

## **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**Friday, 24 May 2019**

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

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)	Shravan Joshi
Munsur Ali	Deputy Brian Mooney
Rehana Ameer	Sylvia Moys
Randall Anderson	Graham Packham
Peter Bennett	Susan Pearson
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Judith Pleasance
Alderman Emma Edhem	James de Sausmarez
Marianne Fredericks	Oliver Sells QC
Alderman Prem Goyal	William Upton QC
Graeme Harrower	

#### **Officers:**

Gordon Roy	-
Zahur Khan	-
Alison Bunn	-
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
David Horkan	-
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Annie Hampson	- Department of the Built Environment
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Mark Bostock, Henry Colthurst, Karina Dostalova, Peter Dunphy, Sophie Fernandes, Tracey Graham, Christopher Hill, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Oliver Lodge, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Andrew Mayer, Deputy Henry Pollard and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

Alderman Prem Goyal declared a standing, personal interest in agenda items 6, 7 and 10 by virtue of holding a tenancy in the Ward of Farringdon Within.

### **3. MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the public minutes of the meeting held on 30 April 2019 as a correct record.

#### **MATTERS ARISING**

**Land Adjacent to 20 Bury Street London EC3A 5AX** (page 7) – The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the Section 106 terms were still being negotiated with the applicant and that the 14 day period in which the Mayor had to respond to this was therefore still to be triggered. Notwithstanding this, an Article 31 had been placed by the Secretary of State meaning that the City Corporation could not determine the application without first advising the Secretary of State.

#### **4. MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the draft minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 17 April 2019.

#### **MATTERS ARISING**

**All Change at Bank** (page 22) – A Member requested an update on the progress of the scheme which had also been considered by the Finance Committee earlier this week. Officers reported that, at the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 2 May 2019, Members agreed to delegate a decision regarding the continuation of, and further capital spending on, the All Change at Bank project during the period of the fundamental review to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman of Resource Allocation Sub Committee. Members agreed this approach subject to the reprioritisation of funding within the Department of the Built Environment and on the basis that there be no resultant increase in central budgets in the 2019/20 financial year. Officers were instructed to produce a report under urgency to the Chair & Deputy Chairman of Resource Allocation Sub-Committee setting out the detail of how this is to be achieved. The urgency requested that Section 106 funding be utilised to fund the All Change at Bank project to Gateway 4 whilst the fundamental review was underway.

In response to questions around the delay to works, the Director of the Built Environment expressed concern around the momentum of this and reported that the urgency had led to significant further questions about the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee's prioritisation around this project and was still, therefore, yet to be signed off. It was estimated that approximately 1 month had been lost already in terms of progressing the works and Officers would need to give careful thought as to how this could now be made up for.

Members echoed the Director's disappointment and asked that a clear message be sent back to the relevant decision makers outlining this. It was noted that many of those using the junction would be waiting to see these physical improvements implemented as soon as possible. The Chairman agreed with this point and highlighted that this project was a top priority for this Committee and had been for some time now. Another Member commented that such delays were simply adding to the overall costs of the project. She added that the Chamberlain's Department had attended recent meetings of the Streets

and Walkways Sub Committee and should therefore be well aware of their priorities.

The Director reported that Officers were now working closely with the Chamberlain to look at how this might be resolved without further delay alongside relevant Members tasked with signing off on the urgency.

## **5. APPOINTMENT OF STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE - RE-BALLOT**

The Chairman stated that it was disappointing to note the error that had been made in terms of the appointment of Members to the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee subsequent to the last meeting.

He went on to state that the total number of Members appointed to each Sub Committee was set out constitutionally for efficiency reasons. He added that his own view was that there must be an optimum size for each Sub Committee and that, whilst he had no wish to prevent Members who were not appointed to specific Sub Committee's providing adequate notice to the Chair and Deputy Chairman that they would be attending specific meetings and wishing to make specific points, he would not encourage this to be regular practice.

The Deputy Chairman stated that he fully endorsed this view and wished to move that the Committee's resolution that the membership of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee be expanded to incorporate eight Members from the grand Committee be rescinded and the number revert to seven, with the re-ballot therefore being for one remaining place between those three Members who had tied in the original ballot. The motion was seconded and put immediately to the vote.

Votes on the Motion were cast as follows:

- In favour– 18 Members
- Opposed – 0 Members
- Abstentions – 1 Member

Members therefore proceeded to ballot for one remaining place on the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee between those three Members who had tied in the original ballot – Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark, Marianne Fredericks and William Upton QC. Members were content to allow the votes to be counted as the meeting proceeded with the Assistant Town Clerk acting as scrutineer. Members requested that the votes for each candidate be read out in full.

The Town Clerk delivered the result as follows:

- Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark – 11 votes
- Marianne Fredericks – 8 votes
- William Upton QC – 1 vote

The Town Clerk therefore declared Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark to also be appointed to the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee for the ensuing year.

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

The 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.

**RECEIVED.**

7. **VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

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

A Member stated that she had been informed that the application relating to 26A Savage Gardens had not been signed by the applicant and that this matter had been raised with the Department of the Built Environment by residents. She added that she had also been informed that the description provided was inaccurate and questioned whether the application could therefore be validated. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that, as she had not received notice of these questions, she would undertake to look in to this application specifically and report back to the Member. She did, however, add that she believed that an electronic signature on an application was sufficient.

Another Member stated that he believed that there were also issues around the description of the application relating to 10 Bolt Court. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that revised details of this had not yet been received.

**RECEIVED.**

8. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing outstanding actions from their last meeting.

Updates were provided as follows:

Ludgate Circus

It was highlighted that this was the subject of a separate agenda item.

Daylight/Sunlight Training

It was noted that training had been organised to take place from 10-11am on Tuesday 18 June, immediately prior to the next Planning and Transportation Committee taking place that same morning.

A Member commented that he hoped that the training would cover not only theory but how this impacted on planning decisions. He referred to a recent course he had attended externally which had referenced 2 recent cases that

had been brought to Judicial Review. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director assured Members that the City Corporation almost always requested an independent assessment of daylight/sunlight submissions.

A Member questioned whether a one hour session would be sufficient on this subject. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that the session was intended to provide Members with an overview of and a useful introduction to the matter. If it was subsequently felt that more in-depth training was required this could be arranged.

#### Daylight/Sunlight- Alternative Guidelines

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that this would now be the subject of a report to the July 2019 meeting of this Committee, given that training was now scheduled for June 2019.

#### Illegal Street Traders on the City's Bridges

It was highlighted that this was the subject of a separate agenda item.

#### Millennium Inclinor

It was highlighted that this was the subject of a separate agenda item.

#### Air Quality

The Chairman referred to the all pervading nature of Air Quality across the City Corporation's work. He assured Members that a formal mechanism whereby he and the Deputy Chairman would meet periodically with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee and relevant Officers to discuss the matter had now been established and would help to ensure a more joined up approach at Member level.

The Chairman proposed that the matter therefore be removed from the Outstanding Actions list.

#### Cameras on the City Bridges

The Transportation and Public Realm Director reported that he had now ascertained that this matter was being led by the City of London Police and that an update report would now be submitted to the next meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board. With that in mind, he suggested that the matter should now be removed from this Committee's list of outstanding actions.

The Member who had originally raised this matter stated that, beyond addressing the issue of suicide/attempted suicide on the bridges, the cameras were also required as a wider security measure. She therefore suggested that it remain on the list of outstanding actions for this Committee going forward. The Member went on to remind the Committee that the matter had originally sat with Planning and Transportation Committee before being passed to the City of London Police. She added that, as Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board, she was happy to also report back to this Committee on progress following their next meeting. If she felt that, at this stage, there had been insufficient progress, she would move to return the matter to the ownership of this Committee.

9. **LUDGATE CIRCUS - PRESENTATION/PROPOSALS FROM VISION ZERO/TFL**

The Chairman welcomed Stuart Reid, Interim Director of Vision Zero at Transport for London (TfL), stating that he was very grateful to have someone of this calibre present today to address the Committee. He added that he would like to thank Mr Reid for the open dialogue that he had helped to facilitate on Ludgate Circus.

Mr Reid began by praising the strong collaborative partnership between TfL and the City Corporation on this work and spoke of plans to introduce more significant/bold improvements to the junction going forward. Mr Reid's presentation to the Committee covered the following points:

- Vision Zero – Targets – Mr Reid spoke on short, medium and longer term targets as well as bus casualty targets;
- Rationale for the current design at Ludgate Circus;
- Finding the right safety solution - reducing waiting time for pedestrians as much as possible as well as changing signal timings to encourage pedestrians to cross safely;
- Proposals to improve road safety at Ludgate Circus - restricting turning movements Southbound from Ludgate Hill and at Fleet Street which would provide an additional 30-35 seconds crossing time for some pedestrians. Mr Reid commented that a surprisingly small number of vehicles were currently making this turn, even at peak times, and that it was therefore felt that this traffic could be re-routed via Queen Victoria Street where it was felt that the impact would be acceptable. There were also proposals around removing east-west movements turning south into New Bridge Street. It was reported that one night bus route currently took this turn and that this route would be retained. Members were informed that thought was now being given as to how these proposals might be enforced with the potential use of CCTV under consideration.;
- Timescales for delivery of the new proposals – Mr Reid reported that new signal timings were currently at design stage. It was hoped that this work would conclude in approximately 3 months time.

The Transportation and Public Realm Director added his thanks to Stuart Reid for presenting a solution to a significant problem aimed at improving safety at the junction for pedestrians. He praised TfL's positive response to the issue and highlighted that any solution was likely to be difficult given that this was one of London's busiest junctions. He highlighted the fact that work to introduce improvements here had been accelerated to be implemented within the next three months and commended this solution to the Committee.

Members were invited to pose questions.

A Member thanked Mr Reid for an excellent piece of work which placed pedestrians as 'number one' in the hierarchy of users of the junction. He went on to question how the additional 30-35 seconds of pedestrian crossing time would be allocated and whether it would equate to the 'green man' simply being illuminated for this much longer. Mr Reid stated that he believed that pedestrians would actually be provided with additional opportunities to cross at the junction, with the aggregate of this being an additional 30-35 seconds of crossing time.

Another Member referred to proposals to prohibit two of the turns and questioned whether this would be applicable to bicycles as well as cars. He welcomed the proposals but expressed concern that these appeared to be a little slow in coming forward. He added that it was already well known that pedestrians were the predominant users of the junction and that it should be made safe for pedestrians of all ages and mobility. With this in mind, he questioned if consideration might also be given to introducing countdown timers for the crossing going forward. The Member also highlighted that he felt that a huge problem here was the inflexibility of the existing cycle route, something which TfL themselves had now recognised was ill-judged. The Member concluded by stating that he was unsure that moving the central crossing was a good idea as many struggled with the length and size of this. He urged that the crossing be made much simpler, clearer and more pedestrian friendly and questioned why this had not been the key aim all along.

The Chairman clarified that the idea of introducing islands in the middle of the crossing had been explored but that this idea had been discounted as unworkable due to the fact that it was likely to result in a large number of pedestrians congregating/penned in to the middle of the highway. The Member responded that, at present, high volumes of pedestrians were congregating on a narrow kerb. He emphasised that a reduction in waiting time should therefore be another key aim.

Mr Reid responded that prohibited turns would apply to all vehicles with the exception of the night bus route referred to which would continue to take the turn at certain times of the day only. He stated that he would seek to discuss the idea of introducing a countdown to the crossing back to engineers. He reiterated the Chairman's point that introducing central islands to the crossing had been looked at alongside the City Corporation but that the conclusion had been that the volume of pedestrians was such that this would not be able to be safely accommodated. It was felt that the pavement was a safer place to congregate and that additional crossing time should go some way to improving the volume of pedestrians doing so at any one time.

The Chairman clarified that one of the arms of the crossing did already have a countdown timer.

Another Member commented that 22 years to achieve 'Vision Zero' did not appear to be overly ambitious. He went on to state that there appeared to be a

lack of ambition around the proposals as a whole and questioned why there were not proposals to raise the surface of the road to cater for pedestrians as priority users. Finally, he questioned the re-routing of traffic via Queen Victoria Street and sought some reassurance as to how this would work in practice.

Mr Reid agreed with the desire to progress more rapidly towards Vision Zero and highlighted that significant progress had already been made in recent years in terms of the number of deaths/serious injuries on London's roads. He highlighted that there were some 'quick wins' that could be implemented and that if Vision Zero could be achieved ahead of 2041 it certainly would be. He went on, however, to highlight the need to be realistic and the fact that there were other contributors towards achieving targets – not least achieving a change in the mindset of pedestrians and other road users.

With regard to the suggestion of raising the surface of the junction, Mr Reid highlighted that the volume of traffic here was such that this measure could be problematic. He added that this proposal was not, however, to be ruled out in the longer term whilst more immediate, rapid improvements were sought. He reassured the Committee that the implementation of any improvements would be carefully monitored with further measures introduced as required.

Mr Reid reported that the Signal Team had carried out an analysis of the prohibited turns and concluded that surprisingly few vehicles made these turns. Diverting via Queen Victoria Street was felt to be the optimum route as traffic flows here were relatively low. He assured the Committee that the consequences of this would be monitored.

The Chairman stated that it was clear that pedestrian safety ranked above traffic flow at this junction and that all parties seemed to be in agreement on this point. He went on to articulate that his view was that the proposals put to the Committee represented a major intervention at this dangerous junction, more so than some of those improvements mentioned that were more visual. He added, however, that it was important to note that these were not to be totally discounted going forward.

A Member cautioned that this project should not be viewed in isolation and questioned the knock-on effects of the proposals around things such as air quality in the area and whether this would be monitored in any way.

Another Member questioned the shorter term, interim targets around Vision Zero were currently on track in terms of achieving a 65% reduction in those killed or seriously injured (KSIs) by 2022 against the 2005-09 baseline. He added that he also had some concerns as to how the prohibited turns would be enforced, particularly in relation to cyclists.

Mr Reid responded to each question in turn, by first highlighting that the 'knock-on' effects of the proposals at the junction had been examined in terms of traffic flow so that Officers were confident that it would be possible to proceed without substantial impact on the surrounding area. In terms of the wider management of the area, signalling would have two layers of control, the first being SCOOT



(an automated system to detect queue lengths with parameters set within which SCOOT could operate to optimise use/flow for each signal) and the second being the ability to take over signalling centrally at TfL's Control Centre if necessary. The Traffic Centre was manned around the clock, 365 days per year.

With specific regard to air quality, Mr Reid stated that, as the proposals concerned low flows of traffic, it was not anticipated that there would be any specific impact. Mr Reid underlined that Air Quality remained a significant priority for TfL and the City Corporation alike.

In terms of progress towards Vision Zero, Mr Reid reported that there had been a multi-pillared approach to this in terms of safe speeds, safe streets and safe vehicles. He added that the aim was to introduce 20mph speed limits on all TfL roads by 2020 with all new bus vehicles fitted with intelligent speed limiters. It was noted that this was also likely to have a positive 'pacing' effect on general traffic in areas where there were a lot of buses. Safer Streets involved work around the education of cyclists, drivers and pedestrians with the introduction of a schools education programme also included. The final pillar centred around safe vehicles and the introduction of things such as auto braking – a technology that it was expected would be rolled out more widely going forward.

A Member highlighted that the need to keep London moving also needed to be a consideration here. Mr Reid highlighted that the need to keep London moving was a statutory duty of TfL's but highlighted that pedestrians were also very much part of that obligation.

Another Member questioned whether jay walking was likely to be addressed as part of the education of pedestrians. Mr Reid stated that he would not be keen to criminalise pedestrians in any way given that the objective for many organisations was to encourage movement around London on foot.

In terms of the wider area, a Member referred to traffic currently turning right from Fleet Street through Whitefriar's Street. He stated that this resulted in 50% of traffic 'rat racing' here at present and that he had previously asked that this matter be addressed/enforced with the use of ANPR cameras. Mr Reid stated that he had not been made aware of the issue previously but was happy to discuss this matter with the Police going forward.

Some Members questioned whether it was necessary to ban both turns as suggested and whether the turns might be permitted at certain times of the day only. Mr Reid responded that it was felt necessary to ban both turns given that it was a straight ahead crossing. In terms of allowing the turns at certain times, Mr Reid stated that, at the outset, for simplicity, it was felt that it was preferable to be unambiguous although this option could be explored on an experimental basis alongside the City Corporation going forward with the turns permitted off-peak, for example.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Mr Reid for a welcome, interesting and informative presentation. He informed Members that progress

on work in the area as well as the monitoring of this would be shared with this Committee at appropriate intervals going forward.

**10. MILLENNIUM INCLINATOR REPORT**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor regarding the Millennium Inclinor.

The City Surveyor highlighted that approximately £1.3 million had been spent on maintaining the Inclinor to date which was inclusive of the sum of £752,000 spent on its replacement in 2012 in time for the London Olympic Games.

A Member commented that he felt that the course of action now recommended within the report was the best option at this stage. Another Member questioned why the Inclinor had been installed in the first place but conceded that the proposal to allow the City Surveyor to commence discussions with the developer of the Millennium Bridge Development to deliver a long-term option of replacing the Inclinor with a more suitable alternative.

Another Member agreed with the proposal that advice now be sought from Kone on the best way to maintain the Inclinor with that service regime then forming part of the new tender exercise which was to be undertaken in the near future to set a new maintenance contract in place. He also questioned whether there was evidence to suggest that the lift was still being misused and, if so, how this might be tackled.

A Member questioned whether alternative structures would be looked at longer term given that technology and materials had moved on since its initial instalment. She referred to the fact that, at present, it impacted negatively on views of St Paul's.

The Chairman noted that discussions with the developer of Millennium Bridge House were an option at this stage but that it was important for Members of the Committee not to pre-judge anything at this stage.

The City Surveyor concluded by clarifying that she was currently liaising directly with Kone on this matter and that Kone currently managed all TfL lifts. Once the tender exercise had concluded and costs were known, an update would be provided to the Planning and Transportation Committee.

**RESOLVED – That Members:**

- Agree that the City can adopt the same approach as TfL to maintain the Inclinor and go back out to the market with very specific requirements. Kone, who maintain the Inclined Lift at Greenford Station, would also be invited to bid for the contract;
- Agree that the City Surveyor can obtain a quote from Kone to replace the Inclinor with one of their own manufactured ones to assess whether it is better value for money to do this or to continue to maintain the current one; and

- Allow the City Surveyor to open discussion with the developer of the Millennium Bridge House Development to deliver the long-term option of replacing the Inclinator with a more suitable alternative.

#### 11. **DARK HOUSE WALK CITY WALKWAY ALTERATION**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding a City walkway alteration in relation to Dark House Walk.

Officers began by drawing Members' attention to the fact that an amended resolution and an enlarged, colour version of the city walkway alteration plan at Appendix 2B had been tabled.

A Member questioned the effects of the proposed alteration which seemed to narrow the walkway in parts. He questioned why this was therefore recommended and highlighted that, at present, it was possible for the public to walk either side of the street furniture situated here whereas the alterations would mean that it was only possible to walk on one side.

Another Member stated that he felt that the riverside walkway was an important amenity and was therefore supportive of these proposals. Another Member stated that, whilst it was fair to say that the Riverside Walkway was currently under utilised, the completion of this had taken some 20 years to date.

A Member expressed concern that the walkway, which was public realm, would be taken away and allocated for private use under these proposals. She questioned how, with this being the case, consent had been granted without first consulting this Committee. Another Member stated that she also had some difficulty in understanding the recommendations and shared the same concerns around giving away an area of prime public realm to a private developer. She went on to question whether it was also intended to remove the benches from this area which had previously been a well used/busy space. Whilst she was happy to see further use of the walkway encouraged, she objected to this being given away. The Member went on to question whether the space was intended to house outside tables for the two storey restaurant and stated that, if so, the developer could apply for a table and chairs licence negating the need to give away this prime, public space. The Member concluded by stating that she would be happier with a compromise whereby space for the restaurant pavilion was allocated but not for the placement of external tables and chairs. She added that she felt that the report was lacking at this stage.

A Member sought clarification from Officers as to what exactly the Walkway was and whether it was necessarily City owned. Another Member stated that clarity was also needed in terms of what the Committee's powers were in these circumstances.

Another Member questioned whether a quid pro quo approach might be taken with the developer whereby they were prepared to offer something in return for acquiring the City walkway space.

*At this point, the Chairman sought approval from the 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.*

Officers confirmed that public right of way must be maintained on City Walkways and that these could go through buildings although not above or below. Members were also informed that Officers were of the view that adequate walkway would be retained if the recommendations were to be agreed. Officers highlighted that the plan tabled showed that the alterations were proposed at the widest point of the walkway meaning that it would be possible to maintain the same width as elsewhere on the walkway plus scope for additional planters/seating. The developer would fund the installation of the proposed planters, the design of which was still to be agreed. Some additional sheltered spaces would also be created.

A Member stated that, whilst this may well be the case, dimensions were a key thing missing from the report/plans which could clearly depict that the remaining space for pedestrians in the area, even with the alterations, would still be superior to space to both the east and west of this area.

Officers went on to explain that the loss of City walkway had been explicit within the original planning application which had been publicly advertised as required. Officers had made a judgement under delegated powers that the application was acceptable and would result in improved facilities and landscaping and an enlivening of the walkway.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director clarified that the granting of the planning application and the rescinding of public highway were two quite separate processes.

Due to the number of outstanding questions and concerns raised in relation to the report, Members were of the view that the report should be deferred for consideration at a future meeting. The Chairman clarified that Members would like to see the grounds for the de-designation of City Walkway set out more clearly in a future report as well as further details of the proposal.

**RESOLVED** – That the item be deferred.

**12. DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT: 'BREXIT' UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the potential implications of Brexit for the Department of the Built Environment.

**RESOLVED** – That, Members note the report and that further update reports will be made to subsequent meetings of the Committee as appropriate.

**13. UPDATE ON STREET TRADING ENFORCEMENT FOR THE CITY'S BRIDGES.**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection updating Members on progress with enforcement in relation to illegal street trading on the City's bridges.

Officers were pleased to report that the enforcement work had been a great success to date with the bridges remaining largely clear in terms of illegal street traders. It was highlighted that the traders tended to be very opportunistic and that enforcement would respond flexibly to this, particularly as the Summer months approached.

A Member praised the hard work and persistence of Officers in this area and underlined that continual enforcement would be key here. He questioned whether the Police had been forthcoming in terms of assistance and co-operation. Officers reported that the Police had been incredibly helpful to date and had recently re-prioritised this work for which they were very grateful.

Another Member questioned reference within the report to the 79 illegal gambling operations that had been disrupted in the past six months and praised the efforts of Officers in relation to this. It was noted that the Police would now also be pursuing this matter.

A Member echoed the thanks given to Officers for their efforts in this area and also highlighted the assistance of CCTV evidence in supporting some prosecutions to date.

**RESOLVED** – That, Members note the contents of the report and that Officers will be undertaking a full review prior to the end of the two-year trial period.

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

Ocean Diva

A Member referred to the proposed operation of the Ocean Diva (a 1,500 capacity, three-deck high party boat – on the River Thames. He noted that the application for this sat with the PLA but that a future planning application at Swan Lane Pier to facilitate the mooring of the vessel at Swan Lane would be considered by this Committee in due course.

The Member went on to question what control, if any, this Committee might have over the size of the proposed vessel which would be 3-4 times the size of existing party vessels that utilised the river.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that the vessel would be regulated by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency with the application regarding Swan Lane Pier currently due to be considered by this Committee in July/September 2019. The application would facilitate the mooring of the vessel at Swan Lane if the pier were to be reconfigured as proposed. It was noted, however, that the vessel could operate on the river, subject to other consents, from other existing piers regardless of this.

The Chairman noted that, as the recently approved Transport Strategy included use of the river, it was right that this Committee should have an eye to this in terms of river traffic and have further details on this and any other lawful considerations within any future report accompanying the planning application.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director articulated that it was within the power of this Committee to control what happens landside in terms of the hours that it was possible for vessels to dock and be serviced and that these aspects would be reported on.

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

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

16. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**Item No.**  
17-18

**Paragraph No(s)**  
3

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the draft minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 17 April 2019.

18. **LAST MILE LOGISTICS UPDATE**

The Committee received a joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the Chamberlain providing Members with an overview of progress towards delivering Last Mile Logistics Hubs within the Square Mile.

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

There were no questions in the non-public session.

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

Officers provided Members with an update on Dockless Cycle Hire in the City.

**The meeting closed at 1.08 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley**  
**tel. no.: 020 7332 3414**  
**[gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**