

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 July 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman) (in the Chair)	Graeme Harrower
Randall Anderson	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Peter Bennett	Shravan Joshi
Mark Bostock	Oliver Lodge
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Sylvia Moys
Alderman Emma Edhem	Barbara Newman
Marianne Fredericks	Susan Pearson
Tracey Graham	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Rory McMullan	- Department of the Built Environment

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair), Munsur Ali, Rehana Ameer, Henry Colthurst, Karina Dostalova, Peter Dunphy, Sophie Fernandes, Alderman Prem Goyal, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Deputy Brian Mooney, Graham Packham, Judith Pleasance, Deputy Henry Pollard, James de Sausmarez and William Upton QC.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

The Committee considered the public minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2019.

A Member proposed an amendment to the minute, under item 10 (City Fund Highway Declaration – 43 Golden Lane, EC1). He wished to further clarify and amend the paragraph which referenced his contribution as follows: *“Another*

Member agreed with the case made by the previous speaker 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 that if the Committee declared the land/airspace to be surplus to requirements, it would be declaring the tree to be surplus to requirements”.

The Committee agreed to the amendment and, with this, approved the minutes as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Museum of London Public Realm Project (page 3) – A Member noted that Members had received further information on this work subsequent to the 9 July meeting. He added, however, that he was underwhelmed by the information provided in that it appeared to illustrate that Officers were taking a very reactive stance on this. He went on to acknowledge the complexities of the work but underlined that the Public Realm aspect of this was a vital part of the project. Officers noted the Members views.

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area (page 14) – A Member enquired as to progress around this work. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that this had been a matter of discussion within the Department since the last meeting of this Committee. She added that authority had now been sought to recruit a new member of staff which would assist in progressing this work and it was hoped that the position would be filled by November 2019.

The Member responded with reference to a large planning application which would come before the Committee in the foreseeable future and added that, with this on the horizon, not fully understanding the Conservation Area would seem to be a huge weakness.

Ocean Diva (page 15) – In response to questions, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that, whilst more information had been received, Officers were of the view that this still did not adequately respond to the questions raised. They would therefore be reverting back to the applicant requesting further information.

4. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

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

Daylight/Sunlight – Alternative Guidelines

The Deputy Chairman stated that there was a separate report on the agenda for today’s meeting regarding Daylight/Sunlight Alternative Guidelines and suggested that this item could therefore be removed from the list going forward.

Construction Works

With regard to Construction Works, the Deputy Chairman highlighted that the general point on this had been noted. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that Officers would be discussing the matter further with colleagues in Environmental Health and would report back to the Committee further in the Autumn.

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 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.

6. 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.

The Deputy Chairman highlighted that, whilst no significant planning applications had been brought to the Committee for consideration in recent months, there were some substantial applications currently at application and pre-application stage. He added that such applications would reach the Committee in the Autumn and reassured Members that this was an issue around timing and that there was still great demand in the City.

RECEIVED.

7. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor containing details of the three public escalators/lifts that were in service for less than 95% of the time.

The City Surveyor reported that all lifts were now back in service. She went on to state that the previous lift maintenance contract had now come to an end and that a new contractor had been in place since early July 2019 – there had been no reported problems with any of the lifts since this time.

The City Surveyor went on to make specific reference to the Millennium Inclinor and reported that Kone would be the maintenance company responsible for this going forward. The maintenance contract would mirror that already in place for a similar Inclinor in Greenford Station, which is also managed by Kone and it was hoped that this would come into effect by September 2019.

A Member reported that she had recently walked from the Barbican to Guildhall and had tried to take the escalator down to Wood Street. She reported that she

had reached the second level only to discover that the escalator here was not in operation. She recognised that this escalator was not the responsibility of the City Corporation but highlighted that, as it was situated within the City there was an issue around public perception and went on to question what the organisation might be able to do around this.

The City Surveyor responded by assuring Members that the organisation had a good working relationship with those who managed the escalator in question and undertook to take this matter forward.

Another Member referred to the London Wall West lift and questioned progress around this. The City Surveyor reported that the issue of water ingress was currently being discussed with the owners of 1 London Wall.

Another Member questioned how long the Speed House lift had been out of service for. The City Surveyor reported that the lift had been out of service since November 2018 and that part of the highway had had to be taken up due to water ingress which had meant the works had taken longer than anticipated.

RECEIVED.

8. DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT GUIDANCE

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director relative to the appropriateness of the City Corporation's current approach to daylight and sunlight and whether there would be a case for having Guidelines more specific to the City setting.

A sheet detailing further Government guidelines issued since the report was prepared was tabled. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director highlighted that this also included reference to the urban context.

The Committee were reminded that this matter had been brought forward at the request of Members who had questioned whether the City should look to produce its own guidelines around daylight and sunlight. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director referred to recent training offered to the Committee on the issue of Daylight and Sunlight and the fact that this had highlighted the number of different methods of assessment that may currently be used. She went on to state that the tools available to the organisation and the industry were changing quite rapidly. She concluded that she was therefore of the view that the policy currently in the Local Plan remained fit for purpose. It was, however, suggested that further guidance might be produced on how the City implements the current policy. It was proposed that this guidance be worked up and be brought back to this Committee in the Autumn.

A Member referenced a number of previous planning applications that had been considered by the Committee where BRE guidelines had been applied but where it was suggested that these guidelines and certain breeches of daylight and sunlight could be ignored. He went on to question whether computer generated images could be used for future applications that had any such implications to clearly demonstrate any loss of daylight and sunlight as well as

radiance. He also suggested that the production of further guidelines around this should be added to the Committee's list of Outstanding Actions.

A Member questioned whether the production of new BRE guidance, expected to be in place by early 2020 was subject to funding going forward. He also questioned whether the new guidelines would be looking at related matters such as radiance. The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that radiance was increasingly being used as a tool. However, whether it could be absolutely required was questionable given that it would require access to affected residences to analyse and that matters such as the internal décor of these residences was relevant.

Another Member expressed the view that the tone of the report was too fatalistic. He highlighted that this was an environmental issue and that improvements should therefore be sought. He went on to state that he felt that any future guidelines should contain the aspiration that future applications coming before the Committee should seek to be, at the least, 'net neutral' in terms of any loss of daylight and sunlight as well as sky visibility. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that, this was a difficult balance to strike in terms of enabling development and also protecting daylight and sunlight. She added that, at present, a worsening of up to 20% was considered as acceptable/not noticeable.

Another Member stated that he was in agreement with the report and its recommendations. He added that this was an issue that clearly affected certain developments and that a balance needed to be struck so that the Committee were not setting targets that were likely to adversely affect what were principally commercial developments. He went on to refer to climate change and the fact that, going forward, those residential units that enjoyed the most daylight and sunlight would also be prone to overheating quicker.

A Member referenced the detail under the Committee's list of Outstanding Actions at Item 4 which called for details as to how Officers would look to create alternative guidelines alongside timescales and any legal implications. He stated that this was not covered within the report before Members today and agreed with the view that this did not go far enough. He questioned when a further report on the matter would be brought to the Committee.

A Member questioned whether glare which could prove a problem for those living opposite large office buildings was also currently covered and what protections existed in this respect. She highlighted that it was often not possible to detect problems related to this until buildings were erected. The Chief Planning Office and Development Director reported that glare had become an increasing issue over the past 20 years and was now explored at pre-application stage. She added that there was often a condition agreement applied with regard to glare and mitigation measures.

A Member highlighted that there was reference to environmental factors within the City's current policies where it was highlighted that consideration should be given to how the design of tall buildings can assist with the dispersal of air

pollution. She questioned whether consolidation/timed deliveries might also usefully be referenced here so as to ensure a wholistic approach. She went on to state that she understood that buildings were previously built around a white tiled centre core which helped with light reflection and questioned whether this was still the practice.

Another Member argued that more specific boundaries and robust definitions of 'noticeable' and 'unacceptable' levels of loss of daylight and sunlight were needed going forward. She was of the view that this might otherwise be the subject of 'creep'. She added that good design was also, in her view, crucial and mentioned that the GLA were currently looking in more detail at this recommending the installation of bow windows for example where appropriate. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that, whilst she understood Members' frustrations around this, it was difficult to come up with absolutely clear guidelines with all applications requiring consideration on a case by case basis.

A Member commented that she would be interested to understand the number of applications received that were not approved due to daylight and sunlight impact. She also questioned whether there was currently any follow up to ascertain that acceptable levels had been maintained with those that had been approved despite having an impact. She concluded by suggesting that the production of any guidelines by the City Corporation would be best timed to align with the production of the new BRE guidelines.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reiterated that the matter was at a time of flex with the BRE currently looking at this and a different set of measures. She added that she believed that these were likely to be more onerous than the present guidelines but that a degree of flexibility would still, nevertheless, have to be maintained. She went on to refer to the inevitable tension between delivering high quantities of urban housing and development whilst protecting light.

A Member referenced the conflict between quality and quantity and state that he was firmly of the view that the time had come to be more serious about quality. He asked that Officers reflect on the views expressed by the Committee today and return with a set of improved and more qualitatively driven set of proposals.

Another Member disagreed with the view that the preparation of the City's own guidelines should await the outcome of the new BRE guidelines. He suggested that there should be no further delay and that the City's own guidelines could be amended, if necessary, once the new BRE guidelines emerged. Another Member disagreed with this and suggested that the organisation keep watch on the emerging BRE guidelines which would take, at most, 6 months to be published. He added that any report to this Committee in the Autumn could update on the BRE's movement on this. A second Member also agreed that, given the current climate and limited resources, updating the City's own guidelines ahead of the BRE review would not be the best use of Officer time.

A Member asked that, when the next report was presented to Committee, it contain details of what impact being more aspirational in this field was likely to have on future planning applications.

A Member questioned if Officers were aware of what the BRE changes were likely to propose in relation to high density areas and the City of London specifically and what this was expected to add. He went on to question whether the City were making representations to the BRE on this to help inform their review and how Officers were getting across those challenges specific to the City on this. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that Officers were in discussion with the BRE but underlined that standards were national and, in this case, were directed from Europe. She added that the London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea was frequently cited as an example of an area where, despite high house prices, residents often experience lower levels of daylight and sunlight.

A Member reiterated the view that applicants should be requested to provide radiance CGI's with any relevant applications with immediate effect. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that she could seek this from applicants going forward although it could not be insisted upon.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the report and request that Officers produce a future report responding more specifically to the points raised at this meeting.

9. **REVIEW OF PROJECTS WITHIN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing the results of a review and proposed prioritisation of transportation and public realm within the Department of the Built Environment.

A Member made reference to the £3million of Section 106 monies that would still remain, some of which was soon to expire, and questioned whether the Committee could receive a future report detailing what was planned for these funds to avoid their expiration.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- a. Note the methodology and ranking of DBE projects set out in paragraphs 7-12 of the report;
- b. Note those DBE projects funded centrally during the period of the fundamental review as set out in Appendix 2;
- c. Agree the allocation of £3,917,518 S106 funding to 4 projects to mitigate the specific developments from which the funds were generated, including the interest accrued;
- d. Authorise Officers to seek an extension to time to S106 with the relevant developer/building owner where applicable as set out in Appendix 4; and
- e. Authorise officers to re-negotiate the use of any S106 deposits, not allocated in this report, that require a variation of scope, to seek their use in mitigating the impacts of the developments generating the deposits, consistent with corporate priorities.

10. **WARDMOTE RESOLUTION FROM THE WARD OF FARRINGDON WITHIN / CODE OF CONDUCT FOR CYCLE TOUR GROUPS USING NARROW LANES AND STREETS**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment proposing a formal Code of Conduct for cycle tour groups using narrow lanes and streets in the City in response to a Wardmote resolution from the Ward of Farringdon Within.

Officers reported that this had proved to be a particular issue on Carter Lane during the lunch time period. Members were informed that Officers had already been working alongside cycle tour groups to gain a better understanding of the issues but that a more formal approach was now proposed in the form of a Code of Conduct.

Members were informed that the cycle tour groups were choosing to use Carter Lane as alternative routes were utilised by buses and had large volumes of traffic. It was, however, proposed that the tour groups dismounted their bicycles to pass through this narrow lane at busy times. Officers were pleased to report that all four of the tour operators concerned had responded positively to the proposed Code. It was suggested that if Members of the public had any continued complaints, they should look to provide Officers with photographic evidence so that the matter could be taken up directly with the relevant tour group.

The Deputy Chairman hailed this as a positive move and thanked Officers for their efforts. Another Member agreed that this was a helpful and constructive move and questioned whether there had been any consultation with local stakeholders on the production of the Code. Officers reported that no such consultation had taken place to date but that this could be explored in terms of how the Code might now be implemented.

A Member questioned whether the fact that the Code had been well received by tour operators meant that they would adhere to it. Officers reported that all four operators had been contacted directly on the matter with two having already begun to implement the Code and provide relevant information on it to their tour guides. The remaining two had stated that they would be happy to look at implementing the Code if it were to be approved by this Committee.

A Member commented that the proposed Code of Conduct had already been well received by the press and was also something which the tour operators would hopefully find useful. She went on to question whether the Code could also incorporate the use of electric scooters in the City going forward given their increasing presence. Officers reported that use of e-scooters on public highway was illegal at present. Members were informed that the City of London Police were currently pursuing this matter but that it continued to be an issue that the Department of Transport were looking at with a potential view to legalising their use in future.

A Member stated that she had some difficulty with the report which seemed to be a sticking plaster for one particular area rather than a solution to the wider problem. She went on to highlight that no traffic was currently permitted to use Carter Lane until after 6pm. However, as this was an area with increasing pedestrian usage, it still remained very crowded after this time. She went on to question why cycle tours would be required to dismount here but not cyclists in general and stated that, in her opinion, this area should not be open to traffic at all. She suggested that traffic usage and timing both here and in other areas with increasing pedestrian usage such as Bow Lane needed to be re-visited.

Officers clarified that it was difficult to engage with individual cycle users as efficiently as with those on cycle tours on these matters.

RESOLVED – That Members approve the proposed Code of Conduct for cycle tour groups.

11. **DOCKLESS CYCLE HIRE UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the trial of a new approach to managing dockless cycle hire in the City.

Officers reported that a six-month trial was currently underway which had seen the introduction of designated parking areas for dockless cycles in the City in an attempt to reduce the amount of obstructions on the highway. Two operators had been selected to take part in the trial which would run until the end of 2019. Other operators had been requested not to include the City of London during the trial period but responses to this request had been mixed. Officers reported that there were currently limited powers available to them here but that it was envisaged that a London-wide bye law would be introduced in due course.

The Deputy Chairman stated that it was frustrating to learn that the organisation had no greater powers to address this issue at present.

A Member enquired as to whether symbols and white lines to mark out the agreed parking locations within the City had now been completed. Officers reported that the marking of all bays would be completed by the end of this week.

A Member referred to recent occurrences where operators who were not part of the current trial had parked in the City to deliver bicycles to locations nearby. She also questioned whether there were sufficient parking spaces given that she had, only today, seen three bicycles in one space, only one of which was a bicycle from an approved operator. Officers encouraged Members to report any issues with operators and obstructions directly to them.

The Member went on to refer to the London Borough of Islington who had recently removed a number of bicycles from their streets that had failed to be reclaimed. She added that many of the bicycles used were relatively cheap and that it was therefore often easier for operators to leave them behind rather than reclaim. She questioned whether there was any concern amongst Officers that

abandoned bicycles would have to be stored and dispersed of at cost to the organisation going forward. Officers reported that the quality of e-bikes tended to be of a better standard and therefore were more costly and it was therefore hoped that this would not be a huge issue going forward.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

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

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members 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.

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

'The Tulip'

A Member questioned what the next steps were in relation to this following the Mayor of London's direction to refuse the planning application. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that, following the Mayor's direction to refuse, decision notices had been issued on behalf of the City of London Corporation. At present, the applicant was deciding whether or not to take the matter to appeal. If an appeal was pursued, this would lead to a Public Inquiry and the final decision would be taken by the Secretary of State. If an appeal was not pursued, the Mayor's decision to reject would rest.

Mansell Street Telephone Boxes

A Member questioned whether the telephone boxes situated on the City side of Mansell Street which was also a red route were the responsibility of the City of London Corporation. She went on to state that the equipment in both telephone boxes was not working and they now tended to be frequently used for anti-social behaviour and as toilet facilities instead. Officers were informed that this matter had been frequently raised by elected Members of the Ward of Portsoken in the past.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that she would like the opportunity to investigate this matter further but that her initial feeling was that this would be a matter for the City of London Corporation to enforce. She undertook to revert back to the Member on this in due course.

E-Scooters in the City

A Member wished to pick up further on the points raised briefly under Item 10. She highlighted that the Metropolitan Police were currently undertaking work to highlight that these scooters were a danger and were, at present, illegal for use on the highway. She went on to state that, despite this, she had seen an increasing number of these in the City and questioned what Officers were doing alongside the City of London Police to address this issue locally.

Officers reported that the City of London Police had been out on the streets stopping e-scooters only this week. They added that they would follow up on this point and discuss how they might best 'reach out' on this matter alongside the City of London Police going forward.

Planning Applications – Notifications and Objections

A Member highlighted that, at present, the full address of those who registered objections to planning applications was published on the City's webpages. He questioned whether this was necessary, whether there were any data privacy issues surrounding this, and whether the current policy could be amended to remove at least the house/door number of objectors going forward.

He went on to highlight that he also believed that notifications of planning applications to those who would be potentially affected by proposed developments was currently problematic. He referred specifically to a planning application opposite Lauderdale House that none of the residents of Lauderdale House had received notice of but stated that he was also aware of other examples.

With regard to potential data protection issues around the publishing of the addresses of objectors, the Comptroller and City Solicitor reported that it was important to strike an appropriate balance between privacy and transparency and promoting maximum participation in the planning process. She added that this was currently consistent with the approach adopted by other local authorities but could be re-visited if that was the desire of this Committee.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded to the points made on notification of planning applications and agreed that this needed to be looked at. She added that notification of the development specifically referred to by the Member would go to Lauderdale House residents. She went on to state that commercial occupiers were not notified but residents were when affected, and public buildings such as churches would also be notified. She added that this particular application had also been advertised within the local press and on site. Wider considerations would have cost implications and would require a review of the Statement of Community Involvement.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

Fundamental Review

The Deputy Chairman reported that he and the Chair had recently met with representatives of both the Policy and Resources and Finance Committee to make clear the views of this Committee on the Fundamental Review. The meeting had led to an agreement that the review was not about cuts but about transformation and innovation in terms of delivering what the organisation does. They had made it clear that the Planning and Transportation Committee were not to be bypassed in the review and expected to be fully consulted where relevant. Officers were currently looking at a number of measures to respond positively to the review and these would be put to this Committee ahead of submission to Policy and Resources.

The Director of the Built Environment stated that there were two aspects to the Fundamental Review for the Department – Revenue and also Capital Projects – around which much work had already been undertaken in terms of prioritisation.

In response to further comments, the Deputy Chairman reported that it was his understanding that a full Governance Review would also take place following the Fundamental Review to ensure that the current approach continued to be fit for purpose. A Member questioned whether the size of Committees would form a part of such a review. Another Member commented that she did not see how the size of a Committee added in any way to cost. She went on to highlight that planning fees were dictated by the Government. On a separate note, the Member stated that she hoped that the Chair and Deputy Chairman of this Committee would ensure that there were no further staff lost from the Department of Built Environment as a result of the Fundamental Review given the resource issues that had already been reported to this Committee at recent meetings.

Another Member agreed with the point made around staffing but stressed that Members also had a role to play here in terms of ensuring that they were not piling up additional requests for Officers on an ad hoc basis.

Another Member stated that she believed that there had already been a significant fall in staff morale due to the review and stressed the need for Members to be sensitive to this. She went on to state that it was important to stress that the number of Committees and Sub Committees currently in place (in excess of 130) were not only City Fund Committees but also City's Cash which were essential in terms of meeting the wishes of benefactors who had bequeathed funds to the organisation that needed to continue to be managed efficiently to ensure that they continued to do as much good as possible both within the Square Mile and beyond.

A Member made the point that there had been a notable lack of information to Members about the whole review process and progress to date. She questioned when they could expect to hear more. She added that she hoped that it would be the case that all Committees would have the opportunity to consider implications relevant to them and feed in to the Policy and Resources Committee on this.

Another Member questioned whether the Policy and Resources Committee had sought any independent, external assurance in terms of how work across the organisation might best be prioritised going forward. The Deputy Chairman reported that he was not aware that this had been explored but that it would ultimately be a matter for the Policy and Resources Committee. He thanked Members for their useful contributions on this matter.

15. **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.

16. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2019.

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

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

18. 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 12.35 pm

Chairman

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