

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 18 September 2012

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

Present

Members:

Martin Farr (Chairman)	Robert Howard
Deputy Michael Welbank (Deputy Chairman)	Michael Hudson
Alex Bain-Stewart	Deputy Keith Knowles
Deputy John Barker	Oliver Lodge
John Brewster	Sylvia Moys
John Chapman	Michael Page
Revd Dr Martin Dudley	Ann Pembroke
John Fletcher	Henry Pollard
Marianne Fredericks	Jeremy Simons
Archie Galloway	John Spanner
Alderman John Garbutt	Angela Starling
George Gillon	Mark Twogood
Alderman David Graves	Alderman John White
Tom Hoffman	

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Simon Murrells	- Assistant Town Clerk
Katie Odling	- Town Clerk's Department
Jacky Compton	- Town Clerk's Department
Paul Nagle	- Chamberlain's Department
Philip Everett	- Director of the Built Environment
Peter Rees	- City Planning Officer
Annie Hampson	- Department of the Built Environment
David Stothard	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Paul Monaghan	- City Surveyor's Department
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Alan Rickwood	- City Police
Alexander Williams	- City Police
Sanjay Odedra	- Press Officer, Public Relations Office

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy John Owen-Ward, Alderman Dr Andrew Parmley and Ian Seaton.

2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ANY PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**

Jeremy Simons declared a personal interest in respect of Item 6 due to being a Member of the City of London Archaeological Trust.

3. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2012, were approved as a correct record subject to Ann Pembroke being included in the list of apologies and the Chairman's declaration of interest (item 2) being amended to read '*...declared a personal interest in respect of item 5B as a consultant of GVA, the applicant's planning advisor*'.

MATTERS ARISING – Item 9 (Site near Cannon Street) – The Member confirmed that his question was in relation to the safety and width of the crossing and the phasing of the lights and the Director of the Built Environment agreed to speak to the Member on the matter following the meeting.

4. **TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received a report of the City Planning Officer relative to development and advertisement applications that had been dealt with using his delegated authority since the previous meeting.

Members expressed their gratitude to Officers and developers for the work undertaken.

RECEIVED.

5. **REPORTS OF THE CITY PLANNING OFFICER RELATIVE TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

5.1 **8 - 10 Moorgate, 3 & 4 King Arms Yard, 16/16A & 17 Tokenhouse Yard & 8 - 10 Telegraph Street London EC3**

Address/Title - 8 – 10 Moorgate, 3 & 4 King Arms Yard, 16/16A & 17 Tokenhouse Yard & 8 – 10 Telegraph Street London

Registered Plan No. 12/00475/CAC

Development Proposal - Demolition of façade at 17 Tokenhouse Yard; part of revised development of this site.

The City Planning Officer detailed site and related information to Members.

Further to the presentation, Members sought clarification regarding the details of the District Surveyors Independent assessment on the application, in particular structural condition of the façade and foundations. In addition, some

Members expressed regret regarding the removal of the facades and suggested deferral until the District Surveyors report had been viewed. In response, the City Planning Officer read out to the Committee the opinion of the District Surveyor which supported the findings of the scheme.

Some Members, although supportive of the design, considered that the additional floor of the proposed development was out of character with the height of other adjoining/nearby buildings. The City Planning Officer explained that the additional floor would screen the set-back roof storeys from street level.

In response to a question, the City Planning Officer confirmed the intention that stonework would be used on the top and one side of the window revealed with brick on the other, except on the top floor where there was stone on each side.

In response to a question, the City Planning Officer confirmed that it was the intention that stonework would be placed around the elevation of the proposed development.

Upon being put to the vote the application was approved: - Vote – 20 in favour, 1 against.

RESOLVED – That conservation area consent be granted in accordance with the conditions set out on the attached schedule.k

5.2 **8 - 10 Moorgate, 3 & 4 King Arms Yard, 16/16A & 17 Tokenhouse Yard & 8 - 10 Telegraph Street London EC3**

Registered Plan No.12/00474/FULMAJ

Address/Title 8 – 10 Moorgate, 3 & 4 King Arms Yard, 16/16A & 17 Tokenhouse Yard & 8 – 10 Telegraph Street London

Development Proposal Redevelopment to provide office and retail accommodation together with associated parking, servicing and plant. Revised Proposal. (17, 405 sqm – nine storeys).

The City Planning Officer detailed site and related information to Members and informed of the following amendments to the report: -

Page 68, paragraph 69 – To provide clarity the second sentence should be amended to include the words underlined as follows : - “The full mayoral planning obligation of £891,353 is subject to a 20% discount...”

Page 70, paragraph 79 – Replace this paragraph with “The applicants will be required to pay the remaining outstanding contribution prior to the demolition of the façade of 17 Tokenhouse Yard or three months after the date of the planning permission, whichever is sooner”.

Page 71, paragraph 84 – Change “prior to occupation” at the end of the first sentence to “within six months of occupation”. This would provide feedback from occupiers to assist formation of the Delivery and Servicing Plan; at present the applicant is unaware of whether there will be single end user or multiple tenants.

Page 72, paragraphs 88, 89 & 90 – The applicant had pointed out that as the application was essentially an amendment to the previous planning permission, contracts were already secured, procurement works had already taken place and works had started under the extant permission. It was therefore recommended that these clauses be omitted from the Section 106 agreement.

RESOLVED – That,

- i) planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the schedule subject the Planning Obligations being entered into as set out in the body of the report, the decision notice not to be issued until such obligations had been executed; and
- ii) Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in “Planning Obligations” under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.

5.3 Alto House, 29 - 30 Newbury Street

Registered Plan No. 12/00216/FULL

Address/Title - Alto House 29 – 30 Newbury Street London, EC1A 7HZ

Development Proposal - Change of use from Offices (Use Class B1) to residential (Use Class C3) to create six self-contained units with associated external alterations comprising (i) the demolition of a chimney stack staircase enclosure at roof level and the erection of a roof extension and the installation of a new balustrade and metal railings (ii) ground floor frontage alterations to accommodate new doors (iii) roof alterations at the rear to accommodate two new roof lights and the infillings of two existing light wells (iv) the replacement of three sash windows with casement windows at the rear.

The City Planning Officer detailed site and related information to Members.

The City Planning Officer informed Members of a complaint received from Laura Daley (page 166 of the Agenda). The Corporation had written to Ms Daley on 6th September, however, she had not received the letter until 13 September which meant that due to being out of the country she was unable to make representations at this meeting. However, Ms Daley’s written representation had been circulated to Members and was included in the papers before the Committee.

An additional condition was to be inserted to control the use of fire escapes, therefore condition 7 would read: -

“No part of the roof areas on the drawings hereby approved shall be used or accessed by occupiers of the building, other than in the case of emergency or for maintenance purposes.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjacent premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan and Core Strategy: HOUS10 and CS21.”

N.B: Condition 7 as shown in the printed schedule would become condition 8.

Jeremy Wright and Simon Strong spoke against the application.

Dean Smith, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The consensus of opinion of Members supported in principle the change to residential use, however, they felt that the addition of a top floor flat was inappropriate. Concern was also expressed regarding noise pollution and the potential loss of light and privacy. The City Planning Officer advised that results of assessments had identified that the loss of daylight would be unnoticeable and the increase in noise pollution would be minimal.

In response to questions, the City Planning Officer advised that the top of the additional floor would be slightly lower than the building at 1-3 Newbury Street and that the ground floor alterations were sympathetic to the area resulting in no loss of character.

A suggestion was made to approve the application with the exception of the top floor flat extension.

A vote was cast as follows:

For the application – 9 Votes

Against the application – 12 Votes

The Town Clerk referred to guidance where the Committee was determining an application contrary to recommendations of the City Planning Officer. He stated that if the Committee, having considered the report and advice of the officers, was satisfied that it had sufficient information to frame substantive and sustainable reasons for refusal or approval, and adequate conditions and reasons therefore in the case of approval, then the application may be determined at the same meeting. If sufficient information was not available to the Committee to determine the application at the meeting, it was open to the Committee to defer the application to the next meeting.

Members were of the view that the Committee had sufficient information to determine the application and it was:

RESOLVED – That Planning Permission be refused and the City Planning Officer be requested to report to the Committee with reasons for refusal at the next meeting.

5.4 **200 Aldersgate Street**

Registered Plan No. 12/00574/FULL

Address/Title - 200 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4HD

Development Proposal Retention of four louvres replacing three smoke vent windows and one cladding panel at first floor level and installation of a plant enclosure at ground floor level containing a double and a single air condenser unit.

The City Planning Officer detailed site and related information to Members.

Deborah Tompkinson spoke against the application.

During discussion, reference was made to noise levels. The City Planning Officer confirmed he considered the proposals would not cause adverse noise impacts for adjacent residents.

Upon being put to the vote planning permission was granted – Vote – 12 for approval, 8 against.

RESOLVED – That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the schedule attached to the report.

5.5 **Fleet Building 40 Shoe Lane & 70 Farringdon Street, London**

Registered Plan No.12/00773/LBC

Address/Title - Fleet Building 40 Shoe Lane and 70 Farringdon Street, London, EC4A 4AP

Development Proposal - The removal and safe storage of the murals attached to the eastern elevation of Fleet Building.

The City Planning Officer detailed site and related information to Members and advised of additional comments received from the London and Middlesex Society (LAMAS).

RESOLVED – That Listed Building Consent be granted for the removal and safe storage of the ceramic panels attached to the eastern elevation of Fleet Building at 40 Shoe Lane and 70 Farringdon Street subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

6. **CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER SUMMARY AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGY SPDS: ADOPTION**

Consideration was given to a report of the City Planning Officer in respect of the Draft Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) for Bow Lane, Queen Street, and Smithfield Conservation Areas which were issued for public consultation during May/July 2012. In response to comments received a number of amendments were proposed and these were set out in the appendix to this report.

RESOLVED – That,

- i) the amendments to the Bow Lane, Queen Street, and Smithfield Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Documents listed in the appendix be agreed; and
- ii) the amended Conservation Area SPDs be adopted.

7. **REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

7.1 **Discontinuance of City Walkway: Bassishaw Highwalk (Part)**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of the Built Environment in respect of the city walkway that formed that part of Bassishaw Highwalk to the south of the city walkway bridge over London Wall which needed to be discontinued in order to allow works to take place to City Place House and City Tower, in accordance with the planning permission for works.

RESOLVED – That the city walkway forming the southern part of Bassishaw Highwalk be discontinued; and that, in order to effect this, the following be resolved:—

- a) WHEREAS the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London acting by the Planning and Transportation Committee pursuant to the delegation to that Committee by the Court of Common Council on 19 July 2001 (hereinafter called “the City”) are authorized by section 6(5) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1967 (hereinafter called “the Act”) BY RESOLUTION TO RESCIND any resolution declaring a city walkway;
- b) AND WHEREAS it appears to the City that the resolution made by the Court of Common Council on 18 February 1993 (hereinafter called “the 1993 Resolution”) should be rescinded to discontinue the city walkway shown on the drawing attached hereto and labelled A1.C.W.D.P.-1-93; and
- c) NOW THEREFORE the City in pursuance of section 6(5) of the Act by resolution HEREBY RESCINDS the 1993 Resolution so as to discontinue the City Walkway on a date to be determined by the Director of the Built Environment.

N.B: SUBJECT TO: the Director of the Built Environment first seeking a further S.106 Unilateral Undertaking regarding retention and maintenance of a protected route during construction works, prior to the Resolution taking effect.

7.2 Business Plan 2012 - 2015 Quarter 1 Progress Report

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to the first progress report of 2012-13 which showed that the department making good progress towards the objectives outlined in the Business Plan, detailed information could be found at Appendix A.

RESOLVED – That the Q1 performance indicators and objectives for 2012/13 and the financial and statistical information be noted.

7.3 Business Risk Management - Initial Report

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of the Built Environment which provided Members with information regarding the Business Risks identified within the Department of the Built Environment in accordance with the City's risk management framework as approved by the Audit and Risk Management Committee in October 2011.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted that future reviews, on an exception basis, be incorporated into the periodic departmental performance reports (normally quarterly in the case of the Planning & Transportation Committee and 4 monthly in the case of Port Health and Environmental Services Committee).

7.4 Public Consultations on Public Realm Strategies and Major Projects

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of the Built Environment which detailed the improvements made in the consultation methods and techniques used in developing and implementing changes to the City's streets. Ahead of commencing consultations on the next Area Enhancement Strategies, this report detailed the range of techniques that would be utilised.

RECEIVED.

8. **RISK MANAGEMENT HANDBOOK, PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION**
Consideration was given to a report of the Director of the Built Environment which provided Members with a summary of the key elements of the Risk Management Handbook and the City's risk management framework as approved by the Audit and Risk Management Committee in October 2011.

RECEIVED.

9. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**
Consideration was given to a report of the Town Clerk which provided details of action taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41 (b).

RECEIVED.

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

Questions were raised as follows : -

West Poultry Avenue – A Member queried which Committee had responsibility for West Poultry Avenue, and for putting it into a proper state of repair so it may be re-opened to all traffic. The Director of the Built Environment responded to the Member advising that responsibility for the highway rested with Planning and Transportation Committee and responsibility for the sub-surface structure rested with Property Investment Board. He also advised that approximately 10 years ago the Planning and Transportation Committee agreed to make a traffic order prohibiting vehicular access, however, if Members so wished, this decision could be revisited.

Closure – A Member requested information regarding the closure of the north / south through pedestrian route from Moorfields to London Wall via the front of Moorgate Underground station and the operation during the closure. Officers agreed to respond to the Member following the meeting.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There was one item of business the Chairman wished to raise.

Resolution from the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee –

PROJECT APPROVAL PROCEDURE - *“Members expressed concern that it was proposed that additional staff costs that had been incurred in rewriting a report when considering a project a second time at the same Gateway as part of the Project Procedure should be funded from a S106 Agreement.”*

In response to the motion and also the issue of the Projects Approval Procedure brought to this Committee in July 2012, the Chairman advised he had met with the Chairman of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee to initiate a review and as part of the review, issues around

spending and value for money of schemes would be addressed. It was therefore considered that at this time the motion should be deferred to allow a thorough review to take place. The Director of the Built Environment hoped that as part of the whole review of the Projects Approval Procedure a more strategic approach could be adopted.

RESOLVED – That the motion be deferred until such time as a thorough consideration had been given to review of the Projects Approval Procedure.

12. 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.

13. LONDON BRIDGE STAIRCASE

Consideration was given to a joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the City Surveyor in respect of London Bridge Staircase.

RECEIVED.

14. DEBT ARREARS - DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of the Built Environment which informed Members regarding arrears of invoiced income as at 30th June 2012.

RECEIVED.

15. BRIDGEMASTER'S HOUSE - POTTERS FIELDS REDEVELOPMENT PHASE II. GATEWAY 4 -DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Consideration was given to a report of the City Surveyor in respect of Bridgemaster's House.

RECEIVED.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 1.05pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Katie Odling
tel. no.: 020 7332 3414
katie.odling@cityoflondon.gov.uk