

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 22 October 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 (Chairman)	Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Munsur Ali	Shravan Joshi
Rehana Ameer	Oliver Lodge
Randall Anderson	Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Adrian Bastow	Andrew Mayer
Peter Bennett	Deputy Brian Mooney
Mark Bostock	Sylvia Moys
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Graham Packham
Henry Colthurst	Susan Pearson
Alderman Emma Edhem	Judith Pleasance
John Edwards	Deputy Henry Pollard
Marianne Fredericks	James de Sausmarez
Alderman Prem Goyal	Oliver Sells QC
Graeme Harrower	William Upton QC
Christopher Hill	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Priya Rane	- Media Officer
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of the Built Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Gideon Stothard	- Department of the Built Environment
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Chhaya Patel	- Department of the Built Environment

Welcome

The Chair took the opportunity to welcome new Member, Adrian Bastow to the Committee and his first meeting. He also wished to formally thank Mr Bastow's predecessor Barbara Newman for her time served on the Committee as well as for her service as a former Chairman.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Peter Dunphy, Sophie Fernandes, Tracey Graham, Deputy Henry Pollard and James de Sausmarez.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2019 as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Ocean Diva (page 2) – A Member noted that no further advice had been provided to the Committee on this case to date and questioned when this would be forthcoming. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that the application was still under consideration and that the applicant had submitted further information which was now in the process of being reviewed. Officers undertook to provide Members with a briefing note on this application setting out the position to date.

The Chair added that he had also met with a number of anticipated objectors to the application last week to hear their concerns.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

Daylight/Sunlight – Alternative Guidelines

A Member noted that the target date for this matter to be completed/progressed had been revised from Autumn 2019 to Winter 2019. He requested that, when target dates were altered, relevant Officers be asked to include a written explanation for this in the report. He went on to question which Winter meeting Members could expect to see a further report on this matter presented to and sought some clarification around the delay. The Chair added that he had also raised the need for further clarity on timing with Officers.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director explained that it was originally hoped that BRE would revise their guidelines in Autumn/Winter 2019 but that this was now unlikely to occur before mid-2020. It was not felt appropriate to revise the City Corporation's own guidelines ahead of this, but they would be considered as soon as possible after revised BRE guidance was issued.

The Member highlighted that he had originally raised this matter in February 2019, as a result of the Wells Court planning application, seeking a practical solution to the issues raised on this. He went on to state that the training offered to all Members of this Committee on daylight/sunlight in July 2019 had been extremely useful and had also referred to the use of radiance. The introduction of a simple technique such as this would, in his view, assist and

would not need to await any BRE revisions to guidance. Officers undertook to look into this matter specifically.

Construction Works

A Member commented that there was evidence to suggest that major development works (the 'Scalpel, having just completed and 'Gotham Towers' with work now just commencing) were already seemingly being phased/co-ordinated within her Ward at the behest of developers/constructors. She commended their excellent approach to managing the area in question and hoped that others would follow suit.

Road Safety Risk – Trends Update

A Member noted that the proposal was to include this information within Transport Strategy quarterly update reports, the first of which would come to the 5 November 2019 meeting of this Committee. Given that this was a corporate risk that impacted across the organisation, she questioned whether the document should be circulated wider than this – to all members of the Court. The Chair stated that the priority here was to keep pace on delivery against the long-term risk and that he was reticent to share this information with the full Court as he felt that a regular report to this Committee adequately covered the matter.

A Member requested that calendar months or quarters be referred to as target dates going forward as this offered Members more certainty than seasons.

RECEIVED.

5. FLAT 3A, 12 TRINITY SQUARE, LONDON, EC3N 4AL

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding a change of use from residential (Class C3) to short-term let accommodation (periods of less than 90 consecutive nights) (Class C3) (83sq.m.).

Officers advised that the application related to a second floor flat in 12 Trinity Square which was also located within a Conservation Area. It was noted that ten objections had been received from residents regarding the proposals. Officers concluded by stating that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on residential amenity and would be contrary to the City's policies. For these reasons, the recommendation before Members was to refuse the application.

Members went on to debate the application.

A Member stated that he strongly supported the recommendation to refuse the application which was clearly in breach of a number of important policies. He went on to request why such decisions could not be delegated to Officers in the same manner that the issue of telephone kiosks had been previously.

Another Member stated that she believed that receipt of more than four objections meant that it was necessary for the application to be put to this

Committee. She added that she also supported the recommendation to refuse, highlighting that there was already a purpose-built block for short-term lets just to the left of 12 Trinity Square as well as plenty of hotels in this same area. The Member went on to state that the mixing of short-term lets within predominantly residential buildings caused huge problems for residents and that this had been borne out in the recent Enforcement Monitoring report considered by this Committee. A refusal on this would, in her view, send a strong message out to those considering taking similar steps in future.

With regard to delegating such decisions to Officers in future, the Deputy Chairman stated that, whilst he had some sympathy with this view, there were clear policies in place, and he would prefer to adhere to these and have such decisions taken at Committee level.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that it was not necessarily the number of objections received that would bring such an application before the Committee but the fact that Officers had limited powers to delegate refusals.

The Chair asked that Members move to a vote on the application. The Committee voted unanimously to refuse the application for the reasons set out within the report and background papers. There were no abstentions.

A Member went on to state that it seemed to be implied that the property in question was already being used for short-term lets. He questioned what powers the organisation had in relation to this. Another Member stated that holiday lets of up to 90 days were legally permitted but that this was notoriously difficult to police and monitor. The Chair reminded Members that a report on Short-Term Lets enforcement was due to come to the next meeting of this Committee.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the schedule attached to the report.

6. **TRANSPORT FOR LONDON FUNDING: LIP ANNUAL SPENDING SUBMISSION 2020/21 AND REALLOCATION FOR 2019/20**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment covering the provision of Transport for London funding to the City of London Corporation and seeking approval for the projects that will be included in the City Corporation's 2020/21 Annual Spending Submission of £3.672m.

RESOLVED – That, the Committee:

- Approve the projects to be included in the City Corporation's 2020/21 Annual Spending Submission of £3.672m, in table 1.
- Approve delegated authority for the Director of the Built Environment to approve reallocations of the 2020/21 Corridors and Neighbourhoods grant of up to £100,000 with the financial year;
- Approve reallocations within 2019/20 to a total of £202,904, as set out in table 3, appendix 1.

7. **CLIMATE ACTION BRIEFING IMPLEMENTATION**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Innovation & Growth, the Director of the Built Environment and the Director of Open Spaces regarding Climate Action Briefing Implementation.

The Chair thanked Officers for a very important and well written document.

A Member agreed that the document was massively welcome and urged Officers to try and move even quicker on this matter if possible. She went on to speak of whole life carbon impacts noting that the document failed to address this point. She highlighted that the Bloomberg building had recently been criticised on this point and that she would therefore welcome seeing it specifically mentioned. The Director of the Built Environment accepted that this should be part of the scope here.

Another Member raised the issue of office lights and keeping these to a minimum at night which would be a 'quick win' in terms of dealing, to some extent, with carbon emissions. He reported that he had visited offices within his own Ward and examined their Building Management Plans. Lights were operated on a Passive Infrared sensor system (PIR) with some on 100 sq. m. per switch and set to illuminate for 1 hour at a time. There were currently no regulations on this, but the Member felt that this was something that could be developed, and the issue addressed by way of programming.

A Member stated that, whilst he was supportive of this document, he wanted to caution against 'virtue signalling' and claiming success for the contributions of the City's Open Spaces. He also questioned the statement within the report that the 2018 freeze had been caused by manmade global warming and asked if this was scientific fact and had any source. A second Member stated that it was important to have a clear understanding of the value the City's Open Spaces added.

Another Member stated that he felt that Officers were adopting the correct approach to this matter in terms of robust data gathering which would hopefully lead to effective action. This, he felt, detracted from any politics and virtue signalling. He emphasised that this seemed to be very much the beginning of the process and not a conclusion. A second Member echoed this point and urged Officers not to shy away from collating the relevant data which was about the best way to effect change and purely factual as opposed to political. The Director of the Built Environment stated that Officers were very aware of the politics around this and had consciously decided against declaring a climate emergency in the way that some other local authorities had. It was felt that the development of this strategy would put the City Corporation in a strong position to tackle the issue going forward.

A Member added that Officers should work to ensure that relevant issues here were translated into actions within the emerging Local Plan.

In response to questions regarding funding, the Director of the Built Environment reported that some posts had been held vacant in preparation for the Fundamental Review and so the budget to progress this work across the three relevant Departments was available without having to detract from work elsewhere. She agreed with the point already made around this being very much a preliminary report and stated that she was happy to take all of the points raised by Members on-board in developing this.

A Member referred to the action within the report stating that the City Corporation would “influence Scope 1 and 2 emissions from the Square Mile by ensuring all new buildings are zero carbon through our planning policy.....”. She questioned whether this was therefore to be a formal planning condition on all applications granted going forward. A second Member questioned the definition of a zero-carbon building. The Chair suggested that it would be useful to have the response to these questions circulated to Members.

Another Member noted that funds to progress this matter were required over the next 8 months and questioned whether there were sufficient funds to carry forward to the next financial year to complete the proposed survey work. He also suggested that the aim of producing a final Strategy by June 2020 might be overly ambitious given that the collation of data was also set to conclude at this time and asked for a more realistic estimate.

The Director of the Built Environment stated that the issue of funding had been flagged to the Finance Committee and that whilst a carry forward was technically possible no additional funding was identified at this stage and neither had the resources been identified to produce the plan to date. For these reasons, it was not yet possible to provide Members with a definite timescale around the strategy.

A Member stated that it was clear that the intended direction of travel from this Committee was at least the semi-pedestrianisation of the City and stated that he was disappointed to not see this referenced. The Director of the Built Environment confirmed that she was well aware of the Committee’s wishes here and re-emphasised that this was not the final strategy.

Another Member noted that there was no reference to the Emissions Reduction Bill and questioned the level of dependency that would be placed on this given the City Corporation’s lack of control around it and lack of statutory powers around things such as Controlled Heat and Power (CHP) plants. A second Member suggested that the emerging Local Plan should be carefully scrutinised to ensure that it went as far as possible on such issues.

The Director of the Built Environment clarified that the Local Plan was an emerging document but already included policies on carbon neutral buildings. She also clarified that there was no strict dependency on the Emissions Reduction Bill.

A Member stated that Officers would also need to be cognisant of and monitor the impact action here had on the City’s competitiveness and cost to build

implications. He appreciated that, whilst this should not be at the forefront of considerations here, it needed to be part of the process with some measure of any impact.

The Director of the Built Environment stated that, whilst she very much welcomed the debate, this remained a preliminary report and that it would be for Members to decide on the final details of the strategy. She added that the competitiveness of the City would remain at the heart of her Department's work.

A Member spoke to highlight that there was some controversy surrounding genuine carbon sequestration and the science around it.

Another Member questioned the timing around this urgent issue and expressed reservations at awaiting a final strategy before taking appropriate actions to address it. He requested that Members be offered a future briefing on the City Corporation's current policy around this alongside steps being taken in the emerging Local Plan to address the matter as he, amongst others, seemed to be unaware that new buildings were now required to be carbon neutral. The Member asked that this be added to the Committee's list of outstanding actions until such time as the information was received and asked that Officers also look to report on what the organisation could be doing/was sustainable to be doing now.

The Chair agreed that it was vital for the City Corporation to be robust on this matter with some local authorities already having declared a climate emergency. He clarified that the work on the Local Plan had currently been stalled as the London Plan was still awaited. However, some dates for the Local Plans Sub Committee to reconvene were already in the process of being set for January and February 2020.

A Member questioned whether it would be possible to provide a breakdown of data by Wards and whether Members could work alongside Officers to help could be enlisted to help fill in any gaps identified in their respective Wards. The Director of the Built Environment undertook to take this point back and query how far it was possible to break down data by Ward. She thanked the Member for the offer of assistance which she would be keen to take up where possible.

A Member asked that a report updating this Committee on data collection and the identification of adequate resources to develop the subsequent strategy be brought back to this Committee in the next three months to ensure that there was adequate pace on this matter.

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

- Note the robust approach taken and current position of developing a Climate Action Strategy for both the Square Mile and the City of London Corporation;
- Approve the reprioritisation of 2019-20 Built Environment (£100,000) departmental budgets to cover the costs of the consultancy support required to deliver the Climate Action Briefing.

8. **THE SECTION 106 AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment detailing the progress made in securing and implementing financial and non-financial planning obligations secured under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, Section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the London Plan, in the financial year 2016 to 2019.

The Deputy Chair thanked Officers for a very interesting report. He noted the considerable sums received under both S106 and CIL and sought assurances from Officers that all such sums would be spent on relevant projects as opposed to returned to developers after a certain period of time. He added that there was no obligation for developers to extend the timing to enable fee expenditure.

Another Member questioned, under S106, when new calculations for affordable housing contributions would be finalised. He added that there was urgency around this matter which had now been running for some time. He went on to state that the governance of these funds seemed obscure and that, whilst he was clear in terms of the percentage of CIL funds attributed to the Department of Built Environment, for example, he wasn't as clear for other Departments/areas. Another Member interjected to state that it was surprising to see how out of touch/unrealistic S106 currently was on affordable housing contributions. This was easily illustrated by the unit costs associated with the COLPAI scheme detailed within the report.

Another Member questioned how funds were allocated and how this linked with the organisation's Education work for example. He noted that the report referred to Local Employment and Training funded by S106 funds but suggested that, if funds remained unspent, there was easily much more that could be done in terms of Work Experience for example.

A Member echoed concerns around the amount of CIL funds collected since its introduction compared with the percentage of funds spent to date which seemed to amount to less than 5% of the total collected. He flagged that this could leave the organisation open to criticism and questioned if Officers could detail those funds that were already committed to spend. Another Member expressed the same concerns around S106 funds and questioned how much could potentially be lost due to funds being time expired.

A Member commented that the fact that some funds were time limited made the situation even worse. She questioned how funds were currently allocated to projects and why, with these funds not yet spent, there was still a queue of projects internally. She added that there was clearly money here that could be spent on improving neighbourhoods and the like.

Another Member added that more could be done in terms of speaking with residents on the challenges they face and consulting them, particularly young residents, in terms of what they would like to see funded. He added that there was a large population in City fringe boroughs living in poverty and that more

work could be done with neighbouring boroughs such as Tower Hamlets to look at what collaborative work might be undertaken and funded to offer people greater access to opportunities.

With regard to governance, the Director of the Built Environment reported that, whilst funds were collected through Planning and Transportation, some were given to other Committees, as appropriate, to spend. The Policy and Resources Committee had agreed a policy for Neighbourhood CIL funds and communicantes were encouraged to come forward to bid for these. Matters relative to this Committee were put to the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee to determine.

She went on to clarify that there were plans for spending some of the funds currently held but that other S106 funds would require further discussions with developers before they could be committed to projects. With regard to CIL funds, these would be reviewed as part of the Fundamental Review. The Director added that these funds were part of the annual bidding process for Capital Projects across the organisation.

The Director of the Built Environment went on to underline that this was simply a statutory, housekeeping report of what had actually been spent to date. A lot more funds had already been allocated and unallocated funds were currently under review.

In terms of funds available to this Committee to expend, there were plans for all of the S106 monies which were not subject to the Fundamental Review and plans for some of the CIL funds with the unallocated sum now part of the Fundamental Review/Capital Projects Annual bidding process.

The Chair asked that Officers come back to this Committee on the point around affordable housing with some urgency as it did not appear to be sustainable to maintain the status quo on this. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that she believed that this was tied to the progression of the Local Plan but undertook to take this matter back and report further. A Member questioned whether it could be brought forward as a separate Supplementary Planning Guidance document.

A Member stated that the Monitoring Report was just a small part of the bigger picture on these funds and highlighted that many other authorities had more complete information published on their websites. The Chair interjected to say that he was of the view that the organisation was currently using some rather outmoded means of consultation and that he was currently looking at how this could be addressed. He added that he was happy to take any views/suggestions that Members might have on this.

A Member stated that he remained confused as to the governance of these funds, what funds were already committed, how much could potentially be lost if not spent and how top-level allocation was decided on. Other Members echoed this questioning which funds were timebound, how much was therefore currently at risk and how much had had to be refunded in recent years. Another Member called for greater transparency in terms of how these funds were

spent/allocated that could be readily accessible on the City Corporation's public website.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor reported that S106 funds were timed, with the standard requirement being that funds are to be repaid to developers if not spent 10 years after the completion of the development. She clarified that CIL funds were not time constrained. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that no S106 funds had been returned to developers to date. Only funds under S278 had been returned as was required if not spent on specific projects.

The Chair summarised by stating that it was clearly felt that information on governance was lacking here and asked that Officers provide assurances on this in the form of a further report to this Committee. He also asked that a statement as to funds allocated be circulated. An Officer reported that, in terms of CIL funds, a further £8m was currently allocated alongside the £1.5m already spent.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

9. **LUNCHTIME STREETS - FIRST YEAR REVIEW**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment reviewing the first year of Lunchtime Streets events.

A Member, also the serving Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, reported that he felt that this was a very useful start but that his Sub Committee were very strongly of the view that more could be done here. He spoke of further events not necessarily at lunch time but on school days to coincide with the end of the school day for example. He added that Members will know their own Wards/areas best and welcomed any ideas they might have as to where future events could be hosted. The Member concluded that the impetus for this had initially come from Chancery Lane Association and had had fantastic support from local businesses.

The Deputy Chair congratulated all on the huge success of this initiative to date. Others echoed their support and congratulations.

A Member spoke of the event in St Mary Axe which was situated within her Ward. She stated that the fact that this had already been designated as a pedestrian priority street was a useful foothold into the Lunchtime Streets initiative. She added that businesses had been very much on-side with this too with no concerns as to effects on deliveries and the like. She stated that the events had also received lots of positive media support and coverage and urged Officers to press on with this work going forward.

One Member expressed some concern that the surveys referred to had been taken of those who had participated in the events and could therefore be considered as self-selecting. He added that the closure of Chancery Lane had been previously considered but rejected by this Committee and questioned whether there was therefore an ulterior motive behind these events. If this was

the case, he suggested that the bigger picture around this be set out in frank terms for all. Another Member agreed that it was important to consider the bigger picture here. He added that it was commendable that the majority of Members now seemed to be moving towards the desire to at least semi-pedestrianise the City.

Another Member stated that she questioned why traffic was allowed to enter the City during rush-hour – a question that she had originally posed some ten years ago when first elected. She was pleased to see that things now seemed to be moving in the right direction but stressed that she hoped that Officers had taken the opportunity to monitor the impact that these closures had had on traffic and any necessary re-routing of it. She went on to refer to the City's recent car-free day as well as the recent closure of Bank Junction due to protest. On these occasions, buses and other traffic seemed to have been successfully re-routed.

A Member stated that Officers needed to ensure that there were sufficient resources to enable these closures if it was something that Members were seeking to encourage. Security, particularly building security, would also need to be aware of closures and consulted on the planning of these in terms of evacuations and the like.

A Member stated that he was mindful of the fact that weekday road closures were perceived very differently to weekend road closures. He referred to celebrations he had held for Bengali New Year in the Guildhall Yard one Sunday in April 2019 and spoke of how this had been a huge success and one which he would like to repeat, perhaps in Aldgate, next year. He spoke of the need to also be mindful of other events taking place during road closures.

A Member, also the serving Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, agreed that more Sunday closures would be desirable with St Paul's having already expressed support for and interest in this. The Chair stated that, in line with the organisations 'Healthy Streets' agenda, things such as timed closures and freight consolidation should be happening regardless with no specific event/reason needed for this. More could be done in terms of looking at how the City's streets could be better utilised in general.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

10. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

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

A Member questioned if the Millennium Bridge Inclinor was subject to a new maintenance contract yet. He also questioned the vandalism of the Blackfriars Bridge lift and what steps might be taken to avoid this reoccurring.

A Member expressed concerns around the amount of time that the Millennium Inclinor had, again, been out of service and questioned if it would be possible for Members to see a service history for the Inclinor.

The City Surveyor state that the Millennium Inclinor was not yet under a new maintenance regime which was still to be resolved. Kone had not fixed the Inclinor on this occasion and the company that had affected the repairs were also now being consulted on maintenance going forward. She added that providing a full-service history for the Inclinor would be problematic, but that Officers remained optimistic that a new maintenance regime would resolve the ongoing issues.

With regard to Blackfriars Bridge, the City Surveyor stated that vandalism was a real issue here with the doors being forced open to gain access and specialist parts required to fix this. The installation of CCTV cameras had been considered as a solution.

A Member referred to the lift between London Wall Place and Salters Hall which was frequently out of service and questioned whether this was one of the City Corporation's lifts. The City Surveyor undertook to look into this matter and report back but stated that she believed that this lift was part of the development. Another Member added that this lift had been an important part of bringing the walkway here back in to use but that there had been some debate around who maintained this.

A Member questioned if, when the City Corporation accepted responsibility for these lifts (or in the case of the Blackfriars Bridge lift, when these were forced upon the organisation) money was also exchanged to help meet the costs of maintaining these. The City Surveyor stated that there was funding towards maintenance and that Officers were working closely with installers to ensure that the equipment used could be more easily sourced going forward.

RECEIVED.

11. 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.

12. 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.

A Member referred to application 19/00939/FULL at 8 Paternoster Row, EC4M 7DX. He noted that it included the installation of extract louvres and that this would therefore be the perfect test case for the condition approved by this Committee on these in what was a particularly sensitive area.

RECEIVED.

13. 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 future update reports will be made to subsequent meetings of the Committee as appropriate.

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

Yellow Line on Coopers Row

A Member referred to yellow lines at Coopers Row which were situated outside the Novatel Hotel and directly opposite a taxi rank – a matter she had raised previously here. She asked that Officers consider the installation of a Give Way/Stop Sign along this road at the junction with Pepys Street.

Hammett Street

A Member referred to cars parking on both sides of the roads in this street which, with the recent opening of a new hotel here, also made it difficult for vehicles to navigate through.

Tables and Chairs Policy

A Member referred to the fact that there was a clear policy within the Transport Strategy to avoid obstructing pavements and pavements were increasingly widened for this reason. However, some establishments' use of tables and chairs was contradicting this work and the Member requested that a report around policy and enforcement on this be brought back to Members.

East/West Smithfield

A Member questioned if an architect had now been appointed and underlined that this work should not be undertaken in siloes. The Director of the Built Environment undertook to report back to the Member on this matter but assured him that the work would be carried out collaboratively.

At this point, the Chair 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.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

London Bridge Waterproofing and Bearing Replacement

Officers spoke to request Delegated Authority to proceed in relation to this project.

Members were reminded that the project had been due to proceed on the Complex route as it was estimated to be over £5m. However, tender returns had now been returned for under £5m making it eligible for the Regular route. Delegated Authority was requested

as the preferred contractor was keen to sign contracts soon to meet the original timeline set out and awaiting the next meeting would delay the project.

RESOLVED – That, Delegated Authority be granted to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Projects Sub Committee to progress this matter.

16. **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.

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the last meeting held on 1 October 2019 as a correct record.

18. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising Members of action taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and (b).

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

There were no questions in the non-public session.

20. **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 12.34 pm

Chairman

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