lodged in relation to the modification of the Section 106 agreement for Sugar Quay.

4. **TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director relative to development and advertisement applications dealt with under delegated authority since the last meeting.

5. **VALID APPLICATIONS LIST FOR COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director which provided details of valid planning applications received by the department.

6. **REPORTS RELATIVE TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Chief Planning Officer advised the Committee that there were a number of common areas between the applications as follows details of which were contained within the reports.

6.1 2no. BT Telephone Kiosks Royal Exchange Buildings, London, EC3V 3NL

The Chief Planning officer explained that there were concerns that the proposed change of use would detract from the amenities of the Grade 1 and 2* listed buildings in the area around the Royal Exchange and the other iconic structures in the Bank Conservation Area and would lead to clutter on the street scene and congestion among pedestrians in an already very busy area.

During discussion, reference was made to non-designated heritage assets which were not listed buildings or conservation areas, but were considered to have heritage value.

A Member asked what would happen to these and similar phone boxes in the long term if alternative uses were not found and regular maintenance not conducted. It was explained that this issue was not a valid planning consideration for these applications, but a report would be submitted to the Committee on this issue in due course.

Upon being put to the vote the application was refused –

Vote: 13 in support, 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the attached schedule (namely that the proposed conversion of the telephone boxes to retail units (Use Class A1) would detract from the significance of the K6 telephone boxes and would result in less than substantial harm to part of the Bank Conservation Area and the setting of the grade I listed Royal Exchange and grade II listed Royal Exchange Buildings. The proposal would detract from the public realm and obstruct the highway contrary to policies DM17.1, DM12.2, DM12.1, DM10.1 and DM10.4 of the Local Plan and policies 6.10B, 7.5B and 7.8 of the London Plan.).

6.2 2 No. BT Telephone Kiosks On Finsbury Circus At Side of 88 - 92 Moorgate London EC2M 6SE

Proposal: Change of use of 2no. BT telephone boxes to 2no. retail kiosks (A1). Replacement of the existing telephone box glazing with toughened safety glass.

Registered No: 15/00039/FULL

The Chief Planning officer explained that there were concerns that the proposed change of use would detract from the Finsbury Circus Conservation Area and would lead to clutter on the streetscene and congestion among pedestrians in what would be an extremely busy area following the opening of the nearby Crossrail station and that there was already significant amounts of street furniture adjacent to the site.

Upon being put to the vote the application was refused –

Vote: 15 in support, 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the attached schedule (namely that the proposed conversion of the telephone boxes to retail units (Use Class A1) would detract from the significance of the K6 telephone boxes and result in less than substantial harm to part of the Finsbury Circus Conservation Area and the setting of the grade II listed 76 to 92 Moorgate. The scheme would obstruct the highway and would detract from the public realm contrary to policies DM17.1, DM12.2, DM12.1, DM10.1 and DM10.4 of the Local Plan and policies 6.10B, 7.5B and 7.8 of the London Plan.).

6.3 1 No. BT Telephone Kiosk O/s 21 Fleet Street, London, EC4Y 1AA
Proposal: Change of use of 1 no. BT telephone boxes to 1 no. retail kiosk (A1). Replacement of the existing telephone box glazing with toughened safety glass.

Registered No: 15/00041/FULL

The Chief Planning officer explained that there were concerns that the proposed change of use would detract from the Fleet Street Conservation Area and the heritage assets nearby, and would lead to clutter on the streetscene and congestion among pedestrians in what was already a busy area.

Upon being put to the vote the application was refused –

Vote: 15 in support, 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the attached schedule (namely that the proposed conversion of the telephone box to a retail unit (Use Class A1) would detract from the significance of the K6 telephone boxes and result in less than substantial harm to part of the Fleet Street Conservation Area and the setting of the grade II listed 18 and 21 Fleet Street. The scheme would obstruct the highway and would detract from the public realm contrary to policies DM17.1, DM12.2, DM12.1, DM10.1 and DM10.4 of the Local Plan and policies 6.10B, 7.5B and 7.8 of the London Plan.).

6.4 1 No. BT Telephone Kiosk O/s Bank Buildings 8 Lothbury London EC2R 7HH

Proposal: Change of use of 1 no. BT telephone box to 1 no. retail kiosk (A1). Replacement of the existing telephone box glazing with toughened safety glass.

Registered No: 15/00042/FULL

The Chief Planning officer explained that there were concerns that the proposed change of use would detract from the Bank Conservation Area and the heritage assets nearby, and would lead to large amounts of clutter on the street scene and congestion among pedestrians in what was already a busy area.

A Member commented on the security of access for the site.

Upon being put to the vote the application was refused –

Vote: 15 in support, 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the attached schedule (namely that the proposed conversion of the telephone box to a retail unit (Use Class A1) would detract from the significance of the K6 telephone box and result in less than substantial harm to part of the Bank Conservation Area. The scheme would obstruct the highway and detract from the public realm contrary to policies DM17.1, DM12.2, DM12.1, DM10.1 and DM10.4 of the Local Plan and policies 6.10B, 7.5B and 7.8 of the London Plan.

7. **REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

7.1 **Rescission of City Walkway - Moorfields Highwalk - 21 Moorfields Redevelopment**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which recommended the rescission of part of the existing city walkway known as Moorfields Highwalk and seeks authority to enter into Section 106 covenants to safeguard its re-provision. The walkway rescission is to enable the redevelopment of 21 Moorfields which was approved by the Committee on 17 March 2015, subject to a Section 106 Agreement (Registered No. 14/01179/FULEIA).

Members asked questions about ensuring spares for the remaining lift, the proposal that the action was taken before the consultation notice expired and why the current City walkway would become private realm.

The Director of the Built Environment explained that the main purpose of the existing walkway was to provide access to the premises at 21 Moorfields, and therefore it was in the interests of the premises owner to maintain this walkway. He clarified that the notice that was notice of the action being taken, and the consultation had already been completed. The City Surveyor explained that the list of critical spares for the remaining lift was being compiled.

RESOLVED – That:

- a) authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to agree the final terms of the proposed Section 106 covenants relating to the re-provision of city walkway as part of the 21 Moorfields development;
- b) subject to the Section 106 covenants referred to above and outlined under the “Section 106 Covenants” heading in the report, the resolution of the Court of Common Council dated 26 May 1977 be varied to alter the city walkway known as Moorfields Highwalk so as to exclude the area shown cross hatched on the City Walkway Variation Drawing No. M000040-HB-010 (Appendix D to this report) in accordance with the resolution set out in Appendix C to the report;
- c) the Director of the Built Environment be authorised to insert an appropriate date for the coming into force of the resolution at (b) above; and

- d) the proposed temporary closure under delegated authority prior to the City Walkway rescission coming into effect be noted.

7.2 Gateway 3 Outline Options Appraisal: Tower Bridge Bascule Re-Decking and Approach Viaduct Waterproofing

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which set out the options appraisal for the Tower Bridge Bascule re-decking and approach viaduct waterproofing.

RESOLVED – That:

- a) the Director of Built Environment be authorised to progress further investigations, in order to provide a firm recommendation on the preferred construction option at Gateway 4 to reduce construction risks;
- b) the Director of Built Environment be authorised to instruct AECOM in a limited initial role, to investigate practical outline solutions to the works, assist in the brief/tender for a Design & Build (D&B) contractor, as well as specifying and supervising exploratory works to inform the GW4 recommendations, the subsequent design proposals and to reduce construction stage risks – working in conjunction with the design and build contractor when appointed. This will be on hourly rates as “additional services” under their current term contract, capped at an estimated value of £62,000 to Gateway 4;
- c) the Director of Built Environment be authorised to tender and appoint a Cost Consultant for the duration of the project (with estimated costs to GW4 as £39,000);
- d) the Director of Built Environment be authorised to tender and appoint a Design and Build Contractor, with an initial appointment in an ECI role to GW4, estimated at £47,000;
- e) the Director of Built Environment be authorised to instruct intrusive investigation works to be carried out, to inform the design, estimated at £50,000 to GW4;
- f) the Director of Built Environment be authorised to allocate staff resources to an estimated value of £25,000, to progress the project to GW4 and
- g) approval be given to allocate resources to the value of £223,000 to GW4 in Financial Year 2015/16 to this project, to cover the costs of consultant fees, investigations and staff costs (the breakdown for which is Appended to this report). The cost of these resources will be covered by re-allocating from the sum of £459,000 in the current plan for 2015/16 for re-tensioning the suspension cables to Millennium Bridge, which are not required this financial year.

7.3 Parking Ticket Office Update and Annual Statistics for 2013-2015

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which advised Members on the activities and progress of the Parking Ticket Office. The report set out the key successes and improvements over what has been a highly successful year, particularly in relation to quality, efficiency and contract savings. It also set out the key business challenges for the current year.

A Member explained that the City's parking hours were not in sync with those of neighbouring authorities and asked whether there were any plans for these to be amended. It was explained that this was a strategic issue that was not within the direct responsibility of the Parking Ticket Office, but further consideration could be given to this by the Department of the Built Environment.

A Member asked whether there were any plans to review parking arrangements in light of the proposals for Cultural Hub. It was explained that this was an issue which was discussed as part of the cross-departmental planning processes.

RESOLVED – That the Committee notes the report.

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

11. **ISSUE REPORT: RELIGHTING OF TOWER BRIDGE 2012**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the City Surveyor regarding outstanding issues in relation to the Relighting of Tower Bridge which took place in 2012.

12. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 11.25 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Chris Braithwaite

tel. no.: 020 7332 1427

Christopher.braithwaite@cityoflondon.gov.uk