

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 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)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman Gregory Jones QC
Munsur Ali	Shravan Joshi
Randall Anderson	Oliver Lodge
Peter Bennett	Alderman Nicholas Lyons
Sir Mark Boleat	Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Mark Bostock	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Brian Mooney
Peter Dunphy	Sylvia Moys
Stuart Fraser	Barbara Newman
Marianne Fredericks	Graham Packham
Alderman Prem Goyal OBE JP	Susan Pearson
Graeme Harrower	Graeme Smith
Christopher Hill	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer & Development Director
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Iain Simmons	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment
Jennifer Ogunleye	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Henry Colthurst, Deputy Henry Pollard, James de Sausmarez, Oliver Sells and William Upton.

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

Peter Bennett declared an interest in Item 7 by virtue of his being a Member of the Board of Trustees of the City of London Academies Trust.

Susan Pearson declared a pecuniary interest in Item 7 and confirmed that as she had not been granted dispensation would neither speak nor vote on this item.

Alderman Gregory Jones declared an interest in Item 11 as a Liveryman of the Leathersellers' Company and confirmed he would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration of the item.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee noted that Sir Brian Langstaff was referred to in places as 'Sir Langstaff' and this should be amended so that he was referred to as Sir Brian Langstaff consistently.

The Committee noted that the church referred to on page 10 was a Welsh Church and not a Jewish Church, and that this should be amended.

RESOLVED – That, pending the above corrections, the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 8 October 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

With regards to the application relating to Great Arthur House considered at the meeting of the Committee on 11 September, a Member asked officers for an update on the issue raised regarding the ceiling height in one of the units.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that one room in one of the units had a ceiling height lower than the guideline height. The Department of Community and Children's Services, as the applicant, was investigating how to deal with this and may need revised planning consent later on.

4. **MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting held on 19 September 2018 and the draft minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting held on 9 October 2018.

Members suggested three amendments to the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2018, with regards to Core Strategic Policy CSXX: Planning Contributions and Policy DM XX: Viability Appraisals. It should be clarified that it was the Housing Fund rather than the Corporation that lost out if the values used were not updated. A Member added that the policy needed to distinguish between the land values and the price paid, as they were not always the same. Members also noted a missing full stop in the minute relating to Core Strategic Policy CSXX: Aldgate and Tower. The Chairman advised that the amendments could be made at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee minutes be noted.

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 their delegated powers since the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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 valid development applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the last meeting.

A Member commended the potential restoration of the pump outside 69 Leadenhall Street, in Aldgate ward, as it would be a valuable facility.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **LAND TRANSACTIONS - FORMER RICHARD CLOUDESLEY SCHOOL SITE**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning changes to the land transaction arrangements previously authorised by the Committee in order to ensure the land is held appropriately and to remove the risk of the scheme being impeded by injunction due to Right of Light infringements resulting from the scheme. The Committee noted a printing error in the report, that recommendation 2 should read that the Committee authorise the appropriation of the City's Land from housing purposes to the planning purposes of facilitating the development of a new school and social housing.

A Member queried the recommendation of the report and argued that it was outside the Committee's terms of reference, because the authority delegated to the Committee to appropriate by Court of Common Council was subject to the criteria for such appropriation as laid down by the Court of Common Council all being met. One of the criteria was whether the rights could be reasonably released by agreement. As there had not been an adequate attempt to remove the risk of the scheme being impeded through negotiation, and as the powers were to be used exceptionally as a last resort, it was felt that the criteria were not met. Therefore, recommendation was beyond the authority of the Committee to approve. The Planning Protocol states that applications regarding the City's land must not be subject to preferential treatment but subject to the same rigorous evaluation as other applications. There was a report relating to a request by a third-party applicant at item 11, and the same considerations needed to be applied equally in both cases. If the Committee approved the recommendation it would be acting against procedure, and at risk of not complying with Protocol, and therefore the Committee should vote it down.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor responded to the points raised, advising the Committee that they had been carefully considered in the preparation of the report. Officers had also obtained the advice of leading counsel on the report. The key difference between this case and the case at item 11 was that in this case most of the land was not yet owned by the developer and the majority of the recommendations in the reports related to arrangements for acquisition. It had been considered premature to initiate negotiations until the acquisition arrangements were further advanced. Court of Common Council had delegated to the Committee authority to consider appropriations, and the decision was within the Committee's responsibilities. Rights holders had been written to and made aware of the proposal, and no responses had been received from those rights holders.

In response to a request from the Chairman, the Comptroller and City Solicitor confirmed that leading counsel was satisfied that the Committee had authority to make the decision.

A Member replied that the authority to disapply the criteria had not been delegated, only to apply it.

A Member argued that the problem was that the report was unhelpful. Whilst there had been alternative arrangements considered earlier in the process, the land was being transferred between local authority purposes, to be occupied for education and housing uses. The case was entirely different to the case to be considered at item 11.

A Member stated that action under Section 203 had to be in the public interest, and that the interests of Golden Lane and Islington residents had not been taken into account.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor drew the Committee's attention to the Court of Common Council resolution delegating authority to determine appropriations set out in the agenda at page 485, part b of which stated that the Planning & Transportation Committee was authorised to determine whether such acquisition or appropriation may be authorised. The Committee had considered all the criteria, including grounds for not requiring compliance with one of the criteria. and the Committee was therefore within its authority to make the decision. The rights of affected residents had been taken into account and the actionable injuries caused were set out in appendix 1A to the report for the Committee'. These were to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The area of land had been held for housing purposes, but had now been declared surplus to that housing purpose and the proposed planning purpose involved part education use and part social housing use.

A Member responded that on this basis, the Committee's attention could be drawn to all the relevant criteria and could decide to waive all the relevant criteria.

Arising from the discussion, the application was then put to the vote amongst eligible Committee Members with 16 voting for and 3 voting against the application, with 5 abstentions.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee authorise the appropriation of the City's Land from housing purposes to the planning purposes of facilitating the development of a new school and social housing.

8. **BLOOMBERG EUROPEAN HEADQUARTERS WINS THE 2018 STIRLING PRIZE**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director informing Members that Bloomberg's European Headquarters at 3 Queen Victoria Street had won the RIBA Stirling prize for architecture. The Chairman advised Members that the reconstruction of the Roman Temple of Mithras, hosted within the building had also received an award for Best Public Presentation of Archaeology at the British Archaeological Awards.

The Chairman praised the unique building's incredible design and sustainability. A Member stated that the inside of the building was also spectacular and recommended a Planning & Transportation Committee Members visit to the building. The Chairman supported this suggestion and asked officers to look into arranging a visit for Members, although Members were advised that the building could not accommodate the next Committee dinner.

A Member queried when the underground exit would be opened, and commended the leap of faith taken in using fresh air rather than an Air Conditioning system for temperature control throughout the building. With the upcoming challenges of climate change, if this proved efficient in summer and winter it would provide great evidence and an example for others to follow. The Director of the Built Environment responded that the underground exit would be open in approximately one month and officers would try to get further details from TfL about a possible opening ceremony.

The Committee gave thanks to officers for helping the building come to fruition and congratulated architects Foster & Partners on their success.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

9. **CITY OF LONDON LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSED DRAFT PLAN**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment seeking agreement for the draft Local Plan, known as City Plan 2036, to be published for public consultation.

The Chairman introduced the item and thanked the Local Plans Sub-Committee for their scrutiny so far. The Plan set out the way forward for the City to enable and service sustainable growth over the coming years. The draft was for Members to agree to publish for consultation before it was brought back to the Committee in Spring 2019.

The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report, and advised Members of larger-scale maps tabled for their reference. A number of typing and cross-referencing errors had already been noted and would be picked up. The Committee was also asked to delegate authority to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman to approve the final draft version to be published for consultation, after Committee Members' comments had been taken into account.

The document was long but still relatively concise, and conformed generally with national policy and the Mayor of London's strategic policy approach. The plan complemented the draft Transport Strategy and the two had been prepared in tandem. Land use policies were complemented by transport aims and objectives and it was recommended that the two strategies be read together. A briefing session had been held for Members two weeks previously and a number of changes had been made based on suggestions received. The second draft would be presented next year after considering responses to the consultation, and the document would then be referred to the Planning Inspectorate, before its eventual adoption in 2020.

Two context points were raised for Members. The Plan emphasised the need to plan for sustainable growth in the economy and employment as well as limited housing growth. Intensification would need to be managed successfully, making full use of available space to facilitate efficient movement around the City. The public consultation would run from 12 November 2018 until 28 February 2019.

A Member stressed the need to do the consultation process justice and engage all stakeholders by making it clear what was new, what had changed, and how the new strategies would work together. The Chairman added that the executive summary needed to bring out the highlights.

A Member queried what definition of affordable housing was used in the Housing Policy, and whether the provision of social housing outside the City was off the table.

A Member added that there were many recommendations and future requirements for the Committee to take account of, and that it would be important to be able to refer to and know the document well when considering future applications.

A Member raised a strategic point, that if the Plan committed to two million square metres of extra floor space based on the there being 100,000 extra people in the City over the next 18 years, the Plan should stress that the numbers were a forecast, and could be determined by the Corporation on an ongoing basis based on the evidence. It was also suggested that it was not essential to looking exclusively within the City boundary, and that neighbouring boroughs be encouraged to permit office development that effectively expanded the City. Furthermore, the aspirations on open spaces were good but were too vague. Open spaces could be insisted upon through the development

process and the aim should be that open spaces grow at least as fast as the population.

The Chairman added that businesses were not especially concerned with local authority boundaries, noting that there was already some spill-over. The Corporation wanted to benefit London as a whole. There had been meetings with Westminster and Camden about potential ways to co-operate and there would be further meetings with them and other boroughs. It was important not to lose sight of the open spaces issue.

A Member stressed the need to make it easy for the community and stakeholders to engage with the process and suggested lots of pictures online and workshops, with an online consultation process that was easy to navigate.

A Member stated that it would be difficult to absorb significant growth whilst reducing carbon footprint, as realistically more people generated a larger carbon footprint. Whilst there would be new technologies, a zero-carbon economy would be difficult to achieve.

A Member said that pollution was a significant issue in the Eastern part of the City such as Portsoken ward, and the Plan needed to adequately consider the residents that would be caught up in the growth of businesses and population.

A Member queried why the Local Plan and the Transport Strategy had different timeframes if they were complementary, as the Plan was to 2036 and the Transport Strategy to 2043, adding that if it couldn't be changed then it could be explained why. The Chairman responded that the Local Plan period was prescribed in regulations.

A Member argued that the City would ultimately be shaped by businesses and the demand for space, and the Corporation's forecasts of growth were no better than other forecasts, particularly given the current uncertainty around Brexit. However, there were still important issues to tackle such as pollution, and therefore it was important to concentrate on the shorter timeframe, to have realistic plans and continue with the central themes. A Member added that whilst the Corporation could not make growth happen, policies needed to be in place that would accommodate it. Whilst financial services jobs had spread out somewhat, recent investment driven by the Far East was a statement of longer-term confidence in the City and enough stock needed to be in place to keep interest.

A Member picked up on the issue of open spaces and asked what comparisons had been made between rooftop viewing galleries and their effect compared to open spaces, as they were not convinced the rooftop viewing galleries were as valuable.

The Director of the Built Environment responded to the points raised. On managing growth and intensification, there was some local discretion but also a requirement to conform generally with regional and national planning policy. The projection of 100,000 extra people was from the Greater London Authority,

and whilst it may not turn out to be accurate the City needed to plan for this broad scale of growth. The City's commercial activities did spread beyond the City boundary so working with neighbouring boroughs was important going forward.

The Local Plan and Transport Strategy would aim to break the link between economic growth and carbon footprint growth by using renewable energy sources and using smart technology to ensure that existing issues were addressed and were not exacerbated. This would also improve air quality. Good growth which does not increase the carbon footprint could be achieved if the right policies were implemented well.

The 15 years set out for the Local Plan was a procedural standard, whilst the Transport Strategy looked further ahead. The aims of both could be fully achieved and they were not in conflict with each other. It was recognised that growth did not all have to be within the City boundaries.

The rooftop viewing galleries were more of a benefit for visitors to the City rather than residents or workers, but this was not necessarily a bad thing, although they could be an issue if they caused congestion. The approach to viewing galleries had recently been revised with an emphasis on amenity space within buildings

The definition used for affordable housing would be included in the glossary when this was added in. The Local Plan put an emphasis on the provision of social housing, reflecting discussions with the Department of Community and Children's Services. The focus would be on on-site provision rather than contributions elsewhere. Social housing provided outside of the City would not be counted towards the Local Plan targets which are just for the City.

Officers were working on Story Maps for the consultation which were more interactive and engaging. A consultation strategy was being devised and officers were looking at drop-in sessions and social media campaigning amongst other things. The aim was to engage groups that were harder to reach. A Member suggested using aspects of the successful consultations so far on the Transport Strategy and try to reach out to commuters.

Arising from the discussion, the recommendation was then put to the vote amongst eligible Committee Members with 21 voting for and 0 voting against the application, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- a) Agree the proposed draft Local Plan as set out at Appendix 1 of the report for public consultation; and
- b) Authorise the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to make further non-material changes and editorial changes prior to public consultation.

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

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment seeking agreement for the draft Transport Strategy to be published for public consultation.

The Director of the Built Environment introduced the item. This was the first long-term Transport Strategy devised by the City and reflected big changes in technology in recent years. The strategy would run alongside the Mayor of London's strategy which ran for 25 years. The strategy was about enabling and supporting growth, and would be reviewed every five years, with the supporting three-year Delivery Plan updated on an annual basis.

The process had been ongoing for ten months so far, with around 2500 responses to consultation already undertaken. There had been input from a Citizens Panel and a Transport Strategy Board, as well as from the Local Plan and Streets & Walkways Sub-Committees. A track-changed version of the draft strategy that incorporated comments from Members of the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee was tabled for the Committee's information.

The strategy contained 10 main outcomes and 54 proposals. The strategy would create more attractive streets with more pedestrian priority, and aimed for lower emissions including a zero-emissions zone. Traffic reduction would help facilitate this and would require a co-ordinated approach. Internal and external partnerships would be key in delivering the strategy, and officers were exploring combined Committee meetings to oversee the delivery. The three-year Delivery Plan (for TfL funded projects) would be brought to the next Committee meeting. The consultation would include a bespoke website, and drop-in sessions and briefing sessions would also be arranged.

The Chairman commended officers for a challenging, radical and ambitious strategy that charted an exciting future, and opened up the discussion to the Committee.

A Member suggested that the strategy should include comparisons with the City's competitors such as Manhattan and Singapore. The Chairman responded that visits to New York, Paris and Stockholm were undertaken during the development of the strategy to compare London's progress on transport issues.

A Member expressed their pleasure at the focus on pedestrian priority but asked if the strategy could go further, and suggested that deliveries be night-time only. The riverside walkway was aimed for 2020 rather than 2022 and officers were asked to amend this in the document.

A Member added that the City was different as it was built on Roman roads and many other cities were rebuilt extensively after the Second World War, and asked what would happen to cycling if the area was pedestrianised, as the City could not implement networks like those in Amsterdam.

A Member commended the process in developing the strategy, particularly in consulting stakeholders on what they needed before drawing up proposals. There were ground-breaking suggestions in the proposal and it was important for the Corporation to work with the government and TfL to try and make them happen. Public transport was expensive in London and there was a need to bring the costs down. It was also important for joined-up working at Member and officer level to make full use of the Corporation's powers and resources.

Officers were asked for assurance that major projects such the new Museum of London and Centre for Music projects had been factored in and co-ordinated into the strategy.

A Member queried whether some of the target dates could be more ambitious, particularly with regards to electric vehicle charging points and a sustainable logistics centre, which some cities already had.

A Member said that the proposal for a 15mph speed limit could be awkward and could be counter-productive if drivers were forced to drive below the limit. Cyclists were not covered by speed limits and the strategy needed to be clear in its position on dangerous or aggressive cycling.

A Member suggested that proposal 19 on accessibility to underground stations could be more ambitious. Whilst the Corporation did not control TfL it had control over many of the buildings adjacent to stations, and developers could be urged to work with TfL to improve access and accessibility to stations.

The Director of the Built Environment thanked Members for their comments and responded to the points raised. The targets around zero-emissions were ambitious but there was a need to be bold. Officers had looked at other cities and hosted a workshop in the City to learn but also develop the City's own approach to the issue.

It was unclear how far technology would reduce the need for a speed limit in the future, but a 15mph limit would reflect the uniqueness of the City. However, all policies would be kept under review. Cycling had grown in terms of numbers and distances and the aim was to promote a relaxed and calmer culture of cycling in the City. Dutch infrastructure would be used around London where there was space, and safer behaviours needed to be encouraged.

Air quality would be looked at on an ongoing basis as proposals were developed. Extensive modelling was being undertaken on impact and ambitious targets and timeframes were put in place as it was an urgent public health issue.

The three-year delivery plan would provide more detail on timescales for projects such as the riverside walkway and the logistics centre, and major projects had been factored into the Transport Strategy plans, with specific plans to help facilitate the projects.

The pedestrian priority streets would not be fully pedestrianised, as access for vehicles would be wanted where it was necessary. The Corporation would make clear that it wanted to work with the government and TfL and encourage better affordability on public transport. The points about underground systems would be picked up. Officers had made enquiries about the Mayor's Strategy and it was hoped the final version of the Transport Strategy would have a clearer indication about plans for City underground stations.

The Committee gave thanks to officers for their work on the strategy so far, and also to all the stakeholders who had engaged with and informed the process.

Arising from the discussion, the recommendation was then put to the vote amongst eligible Committee Members with 21 voting for and 0 voting against the application, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- a) Approve the draft Transport Strategy for consultation; and
- b) Authorise the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to make further non-material changes and editorial changes prior to public consultation.

At this point, Alderman Gregory Jones withdrew from the meeting.

11. **REDEVELOPMENT OF 6-8 BISHOPSGATE AND 150 LEADENHALL STREET - ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR PLANNING PURPOSES**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking approval in principle for the acquisition of land for planning purposes to facilitate the redevelopment of the site at the corner of Bishopsgate and Leadenhall Street.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor drew the Committee's attention to the tabled addendum report which included letters of representations from stakeholders, clarified two points as a result of the representations and gave the Committee an overview of the proposal and recommendation. The Committee was advised that this would not be the final decision and the Town Clerk would have to consider the proposal at a later stage.

RESOLVED - That **SUBJECT TO** the Town Clerk being satisfied that there is an appropriate Indemnity in place and that it is necessary in order to facilitate the carrying out of the Development (including consideration of whether those entitled to rights of light and other easements and the benefit of restrictive covenants are prepared by agreement (on reasonable terms and within a reasonable period) to permit infringements or breach of the restrictions in time to achieve practical completion by 2022) that the Town Clerk be given delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee, to approve the following:

- (i) 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 Development and subsequent disposal of that interest to the Developer (or an associated company) under section 233 of the TCPA; and
- (ii) the terms on which the acquisition and disposal referred to above are to be made.

12. BLACKFRIARS BRIDGE PARAPET REFURBISHMENT AND BRIDGE RE-PAINTING - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment setting out the options for the refurbishment of Blackfriars Bridge.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree that as the parapet has been shown to be of sufficient strength, the project proceeds with Option 3, a full refurbishment of Blackfriars Bridge with repair and replacement of the cast iron features as required; working around the current access restrictions.

13. TRANSPORT FOR LONDON BUS RATIONALISATION PROPOSALS ACROSS LONDON

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment setting out the proposed response from the City of London Corporation to the consultation currently being carried out by TfL concerning proposals to make changes to their bus services across London.

The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report. The changes proposed by TfL were supported as they were in line with the Transport Strategy. The aim was for greater utilisation and fewer empty buses across the City. If approved, the changes would come into effect on a rolling basis throughout 2019.

A Member said that a reduction in the number of buses with minimal impact on uses was welcome, and suggested that the changes be co-ordinated according to the time of day. However, tourist buses were a bigger issue that needed to be addressed and the Corporation's response should include a suggestion that they be banned during peak hours.

A Member welcomed the review and change of direction. There were still problems with buses in the City, such as congestion by buses on Threadneedle Street. A wider look at why there were empty buses in the first place would be valuable, particularly with the implementation of the Transport Strategy.

A Member told the Committee that the frequency and efficiency of buses was good, and they were a useful mode of transport for older people and a whole range of other people. The proposals by TfL did take away some connectivity to the West End and some other areas, and as there was no real mention of how this would be mitigated, the Corporation's response should ask for this to be addressed.

A Member told the Committee that not all underground stations were step-free, and would not be until 2044, buses remained a useful mode of transport for passengers with mobility issues. There was a particularly high demand for buses heading south across London Bridge in the early evening as many workers commuted by bus from South London. Some of the recent decline in demand could be attributable to more people working at home due to the recent chaos on the train network. Any changes should also ensure that passengers did not have to walk long distances at night in order to change buses, as this was a safety concern. Bus services were flexible and could be changed quickly, so the proposals should be taken forward and amended later if they were not working.

A Member added that the bus network was crucial for early morning and late-night workers and the network needed the right links in place. The Hopper ticket had been a success and real progress had been made in improving the bus services. However, more services were needed at night.

A Member reiterated that the proposals lacked any consideration of the time of day. Buses ran at the same frequency at peak commuting hours as they did in the middle of the day which made no sense. The Chairman responded that he had asked TfL about this, and it was supposedly cheaper to keep the buses running during the middle of the day than to send them back to the depot. A Member added that depots and light industrial units close to the City would be valuable.

A Member stressed that the important thing was that a bus user should have a reasonable expectation of getting a bus in a reasonable amount of time, ideally waiting no more than 5 minutes at the bus stop. The proposals needed to consider the consumer point of view and perhaps technology would help to the end.

A Member reminded the Committee that buses that were empty at one stage of the route could have been full at other stages of the route. Arrangements following the changes needed to be made clearer as they would affect a significant number of people, and buses were a vital service.

A Member suggested looking at the effect of current travel subsidies on income and inequality and look at what could be done to address any issues. A Member added that discounts and more affordable pricing would lead to more usage of the buses and fewer cars, meeting multiple objectives.

The Director of the Built Environment responded to the points raised, noting the general support for the proposed changes. Comments made by Committee Members around frequency, time of day, social mobility and tourist buses would be taken into account, and the Corporation's response would be shared with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman before being sent out.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

a) Note the report; and

b) Generally support TfL's proposed changes to bus services across London, taking account of comments from Members as set out.

14. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

The Committee received a list of outstanding references.

Ludgate Circus

There were no further updates since the last meeting of the Committee. Another meeting with TfL was scheduled before the end of the year which the Deputy Chairman would attend.

Lane Rental

A report was due to be presented to the December meeting of the Committee.

Blackfriars Bridge Underpass

The Director of the Built Environment advised Members that officers had visited the site with Members from the Ward and Members of the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee to review the work done by TfL. Whilst the subway itself belonged to TfL the Corporation was responsible for cleaning the underpass. The lighting and tiling had been replaced and it had been concluded that the repairs were to an acceptable standard.

A Member responded that there were still intermittent problems, including with the lighting, and this had been raised with officers. There was some work still to do be done and it was asked that the item be kept on the outstanding references list.

Wind Measurement on Tall Buildings

A report was due to be presented to the December meeting of the Committee.

Fumes

A report was due to be presented to the November meeting of the Committee.

A Member said that the issue of policy and enforcement needed to be addressed. A lot of vents were aimed at pedestrians and this was knowingly permitted then it should be stopped, as it was unlikely that there was no alternative.

The Chairman advised that the report would also go to the Port health & Environmental Services Committee. A Member added that kitchen flumes were not sufficiently cleaned, creating bad smells and also creating a fire hazard.

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

A Member asked why the pedestrian refuges on Gresham Street and Cheapside had been removed so early in preparation for the Lord Mayor's Show, which was not for another 11 days. The refuges had also previously taken too long to reinstate after the Show, and there should be a shorter

window either side. The Director of the Built Environment agreed to respond to the Member directly.

A Member reported an IT issue which had made the papers more difficult to read as there were no bookmarks on the electronic version, and asked that the Town Clerk ensure that the bookmarks were retained where an electronic agenda was split into two parts.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business.

17. 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
18 – 20	3
21 – 22	-

18. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

19. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB COMMITTEE

The Committee received non-public minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee.

20. THAMES COURT FOOTBRIDGE

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

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

There was one question.

22. 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 12.52 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee
tel. no.: 020 7332 1480
joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk