

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Monday, 8 October 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	Shravan Joshi
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)	Oliver Lodge
Randall Anderson	Andrew Mayer
Peter Bennett	Deputy Brian Mooney
Sir Mark Boleat	Sylvia Moys
Mark Bostock	Barbara Newman
Deputy Keith Bottomley	James de Sausmarez
Marianne Fredericks	Oliver Sells QC
Alderman Prem Goyal OBE JP	Graeme Smith
Christopher Hill	William Upton
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Richard Holt	- Town Clerk's Department
Jennifer Ogunleye	- Media Officer
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Bhakti Depala	- Department of the Built Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment
Craig Stansfield	- Department of the Built Environment
Kathryn Stubbs	- Department of the Built Environment

Chairman's Welcome

The Chairman welcomed Zahur Khan, the newly appointed Transportation and Public Realm Director, to his first meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

The Chairman also welcomed the Committee's new, permanent, Clerk Gemma Stokley.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Rehana Ameer, Henry Colthurst, Peter Dunphy, Stuart Fraser, Graeme Harrower, Alderman Nicholas Lyons, Graham Packham, Susan Pearson, Judith Pleasance and Deputy Henry Pollard.

Apologies for absence were also received from Carolyn Dwyer, Director of Built Environment.

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

The Deputy Chairman declared a non-pecuniary, professional interest in relation to Agenda Item 10 – '21 Moorfields – Acquisition of Land' – and stated that, on the advice of the Comptroller and City Solicitor, he would be withdrawing from the meeting whilst this Item was considered and would neither speak nor vote on the matter.

3. **MINUTES**

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 11 September 2018 were considered and approved as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Communication Totems (page 2) – A Member referred to a recent article suggesting that communication totems in the City were 'data harvesting' from mobile phones. She questioned whether this practice was legal given that passers-by would not be aware that this was the case. She referred to a similar issue which had arisen previously concerning recycling bins in the City. The Chief Planning Officer undertook to make enquiries about this but stated that she was certainly not aware that this was the case. The Chairman underlined the need to ensure that any data harvesting that might be taking place was both statutorily compliant and mindful of any data protection implications. Members suggested that it was important to ask these sorts of questions up front in future.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor clarified that, unlike with the previous occurrence referred to which concerned recycling bins in the City, there was no relationship between the City of London Corporation and the totem providers as far as she was aware. Officers nevertheless undertook to explore this matter further given that the City Corporation were the land owners and report back to the Committee.

Golden Lane Community Centre (page 6) – A Member questioned whether some further detail could be provided relative to the 'additional condition' that was to be imposed to address accessibility of the interview room and had been delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to finesse in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee at the last meeting. The Chief Planning Officer clarified that the additional

condition related to use of the Community Centre as an Estate Office and was as follows: “Notwithstanding the details of the office layout shown on drawing 2325_PL_109_2, the use of the sui generis office area shall not commence until details of an interview room have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority that meet the requirements of Local Plan policy DM10.8 which shall be constructed prior to first occupation in accordance with the approved drawings and maintained thereafter whilst the use is in operation. REASON: To ensure that the development will be accessible for people with disabilities in accordance with the following policy of the Local Plan: DM10.8”.

Queenhithe Riverside Walkway (page 13) – A Member stated that he was still awaiting an update on this matter. The Chief Planning Officer undertook to work alongside Officers in Highways to provide the Member with a written response as soon as possible.

Thames Court Footbridge – A Member requested an update on this matter. The Assistant Director (Highways) reported that, despite an open invite, only two tenders for the works had been returned – both of which were significantly over the original budget. City Procurement were now planning to meet with both tenderers to renegotiate where possible. Members were informed that a report on possible options going forward to the next meeting of the Planning & Transportation Committee.

4. MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE

The Committee received the public minutes and summary of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held on 4 September 2018.

The Committee were of the view that future minutes of the Sub Committee submitted to the Grand Committee for information should be clearly marked as ‘draft’. It was agreed that the draft minutes of the Sub Committee would only need to be re-submitted to the Grand Committee if there were any material changes to them once they had been approved as a correct record.

RECEIVED.

5. 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 the delegated powers since the last meeting.

RECEIVED.

6. VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY 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 last meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

RECEIVED.

7. CREED COURT HOTEL

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director concerning an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary condition 49 (approved drawings) of planning permission dated 6 October 2017 to enable (i) removal of third basement level; (ii) internal reconfiguration to create 152 hotel rooms and associated alterations to the fenestration on Ludgate Square, Creed Lane and to the internal courtyard; (iii) relocation of the UKPN sub-station from basement to ground floor level; (iv) reduction in A3 (restaurant) floor area from 1,028sq.m to 466sq.m and relocation of the restaurant entrance door to Creed Lane; (v) reconfiguration of the waste storage facilities and service area; and (vi) other minor internal and external alterations.

The Assistant Director, Planning Development, introduced the application and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the details of the scheme and its wider implications. Photographs of residential amenity in the existing courtyard were tabled at the meeting. The application was recommended for approval in accordance with the details set out in the report.

The Chairman highlighted that there were three objectors who wished to address the Committee as well as a speaker on behalf of the applicant. In response to a question, the Chairman clarified that all those addressing the Committee had been made aware of the Protocol on Public Speaking and to limit their speech to planning matters only.

Sir Brian Langstaff, a local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Sir Langstaff spoke with concern about the principle of securing planning permission for one scheme and then altering this in ways which may be perceived as non-material but will, in reality, make a substantial difference to the scheme overall. Consent had been given, in 2017, for construction of what was thought to be an upmarket hotel in keeping with the St Paul's conservation area. The modified plans now seemed to be for a more 'downmarket' offering with a greater number of smaller bedroom spaces, a smaller restaurant space and no spa facilities. He went on to state that he was strongly of the view that any changes should not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring residents over the consented scheme. However, the revised plans would result in some loss of light, cause inevitable problems by seeking to roughly double the number of windows looking on to the courtyard (onto which residents' bedrooms also face) and also run a real risk of noise from both the courtyard below where guest access no longer appeared to be restricted as it had been in the consented plan and the combined effect of noise/overlooking from guest use of the roof terrace.

Sir Langstaff concluded by suggesting that, in order to safeguard against these concerns, either the plans required modification and should be rejected for the

time being, or sufficient and suitable conditions needed to be imposed to ensure that the revisions do not affect neighbouring amenity further than the present plans already do.

Matthew Rimmer, also a local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Mr Rimmer stated that, although the revised plans sought to relocate the Hotel's sub-station from basement to ground floor level, the depth of the construction was to remain the same as on the consented plans. To his mind, this represented an opportunity for the developer to carry out less intrusive ground works and the fact that they had not taken this opportunity was 'lazy' on their part.

Jeremy Stein addressed the Committee on behalf of his client (a local resident) in objection to the application. He reported that, at present, his client enjoyed clear, peaceful views of St Paul's Cathedral from their top floor residence and they were of the view that this must remain. He went on to state that his client's primary concerns were around use of the rooftop and courtyard areas. The consented plans were for a green rooftop area where access would be restricted to maintenance only. This restriction appeared to have been removed for both the rooftop and the courtyard area in the modified plans. Mr Stein made a plea for the condition around this to remain and for an additional condition to be added requiring the developer to fund the installation of a CCTV system which would use motion alerts to inform them of any unauthorised use of the rooftop and courtyard areas.

Mr Stein added that his client also had concerns around the proposed new bedroom layouts which represented a more downmarket offering with many of the proposed new rooms being behind fixed shut windows with no natural daylight.

Mr Stein informed the Committee that demolition had already begun on site and asked that residents be provided with a full programme of anticipated works throughout the development period in addition to the monthly newsletters already in circulation. He added that the fact that demolition had already commenced underlined that it was not necessary for the Committee to take a decision on the revised plan this morning as it would not cause any undue delay to the planned works.

Mr Stein concluded by stating that the hotel's future revenue was not dependent on the number of bedrooms offered. He suggested that the modified plans needed revisiting and that, whilst residents accepted that a hotel was to be constructed on this site, it was hoped that it would be a high class offering in keeping with the area and not the 'downmarket' version that was now being presented.

Richard Ward, Director of DP9 Limited, address the Committee on behalf of the applicant, in support of the application. He was accompanied by Paul Wells of Dexter Moren Architects and Gordon Ingram of Gordon Ingram Associates. Mr Ward underlined that the proposals brought with them several benefits whereby a redundant office building would be replaced with a 4* plus hotel and frontage

in keeping with the area. Its construction would also contribute towards the City's affordable housing efforts as well as creating jobs both during and after construction. He added that the proposed amendments represented an exciting new scheme that the applicant was keen to deliver as quickly as possible.

A Member asked the applicant's agent why they had taken the decision to submit revised proposals given that the original proposals consented to only last year had been 3-4 years in the making. She also sought confirmation as to whether demolition work had already started on site and, if it had, was it in accordance with the conditions attached to the consent granted in 2017.

The Applicant confirmed that new proposals were being submitted following the appointment of a new architect who had brought a 'fresh pair of eyes' to the process and produced what Officers agreed was an enhanced version of the proposals consented to by this Committee last year. He went on to confirm that demolition had commenced on site and that this had been done in accordance with the conditions discharged.

In response to further questions from Members, the applicant reported that it had always been the intention that the finished hotel would constitute a four star plus offering. They were strongly of the view that what was now being proposed was an enhanced offer as opposed to a downgrading of any sort. In response to questions around the overlooking of residential properties and associated light invasion, the applicant reiterated that the windows looking on to the courtyard area were fixed glaze windows.

Finally, the applicant confirmed that they would be happy to commit to the provision of CCTV as proposed by the objector and would also undertake to provide residents with a full schedule of anticipated works.

Members went on to debate the application before them. A Member questioned the information provided within the daylight/sunlight assessment and how this translated to an overall improvement when compared to the already approved scheme. The Assistant Director, Planning Development, clarified that whilst there would be some impacts on the daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties, the majority of these impacts would be minor in nature.

A Member commented that she was disappointed to see revised proposals submitted to the Committee so soon after it had originally been deliberated on. She reminded the Committee that concerns around the fact that this was a residential site and around the impact of things such as servicing were aired when the application had originally been considered but that Members had been reassured at the time that what was being proposed was a high-class hotel offering in a prime position. She stated that it was her view that, had these amendments featured in the original scheme, it may not have been consented to. Another Member supported this view and stated that he objected to what he saw as major amendments to the original proposals being submitted to the Committee so soon particularly given the sensitivity of the site. He also referred

to the fact that a number of the newly proposed bedrooms would seemingly be without any natural light – something which he felt was unreasonable.

Another Member disagreed with these points and stated that he felt that the speed with which the plans had been amended and resubmitted was reflective of an active market and was arguably a normal part of the development process. He added that he did not perceive the proposed changes as significant and therefore saw no reason not to support the application on purely planning issues.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Comptroller and City Solicitor stated that the original application was not now re-open for debate and that Members were to focus on the proposed amendments only this time around. The Town Clerk highlighted that the list of proposed amendments in full could be found on the opening page of the report and were a helpful aid in terms of focusing discussion.

A Member commented that the proposed relocation of the sub-station from basement to ground floor level did not seem to be an improvement and questioned the reasoning behind this. The Assistant Director, Planning Development, stated that he understood that this was for ease of access and stated that it was often the case that sub-stations were situated at ground floor level and that appropriate conditions would be attached to this.

In response to questions from the Chairman, Officers clarified that residents' concerns around the installation of a CCTV system to monitor rooftop and courtyard usage and blackout blinds to certain windows could be addressed by incorporating reference to these within the conditions. A condition requiring adequate liaison between the developer and residents could also be incorporated.

A Member stated that she was pleased to see that Creed Archway would be retained within the amended proposals.

The Chairman underlined that it was the developers right to be able to return to the Committee with amendments and that it was not for Members to get in to the commerciality of the proposals.

The application was put to the vote amongst eligible Committee Members, with 16 voting for and 3 voting against the application, with no abstentions.

RESOLVED – That, Planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with details set out in the attached schedule, subject to:

- (i) Planning obligations being entered into as set out in the body of this report, the decision not being issued until such obligations have been executed;

- (ii) That Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations respect of those matters set out in “Planning Obligations” under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

8. TENTER HOUSE 45 MOORFIELDS LONDON EC2Y 9AE

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking approval for the demolition of existing building and structures to existing basement slab level and construction of an 18 storey office building (Class B1) with ground and first floor retail (Class A1/A2/A3/A5), together with works to the two basements and the ground floor level with associated servicing, waste storage, plant facilities and cycle parking and public realm improvements to New Union Street.

Officers presented the report to Members, outlining details of the scheme and its wider implications. In light of objections received (primarily around the potential for noise from the roof terraces), conditions limiting the use of these areas at night were proposed. With regard to the reductions in sunlight and daylight to some residents, independent assessments had concluded that any loss was, in fact, due to the presence of overhanging balconies and not the size of the proposed development.

A Member commended Officers on refining the proposals in light of objections received. Members went on to question the possibility of the use of an external consolidation site for the servicing of the building. Officers stated that they had already suggested that this was something that the applicant should explore. The number of deliveries had been limited to 72 vehicles per day. Members suggested that this could be included as a condition.

A Member stated that they would like to see the use of light sensors conditioned. Another Member reported that, whilst they were fully supportive of the proposals, they had some concern around New Union Street and how this would operate in terms of pedestrians and any conflict with vehicles utilising the loading bay. It was suggested that a better signed access route should be established to ensure that it was clear that this was for pedestrian use. Officers reported that there would be substantially less vehicle traffic in this area than previously. He added that Union Street was not under the control of the applicant along its full length and could not therefore be fully pedestrianised.

A Member commented on the number of extra people that the proposed development would attract to the area and the fact that no extra pedestrian space would be provided as a result. He was concerned that the proposal compromised the main area of open space in this area which was set to become even more crowded still with the impending opening of Crossrail.

In response to a question regarding the ‘bleepers’ of reversing vehicles on site, Officers stated that whilst it was not possible to silence these due to health and safety reasons, their use was not permitted on site after 21:00.

The Deputy Chairman referred to the fact that the forthcoming Transport Strategy was explicit in stating that consolidation sites for the servicing of the

City would be the expectation going forward. He felt that it was therefore important to begin to emphasise this point with developers for the future proofing of sites. He suggested that the developer be asked to submit an annual Traffic Management Plan for consideration with commentary on the possible use/introduction of a freight consolidation site. Another Member seconded this proposal.

Members proceeded to vote on this amendment and it was carried unanimously.

Members then proceeded to vote on the application before them with 20 voting for and 1 voting against. There were no abstentions.

RESOLVED – That:-

- (a) Planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to an additional condition requiring the annual submission of a Traffic Management Plan with commentary on the possibility of the introduction of a freight consolidation centre and subject to planning obligations and other agreements being entered into in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until such obligations have been executed;
- (b) Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in the report under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.

9. BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE PROPOSED CONSERVATION AREA

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director proposing that one conservation area be designated to include an area which would comprise the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates, the Barbican Registered Park and Garden, the Barbican Wildlife Garden, Bridgewater Square and the London Wall Scheduled Ancient Monument west and north of Monkwell Square.

The Chairman highlighted that the proposals presented had been shaped by public consultation carried out between December 2017 and February 2018. The Assistant Director, Historic Environment, reported that some additional representations had been received after publication of the report but underlined that these contained no additional concerns to those that had already been raised elsewhere. She went on to report that there had been an adjustment to the proposed boundary to include the Barbican Wildlife Garden and that this had been approved in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

A Member stated that he very much welcomed this report and felt that Officers had been very responsive to the views expressed as part of the public consultation process. He added that he was pleased to see that the proposals now included the Barbican Gardens in their entirety. However, the fact that certain buildings were not to be included within the conservation area

(specifically 45 Beech Street and the Jewish Church) appeared to be a missed opportunity.

The Deputy Chairman stated that any redevelopment would have to consider the character of the adjoining Conservation area and that the importance of these buildings could therefore be recognised without having to necessarily include them within the proposed conservation area and adjust the boundaries.

A second Member stated that she also felt that it was a mistake not to include these buildings within the conservation area and proposed an amendment seeking to adjust the proposed boundaries to include these. Another Member seconded this proposal and it was put to the vote. 9 voted in favour of the amendment and 10 against with 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED – That, having considered the results of the public consultation, analysis and conclusions, Members agree to designate the area identified on the map in Appendix 1 as the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area.

10. REDEVELOPMENT OF 21 MOORFIELDS - ACQUISITION OF LAND

The Deputy Chairman withdrew from the meeting at this point.

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer seeking approval for the acquisition of land for planning purposes by agreement under section 227 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 enabling the operation of powers under Section 203 of the Housing & Planning Act 2016 to facilitate the carrying out of the redevelopment of 21 Moorfields.

RESOLVED – That, Members authorise acquisition of an interest in the Redevelopment Site by the City under S227 in order to engage powers under S203 for the planning purpose of facilitating the carrying out of the revised development (as described in paragraph 4 of the Main Report) and subsequent disposal of that interest to the Owner (or an associated company) under section 223 of the Town & Country Planning Act.

Subject to:

- (i) the City Surveyor being satisfied, following receipt of Counsel's opinion, that the risks associated with the transaction are acceptable;
- (ii) there being a suitable Deed of Indemnity (as described in Paragraph 22) in place satisfactory to the City Surveyor; and
- (iii) the acquisition and disposal referred to above being substantially in accordance with the arrangements in Appendix 2 to this report with authority being delegated to the City Surveyor to agree final terms.

11. SITE VISITS FOR MEMBERS IN RELATION TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Deputy Chairman re-joined the meeting.

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in relation to site visits for planning applications on the Committee Agenda. The report sought Members' views as to whether visits

should be in relation to all planning applications or certain classes of applications and how these are to be organised.

The Chairman underlined that the suggestion was that site visits were offered for all future major applications and that this approach was to be trialled for a period of three months to assess its popularity.

A Member suggested that the Thursday morning visits proposed within the report would be problematic given that Court of Common Council meetings also took place on Thursdays. She also suggested that attendance lists should be published for all future visits.

Members went on to make a plea for more clarity around future visits in terms of which Officers would be accompanying Members and where they were to meet. A request for transport from Guildhall for future visits was also noted.

A Member suggested that a six-month trial would be more sufficient in terms of assessing the popularity of such visits and deciding whether any alterations were then needed.

A Member suggested that a list of pertinent issues should be circulated to Members ahead of all such visits in future. It was also suggested that four days ahead of an application being formally considered by the Committee was not sufficient time for such visits and that the agenda planning process should be utilised to flag any major or genuinely contentious applications at a much earlier stage.

In response to a question, the Comptroller and City Solicitor clarified that those Members who were unable to participate in a site visit would not then be restricted in terms of speaking or voting on a given application at Committee.

RESOLVED – That:

- a) A site visit is offered for Major Applications and
- b) other applications where the impact can only be considered from a non-public place;
- c) the visit(s) should take place as soon as Officers are aware of the forthcoming application via the agenda planning process;
- d) if there is more than one site to visit time slots will be provided;
- e) the appropriate officers will be available to answer questions;
- f) these visits would not normally be accompanied by the applicant or objectors except for the purpose of gaining access;
- g) Members should advise by 2pm on the day before the proposed site visit if they wish to attend, (if more than one, which ones) using a dedicated inbox;
- h) This is trialled for six months to test its popularity and to see whether alterations need to be made to the arrangements; and
- i) Transport to and from Guildhall is to be provided for such visits.

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. PARKING ENFORCEMENT: PERMITTED LOADING AND UNLOADING DURATIONS

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding a review of the protocol allowing commercial vehicles 40 minutes to continuously load and unload on-street.

The Assistant Director (Highways) stated that this issue fitted well within the City's forthcoming Transport Strategy which would provide an overarching approach to freight in the City.

The Chairman stated that he was strongly of the view that 40 minutes was far too long and that his ambition would be to attempt to half this in the City.

A Member expressed concern at the timing of any review if it were to be linked to the Transport Strategy. She suggested that consultation on the matter should commence as soon as possible given the huge impact of this on the City.

A Member agreed with the urgency that should be attached to this matter. He reminded the Committee that the 40-minute rule had been in place for ten years now yet the volume of traffic in the City had escalated hugely in this time.

Another Member stated that it would be important to see that any revision to the continuous loading and unloading time was also adequately policed and enforced going forward.

RESOLVED – That Members agree that:

- A review of the current 40min permitted loading and unloading period be undertaken as an early outcome of the Transport Strategy adoption process and, in any event, not later than the end of 2019 and
- Appropriate data capture, informal engagement with the freight industry and discussion with London Councils be undertaken to inform this review in the interim period.

13. CONGESTION MITIGATION: PARKING, TRAFFIC & CYCLING ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning congestion mitigation: Parking, Traffic and Cycling Enforcement resources.

The Town Clerk reported that the Resource Allocation Sub Committee had considered the report at their meeting on 4 October 2018 and had approved the necessary funding.

The Assistant Director (Highways) reported that it was proposed that additional Indigo officers were used in the evening given the changes in traffic flow in the

City at this time and that new technology was reinvested in in order to enhance the parking enforcement service as a whole. The report also recommends funding from the On-Street Parking Account be set aside to allow the introduction of three new City Corporation Traffic & Congestion Officers, whose role would be specifically aimed at identifying and resolving congestion hotspots on the ground and tackling things that Indigo currently cannot. Through a new City Police accreditation system, they would also have the authority to stop and direct traffic as well as to deal with minor police enforcement duties such as low-level cycling offences.

Members were told that this should be viewed as a positive step towards being able to deal with these kinds of issues in 'real time' and providing additional resources to help improve the effectiveness and safety of the City's road network.

A Member commented that this clearly presumed that the income generated in this area would outweigh the expense. He asked that this be monitored and that a report on this and the overall effectiveness of the initiative be brought back to Committee in a year's time.

RESOLVED – That, Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee:

- Approve the supplementary parking enforcement measures outlined in this report and
- Approve the introduction of three City Corporation Traffic & Congestion Officers for an initial two-year period to be focused on congestion and road safety issues.

14. **GREEN INITIATIVES IN THE CITY**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment presenting information on green initiatives in the City of London and outlining the results of a study into the use of a technique called Urban Greening Factor (UGF) as a means of delivering additional greening.

The report indicated that the City was surprisingly 'green'. A Member stated that there had been a number of new trees planted in the City since 2010 and that it was disappointing to not see this referred to within the report. It was suggested that the City Commons at Ashted and West Wickham should also be referred to in order to demonstrate the breadth of the City's green interests.

A Member commented that the map at Appendix 1 depicting the distribution of trees across the City seemed to show a lack of planting in the Fleet Street area and the South Western block of the City. He therefore questioned how many trees had been planted here in the past 12 months or how many were planned in future for this area specifically.

Officers undertook to report back to Members on the number of trees planted and in which areas in recent years.

A Member stated that the initial cost of any future planting needed to be taken in to account as well as the ongoing maintenance of any trees planted.

A Member referred to the statement which highlighted that ground level space was at a premium in the City within the report and questioned whether this Committee and its Officers should be bold in future and focus on the provision of open/pedestrian space with developers. He suggested that perhaps a factor could be adopted going forward whereby developments likely to attract in excess of, say, 1,000 additional people to a certain area would be required to have a ratio applied in terms of how much space they should then look to provide for general public use at ground level.

The Chairman stated that the Local Plan would be the correct vehicle for considering the provision of public space at ground level and reminded Members that the draft document would be brought to the next meeting of this Committee for consideration.

RESOLVED – That Members note the green initiatives being undertaken in the City outlined in this report and the potential further progress under the Urban Greening Factor (UGF).

15. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk listing their Outstanding References which had been recently updated with the help of the responsible Officers.

Ludgate Circus

The Assistant Director (Highways) reported that updates had been received from TfL on their actions to date since the time of publication of this report. Collision diagrams had now been provided and these highlighted that the main cause for these were left turning vehicles in conflict with pedestrians crossing informally.

Members were informed that TfL had now agreed to allow the City to use their Enforcement Team to assist in undertaking cycle behaviour training at the Ludgate Circus Junction. TfL had also agreed to look in to the cost of surveys on the junction and report back. A review of signal timings at the junction would also take place in the next few months.

The Deputy Chairman stated that whilst he was not surprised by TfL's conclusion that the biggest risks here related to pedestrians crossing informally, he would like to ensure that they were not dismissive of the issue simply because it happens elsewhere. He asked that City Officers continue to press TfL to identify ways in which these informal crossing routes could be made safer and more pedestrian friendly.

Blackfriars Bridge Underpass

Members were informed that TfL had undertaken tar repairs in the underpass and that a deep clean of the area had also been undertaken by City Highways. TfL had now also undertaken to look at the issue of rough sleeping here alongside the City's own outreach team. The Assistant Director (Highways) was

pleased to report that, although progress to date was slower than hoped, things were certainly moving in the right direction.

In response to a question regarding whether LED lighting would be used in the underpass, the Assistant Director (Highways) stated that he assumed that this would be the case given that it was best practice. He undertook to look in to this further and to report back to the Member on this matter.

Wind Measurement on Tall Buildings

The Chairman informed Members that a report on this matter would be brought to the December 2018 meeting of this Committee.

A Member questioned whether this report was intended to cover all those areas which the Committee would like to keep under review. He stated that, if so, he would like to see reference to Fumes and to Pavements included given that these were both issues he had requested further information on previously.

A Member requested that the names of responsible Officers also be added to all Outstanding References going forward.

16. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

Residents Association representation at Annual Committee Dinners

In response to a question, the Chairman reported that he would be happy to include Residents Association representatives on the Annual Committee Dinner guest list going forward and had already confirmed this in writing to the Member who had originally posed this question.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT **Annual Committee Dinner**

The Chairman reported that the 2018/19 Committee Dinner would take place on Thursday 21 February 2019 at Glaziers Hall.

Local Development Plan and Transport Strategy Member Briefing

The Deputy Chairman reminded Members that an informal briefing on the Local Development Plan and Transport Strategy that was open to all Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee was scheduled for 10.30am on Thursday, 11 October 2018. He stated that prior notice of any specific issues/themes which Members wished to explore within this context would be useful in terms of focusing discussion on the day.

18. 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.	Exempt Paragraph(s)
-----------------	----------------------------

19-20	3
21-22	-

19. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2018.

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

The Committee received the draft non-public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee meeting on 4 September 2018.

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

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

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

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting closed at 12.22 pm

Chairman

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