

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 11 September 2018

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

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman, in the Chair)	Christopher Hill
Munsur Ali	Shravan Joshi
Rehana Ameer	Alderman Nicholas Lyons
Randall Anderson	Deputy Brian Mooney
Peter Bennett	Sylvia Moys
Sir Mark Boleat	Barbara Newman
Mark Bostock	Graham Packham
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Susan Pearson
Henry Colthurst	Judith Pleasance
Stuart Fraser	James de Sausmarez
Marianne Fredericks	William Upton
Alderman Prem Goyal OBE JP	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Graeme Harrower	

Officers:

Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of the Built Environment
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Natasha Dogra	- Town Clerk's Department
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Ted Rayment	- Department of the Built Environment
Richard Steele	- Department of the Built Environment
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Gideon Stothard	- Department of the Built Environment

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Christopher Hayward (Chairman), Peter Dunphy, Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark, Oliver Lodge, Andrew Mayer, Deputy Henry Pollard, Oliver Sells, and Graeme Smith.

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

Susan Pearson declared a pecuniary interest in Items 7 and 8, and confirmed she had been granted dispensation to speak on this item.

3. **MINUTES**

Members noted that a number of outstanding references needed to be updated, including that on wind measurements for tall buildings which had been discussed at the previous meeting. A report would be brought to the November meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 26 July 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

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

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of development and advertising applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the last meeting.

A Member confirmed that officers had circulated information on Communication Totems as requested at the last meeting, and that they had noted the volume of applications of this nature that were coming in. A Member added that this was an issue in Westminster, and that these applications were slowing down the appeal system as they were always appealed when refused.

The Director of the Built Environment responded that this was an issue across London and was recognised as such. The City of London Corporation had been successful with appeals, winning around 90% of them. A Member suggested that if a number of boroughs had concerns, the issue could be raised at a London Councils meeting.

In response to a query from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment confirmed that the lift would remain in place after the work on John Wesley Highwalk was completed.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

5. **VALID APPLICATIONS LIST FOR COMMITTEE**

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

6. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor providing an update in respect of the status of public lifts and escalators in the City. The City Surveyor

advised the Committee that since the publication of the report, the lift on Pilgrim Street was back in service, and all the lifts on the list were currently working.

A Member pointed out that it had previously been suggested that a system be developed to alert people to lift faults in advance, so that they found out before travelling to use the lift, and asked if there had been any progress in developing this system. The City Surveyor responded that details of faults were posted on the Corporation website. A provider for a real-time information service had been sourced and officers were looking at this in detail. It was hoped that this could be progressed in the next few months.

In response to a query from a Member, the City Surveyor confirmed that the Corporation was responsible for the lift at Blackfriars Bridge. The lift had frequent problems with vandalism, but more robust measures to protect it had been put in place.

Members felt that more thought about how to communicate with service users was needed as pedestrians were unlikely to look at the Corporation website for lift updates. Members suggested making more use of social media or including alerts on the Transport for London (TfL) website as part of the Journey Planner function, and asked for a report to be brought back to Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **GOLDEN LANE COMMUNITY CENTRE**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking planning permission for the change of use of part ground floor from community centre (class D1) to a mix of community centre and estate office use (sui generis). No physical alterations were proposed as part of the application.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director introduced the application to Members and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the details of the scheme and its wider implications. The application was recommended for approval, in accordance with the details set out in the schedule attached to the report.

Tim Godsmark, on behalf of the Golden Lane Residents Association, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The residents did not feel that the estate office should be moved, and only 22% supported the move. The move would take away community centre and community-use office space. The application would contravene Policy DM22.1 as there was no proposal in the application to replace the communal and recreational space lost. The application also did not evidence a lack of need or an options appraisal, and underuse of the facilities had not been demonstrated.

The space was too small for the intended use in the application, and could not fit all the parties proposed to use it. The hotdesking system suggested would result in extra staff hanging around the estate and there would be a reduction in access to the space for residents. Other feasible areas in the estate had not

been considered for the move, and there had been a lack of trust in the process so far. Residents were concerned that this move would be the thin end of a wedge. The Committee was urged to refuse the application, on the basis that evidence that alternatives had been considered had not been demonstrated, and the application contravened policy.

Jacqueline Swanson also addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The refurbishment of the community centre had been anticipated by residents and many wanted to be a part of it, but there were a lot of concerns over the application. The needs of the estate office should be contained, and it was felt there would not be space to meet the needs of three offices. Any overspill would make it difficult to ensure data protection, and the lack of private space to deal with vulnerable or angry residents discreetly.

Residents were concerned about office staff, particularly the receptionist, as there would be too much traffic and footfall through the building. There was an eager team of resident volunteers ready to help, who would need access to the office. There would not be enough space, and the proposal was not fit for purpose, with a disregard for privacy and the planning process. The shared office space would be intimidating for more vulnerable residents and would create undue stress on staff.

Andrew Carter and Jacquie Campbell addressed the Committee in support of the application. The aim of the scheme was to develop a vibrant and thriving community centre that was a local hub for residents, and had key staff on site and available to them. The proposed model had proved effective in other boroughs such as Islington and Hackney. The proposal would make the community centre more welcoming, more relevant and more accessible. Estate staff were part of the estate and were familiar faces that the most frequent users of the office trusted. The additional income that was part of the proposal was vital to sustaining the community centre, otherwise it would not be viable in the short to medium term.

Between three and five members of staff were proposed to be on site, and health and safety officers had adjudged the space to be big enough for five or six members of staff, plus storage space. The space proposed for the estate office had not previously been community space and was designated as storage and office space. The new centre would retain the interview room, and officers undertook home visits to support residents with mobility or mental health issues. Currently, visits by residents to the office were mostly routine rather than about sensitive issues or emergencies, and the current estate office did not have a confidential room.

The cost savings as a result of the move would mean that subsidies from Housing Revenue Account would no longer be required. Officers had walked around the space with residents and felt there was a more than adequate amount of room, which was backed up by health and safety inspections. It was not certain whether the building would be subject to business rates. The interview room was not large enough to be accessible for wheelchair users, and therefore home visits would need to be undertaken. Other options for the estate

office had been considered but were not viable, with issues like lack of daylight, and did not have the same hub feeling as the community centre. A disability impact assessment had not been undertaken.

With regards to planning policy, there was no loss of communal or recreational space, and it was felt the proposal would enhance community space rather than take it away. The space was previously unused office space and had not been part of the hall or the classroom. Prior to refurbishment, the centre had been run by a resident-led committee and had not been financially viable.

The Comptroller & City Solicitor clarified the relevant planning issues for the Committee. As there was no reduction in facility, the consideration of alternative spaces was not relevant as there was no policy non-compliance. The scheme was considered to be acceptable in planning terms. The details and configuration of operational arrangements were considered housing management matters rather than planning matters.

Members of the Committee then debated the application. A Member said that the application was forgetting of the use of volunteers at the centre, and that they did not think evidence of underuse had been demonstrated. The space was for the community and an alternative space for volunteer groups had not been offered.

A Member drew the Committee's attention to a point raised by an objector, that the refurbishment of the community centre had been granted with guarantee that there were no plans to move the estate office there, and that residents ultimately lost a consultation opportunity as a result. Furthermore, there was a misleading point repeated several times in the report, as while most residents favoured no change, it was emphasised that 84% of residents preferred the estate office to be moved to the community centre over the Barbican Estate office, which was not relevant to the application. The proposal was clearly not supported by residents, and as their objections had not been addressed, Members should vote against the application.

A Member stated that they objected on practical grounds, as if the centre would not have enough space for wheelchair users it was not going to work. Officers were asked if they had looked at the disability issue, as proper facilities had to be ensured. A Member added that access was a planning matter and the Committee needed specific reassurances on this.

A Member said that they could not see any strong reason to object on planning grounds but recognised the challenges that the Department of Community and Children's Services would have in managing the centre.

In response to Members' queries officers suggested that if the recommendation was agreed, to add a condition in relation to the provision of the meeting room and inclusive design, to comply with Policy DM10.8.

Arising from the discussion, the application was then put to the vote amongst eligible Committee Members, with 13 voting for and 10 voting against the application, with no abstentions.

RESOLVED – That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule, subject to an additional condition to address accessibility of the interview room, the wording of the condition to be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman.

8. **GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE, GOLDEN LANE ESTATE, LONDON EC1Y 0RE**

The Committee considered two reports of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director, seeking approval for planning permission, and listed building consent, to convert part of the ground floor to three flats (one, one bedroom and two, two bedroom) that would be let on a social rent basis.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director introduced the application to Members and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the details of the scheme and its wider implications. The Committee was advised that Historic England had confirmed that they were not required to be consulted on the application. Officers also wanted to add a condition that an electric vehicle charging point must be provided alongside the disabled car parking bay.

The facilities that would be lost by approving the applications would be mitigated by the approval of the Golden Lane Community Centre application, as it provided replacement facilities in accordance with Policy DM22.1. Both applications were recommended for approval in accordance with the details set out in the schedule attached to the report.

Tim Godsmark, on behalf of the Golden Lane Residents Association, addressed the Committee in objection to the scheme. Whilst residents were not opposed to social housing, the scheme was fundamentally flawed, unsafe and unworkable, with substandard accommodation. The units had rooms backing on to the car park, and the main pedestrian routes which would expose the occupants to noise and exhaust fumes, and inhibit their privacy, with further implications for security. The design of the units also raised issues with regards refuse disposal, fire safety and escape routes.

It was rumoured that one unit was to be commercially rented for respite care. This was an arrangement already in place in two other City social housing units and was not appropriate. This would also represent a different use and would require a further application. The building had also not properly been surveyed, and the current storeroom which was planned to be a bedroom would have inadequate ceiling space due to the podium it was built on, the ceiling height being below two metres.

Chamoun Issa, a resident in Great Arthur House, also addressed the Committee in objection to the scheme. The scheme violated the listed building management process and went against guidelines. There was a need to

preserve the architecture of Great Arthur House and the alterations were ill-considered and inconsistent with the rest of the building. Great Arthur House was designed for one-bedroom flats and the size of the units were therefore inappropriate.

The consultation process had been flawed and there had only been one meeting with residents, in 2017, and the plans had not changed since then. The Committee was urged to reject the application for the residents of the estate, and to approve it would demonstrate a willingness to engage in a flawed process.

Andrew Carter and James Ilsley then addressed the Committee in support of the application. Members were aware of the ongoing housing crisis, and the lack of affordable housing was most acute in London. The waiting list for social housing was very long, and the wait for a two-bedroom, fully accessible flat was an indefinite wait as there were currently no units of this type in the Square Mile. Tenants had previously left the estate due to a lack of accessibility. Residents demanded more social housing, and this was a rare opportunity to support vulnerable families and individuals.

The unit to the north-east by the car park would have planters in defensible space, in keeping with the character of the building and with enough distance to mitigate noise and pollution concerns. The closest parking space would be designated as a disabled space. As the flats were on the ground floor, the fire escape route would be through the main doors. Doors would also be built in to give access to the refuse chute.

With regards to the listed building management, the window frames were not changing, and the building had recently been double-glazed. The film that would be applied to the windows was not new to the estate, and frosted windows were already in place in Stanley House. The applicant was not aware of the ceiling height issue and assumed this was something the architect had considered. The unit could be turned into a one-bedroom flat if the room in question was deemed unsuitable for a bedroom or bathroom. There was no proposal to rent one of the units on a commercial basis.

Members of the Committee then debated the application. A Member asked why the application was under consideration if it could not be done. A Member asked for clarification on the ceiling height issue and whether it was in accordance with the London Plan. The Committee was advised that it was only one room that was in question with regard to ceiling height.

A Member stated that a two-bed, fully accessible flat was much-needed, but was better for long-term use, and there were concerns about it subsequently being used for a different purpose. The Committee did not need to consider the application, as the application was for a two-bedroom flat which would not work with the application as it is, and the scheme was therefore flawed.

A Member added that Great Arthur House had a special place in architectural history, and flats were not built on the ground floor for a reason. The concept of

the building was centred on quality accommodation and to squeeze substandard accommodation in would comprise the vision of Great Arthur House.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor advised the Committee that there was no need for a different permission to change a unit from a two-bedroom flat to a one-bedroom flat, but there may be an issue relating to Listed Building Management. The Committee was still able to approve the application if it was so minded, and if further permission or a further application was needed this could be done later.

Arising from the discussion, both the planning application and the listed building consent were then put to the vote amongst eligible Committee Members, with 16 voting for and 5 voting against the applications, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED –

- a) That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule, with an added condition electric vehicle charging point must be provided alongside the disabled car parking bay; and
- b) (1) That listed building consent be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to the provision that no objection be received from Historic England or the Twentieth Century Society; or

(2) Should an objection be received from Historic England or the Twentieth Century Society, that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to make an application to the Secretary of State for determination in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990 (as amended) informing the Secretary of State that the City of London would be minded to grant listed building consent in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule if it were determining the application.

9. DOCKLESS CYCLE HIRE REVIEW

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment, proposing that the current policy on dockless cycle hire be continued until the City of London Transport Strategy is adopted early next year, at which point the policy will be reviewed and updated. The report also proposed adopting additional measures to improve the management of dockless cycle hire, including Street Environment Officers proactively removing bikes in accordance with the City of London Corporation's Street Obstruction Policy.

The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report, acknowledging the increase in the use of dockless bikes, and advising that the Street Obstructions Policy would be brought back before Members for review, having last been agreed in 2014. The legal advice given was that the Corporation could not stop dockless cycle hire operators from operating within the City, but could enforce

on obstructions. Officers would continue to review and try to enhance these powers and continue to work with operators. On balance, it was believed the dockless cycles provided an amenity and would feature in the upcoming Transport Strategy. However, the Corporation could be more proactive about tackling obstructions.

Officers were taking the issue seriously, and felt more time was needed to work with operators, continue to look at what was happening in other areas, and gather more data about the extent of any problems.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee approve:

- a) The continuation of the current dockless cycle hire policy until the Transport Strategy is adopted and the policy updated accordingly;
- b) The adoption of additional management measures for dockless cycle hire operations during this period; and
- c) Support to London Councils in their review of the potential for a London-wide byelaw to regulate dockless cycle hire.

10. **TUDOR STREET/NEW BRIDGE STREET - UPDATE REPORT**

The item was withdrawn.

11. **ADOPTION OF THE CITY LIGHTING STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment seeking approval for the adoption of the revised City Lighting Strategy and informing Members of the results of public consultation and the subsequent revisions to the document.

The Director of the Built Environment reiterated the objectives of the strategy and advised Members that it should be seen as an opportunity. There would be an emphasis on linking the strategy with the planning process as this had been a consistent feature in consultation feedback, and officers were looking at producing a guidance note for developers to this end. The rollout of LED lights was currently in progress. The proposals were seen as ground-breaking and the City was being praised for its approach.

A Member advised officers that there was a row of street lights by St. Giles that were permanently on. The issue had been reported. The Director of the Built Environment responded that an old system was still in place in the area and the control system was currently being changed.

A Member praised the strategy which made it easy to alter levels of light and boasted incredible possibilities.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- a) Approve the proposed amendments to the City Lighting Strategy document set out in Appendix 2;

- b) Endorse the City Lighting Strategy for onward approval by the Court of Common Council; and
- c) Approve the development of a Planning guidance document on lighting, as suggested in the Strategy's recommendations.

At this point, the Chairman sought approval from Committee Members 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.

12. **CULTURE MILE LOOK AND FEEL STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment seeking approval for the adoption of the Culture Mile Look and Feel Strategy and to inform Members of the results of the public consultation and the subsequent revisions to the Strategy. The strategy would also be referred to the Court of Common Council for approval.

The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report. The draft strategy had previously been submitted to Members, and there had been plenty of consultation and engagement since this point. There had been a well-attended briefing for Members in the previous week. The Look and Feel strategy supported the aims of the Culture Mile Strategy and built on previous work.

A Member suggested the strategy could do more to bring out vision and ambition, particularly with regards to Smithfield Market. The Corporation should be ambitious in what it aimed for given the importance of the site. A Member added that the strategy could be spread beyond the Culture Mile to encourage more walking around the City, and the name could even be changed to the Culture Square Mile. The strategy was supported but officers should be working with Highways to consider options for Beech Street, given the pollution issues. The Director of the Built Environment responded that this was in progress and there was reference to air quality in the strategy, which was critical for its success.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee adopt the Culture Mile Look and Feel Strategy, the Detailed Delivery Plan and Evidence Base document.

13. **WEST SMITHFIELD AND CHARTERHOUSE STREET (THAMESLINK) BRIDGES REMEDIAL WORKS**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment relating to essential structural maintenance and repairs at two highway structures over the Thameslink railway near Smithfield Market.

A Member stated that this issue had been raised before and it was pleasing that the report was also being presented to the Corporate Asset Sub-Committee. It was important to understand that the costs given were indicative and may escalate.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree that:

- a) Option 2 from the Options Appraisal Table is approved (i.e. full programme of works identified to both bridges)
- b) The project budget of £684,000 is approved (inclusive of £100,000 risk allowance)
- c) Currently approved Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) funding of £230,000 is transferred to this project and managed under the Gateway project procedures
- d) Additional funding of £323,000 from the Additional Capital Funds for City Fund Properties Programme (as approved by RASC 18th January 2018) is allocated to the project & managed under the Gateway project procedures
- e) Additional funding of £131,000 from savings in the 2016/17 Additional Works Programme (AWP) is allocated to the project and managed under the Gateway project procedures

14. CITY FUND HIGHWAY DECLARATION - SHOE LANE & STONECUTTER STREET, EC4

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor, seeking approval to declare a volume of airspace situated above 1,634 ft² (151.80 m²) of City Fund highway land at Shoe Lane and Stonecutter Street, EC4 to be surplus to highway requirements to allow its disposal in conjunction with the permitted development scheme at Shoe Lane and Plumtree Court, EC4.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee declare a volume of City Fund highway land above an area of highway measuring 1,634 ft² (151.80 m²) situated in Shoe Lane and Farringdon Street, EC4 to be surplus to highway requirements to enable its disposal upon terms to be approved by the Corporate Asset Sub Committee and subject to the City Corporation retaining ownership of the highway and the continuing highway functions.

15. CITY FUND HIGHWAY DECLARATION - 42/44 BISHOPSGATE, EC2

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor seeking approval to declare a volume of City Fund airspace above an area of highway at Great St Helens, EC2 to be surplus to highway requirements to allow its disposal in conjunction with the development scheme at 22 Bishopsgate, EC2.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee declare a volume of City Fund airspace above the highway at Great St Helen's EC2 measuring 43ft² (3.97m²) and between datum levels to be determined by the City Surveyor to be surplus to highway requirements which will preserve the highway stratum and the continuing highway functions therein to enable its disposal upon terms to be approved by the Corporate Asset Sub Committee.

16. DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT RISK MANAGEMENT - QUARTERLY REPORT

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment, providing the Committee with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Department of the Built Environment are satisfactory and that

they meet the requirements of the corporate Risk Management Framework. The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and advised the Committee of the key points.

A Member advised that the risk relating to the Lord Mayor's Fireworks should be put back on the register for 2019 as it may be reintroduced in future years.

With regards to the risk on road safety, a Member commented that the reputational damage to the City was trivial compared to the impact on the victims of accidents and their families, and the current wording implied that the City was more concerned about its reputation than safety. The Director of the Built Environment responded that as there would always be casualties, presenting the risk differently would mean it always carried the top rating. A Member added that Bank Junction was not the only concern with regards to road safety as Ludgate Circus was also problematic and should be captured on the risk register. The Director of the Built Environment advised the Committee that Road Safety would be the subject of an upcoming deep dive by the Audit & Risk Management Committee.

In response to a query from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment advised that the risk relating to staff retention was being considered as part of another risk.

A Member requested that a briefing session be arranged for Members on the final version of the National Policy Planning Framework, which had been released in July.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

17. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising Members of action taken by the Town Clerk since the last meeting of the Committee, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b).

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

18. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

The Committee received a list of outstanding references. The Committee noted that the item on Ludgate Circus needed to be updated. The Director of the Built environment advised that the cleansing team had done a site visit of Blackfriars Bridge Underpass and work was ongoing. A Member thanked officers for the work done so far, and advised that the underpass had been redecorated and there was visible improvement, but more overhead lights needed to be replaced, and the gullies at the side should be treated for sewage. Whilst a deep clean may be expensive, the costs should be considered.

RESOLVED – That the list of outstanding references be noted, and should be updated ahead of the next Committee meeting.

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

A Member asked whether the Chairman was planning to invite representatives of City Residents Associations to the Committee dinner later that year. The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, advised that this would be passed on for the Chairman to consider.

A Member asked for an update on the plans for Queenhithe Riverside Walkway. The Chief Planning Officer responded that officers would take this away and circulate a full response to Committee Members.

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

The Committee was advised that the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee had requested that the Planning & Transportation Committee amend its composition to enable the Sub-Committee to invite the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee to nominate one Member to the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee, in order to ensure the Sub-Committee's deliberations were tied in with pollution issues in the City.

RESOLVED – That the composition of the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee be amended accordingly, and that the Port health & Environmental Services Committee be invited to nominate one Member to the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee.

21. **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 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.	Exempt Paragraphs
22 – 23	3
24 – 25	-

22. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX: TUDOR STREET/NEW BRIDGE STREET - UPDATE REPORT**

The item was withdrawn.

23. **LONDON BRIDGE STAIRCASE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 1.00 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee (temporary cover)
tel. no.: 020 7332 1480
joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk**