

LOCAL PLANS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 9 October 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation)
Committee held at Committee Rooms - Committee Rooms on Tuesday, 9 October
2018 at 2.00 pm

Present

Members:

Christopher Hayward (Chairman)
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Mark Bostock
Marianne Fredericks
Dhruv Patel OBE

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Jennifer Ogunleye	- Media Officer
Adrian Roche	- Department of the Built Environment
John Harte	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Lisa Russell	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Iain Simmons	- Department of the Built Environment
Jonathan Blathwayt	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 19 September 2018 were considered and approved as a correct record.

4. CITY OF LONDON LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSED DRAFT PLAN

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment drawing attention to the main changes that have been made to the draft policies within the new Local Plan since they were originally considered by Members and seeking approval for the draft Plan in its entirety to go forward to the Grand Committee for consideration later this month.

Members were informed that a key diagram setting out all of the areas referred to within the Plan spatially would accompany the draft submitted to Grand Committee.

The Director of Built Environment proceeded to talk Members through each of the substantive changes as follows:

- **Strengthening of Policy Wording across the Plan**
The Director of the Built Environment reported that the tone of the Plan had been strengthened where appropriate with references to 'should' changed to 'must' and 'could' to 'should' throughout.
- **Alignment with new Corporate Plan**
The draft vision and strategic objectives had been updated to dovetail more effectively with the Corporate Plan. A Member requested that Officers check that any figures quoted within the two Plans were consistent across these and various other relevant policies.
- **Noise and Light Pollution Policy**
Officers reported that, in response to comments previously made by the Sub-Committee, the Noise and Light Pollution Policy had been amended to cover both aspects adequately. In response to a Member who questioned if the Plan was clear enough in terms of what would be taken into account on daylight and sunlight, the Director of the Built Environment reported that this had been worked in to the design policies and highlighted that ideal daylight and sunlight conditions may not be practical in densely-developed city centre locations.
- **Protecting Social, Community and Sporting Facilities in situ**
The Director of Built Environment reported that a cascade approach was to be adopted whereby the start point would be to protect the existing use of such a facility before considering (and giving preference to) a similar use and then only considering alternative uses if this was not possible.

A Member questioned if social rent for some units could be taken in to account. Officers undertook to look further in to the affordability and cost implications of this and to look to reflect this aspiration in so far as possible going forward.
- **Collective Security Measures for Major Developments**
Officers highlighted that the suggested approach to security was a collaborative one with security features for individual buildings being a last approach.
- **On-Site Affordable Housing**
Officers highlighted that the policy emphasised the need for affordable housing to be provided on-site and only exceptionally off-site. This was in line with concerns raised previously by Members and was also

consistent with the message in both the National Planning Policy Framework and London Plan.

A Member referred to the discussion that had taken place around this at the last meeting of the Sub-Committee and the possibility of changing the relevant Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Officers reported that they had discussed this matter further with colleagues in Community and Children's Services and any changes to the SPD would require public consultation. Members suggested that this process should be instigated sooner rather than later.

A Member requested that points 2. a. and b. of the Housing Policy be put in bold type.

- **Review of existing Residential Areas**

Maps of existing residential areas depicting housing units that were either completed or in the pipeline were tabled for discussion. Members asked that the number of units in each area be clearly highlighted within the map key and that the types of housing were also specified.

In response to questions, Officers highlighted that the 'pink' areas depicted existing residential clusters and that the 'blue' areas were suggestions of other areas which it might be suitable to include subject to the views of Members.

Members were firmly of the view that the areas in which residential development was encouraged should be clearly identified and kept to a minimum.

In response to further questions, the Director of the Built Environment confirmed that residential amenity was already protected within existing policies. The Deputy Chairman asked that it be made explicit that, whilst housing may be outside of these specified zones, residential amenity would still be safeguarded. Officers undertook to verify this.

- **Proposed Phasing Profile to the increase in Office Stock**

Officers reported that it would be made clear in the Policy that this was 'indicative' phasing. Members were informed that the increase of 750,000 square metres referred to for 2016-2021 was largely made up of schemes that were already in the pipeline.

- **Principal Shopping Centres**

Members were informed that the Policy had been amended to encourage more diversity in terms of the retail offer and unit sizes/frontage.

In response to a question, it was reported that an impact assessment would be necessary if several units were amalgamated above a certain floorspace.

- **Specialist Retail Uses and Markets**
Members were informed that these were now treated as separate issues and sub-divided into separate policies.
- **Pedestrian Routes through Buildings and Development Sites**
Officers reported that the Policy now clarified the need to seek to provide new pedestrian routes through buildings and development sites as well as protecting existing routes. This also 'reads across' well to the draft Transport Strategy.

The Deputy Chairman highlighted the need to link both this and the New Development Policy within the Plan. He referred to the point raised by a Member at Grand Committee earlier this week stating that any new development should look to enhance or at least consider how any building becomes part of the public realm. A Member spoke about the possibility of providing developers with a non-exclusive list of things that it was felt would benefit the City and would therefore be in their interests to include (for example, public viewing galleries). Another Member clarified that the point made at Grand Committee had been more specifically around the provision of more publicly accessible ground floor space by developers.

The Deputy Chairman added that consideration should also be given to the metrics of how an assessment impact of a new development might be undertaken and what the expectations around mitigation then were.

Officers undertook to look at how they might strengthen the Policy along these lines.

- **On-Site Servicing Provision**
Greater emphasis had been placed on the need for on-site servicing provision within development schemes.

Members suggested that paragraph 3 of the policy be amended to replace 'Developments should...' with 'Developments *must*'.

The Deputy Chairman spoke on paragraph 2 of the Policy and freight consolidation. He added that this was something that would be a huge change going forward and that developers could therefore be asked, in the interim, to produce Transport Management Plans with reference to this in recognition of the proposed shift towards this approach and to ensure that it remained a live issue. The Chairman concurred with this point and suggested that, going forward, there would be a presumption in favour of consolidation.

A Member suggested that paragraph 1 of the Policy be amended to read 'Applicants are required to consult with the City Corporation *and agree* all matters relating to servicing at an early design concept stage'. She went on to state that, where deliveries on site were necessary, there

should be strict conditions around these and this should be flagged with developers at the very outset.

- **Alignment with the draft Transport Strategy**

Language within the plan would be amended to remove reference to 'super blocks' and replace with reference to healthy planned street areas.

A Member went on to discuss outside spaces more generally, with reference to tables and chairs on public highways and drinking in the street which could prove costly in terms of cleansing and maintenance. She questioned how Officers could look to ensure that developers were not looking to utilise public highways for this purpose going forward. She referred to Westminster City Council who had a policy in terms of tables and chairs and required separate trading licences for these.

The Chairman reiterated this point and questioned how this might be tackled in design terms. He wanted to be clear that any widening of pavements, for example, was for safety purposes and should not be viewed as additional space for developers. The Director of the Built Environment stated that the Local Plan did not deal with public highways but that this led back to previous issues raised around pedestrian permeability. It was suggested that reference to these points might usefully be included within the policy on 'Advertisements'.

Another Member suggested that, if these kinds of issues could be predicted from the use of the Unit, developers could be asked to contribute financially to pavement improvements/cleansing going forward. Officers stated that further views could be sought around this at consultation.

- **Use of the River Thames**

Members were informed that there was now a stronger policy requirement for developers to consider the use of the River Thames for the movement of construction materials and waste and the servicing of development.

The Deputy Chairman suggested that this might be strengthened further still by suggesting that the River also be used more generally for deliveries and the like going forward.

- **Facilities for Public Cycle Parking**

Officers highlighted that paragraph 1 of the Cycle Parking policy had been amended to require developments to provide on-site cycle parking for both occupiers, visitors and, where feasible, the general public.

A Member stated that, in terms of future-proofing such provisions, developers needed to be aware that e-bikes required Wi-Fi signal access and so either Wi-Fi access needed to be improved in certain

areas or additional thought would need to be given to the placement of cycle parking in basements, for example.

Members requested that the wording 'where feasible' be removed from paragraph 1 to strengthen the requirements around public cycle parking.

- **Potential Public Facilities within Tall Buildings**

Members requested that 'must' replace 'should' in paragraph 4 of the Policy.

In response to questions, Officers stated that they were in discussion with the GLA to ensure that this Policy aligned with the London Plan around the need for more publicly accessible spaces.

- **Key Areas of Change**

Maps of the individual key areas were tabled at the meeting.

Pool of London

In response to a question around whether there would be more public toilets provided along the Riverside Walkway, Officers clarified that the onus would be on new developments to provide public access to toilets, water and defibrillators within buildings.

Aldgate and Tower

A Member asked that Portsoken also be included in this Key Area.

Smithfield and Barbican

A Member referred to the 'Smithfield and Barbican Key Area of Change' policy wording and highlighted sensitivity around the suggestion that pedestrian permeability and connectivity through the Barbican Estate might be anywhere other than the existing highwalks. Officers noted this viewpoint but suggested that, at planning stage, it would be their preference to keep options around permeability and connectivity open and to seek specific views around this at consultation.

A Member commented that they felt that Officers had produced a good contextual write up of each Key Area of Change. He went on to state that the area linking Liverpool Street and the Smithfield/Barbican Area would become increasingly important going forward with the introduction of Crossrail and the Cultural Mile, marking an important shift in City Policy, He was therefore keen that reference to this should feature throughout the relevant documents.

Members went on to raise questions around other aspects of the draft Plan. With regard to the 'Air Quality' policy, a Member questioned if it would be better to install the best available technology as opposed to being quite specific around 'biomass or biofuel boilers'.

With regard to the 'Pipe Subways' policy, a Member questioned what thought could be given to the future proofing of infrastructure such as this.

With reference to the 'Housing' policy a Member questioned whether there would be any circumstances whereby a proposal for a scheme offering 100% intermediate housing would be acceptable. Officers reported that this would be considered on a case by case basis and highlighted that there would be new Government requirements around this coming forward. It was generally accepted that if such a proposal were to meet priority need in the City, it would be acceptable despite the 70%/30% reference in paragraph 2.c.

A Member commented that he felt that any reference to area viability was lacking in the Plan. Officers confirmed that the whole Plan would be subject to viability assessment after consultation. The Member asked that this be referred to within the draft Plan.

Officers concluded by stating that the draft Plan would now be submitted to the Planning and Transportation Committee for approval later this month before going out for public consultation, the results of which would be reported to this Sub-Committee in Spring 2019.

RESOLVED – That, Members agree the proposed draft Local Plan set out at Appendix 1 and authorise the Director of the Built Environment to make further minor editorial changes and non-material additions to the draft Plan prior to its consideration by the Planning and Transportation Committee.

5. **DRAFT CITY OF LONDON TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment detailing the draft City of London Transport Strategy.

The Chairman questioned the use of the word 'delight' within the visions, aims and outcomes text. Officers reported that this had been well received at initial consultation and it was therefore felt that this was appropriate. Officers reported that reference to 'super blocks' had also been removed from this document following initial comments received and to make it consistent with the Local Plan in this respect.

A Member commented that passing a resolution to shift from 20 to 15mph may prove challenging and he therefore asked for the justification behind this given that it was likely to be one of the Strategy's hottest topics. Officers reported that they wanted this document to make a difference. Evidence showed that the likelihood of fatal collisions was much diminished at 15 versus 20mph.

The Sub-Committee recognised that, whilst this shift would be perceived as radical and had not been adopted elsewhere in London to date, there was no reason that the City should not lead on this initiative, particularly when keeping in mind the Mayor of London's aspirations around 'Vision Zero'. Officers went on to highlight that the City was a totally unique area of London, particularly given the amount of pedestrian footfall in the square mile which was only set to increase in future years.

The Chairman praised the Strategy for being bold and innovative in an attempt to incite real change. In response to questions, Officers reported that, aside from the 15mph proposals, issues around pedestrian priority at certain times, a 50% reduction in peak time deliveries and cycling may also incite debate.

In response to questions, Officers reported that the proposals within the draft document largely aligned with or were slightly ahead of those within the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy. The Deputy Chairman added that there was also full alignment with TfL who liked what the City were doing in this area and seemed to be on board with the proposals.

With regard to commentary on step free access at underground stations, it was reported that the ambition was for all stations to be step free by 2044 which was in line with the Mayor's Strategy.

The Director of the Built Environment reported that this was the City's first Transport Strategy. It was Officers' and Members' genuine belief that it was an exciting, refreshing and useful document where the sum was a coherent, forward thinking plan intended to be greater than any of the individual issues within it. The Deputy Chairman added that, throughout the process of shaping this document, accessibility for all users of the space had been key and the draft Strategy was very inclusive in this regard.

RESOLVED – That, Members of the Local Plan Sub-Committee approve the draft Transport Strategy for final presentation to the Planning and Transportation Committee on 30 October 2018.

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

There were no questions.

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

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

8. **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 of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.

Exempt Paragraph(s)

9-10

-

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

There were no questions raised in the non-public session.

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

The Chairman informed the Sub-Committee about media interest around the draft Local Plan and Transport Strategy.

The meeting ended at 3.56 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
Tel.no.: 020 7332 3414
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk