

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chairman)	Alderman Prem Goyal
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)	Graeme Harrower
Randall Anderson	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Adrian Bastow	Shravan Joshi
Peter Bennett	Oliver Lodge
Mark Bostock	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Brian Mooney
Henry Colthurst	Graham Packham
Alderman Emma Edhem	Susan Pearson
Marianne Fredericks	James de Sausmarez

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Priya Rane	- Media Officer
David MacKintosh	- Policy Advisor
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Fleur Francis	- 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
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Richard Steele	- Department of the Built Environment
Beverley Bush	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Tom Parker	- Department of the Built Environment

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Rehana Ameer, Peter Dunphy, John Edwards, Sophie Fernandes, Tracey Graham, Christopher Hill, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Sylvia Moys, Judith Pleasance, Deputy Henry Pollard, Oliver Sells, William Upton and Alderman David Wootton.

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 public minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2019.

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

The Committee received the public minutes of the 15 October 2019 meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee.

In response to a question, the Town Clerk confirmed that the draft minutes of the December Streets and Walkways Sub Committee meeting would be received by this Committee in early January 2020. A Member referred to a report considered by the December meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee concerning Beech Street and requested an update as to progress around this. Officers reported that the Sub Committee had approved the delivery of the scheme and that a further update was to be provided to the Resource Allocation Sub Committee this afternoon and to Projects Sub Committee early next week. It was intended that the works would be delivered by March 2020. The Member made a plea that both Barbican and Golden Lane residents be kept informed of progress around this. Officers undertook to ensure that this was the case.

RECEIVED

5. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing outstanding actions.

The Chair highlighted that the presentation of the list had now been amended in accordance with the views expressed by Members at the last meeting.

A Member requested that the need for an updated Supplementary Planning Document on contributions to Affordable Housing be added to the list going forward so that this was not lost sight of. The Committee were supportive of this suggestion and the Town Clerk undertook to amend the list accordingly.

RECEIVED.

6. **CITY POINT 1 ROPEMAKER STREET, LONDON, EC2Y 9AW**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking agreement to alterations to the north terrace at level 6 to include installation of 1.3m high glass balustrade; timber decking, lighting, planters and seating; double doors to provide access to the terrace from the existing offices and installation of a spiral staircase to access level 7 and alterations to the west terrace at level 8 to include removal of existing projecting (non-structural) columns; installation of 1.3m high glass balustrade; timber decking, lighting, planters and seating; double doors to improve access to the existing terrace from the offices.

Officers tabled an addendum to the report detailing an additional condition setting out the need for landscaping and planting to be installed prior to the first use of the roof terraces at levels 06 and 08 and maintained for the lifetime of the development. Officers also highlighted some corrections to the report stating that the comment from the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection regarding usage of the terraces at paragraph 6 should read “... *between the hours of 1800 hours on one day and 0900 hours on the following day*”. Paragraph 8 of the report should also reference 28 neighbour responses received and not 24.

Officers went on to report that this application essentially centred around the refurbishment and improved use of two existing terraces. The main issues stemming from the application were striking a balance between office use and the concerns of neighbouring residents. Members were informed that residents had been consulted as part of the application process and that the applicant, who had originally requested use of the terraces from 8am-8pm, had made concessions around this to address concerns and had also agreed to no use on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Officers summarised the location of the terraces and the proposed alterations which included the installation of timber decking, planting around the edge and the installation of seating. They went on to highlight that the level of the terraces would remain unchanged and that there was also the possibility of a spiral staircase from level 6 to 7 being installed. Members were shown visuals of this. Members were informed that the second terrace was situated 24m from Willoughby House and 16m from the Heron building. There were currently doors on to this terrace and there were non-structural beams to be removed in this location. Both terraces were usable at present and the City of London Corporation had no control over their use as things currently stood.

Officers went on to clarify that the 28 objections received had centred around noise, lighting and loss of privacy – they were, however, of the view that conditions now adequately covered these points and that the application could be approved with these conditions attached.

The Chair thanked Officers for their presentation of the application and, in the absence of any speakers, invited questions from the Committee.

A Member questioned whether it would be possible to condition the height of the plants when first installed so as to ensure a screening effect at the edge of the terraces. Officers reported that the condition tabled required details of planting and also its ongoing maintenance. They added that this could be added to so that mature planting was sought from the outset.

Another Member referred to the objection received from the organisation's former Chief Planning Officer and highlighted that this did not, however, specifically request that this application be refused given that there were no clear-cut grounds for doing so.

A third Member referred to the 28 objections received in total. He recognised that some had called for restricted hours of use for the terraces and that this point had been conceded by the applicant, but there were others who seemed to object to the application more fully. It was important, therefore, to assess this application against relevant planning considerations. The Member went on to refer to the written report – specifically paragraph 16 concerning assessment of the application in terms of land use. He highlighted the statement here that the provision of roof terraces could promote health and wellbeing but questioned what discernible health benefits this really offered.

The Member continued, referring this time to Local Plan Policy CS1, and the provision of additional offices. He stated that this same policy had been considered in light of a recent, similar application where it had been adequately argued that the provision of a roof terrace did not equate to additional office space or employment. In his view, the same arguments applied here, on a larger scale, and the land use argument was therefore inadequately played out within the report.

In terms of design, the Member spoke on the proposed removal of thirteen projecting (non-structural) architectural beams at level 8. He suggested that the beams, if non-structural, were clearly intended as part of the architectural context of the building and questioned why their removal would therefore be acceptable or anything other than negative in design terms. The written report, with reference to contribution to the 'fifth elevation' offered, in his opinion, a description and not a justification for their removal. The Member stated that the removal of these beams would, in his opinion, lead to a distinct break in the flow of the building.

The Member turned to noise and disturbance issues suggesting that noise during the day would be amplified by the narrow streets surrounding the building which would create an 'echo effect' and also by the glass building situated directly behind the terrace. He concluded that it should be for the applicant to prove that there would be no noise nuisance here. He also referred to concerns around privacy and overlooking stating that use of these terraces would be contrary to our own policy (DM 10.3). He failed to see any good reason for going against policy here articulated within the report. He added that current use of the terraces which seemed limited at present and contained no seating areas was not a fair comparison to make. He also stated that office and residential use were two very different matters with office workers normally working from screens with desks angled away from any overlooking.

The Member concluded by stating that he felt that the applicant had failed to make the case for why this application should be granted and that, in his view, it should be refused in its current state.

Officers sought to address the various points made by the Member and began by stating that outdoor spaces were increasingly sought by offices due to their positive impact on health and wellbeing for workers. Policy CS1 also referred to the provision of office development of the highest quality and, for many, this now involved the inclusion of outdoor, break-out spaces. The Committee were

also informed that the applicant was also prepared to provide a detailed Management Plan in terms of use of the terraces. The applicant was also known to have revoked the use of terraces elsewhere where complaints had been received.

In design terms, Members were shown visuals of the before and after effect of removing the thirteen beams. These showed that the essential architecture of the 'fin' would remain and that the overall impact would be minimal.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that, in some ways, noise would have to be self-managed. She went on to state that, whilst daytime noise should, of course, not be excessive, it was entirely appropriate within a residential area and would be subject to the Management Plan controls. She concluded by stating that it wasn't for the applicant to prove why something should be allowed, it was for the planning authority to prove why it should not.

A Member commented that she had called, many years ago, for the development of a design brief for roof terraces given their increasing popularity. She went on to question whether the applicant had considered carrying out an analysis of noise impact from the terraces at present and how that might increase or decrease with this application. She also questioned if there was any information as to capacity level for the terraces and how some comfort might be provided to neighbouring residents that the 1800 terminal hour would be adhered to – could it, for example, be written into the lease. Officers confirmed that this would be the case. Officers confirmed that there was no acoustic report available at present.

Another Member, who had also attended the site visit organised by Officers earlier in the week, stated that it was not possible to see inside the nearby residential units from the terraces during the daytime. He also highlighted that there were actually significant differences between this application and the similar application dealt with by this Committee in October – the key differences being the distance between the terraces and nearby residential property and the fact that the applicant had made concessions on the hours of usage. He would, however, support a harder line on the planting used for screening purposes which might also go some way to addressing noise concerns.

Another Member took up and concurred with the point made previously on the beams to be removed being part of the architectural concept of the building. She went on to state that there was potential for 400 people to be accessing these terraces given that each floor was occupied by 200 staff and also questioned accessibility to the terraces with a spiral staircase proposed from level 7. Officers responded that the staircase within the visuals provided today was shown indicatively but that extra detail could be requested at condition stage. In terms of access, the applicant was committed to providing level access and there was also an internal lift. Officers also stated that they were of the view that the architectural alterations proposed were entirely in keeping with the building and did not materially affect its presentation.

The Member also questioned the need for lighting on the terraces at all given that the proposed hours of usage terminated at 1800 and supported the need for more conditions around the maintenance and adequacy of the proposed planting intended as screenage. Finally, she questioned why Officers had attached so many conditions to the application – she suggested that these were needed due to the fact that this was essentially little more than an outline planning application at present.

Another Member stated that he was interested to note that none of the residents who had objected to the application were present to address the Committee this morning. He understood that there had been extensive dialogue between the applicant and residents to date and was therefore encouraged that this had been productive. He added that the Management Plan document offered by the applicant would be key here and questioned whether this Committee/Officers were able to have any influence on its content.

Officers agreed that the Management Plan would be key here. They added that the document could stipulate and control the maximum numbers of people permitted to access the terraces at any one time as well as set out the general use of the space and that planners would be in a position to influence this. The Chair highlighted that Officers were, of course, very well accustomed to regularly signing off on such documents.

Officers went on to reiterate that, unlike the previous, similar application referred to by Members, these terraces were already useable.

The Deputy Chairman spoke to disagree with the points made earlier around this being a ‘half-baked’ application in any sense. He, too, highlighted that, at present, the terraces in question could be utilised with the City Corporation able to assert no control over this. He agreed that the use of mature planting would be important and was reassured by Officers responses to this request. He referred to the points made around architectural damage but highlighted that the visuals depicted how minimal this would be. He concluded by commending the fact that residents had clearly been closely involved in the development of these proposals.

A Member expressed concerns as to how usage and hours of usage would be effectively enforced. She added that health and wellbeing was important in terms of local residents as well as workers.

The Committee moved to vote on the application with votes cast as follows:

- IN FAVOUR – 13
- OPPOSED – 4

There were no abstentions.

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

7. **INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE VALIDATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding information requirements for the validation of planning applications.

Officers tabled an addendum to the report. Members were informed that consultation was recommended to take place over a six-week period.

In response to a question, Officers clarified that this was intended to include major applications too but that this could be made more specific in consultation documents, stipulating that it applied to all new buildings and extensions irrespective of their size.

RESOLVED – That, Members agree to consultation with the local community, including applicants and agents, on the local list of information required with planning and other applications as set out in Annexe A, Annexe B and Annexe C of this report, and that if no significant comments are received, that they authorise the Chief Planning Officer to adopt the list.

8. **BAYNARD HOUSE CAR PARK - VENTILATION & SMOKE CLEARANCE SYSTEM**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the City Surveyor relative to Baynard House Car Park – Ventilation and Smoke Clearance system.

RESOLVED – That, the Committee:

1. Approve a budget of £37,000 for Baynard House car park ventilation system to reach the next Gateway 5;
2. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £647,000(excluding risk); which has been included as part of the annual capital bid for the Department of the Built Environment 2020/21; funding requested from On-Street Parking Revenue account;
3. Note the risk register in Appendix 2; and
4. Approve Option 1A to install a new ventilation system to Baynard House car park.

9. **TOWER BRIDGE SERVICE TRENCHES REFURBISHMENT**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to Tower Bridge Services Trenches Refurbishment.

A Member commented that, in essence, this was simply the replacement of the existing access plates with those that were more manoeuvrable and some additional 'cleaning up'. He therefore found the estimated costs of £500,000 concerning for this work.

Another Member referred to the notable exclusions within the report and the statement that existing proposals and project budget did not include the replacement of the cast-iron bedding frames. He questioned whether any

maintenance would at least be carried out on elements such as these whilst Officers had the relevant access.

Officers reported that the cast-iron frames had been recently inspected and seemed in good condition at present, no problems were therefore anticipated here, although a more detailed survey would be carried out in due course with any maintenance effected whilst Officers had access if this was deemed necessary.

In terms of costs, Officers stated that the replacement of these elements would involve a lot of work given that there was no 'off the shelf' equivalent to the existing plates. The estimates were arguably conservative at this stage although the Gateway process would refine these further.

RESOLVED – That the Committee:

1. Approve a budget of £10,000 for staff costs and investigations to reach the next Gateway;
2. Note the total estimated cost of the project at between £300,000 and £500,000 (excluding risk); and
3. Note that no Costed Risk Provision is requested at this stage, although £120,000 of costed risks against asbestos and contamination are identified in the Project Risk Register. These will be reviewed at the next Gateway following further investigations.

10. DOCKLESS CYCLE HIRE TRIAL OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing Members with the Dockless cycle hire trial outcome and setting out next steps.

A Member stated that he was minded to support the Officer recommendation of Option C. He added that he had used the bicycles himself during the trial and that his experience matched what was set out within the report. He went on to question whether it would be possible to restrict parking provisions for the bicycles on pedestrian space going forward and push this, instead, on to the street side given that there were clear aspirations to reduce traffic flow on the City's roads anyway. Officers confirmed that the assumption was that future parking would be provided for on the carriageway.

Another Member referred to the compliance rate percentages referred to within the report and questioned how this translated in terms of how many bikes were not parked appropriately and were a potential hazard to elderly or disabled pedestrians. Officers undertook to come back to the Member on this point but reported that they were constantly trying to move towards ever higher compliance rates with hire/bicycle companies proactively addressing any issues as they arise.

A third Member spoke to state that she was delighted with the success of the trial but found it disappointing that unsuccessful operators continued to bring their bikes into the City. She questioned whether it would be possible to rank

bikes in parking spaces once the scheme was opened up . She also noted that there would be little control over what bicycles were coming into the City once the London-wide byelaw came into effect so sufficient parking spaces and appropriate infrastructure would be key. The Member questioned whether operators might also bear the costs of providing such infrastructure alongside the City of London Corporation.

Another Member concurred with the points made around adequate parking and suggested that Officers also explore what could be done with the organisation's carparks, some of which occupied large spaces. Officers reported that they had already raised the option of utilising carparks with bicycle operators as a means of managing flows going forward. They would continue to explore this option further.

In response to further questions, Officers reported that they were continuing to monitor and adjust penalty charges where necessary. Operators were also keen to address this point and align charges with the forthcoming byelaw. Officers also undertook to come back to Members with further information regarding enforcement in general.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Agree Option C: Continue the parking arrangements as trialled and approve additional operators; and
- Agree the extension of the current trial until 31 March 2020, allowing Beryl and Freebike to continue operating as-is while preparations are made to accommodate additional operators.

11. **SEEKING A PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER - LONDON MARATHON RELATED DISORDER**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Community Safety informing Members of a proposal to seek a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) to help respond to recurring issues of violent disorder and anti-social behaviour which have occurred on the day of the London Marathon.

RECEIVED.

12. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

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

A Member questioned the official reported response rate or target for those stuck in lifts and referred to a recent case where he had been informed that one lift user had waited for over an hour for a response and, as a result, was forced to call the fire brigade in order to be released. The City Surveyor responded that the emergency response rate target with contractors was 30 minutes and that this had been achieved 100% of the time to date. She added that she had not been made aware of the particular incident referred to previously but would now seek to take this up separately with contractors.

Another Member referred to the lift failure at London Wall West and questioned whether there had been any further progress in terms of access here. He added that the escalators at this same location were also out of service for much of the same period. The City Surveyor confirmed access issues continued and that this was a difficulty particularly if failures happened out of hours.

RECEIVED.

13. MILLENNIUM INCLINATOR MAINTENANCE UPDATE REPORT

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor giving Members an update on the current situation on the Millennium Inclinor maintenance schedule.

A Member stated that he was concerned about Kone's comments that the inclinor required a roof. He added that it was clear that the whole thing, ultimately, needed replacing. He thanked Officers for all of their hard work on this matter but added that, unfortunately, it was simply not successful.

In response to further questions around the proposal for a roof, Officers reported that the suggestion was that the inclinor should be covered by a roof in totality but that they were under the understanding that this had not previously been pursued due to planning restrictions.

Officers concluded on a more positive note stating that Acute seemed to have taken up the maintenance of the Inclinor very proactively to date.

RECEIVED.

14. UPDATE ON GOVERNANCE AND SPENDING OF THE CITY OF LONDON'S COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND THE PLANNING OBLIGATION AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTIONS

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment responding to Member requests to summarise the governance arrangements and recent spending for the City Corporation's City Community Infrastructure Levy (City CIL) and for the use of Sec. 106 planning obligations to contribute funding for the provision of affordable housing. The report also outlined potential changes to governance arrangements and the process for increasing the scale of Sec. 106 funding for affordable housing.

Officers reported that, in terms of current governance, this Committee were responsible for setting CIL rates with spending decisions then taken by the Policy and Resources Committee. To date, this Committee's areas of interest had attracted 80% of the spend in comparison to the 40% originally envisaged.

With regard to funding for affordable housing, Officers reported that they would be looking to increase the contributions developers were required to make here and were discussing this at present with consultants in terms of a viability study. It was intended that this would be the subject of a further report to this Committee in March 2020.

The Chair spoke to underline the need for pace with regard to affordable housing contributions. He added that different local planning authorities varied in terms of how CIL funds were governed and also reminded Members that the City of London was due to commence a Governance Review of its own in the near future.

A Member thanked Officers for a helpful report and stated that he, personally, was in favour of continuing to separate collecting and spending powers given that this Committee's areas of work were currently doing well from the process.

Another Member stressed the importance of any viability study on affordable housing contributions needing to be of net profitability of building in the City and not necessarily just of rising costs.

In response to a question regarding references to affordable units and not social housing, Members were informed that affordable housing was a generic term which included many types of subsidised housing including social rented housing which was needed to address the City's affordable housing needs.

RESOLVED – That Members note the content of the report.

15. DEFINITION OF NET ZERO CARBON

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing definitions of zero carbon that are in use in planning, demonstrating how these are applied in practice and highlighting the weight given to the draft London Plan targets since publication of the draft London Plan Panel Report in October 2019.

Officers highlighted that the draft London Plan required new developments to be net zero-Carbon, commencing Spring 2020, and would otherwise require developers to contribute funds through carbon-offsetting.

A Member stated that the definitions within the report were clear but questioned how far back these went and whether they also referred, for example, to the deconstruction or construction of a building and how this would be possible to achieve with the use of fossil fuels and the like. Officers agreed with the difficulties highlighted by Members but stated that the zero-carbon assessment set by the London Plan related to the building's use only.

In response to further questions, Officers highlighted that the City Corporation's draft Local Plan included a circular economy policy that strongly emphasised the benefits of re-use/re-cycling of existing buildings over the demolition of one to be replaced by another on the same site.

RESOLVED – That Members note the content of the report.

16. **FREIGHT PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing Members with an update on work to date to reduce the impact of freight on City streets.

Members thanked Officers for a well drafted, specialist report.

A Member highlighted the reference within the report to 'River Logistics'. He stated that, whilst he was in general agreement with these proposals, fuel standards for river transport were significantly lower than those of road vehicles. He therefore questioned the overall effect that this was likely to have on air quality. He concluded by stating that the Port of London Authority (PLA) were currently working on exhaust scrubbers and encouraged Officers to work collaboratively with them on this.

The same Member went on to refer to the work being carried out alongside Ford Mobility to trial multi-modal delivery using pedestrian porters in the Square Mile. He expressed concern that this could add to the already overly congested pedestrian pathways in the City and create more opportunities for accidents.

Another Member stated that she was concerned that some work in this area was not progressing quickly enough. With regard to 'River Logistics' she referred to cities in Europe that had introduced electric vehicles only to their waterways with great success. The Member referred also to the City's carparks and suggested that these should not be hastily sold off as they could prove strategically important spaces going forward.

The Deputy Chairman also spoke on river logistics, agreeing that work here should continue to drive forward as soon as possible as he was of the view that the River Thames was a fantastic, underused resource for the City at present. Officers were pleased to report that Air Quality funding had now been secured from the Mayor of London to enable them to trial the cleanest possible vehicles on the river. This work would also be co-ordinated with the PLA's Air Quality Strategy.

A Member questioned whether Amazon were included within the proposals around last mile logistics. Officers clarified that they were in discussions with Amazon who were also looking at the use of logistic hubs.

Officers reported that freight deliveries in London were generally encouraged from 7-9am and that they had met with London Councils to ask that they reconsider how this would work for the Square Mile. They added that they were trying to move further and faster in this area than both TfL and the Mayor of London but were equally reliant on the support of a variety of other stakeholders to deliver the freight programme.

A Member questioned whether there were any statistics available to demonstrate the impact of the introduction of the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ). The Chair highlighted that there was further detail on this at item 18. He added that pace was very important here and that the development

community were already very aware of this agenda. He concluded by stating that it was very important to carry out this work in a considered and planned manner.

RESOLVED – That Members note the contents of the report.

17. **2019 CAR FREE DAY UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the September 2019 Car Free day.

A Member commended TfL for the re-routing of bus routes on the day to ensure that gridlock was avoided. She added that she was, however, surprised to see that traffic had been permitted at Tower Hill on the day. The Member added that Hotels and other occupiers in the area had gone to great lengths to promote the car free day to their guests and others and many of these people were therefore disgruntled to learn that this was not the case for all and that they could have arrived at their destination in taxis. Officers stated that they would like to pick this matter up separately with the Member in terms of details of the Hotels concerned as communications had clearly depicted those areas that would remain open to traffic on the day.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the report.

18. **6-MONTH UPDATE ON THE ULTRA LOW EMISSION ZONE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment summarising the GLA's evaluation of the impacts of ULEZ over the first six months of operation.

Officers reported that the highest impact seemed to be for evenings and weekends. More clarity was, however, being sought on impact specific to the City and the types of vehicles affected. This would be forthcoming in the next few months and would be presented to this Committee in March 2020 when once analysis of this had been carried out.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

19. **LOCAL PLAN UPDATE**

Officers were heard relative to the progress of the City's draft Local Plan.

Members were informed that the Local Plans Sub Committee was scheduled to meet further in January and February 2020. Thereafter, it was intended that the full, draft Plan would be presented to this Committee for approval in March 2020 and to the Court of Common Council in April 2020. The finalised draft would then be for forward submission to Government.

20. **DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT RISK MANAGEMENT - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing Members with assurance that risk management procedures in place

within the Department of the Built Environment are satisfactory and that they meet the requirements of the corporate Risk Management Framework.

A Member queried whether the work being undertaken around freight consolidation could be referenced as a mitigation under the Road Danger Reduction risk. Officers undertook to raise this when the risk register was next reviewed.

Another Member referred to the risk associated with major projects and key programmes not being delivered as TfL funding was not received and questioned why the target risk rating attached to this seemed to be worse than the current risk rating. He noted that there were also four other risks within the register where the target risk rating was intended to stay the same as the current risk rating – he questioned whether this was the correct approach. Officers clarified that risk targets were based on corporate risk appetite and that whilst they would accept a worse position in relation to this particular risk, they were not intending worse. Members were also informed that TfL funding was cyclical and that the current risk score reflected where the department happened to be within that cycle at present.

Officers went on to report that, at present, the organisation was doing well in terms of LIP funding and were therefore comfortable with a higher risk around this. They added that the organisation was fortunate enough to have other income streams to make it so that TfL funding was not critical. The Member accepted this explanation but asked that this be detailed against the risk so that the document did not give the impression that there was ambition for a worse position.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report and the actions taken in the Department of the Built Environment to monitor and manage effectively risks arising from the department's operations.

21. 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.

22. VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY 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.

RESOLVED.

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

There were no questions.

24. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

25. **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.

<u>Item No</u>	<u>Paragraph No(s)</u>
26 & 27	3
28	3 & 5
29	3, 5 & 7
30	3
31 & 32	-

26. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2019.

27. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising Members on action taken by the Town Clerk since the last meeting of this Committee, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Orders Nos. 41(a) and 41(b).

28. **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES STRATEGIC REVIEW - UPDATE THREE**

The Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk and Chief Executive, the Chief Grants Officer and the Director of City Bridge Trust providing Members with an update of the work that has been undertaken as part of the Bridge House Estates (BHE) strategic governance review since the last report in June/July 2019.

29. **DEBT ARREARS - BUILT ENVIRONMENT (P&T COMMITTEE) PERIOD ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 2019**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment informing Members of arrears of invoiced income as at 30th September 2019 and providing an analysis of this debt.

30. **TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC REALM CONSULTANCY FRAMEWORK**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding a framework contract for procuring external consultancy services in the Transportation and Public Realm Division within the Department of the Built Environment.

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

There were no questions in the non-public session

32. **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 12.00 pm

Chairman

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