

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 9 July 2019

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

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Rehana Ameer	Shravan Joshi
Randall Anderson	Andrew Mayer
Peter Bennett	Deputy Brian Mooney
Mark Bostock	Sylvia Moys
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Barbara Newman
Henry Colthurst	Graham Packham
Karina Dostalova	Susan Pearson
Peter Dunphy	Judith Pleasance
Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Henry Pollard
Alderman Prem Goyal	James de Sausmarez
Tracey Graham	Oliver Sells QC
Graeme Harrower	William Upton QC
Christopher Hill	

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
David Farnsworth	- Town Clerk's Department
Simon Latham	- Town Clerk's Department
Amelia Ehren	- Town Clerk's Department
Chandni Tanna	- Town Clerk's Department
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Nicholas Welland	- City Surveyor's Department
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of the Built Environment
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
David Horkan	- 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
Samantha Tharme	- Department of the Built Environment
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment
Craig Stansfield	- Department of the Built Environment
Ruth Calderwood	- Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

Also Present:

Simon Hart, Pringle Richards Sharratt Limited

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman), Alderman Emma Edhem, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Oliver Lodge and Natasha Lloyd-Owen.

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

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

The Chair declared an interest in agenda item 10, reporting that he had acted in a professional capacity with regard to the original planning application and was therefore intending to withdraw from the meeting whilst this report was considered.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the public minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019 as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Ludgate Circus (page 2) – A Member clarified that right turns from Fleet Street into New Bridge Street were banned.

10 Bolt Court (page 2) – A Member commented that he had been informed that work had already commenced on site, on the roof terrace but that neither he nor local residents had seen a planning application relating to this.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that revised drawings had not been received to date and that she would investigate the current situation on site before reporting back to the Member on this matter.

Telephone Kiosk – Fleet Street (page 10) – In response to a question on progress on this matter, the Chief Planning Officer and Development director confirmed that discussions with the legal department on this matter were ongoing.

Bow Lane Traffic (page 11) – The Member who had originally raised this question at the last meeting thanked Officers for their response on this but questioned when the work here would be undertaken given that it was an ongoing health and safety risk. Officers undertook to report back further to the Member.

Yellow Line on Coopers Row (page 11) – The Member who originally raised this query at the last meeting referred also to several near misses at the junction with Pepys Street and asked that the possibility of introducing traffic calming measures also be investigated here. Officers undertook to report back to the Member on this additional point.

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

The Committee received the draft public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 28 May 2019.

MATTERS ARISING

Museum of London Public Realm Project (page 15) – A Member reported that he had attended a consultation meeting on the Museum of London project last week and was concerned that there were no proposals for Public Realm, pedestrian movement and road closures within the presentation. He added that, to his mind, this was an essential part of the project and sought reassurance from Officers that it was therefore being properly integrated. The Director of the Built Environment undertook to update Members on this matter in writing.

Dockless Bikes (page 14) – A Member questioned progress around the dockless bike hire trial and asked how many bikes from operators not participating in the trial had been confiscated by enforcement officers to date. She went on to question how this message was being communicated to those operators not selected to form part of the trial.

The Transportation and Public Realm Director reported that there were currently 30 bikes in store and that talks were being held with the relevant operators around how they might retrieve these and also ensure that their bikes are not operating within the City boundaries going forward. He confirmed that no fees had been charged for the recovery of the bikes to date and that Officers were placing more emphasis on reducing the presence of other operators in the City at present.

A Member questioned who was deemed to be at fault (the hirer or the operator) if a bicycle was hired outside of the City but then left here after a journey had been completed.

Another Member stated that the vast majority of people were unaware of where the City boundaries were and to therefore only permit two bicycle operators to operate within the City was, in his view, a problem of the organisation's own making.

The Chairman reported that a report providing Members with a full update on the trial to date, alongside enforcement and other related matters would be submitted to the next meeting of this Committee.

5. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

RECEIVED.

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

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director detailing development and advertisement applications

determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

RECEIVED.

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

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

RECEIVED.

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

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

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

9. **DARK HOUSE WALK CITY WALKWAY ALTERATION**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to Dark House Walk, City Walkway Alteration.

The Transport Planning Manager reminded Members that this report had been deferred from the 24 May Planning and Transportation Committee meeting. The re-submitted report now included a more detailed plan including dimensions of the walkway area that would remain alongside some proposal alterations.

The Chair welcomed Simon Hart of Pringle Richards Sharratt Limited – the architects acting on behalf of the applicant - to the meeting and asked him to address the Committee on the proposals.

Mr Hart referred to the fact that the existing area of walkway concerned was in a poor state, it was a secluded and segregated slot with a lack of seating provided and where there was evidence of some misuse. He added that the width of walkway here presented a great opportunity to add to and improve this area of river walkway.

Mr Hart went on to state that the applicant had been working closely with the City Corporation's Open Spaces team and intended to retain a lot of the greenery in the existing location. In addition, seating would be incorporated and most of this would be river facing. Members were informed that the pavilion itself would be set back allowing for a more open and free flowing space.

Mr Hart invited comments and questions from the Committee.

A Member stated that, whilst he was content with the proposals regarding the pavilion, he was concerned about how the external seating area here would be properly managed so that dining furniture was not taken on to the public walkway. Mr Hart responded by stating that a row of timber posts/bollards in front of the seating area would clearly mark out public seating and restaurant furniture.

A Member questioned whether the addition of these bollards might restrict access for the emergency services. Mr Hart assured the Member that this was not the case. He commented that emergency vehicles were already unable to access this area of river walkway but assured Members of the arrangements in place.

A Member questioned why the external seating area could not be managed by way of a tables and chairs licence which would not necessitate the 'handing over' of an area of public walkway in this manner. Mr Hart stated that this was an important location and highlighted that anyone operating here was almost certain to want some external space to manage. The Transport Planning Manager responded that the nature of the external, private seating required for dining only was very different to a café style approach where tables and chairs licenses operated quite successfully. The granting of a tables and chairs licence here would mean that the seating becomes a public amenity whereas the restaurant required exclusive use of the furniture on the City walkway. He added that it was also not possible to operate a table and chairs licence on private land and that the use of the proposed timber bollards was therefore felt to be more appropriate.

A Member commented favourably on the proposals but questioned ownership of 10 Lower Thames Street, plans for the future of this building and whether or not these might be disruptive to the erection of a pavilion. Mr Hart clarified that the pavilion would be a timber structure and would not therefore affect any future development of the building. He clarified that he was not aware of any plans for the building at present and that the current owners held a 2,000-year lease over the Wharf.

A Member sought clarification around what appeared to represent a permanent change and loss of control of walkway for commercial use. He agreed that the proposals for the area would enhance it but expressed concern over a loss of control in terms of the management of the area which would then fall to landowners. Mr Hart referred once more to the fact that this was a very generous part of the riverside walkway which was currently not in use. He reiterated that these proposals would alter that. The Comptroller and City Solicitor confirmed that City walkways were not public but granted public rights of access only.

A Member, also currently serving as Chairman of the Licensing Committee, stated that he felt that it was likely that this matter would also, in time, be the subject of a licensing hearing given the location and concerns raised. He added that there were many conditions that could be placed upon a licence to address specific concerns around outside drinking such as the serving of alcohol up to a

particular time or only whilst patrons were seated/eating. He therefore encouraged the applicant to engage with the relevant officers as soon as possible on this matter.

A Member commented that planning consent had been granted for a café/restaurant/bar but that she could not find reference in the brief to the request for extra external space for tables and chairs. She went on to question why this could not be amalgamated on the roof of the building. Mr Hart confirmed that, at one stage, plans had incorporated a balcony on the upper level for this purpose, but it was felt, after discussions with planning officers, that this would dominate the space and was therefore not appropriate. He reminded Members that the area of walkway requested for this purpose was 2.4m only and concurred that, whilst the official description ought to have made proper reference to the external tables and chairs required, planning permission had been granted on this.

A Member commented that the proposals, which were within his Ward, seemed very encouraging in terms of the vibrancy they could bring to the location. He added that, should these proposals be approved today, the matter would then be considered by the Corporate Asset Sub Committee.

Members proceeded to vote on the recommendation before them and votes were cast as follows:

- IN FAVOUR – 25 Votes
- OPPOSED – 2 Votes
- ABSTENTIONS - None

RESOLVED – That, the Committee resolve to vary the resolution of the Court of Common Council made on 25 April 1991 by making a resolution in the form appended to this report as Appendices 2A and 2B and delegate to the Transport Planning Manager authority to insert into the resolution an appropriate date for the coming into force of the variation.

10. CITY FUND HIGHWAY DECLARATION - 43 GOLDEN LANE, EC1

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor seeking approval to declare a volume of land and airspace totalling 81 square foot (7.5 square metres) of City Fund Highway land at Golden Lane, EC1 to be surplus to highway requirements to allow its disposal to provide 99 residential dwellings at 43 Golden Lane, EC1.

The Chair withdrew from the meeting whilst this item was considered. It was moved and unanimously seconded that past Chairman Barbara Newman take the chair for this item.

The City Surveyor opened by clarifying that the works received full planning permission from this Committee in 2017 as opposed to under delegated powers as suggested within the report.

A Member tabled an email which she had also sent to the Committee electronically outlining her concerns around these proposals. She drew Members' attention to Appendix 2 and 3 of the report which did not show a large lime tree situated on the site in question. She added that the space overlapped by the tree fell within the area that the Committee were now being asked to declare surplus. The Member highlighted that the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director had assured her that the tree would be protected during the construction phase of the development, but no such assurances were made thereafter.

The Member continued by stating that the tree in question was a large, mature tree and, apart from providing visual amenity, it also served the important role of reducing air pollution and cleaning the air in a residential area with schools situated directly opposite. It was therefore plainly not 'surplus'.

Another Member agreed with the case made and noted that, whilst airspace was ordinarily uncontroversial, in this case the space in question was occupied by a large, mature tree. He went on to state that the development in question had no public benefit and had been sold to a developer to develop a number of luxury flats and sought assurances that, if the land/airspace were to be declared surplus, the tree would still remain.

A Member stated that the Committee needed to be clear in terms of the decision they were being asked to make – not a decision stating that the tree was surplus, but simply that it would require cutting back at high level. A second Member questioned whether this would also involve an ongoing requirement to keep the trees branches out of the airspace in question.

The City Surveyor confirmed that there were no plans to remove the tree in question. This was a question of clarifying ownership of the airspace and was brought to Officers attention by the developer towards the end of 2018. There was no change to the approved plans. He added that something could be added to the airspace lease stipulating that access for the purpose of maintaining the tree was to continue.

A Member questioned the pocket park which featured in the original application. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that this would not be impacted by these proposals.

Another Member questioned whether a condition could be added stating that the health of the tree was not to be compromised. The City Surveyor reiterated that he would seek to insert a suitable clause within the lease around the tree's health/ongoing access.

A Member questioned whether, in light of the concerns expressed, it would be possible to place a tree protection order (TPO) on the tree. The Chief Planning Officer stated that she believed that this would have to be advertised and notice served on the owner (in this case the City Corporation). Typically, the organisation did not serve TPO's on itself but that she would look to initiate this as a separate process if that was the wish of Members.

Members questioned the current height of the tree. The City Surveyor reported that, at present, the second-floor balconies of the development protruded out into the tree's branches. This was as per the original plans. A Member noted that, at present, the tree reached up to the fifth floor of the development and questioned whether it would therefore be cut out in the outline of the second floor balconies or cut down to below the second floor and how this might affect the tree's stability.

A Member agreed that whilst the health of the tree was important this was something that could be discussed with the developer and adequately conditioned. It should not, therefore, affect the decision to be taken today regarding surplus land/airspace. Another Member supported this point and noted that the tree had already been trimmed back. He suggested that Members therefore agree to this very small area being declared surplus whilst noting that the tree itself would remain on the highway which would ultimately remain under the ownership of the City Corporation. He also noted that the balconies on the development were stepped and not situated one above the other.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the proposal before them. Votes were cast as follows:

- IN FAVOUR – 16 Votes
- OPPOSED – 7 Votes
- ABSTENTIONS – 3

RESOLVED – That Members declare a volume of City Fund highway land measuring a total of 81 square foot (17.5 square meters) situated in Golden Lane, EC1 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.

11. **CITY OF LONDON HOUSING DELIVERY TEST ACTION PLAN**

The Chair re-joined the meeting at this point.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment detailing the City of London Housing Delivery Test action plan.

The Policy & Performance Director reported that, as the City of London had not met the housing delivery requirements set out within the first set of Government Housing Delivery Test figures, the organisation was required to produce an action plan setting out how it will improve new housing delivery to meet targets and apply a 20% buffer to its 5 year housing land requirement to provide greater flexibility to developers in bringing housing sites forward. He went on to clarify that, at present - no further action was required in addition to implementing our Local Plan policies, as projections showed that sufficient new

housing would be constructed consistent with those policies to meet housing delivery targets up until 2022.

In response to questions, the Policy & Performance Director clarified that this was a national approach to housing delivery and that there were no exceptions made for local circumstances.

RESOLVED – That, Members approve publication of the City of London Housing Delivery Test Action Plan, attached at Appendix 1.

12. CITY OF LONDON TRANSPORT STRATEGY DELIVERY PLAN 2019/20 TO 2021/22

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment covering the draft Transport Strategy 3-year Delivery Plan 2019/20 – 2021/22.

The Strategic Transportation Officer indicated that a separate report focusing on Section 106 allocations would be submitted to the next meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee and then to this Committee. A final delivery plan would then also be brought back to this Committee at the conclusion of the Fundamental Review and reviewed by Members annually thereafter.

The Chair underlined that the delivery of the transport strategy was a political priority for he and the Deputy Chairman to pursue. He added that it was clear that action could be taken on some issues now and some projects delivered by the end of the year, whereas other issues had been paused pending the outcome of the Fundamental Review which was set to conclude in the Autumn. He underlined that the organisation was very much leading the way with this transport strategy and it would also have wider effects beyond the City.

A Member made reference to the Riverside Walkway Project and underlined that what was needed here was completion of the project. The Group Manager Strategic Transportation reported that it was made clear throughout the strategy itself that the aim was to achieve the completion of the Riverside Walkway.

A Member expressed concern around the Fundamental Review which, in his opinion, would not only hold up many large Capital Project proposals but would also risk vital work like this becoming stalled or unnecessarily slowed down. He was of the view that the strategy should be pursued as soon as possible. He encouraged all Members of the Committee to also push this corporately. He concluded by stating that he personally considered that there were too many large Capital Projects being pursued and that this was at the cost of vital public services such as St Paul's Gyrotory which was currently on hold awaiting the outcome of the fundamental review.

A second Member agreed with this point and stated that he hoped that the pause around the Fundamental Review was just that and not a long delay.

A Member congratulated Officers on this report but underlined the need for Capital Projects to be properly developed and not in siloes. He referred once

more to the Museum of London project as an example and reiterated the need to integrate work here in terms of public realm and, in this case, work alongside the London Borough of Islington. The Director of the Built Environment undertook to respond to Members in full on this matter but assured the Committee that work here was being undertaken alongside Islington on the borough boundary.

The Chair stated that he was surprised to see that some of the end dates were relatively close.

A Member referred to the budget stated in relation to the Smithfield Area Public Realm and Transport Measures and also commented that the end date stated seemed to be too late.

The Group Manager Strategic Transportation stated that, in some cases, there were elements of a project that could be brought forward and delivered in phases within the delivery times stated. Finsbury Circus was a working example of such an approach. He added that some timescales were ambitious and were based on Member feedback. He recognised that these may need to change as work progressed. Having said that, there was widespread support for the Transport Strategy including from TfL who were willing to try and accelerate any elements of projects that they could to help deliver it.

The Chair highlighted that an update on various Capital Projects would be brought to the Committee at the conclusion of the Fundamental Review. A Member questioned whether the Committee would be presented with competing projects to prioritise as an outcome of the Fundamental Review. The Director of the Built Environment clarified that it was her understanding that some projects, including All Change at Bank, met the criteria to continue whilst the Fundamental Review progressed. Thereafter, it was thought that it would be for the Resource Allocation Sub Committee to prioritise projects corporately. Any grand Committee oversight of this process was still to be clarified. Members were of the view that it would be preferable to present Committees with choices as opposed to recommendations going forward. A Member also stated that the consequences of any projects that were to be potentially halted as a result of the Fundamental Review were widely known given that many could have a ripple effect.

The Chair stated that he was fully aligned with the principles of the Fundamental Review and that the outcome of this process should be awaited before this Committee then decided on any response to that.

Members questioned whether it would be appropriate for the Chair of this Committee to attend this weekend's Resource Allocation Sub Committee Awayday where the first information on the Fundamental Review would be shared with Members and asked that he pursue this further with the Town Clerk.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the draft Transport Strategy Delivery Plan 2019/20-2021-22 (Appendix 1).

13. DISTRICT SURVEYORS ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the workings of the District Surveyor's office which reports to it for the purposes of building control, engineering services for the City's major infrastructure and to provide resilience to buildings and businesses within the square mile that may be affected by environmental hazards.

The District Surveyor & Environmental Resilience Director reported that financial statements for the year were due to be issued shortly and would show an increase in income for the year which was to be applauded in a very competitive market in which many were still choosing to use the District Surveyor's Office for works in the City.

He highlighted that, whilst 2016 had seen a pause in construction in the City, numbers had risen consistently since this time. He assured Members that the Building Control Team was currently fully staffed.

Members were informed that, following the Grenfell tragedy, much work had been done and would continue to be done around Building Regulations and Fire Safety.

A Member questioned the introduction, for the first time this year, of a Building Control Apprentice. The District Surveyor & Environmental Resilience Director reported that Local Authority Building Control (LABC) had set up a new Building Control degree qualification and that the City Corporation had secured a slot on the course. At least 3 A-Levels were required of applicants who were also required to sit a University entrance interview.

A Member questioned whether those who chose not to use the District Surveyor's Officer did so because other private firms sought to undercut them. She also questioned how often, in these cases, the District Surveyor's Office were called upon to later unravel any difficulties.

The same Member also referred to the ongoing training and development being offered to staff and commended the division on this.

A Member questioned whether data on market share, the costs of running the service and fee income was available. The District Surveyor & Environmental Resilience Director reported that the cost of running the service would be published within the trading statement which he was happy to share with the Member. He clarified that the building regulation side of the work had to be cost neutral over 3-5-year period and was regularly monitored by the Chamberlain to ensure that this was the case.

A Member questioned whether feedback was sought in cases where the division bid for work unsuccessfully and whether such feedback revealed that this was attributable to fees only and, if so, what could be done about this in terms of overheads and the like. The District Surveyor & Environmental Resilience Director reported that fees were predominantly not an issue and that

those choosing not to use the services of the District Surveyor tended to be outlets such as Costa Coffee or Starbucks who tended to work with one contractor nationally.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the report as information.

14. **PARK STREET BRIDGE WATERPROOFING - GATEWAY 6 - OUTCOME REPORT**

The Committee considered a Gateway 6 outcome report of the Director of the Built Environment on Park Street Bridge waterproofing.

A Member questioned why work on this project, originally initiated on 2007, had not commenced until 11 years later. Another Member highlighted that the report referred to water main leakage that had delayed the commencement of the works alongside protracted discussions with Thames Water on these. The Member went on to question whether this remained a problem.

The Assistant Director, Engineering reported that Thames Water had now made some repairs and that preparations for the next phase were commencing imminently after the City Corporation had managed to identify the leak for them.

A Member questioned the consequences of delaying the second phase of the works by 2 years. The Assistant Director, Engineering assured Members that the design and the tendering of the works were progressing so that costs could be fixed at this stage and minimise any risk in that respect. Work would then commence as soon as practicably possible.

RESOLVED – That, Members approve the content of this Outcome Report and approve that the project be closed, subject to successful verification of the final account by the Chamberlain's Financial Services Division.

15. **AIR QUALITY STRATEGY 2019 - 2024**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection setting out the City Corporation's Air Quality Strategy 2019 – 2024.

The Air Quality Manager highlighted that the Strategy was overseen by the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee and had been out to consultation for a period of eight weeks from March 2019.

The Strategy had been well received with the GLA, who oversee the organisation's work in this area, stating that they felt it was an excellent, ambitious plan which demonstrated leadership. It was also stated that some of the work being undertaken here, including work taking place as part of the planning process, went above and beyond minimum requirements.

In response to questions, the Air Quality Manager reported that Officers across the organisation had always worked very closely in terms of minimising any impact on local air quality and would continue to do so.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee note the content of the Air Quality Strategy 2019-2024 and continue to provide support for improving air quality and reducing the impact of poor air quality on public health.

16. **EMISSIONS REDUCTION BILL UPDATE**

The Committee received a joint report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection and the Remembrancer providing an update on action taken since the approval given by the Port Health and Environmental Services and the Policy and Resources Committee to develop a Private Members bill to deal with emissions from combustion plant.

The Air Quality Manager reported that it was hoped that the proposals were such that they could be adopted by any London local authority. It was hoped that the Bill could be introduced in the next parliamentary session in September 2019.

A Member congratulated Officers on this piece of work but questioned whether the Air Quality Manager was content with the language used around this within the draft City Plan. The Air Quality Manager stated that she was pleased with the way that the draft City Plan was being developed on this point and also with the way that the London Plan addressed the matter.

Another Member echoed the congratulations offered to Officer but went on to question whether it demonstrated a lack of ambition to state that the limits imposed in respect of gas boilers, solid fuel burners and combined cooling heat & power plants would not affect existing installations. He pressed Officers as to why this was the case. The Air Quality Manger reported that this issue had been discussed at length with the Remembrancer who had cautioned that Officers should look to give the Bill as much opportunity as possible to be discussed and not risk it being pushed out on this one issue. She undertook to seek further feedback and clarification on this point.

The Chair agreed with the point made and asked that this Committee's views on the matter be fed back to the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee underlining that they were of the view that aspirations here should be higher. He also questioned what powers the City Corporation might have to deal with the matter if the organisation were looking to lead the way on this.

Another Member referred to proposals to increase fines from £40 to £150 for unnecessary vehicle engine idling and underlined that the problem here at present was around a lack of enforcement. He questioned who was to ley these on the spot increased fines going forward. The Air Quality Manager reported that the issue of fines and enforcement were to be the subject of consultation by the Department of Transport over the Summer and it was hoped that this would result in some improvement here.

At this point, the Chairman sought approval from the Committee to continue the meeting beyond two hours from the appointed time for the start of the meeting, in accordance with Standing Order 40, and this was agreed.

A Member referred to diesel cars/taxis and questioned whether any mechanism requiring their maintenance might also be introduced.

RESOLVED – That Members note this report.

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

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area

A Member stated that he had recently questioned when Members could expect to see the Management Strategy Supplementation Planning Document for the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, which was registered on 31 October 2018. He reported that he had been advised that this had been delayed due to resource constraint and expressed his disappointment at this which, in his view, should be regarded as a priority.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director agreed that the current position was regrettable and undertook to look at how this matter might be advanced.

London City Airport Masterplan Consultation

A Member referred to London City Airport plans to expand from 75,000 to 151,000 aircraft flights a year by 2035. He reported that their Masterplan was currently out for consultation until 20 September 2019 and questioned whether the City Corporation was planning to respond on this and, if so, whether Members could see a draft of the response before it was sent.

The Policy & Performance Director reported that a response would be co-ordinated by the deadline and that this would be considered by the appropriate Committees which would depend on the nature of the response but would probably include Port Health and Environmental Services. He also undertook to keep the Member informed of progress on this.

Ludgate Circus – RTA

A Member referred to a road traffic accident at Ludgate Circus that had taken place just yesterday, the details of which were communicated by another elected Member. He asked for further details on the incident.

The Transportation and Public Realm Director confirmed that a small van had lost control and run into a signal pole at the junction and that Officers had requested further details around this. He added that he believed that no one had been hurt as a result of the incident but that this highlighted the many problems with this dangerous junction. He undertook to keep the Committee informed of any further details once these were available.

Another Member questioned when TfL improvement works were due to commence here. The Transportation and Public Realm Director reported that a meeting to discuss progress on this was set to take place next week and that he currently had no reason to believe that the works would not go ahead according to plan.

Millennium Inclinor

A Member reported that the Millennium Inclinor had, once again, been out of service since this Committee had last met and requested further information on this latest outage.

The Chair clarified that a public lift report as well as an update on the Millennium Inclinor would be brought to the next meeting of this Committee on 30 July 2019.

Ocean Diva

A Member questioned whether Officers were able to update further on proposals around the Ocean Diva.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the additional information requested from the applicant of Swan Lane Pier around the Ocean Diva had not been received to date.

The Member requested that Officers now proactively chase this information on what he felt was a major issue coming forward.

Coopers Row and Pepys Street junction

A Member referred to two-way cycling at this unclear, undefined junction. She also questioned traffic speeds here and asked that Officers consider what steps could be taken to improve visibility and slow traffic here.

Officers undertook to respond to the Member directly on these points.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee for the City of London (CAAC)

A Member referred to an email that all Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee had recently received from the Chairman of the CAAC expressing concern at the fact that he believed that the City Corporation would no longer be supporting the work of this Committee. The Member questioned whether this was the case.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director underlined that this was not directly related to the Fundamental Review and had been raised as a result of staffing/resources issues. The Chair added that the City Corporation very much valued the outputs from this Committee but that, equally, there was a balance to be struck here in terms of resources.

Another Member stated that he had been made aware of this last month and was disappointed to note the current situation. He added that the CAAC met each month and was of enormous value. The Chair underlined that this Committee fully valued the work of the CAAC.

The Director of the Built Environment reported that the Chairman of CAAC had also written directly to her and the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director on this matter and that they were set to respond clarifying that there

was no intention at this stage to withdraw any resources from the CAAC. The Director undertook to share the response with Members.

Construction noise/disturbance

A Member referred to the many construction sites within her Ward that were causing noise/disturbance issues by way of things such as alarms being set off on site or works commencing too early. She asked if officers could look at how this matter might be improved and more effectively controlled and questioned whether any restrictions could be placed on construction when applications were first approved/granted consent.

The Chair reiterated that Members had also requested, at the last meeting of this Committee, that Officers consider what powers, if any, might be used with regard to construction time periods and how construction in any given area might 'dovetail'.

18. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the public session.
19. **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.
20. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019.
21. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**
The Committee received the draft non-public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 28 May 2019.
22. **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES STRATEGIC REVIEW - UPDATE TWO**
The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive providing Members with an update of the work that has been undertaken as part of the Bridge House Estates (BHE) strategic governance review since the last report to Members in December 2018.
23. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions raised in the non-public session.
24. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no urgent, additional items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting closed at 12.57 pm

Chairman

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