

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 23 June 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 9.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair)	Christopher Hill
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Rehana Ameer	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Randall Anderson	Shravan Joshi
Peter Bennett	Oliver Lodge
Mark Bostock	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner)
Henry Colthurst	Sylvia Moys
Deputy Peter Dunphy	Graham Packham
Alderman Emma Edhem	Susan Pearson
John Edwards	Judith Pleasance
Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Henry Pollard
Alderman Prem Goyal	Oliver Sells QC
Tracey Graham	William Upton QC
Graeme Harrower	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Lorraine Brook	- Town Clerk's Department
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerk's Department
Rhiannon Leary	- Town Clerk's Department
Kerry Nicholls	- Town Clerk's Department
Amelia Ehren	- Town Clerk's Department
David Farnsworth	- Chief Grants Officer and Director of City Bridge Trust
Shani Annand-Baron	- Media Officer
James Gibson	- IS Services
Peter Digby	- City of London Police
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Nicholas Gill	- City Surveyor's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Chris Bonner	- City Surveyor's Department
Gwyn Richards	- Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director

Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of the Built Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Maria Herrera	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment
Beverley Bush	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ben Eley	- Department of the Built Environment
Gemma Delves	- Department of the Built Environment
Neel Devlia	- Department of the Built Environment
Helen Kearney	- Department of the Built Environment
Tom Nancollas	- Department of the Built Environment
Joanna Parker	- Department of the Built Environment
Stefania Pizzato	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Craig Stansfield	- Department of the Built Environment
Dom Strickland	- Department of the Built Environment
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Jon Averbs	- Director of Markets & Consumer Protection
Rachel Pye	- Markets & Consumer Protection
Peter Davenport	- Markets & Consumer Protection
Robin Whitehouse	- Markets & Consumer Protection
Paul Forster	- Markets & Consumer Protection

In Attendance:

Deputy Edward Lord – Common Councillor

Tijs Broeke – Common Councillor

Sharon Ament – Director of the Museum of London, MoL Application

Gregory Lawrence – Common Councillor and Chairman of the Smithfield Market Tenants Association (SMTA), MoL Application

Roy McGowan – Momentum Transport, Highways Advisor, MoL Application

Rawdon Pettitt – Architect, Stanton Williams, MoL Application

Jeremy Randall – Partner, Gerald Eve, MoL Application

Paul Williams – Lead Architect, Stanton Williams, MoL Application

Peter Bovill – Montagu Evans, 81 Newgate Street Application

John Bushell – KPF, Montagu Evans, 81 Newgate Street Application

George Kyriacou – Applicant, 81 Newgate Street Application

Chris Miele – Montagu Evans, 81 Newgate Street Application

Alec Shaw – Project Director – Smithfield, Museum of London, MoL Application

Louis Vorster – KPF, Montagu Evans, 81 Newgate Street Application

Introductions

The Town Clerk opened the meeting by introducing herself and stating that the Committee was quorate.

A roll call of Members present was undertaken by the Town Clerk who also reminded those participating to alert her to any technical issues they might experience as the meeting progressed.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Natasha Lloyd-Owen and James de Sausmarez.

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

Oliver Sells QC declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 by virtue of the fact that he is also a member of the Capital Buildings Committee and may be perceived, in this capacity, as having predetermined the application. He clarified that he would not, therefore speak or vote on this item.

Judith Pleasance declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she is a member of the Board of Governors of the Museum of London and would also not be speaking or voting on agenda item 6.

Mark Bostock declared a non-pecuniary interest, stating that he is a member of the Markets Committee but that, as that committee had not taken a lead on the plans for the Museum of London, he intended to both speak and vote on agenda item 6.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor advised that participation in Agenda items in which Members have a non-pecuniary interest, needed to be considered by the Member on a case by case basis in accordance with the Code of Conduct (para 14). Whether there is a real danger of bias is a matter for individual Members, knowing all the facts, but if having turned their mind to any previous involvement they might have had in taking decisions on the new museum, they are of the view that they can be impartial and decide the application on the planning merits, then it would seem to be within the range of reasonable decisions for them to conclude there was no real danger of actual or apparent bias and that they are therefore able to speak and vote. It would equally be acceptable for them to decide that they did not wish to participate in the decision on this application. She added that paragraph 34 of the City's Guidance to Members on the Code of Conduct advises that it is good practise to declare non-pecuniary interests at meetings where they arise, in the interests of transparency.

The Deputy Chairman, Sheriff Christopher Hayward declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was also a serving member of the Capital Buildings Committee but was satisfied that he had in no way pre-determined this application and would therefore speak and vote on agenda item 6.

Alderman Sir David Wootton, Deputy Keith Bottomley and Deputy Jamie Ingham-Clark also declared non-pecuniary interests as serving members of the Capital Buildings Committee but stated that they intended to speak and vote on agenda item 6.

Finally, Peter Bennett declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of both the Capital Buildings and the Markets Committee but stated that he would also be speaking and voting on agenda item 6.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered the public minutes and non-public summary of the virtual meeting held on 2 June 2020 and approved them as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

E-Scooters (page 16) – Officers clarified that a report on e-scooters that they had originally hoped to bring to this meeting had been delayed as Department for Transport (DfT) guidance on e-scooter trials had not been published in sufficient time for them to be considered ahead of the paper deadline for today. They highlighted that this report would now therefore be put to the 14 July meeting of this Committee.

Changes to the Congestion Charge (page 19) – Officers reported that the letter sent by the Chair and Deputy Chair to the Mayor of London on this matter had been circulated to all Members of the Committee. It was highlighted that the temporary changes to the congestion charge came into effect yesterday and that TfL had confirmed that the reimbursement scheme for NHS and care home staff would be extended to local authority workers and charity workers providing certain support services during the ongoing pandemic. This would include domiciliary care workers providing services on behalf of a local authority. The deadline for applying for residents' discounts had also been extended to 1 August 2020 to provide those residents not currently registered with additional time to submit their applications. Finally, Members were informed that Officers were still awaiting clarification as to the timetable and process for reviewing these temporary changes and would look to bring updates on this to the Committee when they were available.

A Member commented that he was disappointed in the limited response received to the Chair's letter. He added that a lack of clarification around the temporary period was also concerning as was the 1 August cut-off date for new applications from residents. He asked that the Chair and Officers continue to pursue these points.

Officers reported that they understood that the Chair would receive a formal response to his letter from the Mayor's office in due course. The Chair reassured Members that he had been in personal contact with the Mayor's office and confirmed that they had proactively reached out to the City Corporation as a result of the letter. He undertook to continue to pursue the concerns of Members in terms of residents' discounts and access to places of worship. The Chair went on to provide some further context by reporting that how the City Corporation was implementing its local arrangements/schemes as lockdown eased was a locally based approach and he had therefore suggested to the Mayor's office that how exemptions and the like were dealt with should also be dealt with at a local/borough level. The Chair was now waiting to see if this proposal would gain any traction.

4. **PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**
The Committee received the draft public minutes of the virtual meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee held on 26 May 2020.

RECEIVED.

5. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing the Committee's outstanding actions.

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area

A Member highlighted that a Conservation Management Plan was still awaited for this area in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document. He added that this was originally approved by this Committee in October 2018 and that he had requested an update on progress on several occasions since. He asked that this also now be included within the list of Outstanding Actions so that it was not lost sight of entirely.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that Officers were scheduling to bring this matter to Committee in Autumn 2020 and that the document was currently in draft form.

The Town Clerk undertook to update the list of Outstanding Actions accordingly.

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) re: Housing

Officers reported that the intention was to bring something on this matter to the next meeting of this Committee on 14 July 2020. Work was currently underway to finalise whether this would be a full review of the SPD or a partial review looking at affordable housing elements only.

The Chair added that Officers were trying to balance making concessions to developers where it was felt that they were appropriate in relation to economic recovery from the current pandemic with the need to reflect the Committee's wishes to correct current practices regarding affordable housing.

RECEIVED.

6. **POULTRY MARKET AND GENERAL MARKET AND THE ANNEXE BUILDINGS WEST SMITHFIELD LONDON EC1A 9PS**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding an application for the Poultry Market and General Market and The Annexe Buildings West Smithfield London EC1A 9PS. With regard to the General Market - proposals involved the partial demolition, repair, refurbishment and extension of the existing building known as the General Market at 43 Farringdon Street on the basement, ground, first and roof levels; creation of a new entrance structure on West Poultry Avenue (and

associated refurbishment of the existing canopy over West Poultry Avenue) with new facades to West Smithfield and Charterhouse Street; new entrances on the corner of Farringdon Street and Charterhouse Street; Change of use to provide a museum and ancillary uses and areas, together with a flexible retail, restaurant, drinking establishment and leisure (gym) use for the perimeter 'houses'.

Proposals for the Poultry Market included partial demolition, repair, refurbishment and alteration of the existing building known as the Poultry Market, Charterhouse Street at basement, ground and first levels; change of use to a museum and ancillary uses and areas.

Proposals for the Annexe Site (Red House, Iron Mountain, Fish Market and Engine House) include the partial demolition, refurbishment and extension of the existing buildings known as the Annexe Site at 25 Snow Hill and 29 Smithfield Street at basement, ground, first, second and third levels; creation of a triple height canopy above a public realm space; change of use to a flexible museum, offices, retail, restaurant, drinking establishment, events and functions use. Refurbishment of and minor alterations to the existing building known as the Engine House at West Smithfield at basement and ground levels; Change of use to a flexible retail and museum use.

(The proposal would provide 33,340sq.m of Museum floorspace (Class D1), 4254sq.m of flexible A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1 & D2 floorspace, 2459sq.m of flexible B1/D1 floorspace, 812sq.m of flexible A3/A4/D1 & D2 floorspace, 23sq.m of flexible A1/D1 floorspace and 86sq.m of flexible A1/A3/A4/D1 floorspace.)

The report also covers considerations under application reference 19/01344/LBC, which is an application for listed building consent in relation to the following works to the Poultry Market :

Part demolition, repair, and refurbishment of the building known at the Poultry Market, Charterhouse Street at ground, first and basement levels, associated with a change of use of the building to provide a museum and ancillary uses and areas; including: works associated with an entrance structure on West Poultry Avenue; internal alterations including creation of a part new first floor; fabric removal and refurbishment on all floors; replacement glazing; facade cleaning and other facade repair; levelling of ground floor; works of repair to the roof; installation of new heating and cooling equipment; new M&E services; repurposing of the south service bay and associated infill structure; remodelling of the north service bay; internal decoration; replacement balustrade; and other associated works as shown on the submitted plans and drawings.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director presented the application to Members, beginning by reporting that there was an update that, whilst not strictly a planning matter, did provide clarity on parliamentary issues. He highlighted that reference was made at paragraph 74 of the report to the fact that Smithfield Market is regulated by a series of Acts of Parliament, amongst them the Metropolitan Meat and Poultry Act, 1860 and the London Central Markets Act, 1875. Section 21 of the 1875 Act provides that the markets established under the 1860 act and the 1875 act shall be designated collectively as London Central Markets. Section 25 of the 1875 Act empowers the City Corporation to “... appropriate and use for any purpose, any lands acquired by them for purposes of the London Central Markets, or any of them, but not required to be retained by them for those purposes” It is currently intended that the Bill will lift all the restrictions as to use as a market from the Smithfield site. However, if a surplus resolution is passed by the City in respect of the Poultry Market, then that has the effect of removing the restrictions from that part of the site and in those circumstances the development under consideration today will not be reliant on the passage of the Bill.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director went on to state that, as paragraph 76 of the report noted, the planning system operates as a separate and self-contained statutory code. The grant of planning permission would not override the provisions of the relevant Act of Parliament. Members were informed that the planning application should be determined on its own planning merits and that it will be for any future user of the site to ensure that any relevant parcels of land are able lawfully to be used for the purposes proposed, whether through appropriation or amendment to the Acts of Parliament or otherwise.

Officers went on to refer to the additional information on the application provided to Members in the form of a virtual site visit and fly-through animation of the site as well as an addendum report and PowerPoint presentation. They stated that they would provide a further overview of the scheme today as an aide memoire.

Members were informed that the site in question was as the western end of Smithfield and included three separate buildings – the General Market, Poultry Market and the Annexe buildings. The proposed new Museum would occupy the General and Poultry Market with a mixed-use scheme on the Annexe buildings to the south. Officers reported that the General Market is a Horace Jones building 1883 and is not listed. The building had been subject to numerous alterations in the 1950s due to bomb damage. The Poultry Market is a Grade II listed building built in 1963 by T.P. Bennett and Ove Arup. The Annexe site is made up of four separate elements – the Fish Market (an 1880 Horace Jones building), the Iron Mountain site (a 1961 warehouse), the Red House (an 1899 purpose built Victorian coal store) and the Engine House (built in 1898).

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the approach to the scheme was a conservation and restoration-based approach

with some modern elements alongside this. The concept involved a very permeable and accessible public building both day and night with multiple entrances. West Poultry Avenue would be Stopped Up and was proposed as the principle entrance to the new Museum. Other access points would be located on West Smithfield and Hart's Corner. Officers went on to highlight the vehicular and other servicing points across the site as well as access to the educational facilities and where servicing points for the Poultry Market would remain.

Members were informed that the Museum concept was 'A Journey Through Time', utilising the depth of the building from the very imposing basements to the upper storeys to create flexible/adaptable spaces to depict from past time all the way through to future, imagined time.

The presentation proceeded to focus specifically on the General Market building, comprised of three elements, the imposing and spacious civic space at ground floor-level which celebrates the views to the roof and the dome as well as the Phoenix Columns. This was intended as a flexible programming/events space. The outer crust of the building (a term referring to the shops and houses around the periphery of the Market) was intended to be a rich mix of entrances to the new Museum, museum displays, educational facilities, retail units, bars and restaurants with vibrant frontages onto Smithfield and also in to the central space. The uses were designed to have a collaborative synergy with the Museum.

Members were shown images of the existing view of the General Market building, currently under restoration, to provide a clear idea of the spacious and imposing nature of its interior. The outer crust would rise up to first and second floor level with, again, ancillary retail and educational uses leading onto the Museum and facing out to the surround streets. The outer crust proposals would involve a light touch approach of conservation and new openings to provide flexible spaces for educational uses and the like. In terms of the central space here, proposed to be a very flexible and adaptable space for exhibitions displays and gatherings. Members were also shown images of the rear elevation of houses on the periphery where, again, a light touch conservation approach was proposed with selected new openings. The houses, when originally built, were quite an eclectic series of facades and proposals were to continue to reflect this eclectic mix with a diversity of approaches to shop fronts, retaining and restoring any original or existing shop fronts of merit on the site but also proposing new shop fronts within certain tenant design guidelines and creating new windows which would offer views into the Museum and its activity as well as display windows which would contain artefacts, artwork and other creative items.

At the entrance, Members were shown images of a very imposing staircase with a lift core down to the basement of the market (a particularly exceptional example of Victorian brick and steel engineering with brick vaults which reach down to Roman level making it, potentially, one of the most captivating spaces in London). Access through this point and on the landing of the stairs would be intended to celebrate the engineering scale and imposing proportions of the

space. At the end of this area, there were proposals for a café area where visitors would be able to see, hear and feel trains on a live railway track passing by through a windowed area which would be a unique experience at almost Roman levels.

Members were shown computer generated images of the look and feel of the space and the interior.

At roof level, the approach proposed was generally to restore the existing pitch roofs, however, some (which were generally concealed from any vantage point including Holborn Viaduct) would be removed and replaced with a green roof. This was considered acceptable due to the minimum impact it would have on public views.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the current General Market building itself was currently somewhat understated and restrained. The dynamic approach to creative displays proposed as well as the reinstatement of the original blinds would help to rectify this.

With regard to Poultry Avenue, Members were shown existing views of the site with an oppressive brick beam across what was proposed as the main entrance to the new Museum. This would be Stopped Up, but the Museum would commit to 7am-midnight opening to the public which would be managed through an access management plan with reviewing scope to offer enhanced access outside of these hours. On top of the entrance would be a mesh LED screen depicting images of the displays, collections and exhibitions currently on show in the Museum. The space inside was proposed to be a curative, flexible space to allow the public to pass through most hours of the day.

From West Poultry Avenue, heading east, access could be gained to the Poultry Market, a building characterised by pop-art architecture as well as a very imposing shell concrete dome roof. Proposals for the Poultry Market involved a mixture of display and events with a large temporary gallery, basement collection stores, workshops and also a research centre. The Committee were shown existing plans of the building and Members attention was drawn to Buyer's Walk, the east to west spine of the existing building. When proposed floorplans were displayed, Members were shown how Buyers Walk was picked out in a subtle way but with a new temporary gallery inserted. Officers explained that temporary galleries were increasingly important in terms of generating income and attracting new audiences.

Visitors would enter the building from West Poultry Avenue and walk into a very spacious area. Officers highlighted that one of the major debates around this application had been the arrival experience of the shell roof. Instead of celebrating the east-west axis of the roof, proposals would remove existing traders stalls and celebrate the north-south axis to give a very good appreciation of the ingenious structural aspects of the roof and these were therefore considered acceptable in historic building terms. The space would be 5.6m high and would enable the curation of world-class new exhibitions. With regard to the educational facility for schools, Officers highlighted that the

strategic goal of the Museum was to engage with every school child in London and this facility would enable them to do so by accommodating an average of 30 school visits per day. To the east on East Poultry Avenue, would be the entrance to the lecture theatre.

At first floor level, Members were shown an existing view featuring market stalls and a rather unexceptional roofscape. Proposals involved the removal and replacement of these with a new, slightly higher level, insert to provide another flexible space for exhibitions. It would also create a powerful vantage point to appreciate the fine curved roof and allow views, on the north side of the building, into the centre for research, restoration and conservation and critical back of house elements currently not visible to the public.

An element of the scheme that was contentious in historic building terms was the removal of the clerestory glazing and its like for like replacement. Many retention options had been explored, however, the replacement was considered to be acceptable (including the replacement of the 'fritting'), firstly because it would match the original joinery and details of the windows and secondly because it would allow the Museum to take a passive energy approach. This would, however, be conditioned.

Members were shown the entrance from ground floor level down to the basement, where the proposal was for the museum to allow visitors to go down and immerse themselves in their rich collection stores, much of which was not currently accessible to the public.

Finally, with regards to the Annexe sites to the south-west, Officers reported that this part of the development was not within the curtilage of the Museum but would serve as rich ecosystem of office use (aimed at SMEs and those working in the creative industry), retail, restaurants and gyms amongst others to complement the Museum setting. Members were informed that the existing Fish Market was currently being stabilised and that proposals here involved a conservation approach to celebrate and reinvent the existing architect. As with the General Market building, the brick vaults within the Annexe buildings were hugely impressive and it was proposed to open these up to the public with active uses. The Red House would provide office floor space. A roof terrace would also be provided here as would a new 'Iron Mountain' canopy between the Fish Market and the Red House. The canopy was intended to celebrate the rich legacy of steelwork and architecture of the market buildings and was considered to be a very convincing, contemporary reinterpretation of this.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the Red House, originally designed as a coal store, would see a new two storey extension as well as alterations to the windows. The proposal involved a very sensitive/sympathetic creation of new window openings to provide light to the new office accommodation within. The new roof extension was a contemporary design, setback to be deferential to the main building. It would, however, be designed in a manner which picks up on the architecture of the existing building.

Finally, Members were shown images of the proposed new Iron Mountain canopy, an imposing steel structure which would sit over a new wedge-shaped area of adaptable, flexible public realm which could be utilised throughout the year and also throughout the night.

With regard to the Engine House, Members were informed that proposals were to celebrate and re-enliven the existing building with the addition of a new green roof and to utilise the building as a new A use building.

Officers concluded by discussing the key planning issues and the recommendations before Members, indicating that the report was very clear and acknowledged that the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan policies that seek to support the continued presence of Smithfield Market as market uses will be displaced from the Poultry Market. Although there would be a diminishment in the capacity of Smithfield Market through the loss of the Poultry Market, the majority of traders in units operate from within the east and west market which would continue as part of the proposal. Critically, the scheme had been designed to co-exist alongside an operational meat market, the operational times of the two uses complement each other with only a small element of overlap that would be carefully managed.

Members were informed that very careful consideration had been given to potential Section 278 works and the delivery of servicing arrangements and the impact that the proposal would have on the market during construction of the Museum. These were considered proportional and reasonable by the Market Superintendent, who oversaw the operation of the market, to allow the market to continue to function unhindered. The Transport addendum which forms part of the scheme demonstrates that there is a solution, however, this would continue to be refined in consultation with all relevant stakeholders.

Officers reported that the proposed Museum use was supported on the basis of the City's wider cultural aspirations and the vision of the Smithfield area as part of the Culture Mile and the very substantial wider public benefits the scheme offers in an area characterised by diverse uses including cultural attractions. It was also highlighted that the scheme was a strategic development which would generate significant employment, spending and tourism which would benefit the economy. It would secure a long-term occupier for these buildings, breathing life into and enlivening these and the surrounding public realm. It would transform the market buildings into a world class museum, retail and office use area – uses that would inevitably require physical change to the historic fabric. These alterations to original features through the remodelling of the Poultry Market interior will, to a degree, diminish the original layout and fabric however, any harm is considered to be clearly outweighed by the wider public benefit. It is considered that the proposed changes are justified, sensitive and skilful in the way that they successfully weave together Victorian, 20th century and contemporary architecture. The site would enable the museum to enhance its visitor offering and to showcase more of its collection and back of house research/conservation work to the public for the first time. The social benefits of the scheme are considered substantial, allowing all sections of the community, irrespective of economic and social position, to access and appreciate the

interiors of such historically significant buildings and the Museum's collection. The scheme also provides the opportunity for the museum to expand its work with communities around wellbeing and social inclusion and will provide enhanced learning space allowing more engagement with schools.

Officers stated that they considered the scheme to be exemplary in its environmental and sustainability credentials. The circle economy principles adopted with the re-use and salvaging of existing fabric is also considered exemplary as well as the connection to Citigen. The scheme is considered as an exceptional and world-class example of the sensitive restoration and reuse of historic buildings whilst maximising economic and socially inclusive public access.

In conclusion, overall, the scheme was considered as an exceptional opportunity to sensitively revive an underutilised area of Smithfield into a new destination of London, if not UK-wide, importance that would be accessible to all groups in the community and have significant social, educational, cultural, economic, historic buildings and environmental benefits and was therefore recommended favourably to the Committee.

In advance of the Chair calling speakers to address the Committee, a Member raised a point of order stating that he and other members of the Committee had been sent an email from the Chairman of the Smithfield Market Tenants Association (SMTA) this morning containing some representations that he wished to draw to their attention. He stated that he was aware that this correspondence had been sent to the Case Officer on Friday afternoon and was therefore surprised that it had not been shared with Members in advance of this meeting, particularly when a further addendum containing representations sent after those from the Chair of the SMTA and his association was circulated yesterday. He questioned what Members and the applicant ought to now do with these representations and why they were not included in the addendum. The Chair responded that he was aware of this and intended, at this stage, to ensure that all Members had now received this information and had had adequate time to read through it. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that, in essence, this was external correspondence between two third parties and not directed to the City Corporation. He added that if Officers were to include all similar types of correspondence between parties involved in an application, background papers would be immense. Officers had, however, considered the correspondence and the issues raised in it and noted that it reiterated issues that had already been made as part of the objectors' statement and were therefore addressed in the report. The Chair asked that the Town Clerk now circulate the correspondence sent by the SMTA this morning to allow Members time to read this whilst the Committee were addressed by speakers.

The Chair introduced Mr Gregory Lawrence, a registered objector, in his capacity as Chairman of the SMTA and invited him to address the Committee. Mr Lawrence clarified that he was speaking on behalf of the SMTA and as a market trader within the central markets. He reported that the markets had been very successfully operating from this site for hundreds of years and

intended to do so for the foreseeable future as they had long, strong leases that were capable of being renewed. He also highlighted that Smithfield Market was here by Royal Charter. Whilst the SMTA did not oppose the principles of regenerating the redundant Smithfield General Market, they consider there to be substantial and significant gaps in the submitted planning application and a lack of certainty and cohesiveness around the long-term plans for the market complex, meaning that they felt that the application was premature. Mr Lawrence reported that the SMTA had submitted a detailed representation to this effect in February 2020 and that their concerns had yet to be fully addressed. The SMTA were also concerned about the potential conflict of interest for various Members of this Committee who also sit on the Markets Committee, the Capital Buildings Committee and the Board of Governors of the Museum of London, all of whom would seem to have a vested interest in seeing the Museum of London's proposals approved. They were also concerned about a lack of consultation from the applicant, specifically the SMTA had not been consulted on the developing details of servicing, traffic and public realm. Whilst the applicant had consulted the Market Superintendent, he is employed by and represent the City Corporation and not the SMTA. The SMTAs input would have helped to inform the proposed development, chiefly, proposals regarding traffic, pedestrian movement and the public realm. Mr Lawrence went on to assert that there were a series of inaccuracies within the planning application, highlighting that, importantly, the Poultry Market is not, as indicated, surplus to requirements. He added that the Poultry Market was an active part of the central markets, accounting for up to 35% of the trade of the whole of Smithfield and that employment figures referenced within the planning submission were also wholly inaccurate and misleading in the context of this application.

Mr Lawrence commented that, whilst the applicant had explored the economic benefits associated with the relocation of the Museum of London, they have not considered the disruption and disturbance caused to market traders and the economic implications of this. Insufficient information had been provided to establish how the Museum and Central Markets could operate alongside each other without operational conflicts, particularly in terms of servicing and deliveries. The application contains too much flexibility in terms of the range and quantum of uses proposed making it difficult for Officers and Members to truly understand and make an informed judgement. This flexibility also made it challenging to establish appropriate planning obligations, affordable housing contributions and CIL contributions. He commented that the planning application lacked any detail for the public realm which would be severely compromised by the applicants expected 2 million new visitors per annum. This concern had also been raised by the GLA who had requested further information in relation to a number of technical queries including costs, phasing and deliverability of public realm measures.

Mr Lawrence concluded by stating that the SMTA believed that the application was premature in so far that it assumes the short and long-term relocation of the markets when no such plans had been agreed with them and the principle of long-term relocation is founded on emerging rather than adopted planning policies. Mr Lawrence commented that the SMTA had raised other technical matters which he did not have time to cover today but added that he trusted

that Members had read their submissions and would seek clarity from Officers on all such matters. He stated that a comprehensive approach was required for this sensitive and important London site and not the piecemeal approach that created uncertainty around the longer term future of Smithfield Market and the businesses that trade there or those suppliers and customers who are dependent on the markets. In summary, he highlighted that the SMTA felt that there were substantial and significant gaps in the submitted planning application which made it impossible for the City Corporation to establish the true impacts of the proposed development which should be refused or deferred until the issues outlined had been addressed.

The Chair thanked Mr Lawrence for his contribution and invited questions from Members.

A Member questioned Mr Lawrence on a lack of consultation with traders which it was suggested had been carried out through the Market Superintendent only. She also referred to the suggestion that the market would need to relocate ancillary facilities and questioned how important these were to the running of the market as well as whether Mr Lawrence had any view as to where they might be relocated to.

Mr Lawrence reported that the SMTA were in talks with the Director of the Museum of London in 2015-2017 but that these were concerning the Museum of London relocating to the Annexe buildings – the Red House, the General Market and the basement of the Poultry Market. At no time was utilising the whole of the Poultry Market discussed up until the beginning of 2018. Mr Lawrence went on to reference several meetings between the Museum of London and the SMTA that had taken place from 2018 onwards, highlighting that, on 23 November 2018, the SMTA were presented with detailed designs for the upper floor of the Poultry Market but had refused to consider these as tenants had no plans to vacate the building which was made clear at the meeting as was the fact that if these plans were publicly consulted on the SMTA would have to oppose them. At subsequent meetings, the Director of the Museum of London had been asked to look at a phased move, but it was highlighted that this would be more costly for the Museum. The SMTA advised the Director, at this stage, to hold back on the consultation at the end of February 2019 until tenants had more information which she agreed to. Mr Lawrence went on to report that on 26 June 2019, the public consultation display images were delivered to the SMTA containing images of the whole market. A meeting between the SMTA and the Director which took place on 28 June 2019 was for the purpose of providing updates only and no subsequent meetings took place by way of consultation.

With regard to the ancillary facilities, Mr Lawrence stressed that these were absolutely vital to the running of Smithfield Market and that the SMTA had no idea as to where they could be satisfactorily relocated. He added that there were currently ten successful and vital businesses operating out of the Poultry Market and that the SMTA also had concerns as to where these would be relocated despite suggestions that they could be housed in the East and West Market. Mr Lawrence went on to question how Smithfield Market would be

expected to run at 60% of what it currently does without the Poultry Market. He also questioned how this project would ever work should the Barking project not proceed.

Another Member wished to explore the issue of co-existence further with Mr Lawrence. He referred to paragraph 111 of the report which stated “the City as landlord and manager of the markets has been investigating the relocation of these facilities as part of the market’s consolidation programme. Re-location of the facilities into City owned 79-83 Charterhouse Street, the Rotunda Basement Carpark and areas within the East and West Markets would be possible”. And questioned whether any of this had been discussed with the SMTA. He went on to question how many basements there were in the Poultry Market that tenants were currently using, how the SMTA had arrived at a figure of 35% for the Poultry Market and whether it was possible to phase the move so that the General Market could be the primary focus for the Museum with the Poultry Market being phased in thereafter. He went on to refer to the SMTA’s views that the application today was premature and questioned whether this was because there may be a better scheme to come forward. Mr Lawrence reported that the Museum had touched upon relocating certain facilities within Grand Avenue which the SMTA did not think was feasible. With regard to the figure of 35%, Mr Lawrence stated that this was arrived at through analysing tonnage and turnover and added that it would have been preferable for the Committee to visit Smithfield Market in the early hours of the morning to see exactly how it operates and how busy the Poultry Market is.

With regard to basements, Mr Lawrence reported that some but not all businesses located here had a basement. He added that there was also vacant space that needed to be let in the Poultry Market at present.

The Deputy Chairman asked Mr Lawrence what he regarded as the most significant planning objections/considerations that Members could legitimately consider in making their decision today. Mr Lawrence stated that servicing was vital in this respect as was the conflict in terms of co-existence given the SMTA’s views that there was too much flexibility in the application in terms of the range and quantum of uses proposed and the difficulties this created in terms of establishing appropriate planning obligations.

A Member asked for clarity as to whether the ongoing discussions around SMTA members leases and the potential future location of the Market, whilst important, were planning matters. The Comptroller and City Solicitor advised that it was not uncommon, when considering a redevelopment scheme, for planning permission to come forward very early in the process, ahead of any compulsory purchase order. This meant that there were often leaseholders or owners still in occupation. Members were informed that these were essentially commercial arrangements that would need to be resolved before a development could be commenced. They were not, however, material to planning. That being said, the desirability of retaining a market and market operations on site was material.

The Chair invited Sharon Ament, Director of the Museum of London, speaking in favour of the application, to address the Committee. On consultation, the Director stated that she was genuinely saddened to hear from Mr Lawrence on the SMTAs concerns. However, she added that she was really confident about the Museum's extensive approach to consultation and looked forward to productive dialogue with the SMTA in the future. The Museum would relish the opportunity to operate alongside and in harmony with a thriving wholesale meat market. The Director went on to report that, since 2015, when the Museum had first announced its intent to move, they had been in active consultation and had engaged with over 13,000 people. During the 2019 public consultation, it became evident that there was a very strong public backing for this scheme with 96% of respondents voicing their support. Since submission of the scheme over 70 letters of support had also been received. Of particular note in this regard, were the positive, strong letters of support from heritage organisations – Historic England, SAVE and the Victorian Society amongst them. However, in spite of all of this support, the Museum did also recognise the objection that had just been made on behalf of the SMTA and it that regard the Museum team had worked extremely hard to ensure that the new Museum could work successfully alongside the functioning meat market through both the construction phase and operation.

The Director went on to refer to social need, highlighting that the Museum was a civic space, a place of learning, exploration and social interaction. The Museum would be able to do all of this with much greater effect via this project and, in particular, to better fulfil its ambitions of enabling schools/young people and future generations to engage in the history of London and to better understand and participate in their City. The designs for the West Smithfield site and the proposed world-class learning facilities would help meet society's current demands around engagement, empathy and understanding and would give the Museum the opportunity to better reflect the breadth of London's diverse communities (BAME, women and LGBTQ+).

In terms of economic and environmental impact, the Director stated that the aim was for this project to create very real social and public value. 1,700 new jobs would be created in the Museum and through its supply chain. Meanwhile, the 2 million people visiting each year would benefit businesses in the local area. The new Museum was also expected to generate a huge £755 million in GVA to the economy over a ten-year period and that economic growth would be spread right across London to all boroughs. With regard to climate change, Members were informed the Museum were aiming for a BREEAM rating of excellent with an extensive plan that would see their CO2 emissions reduced by 42%, all of which were part of the design principles which encompass and embrace the circular economy.

Finally, the Director spoke on the Museums vision and this extraordinary, once in a generation, opportunity created through this design for its galleries, shops and places where people can meet, research and delve into the London Collections. The Museum's plan was to be the most open, accessible and connected museum ever. As well as connecting with people, the Museum would connect with the surrounding neighbourhood and they themselves would

also be connected with unparalleled transport links, right in the centre of the City of London. The Director concluded by thanking Officers for their diligence in bringing this application forward and stated that she was joined today by several colleagues – Paul Williams, Lead Architect, Stanton Williams and his colleague Rawdon Pettitt. Roy McGowan, Highways Advisor, Momentum Transport, Alec Shaw, the Museum of London's Project Director and Jeremy Randall, Partner, Gerald Eve LLP – all of whom were able to respond to any technical questions Members might have.

The Chair thanked the Director for her contribution and invited questions from Members.

A Member questioned why the Museum were fixed on visitor numbers of 2 million per annum which was a significant increase on the Museum of London's visitor numbers over the past two years but was much less than some of the main competitor museums in London which attracted 4-6 million per annum and therefore seemed rather modest. The Director reported that a number of studies had been carried out from the beginning of this project, through to the present day, looking at the likelihood of visitor numbers and needed to arrive at a number for the Museum's business case. Others had similarly suggested that this was a rather modest projection but for business planning purposes and to create the design of the museum with all of its functionality, this number had been arrived at and plans were now working around this to create the facilities to accommodate this number of visitors. The Director stated that she hoped that in the future, the Museum would be dealing with the problems of absolute success, but the current projections had been based on a wealth of information and intelligence.

The Member went on to state that, in his opinion, the design did not take full advantage of the logistical advantages that the site offered and was disappointed to see that, with approximately 80% of visitors to the new museum presumably set to arrive from Farringdon Station and being directed up to the museum via Cowcross Street, a huge opportunity was being missed in not having a dedicated and safer route particularly for visiting school parties. He questioned whether the Director was disappointed at not being able to secure this. The Director stated that the Museum was hugely ambitious as an organisation but were working within the designs which they felt are appropriate. The Director asked Roy McGowan to also comment on this particular point. Mr McGowan confirmed that there were conversations with Islington Council, TfL and the City of London Corporation very early on in the project and in the early stages of the Crossrail proposals but it was clear that this would be a very difficult route to achieve. More recent conversations with Islington Council's Transport Department had confirmed that a dedicated route for the Museum would not be achievable now given how far advanced the Crossrail station works are.

Another Member repeated that he remained very concerned about coexistence. Members were being told that, because of the Act, that it may be that the Poultry Market may take some time to be declared surplus. His question to the Director was therefore whether it was possible to phase the development to

enable a period of transition where the General Market and those areas that were surplus could be developed but the Poultry Market was not so that the Market could continue operations until it was able to be properly relocated whether that was to Barking or elsewhere in due course. Secondly, the Member questioned coexistence in terms of operational hours and deliveries and asked whether the Director would accept that there should be restrictions placed on the Museum to ensure that the meat market was still able to function as it needs to. The Director reported that the issue of phasing had been looked at in great depth but that it was virtually impossible to do a phased design. She asked Paul Williams to comment further on the technicalities of this. Mr Williams reported that plans for the Poultry Market involved a temporary gallery but also a permanent collection and research laboratories below ground all of which were a key part of the Museum's vision. Without these and the educational areas and loading bays as part of the overall plan, it was unlikely that this would be a viable option. Consideration was given to using parts of the Annexe building for this purpose as part of a phased development but the spaces that this offered were not appropriate for housing this, even in the interim. The Director clarified that this application was for the full scheme. In terms of operational hours, the Director reiterated that the Museum would very much relish the opportunity to work alongside a functioning meat market and felt that this would help to tell the story of London in a very evocative and compelling way. She felt that the Museum had provided assurances around how the hours of its operation would work with those of the market and invited Roy McGowan to comment further. Mr McGowan reported that this had been examined in great detail and reported that there was a servicing area located underneath the General Market accessible via a ramp previously utilised for the Crossrail construction works. This could be fully self-contained for the needs of the market and waste management. A further servicing area would be situated to the north side of the Poultry Market within an area that was not currently heavily utilised by vehicles for the market itself. All of the servicing for the new Museum could be accommodated within this area as detailed within the transport reports. There would be limited on-street servicing for when the museum held events, and this would be in the late afternoon period and therefore not impact on market operations. From the studies undertaken, when the large market vehicles begin to arrive in the evening, there was plenty of capacity to accommodate them. The Market loading areas began to be more fully utilised from midnight onwards and, again, the museum operations would not impact on this. The market area was generally cleaned from 7-8am each morning and returned to commuter/pedestrian movements soon afterwards which is when the museum would expect to see the arrival of visitors to the area. Co-existence, from all of the detailed studies carried out by the applicant, therefore looked to work well.

A Member questioned why the BREEAM ratings for the Annexe buildings would only seek to be 'very good' which fell short of policy requirements. More broadly, he asked how the carbon target reduction figure of 58% based on the energy statement had been arrived at within the context of all now wanting to see net zero carbon within a reasonably short space of time and certainly within the early life of the proposed development. The Director responded that it was really important to recognise that the new museum would be inhabiting old

buildings which came with inherent issues around this. She also asked Members to consider the fact that the development would be re-using an old building itself as being a very sustainable approach. The Director invited Rawdon Pettitt to comment further. Mr Rawdon commented that he felt it was clear from the submission that the applicant was committed to environmental and sustainable causes and that this was at the core of these proposals. He added that they were also trying to work within the context of existing buildings. With regard to BREEAM ratings both the design team and the applicant have ambitions to achieve the highest credentials possible but, in calculating ratings, several factors are taken into account around the extent of work being carried out. With regard to the Red House, what was referred to as a 'category A' fit out would be undertaken which would provide additional points and achieve an excellent rating, however, with the fish market, a 'shell and core' approach was being carried out to provide maximum flexibility and also to retain a lot of the historic character of the space – this meant that less points were awarded taking the rating to just below excellent. The design team had, however, continued to look at ways in which they might be able to gain further credit and it was their intention to work with the applicant to explore this in future stages as development progressed. Jeremy Randall spoke to state that the scheme was exemplary in energy terms and that a 58% reduction in carbon was extremely good having regard to the nature and fabric of the buildings. The proposed connection to Citigen also helped with the overall reduction. Members were informed that the 58% reduction was set against a benchmark of the Building Regulations, Part L, 2013 and the Stage 3 assessment carried out had considered this. As the development progressed through further stages this was expected to improve. Some of the carbon reduction achieved would be dependent on how Citigen operates and decarbonises in coming years.

Another Member spoke to commend the vision, stating that she could not think of a more appropriate site to move the museum to. She went on, however, to seek further clarity and assurances around co-existence with the existing market which could remain on site for some years. She noted that the Museum had submitted a further consultation addendum in May 2020 which addressed relocating the markets ancillary facilities, the public realm and highway proposals but questioned whether the Director felt, given that this had been submitted in the midst of the current pandemic, that the market traders had had sufficient opportunity to digest and respond to this information. Finally, she asked whether the Director was assured that, if the market did not move from its current site, this scheme was viable, particularly if the Poultry Market were not available. The Director reiterated that this planning application was for the General Market, the Poultry Market and the Annexe buildings and that the Museum believed that the relocation of the market was a City of London Corporation matter.

The Chair asked that Members now move to debate the application.

A Member spoke to record his strong support for the application which he felt would provide a great new home for the Museum of London to expand in a location with the best accessibility in London. It would also provide a major anchor for the Culture Mile and primed the regeneration of this area, especially

the General Market and Annexe buildings. He added that, over the past 25 years, he had been involved with this site, including with the two previously aborted schemes for these buildings where it had been clear from the eventual outcome of the two applications that the Government's Planning Inspectorate was not prepared to countenance a commercially viable solution for the site. Instead, they were prepared to see the site deteriorate until a funder could be found to expend huge resource just to retain buildings. He felt that the City were therefore very fortunate, after a quarter of a century, to find both a very suitable occupier and funders prepared to pay the cost of building retention and hoped to see the scheme before the Committee approved today and eventually fully developed. However, he stated that the cost to the public purse as a result of previous decision delays occasioned by the Planning Inspectorate should be publicly recognised and steps taken to avoid a similar repetition.

Another Member stated that he had some questions arising from both the applicant and the objector speeches. He added that this application was for a site within his Ward and had both positive and negative attributes. The positive would be moving the museum into a building which could suit its future needs, the negative was around the need to coexist with what was already on site. He went on to state that this was not an application for the General Market building only but also for the Poultry Market and that he remained unsatisfied that this aspect of the scheme could work. He noted that Officers had confirmed that the development of the Poultry Market would not be permitted until the Act was changed and that it was presumably unlawful, therefore, to expect this to go forward in the absence of this. This could perhaps be overcome by phasing the scheme but, as the applicant had stressed, this could not be done. The Member noted that the GLA had also posed a very specific question around whether, despite a loss of 27 market stalls, the overall functionality of the remaining east and west central market would be unaffected. That assurance was not, however, given, neither was information as to where the ancillary facilities could be relocated despite reference at paragraph 111 to this being investigated by the City as landlord. The Member concluded by stating that he was keen for the museum scheme to work but, in the absence of a phased approach and no guarantees as to the market vacating this site, he was not satisfied that it could whilst also ensuring that the overall functionality of the remaining market was not affected as per the planning steer from the Mayor. He stated that he was deeply disappointed to be presented with this report which did not resolve the problems around co-existence that were discussed over two years ago and that a solution around phasing had not been identified. This was a land-use matter, with a public duty for the City Corporation to maintain a market in the centre of London until such time as Parliament directed otherwise. Planning Policy also underlined the need to support the market. He was of the view that the Museum had now extended the scheme to the maximum with no interim plan as to how the market could continue to provide its critical function as they had done during the current pandemic. He asked that the applicant revisit these issues within this complex and important project in which coexistence was critical and not adequately covered by conditions and planning obligations as currently drafted. He asked Officers whether they would agree that, at the moment, the remaining function of the east and west central market is affected. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and

Development Director reported that, on coexistence in terms of servicing, these elements had been reviewed by the City's own highways team, TfL, the Market Superintendent and Momentum who had addressed the Committee earlier. He added that there were plans for some facilities within the Poultry Market to relocate into the General Market and that it was his understanding that the applicant would be willing to have this as a condition of permission, to ensure that these works were in place before implementation. The Chair requested that Officers seek some clarity from the applicant on exactly what that condition would be so that Members could be updated prior to a decision being taken.

Another Member referred to the Museum of London wishing to relocate from its present site and wishing to have planning permission granted now to facilitate its raising of funds for a proposed opening on site in 2024 given that both matters were mentioned within the report. He questioned Officers as to whether these matters were relevant planning considerations. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that funding arrangements were not a relevant planning consideration and did not inform Officers recommendations. The fact that the museum wished to relocate from their current site was, however, thought to be relevant and a material consideration as it underpinned their rationale for this application. The Member responded to question why funding had therefore been included in the report without highlighting that it was not a relevant planning consideration to ensure that Members did not decide the application for the wrong reasons and to make it clear that there was no urgency attached to this. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that this was background information in terms of information submitted by the applicant in support of the application but was not a key driver in terms of the recommendations. He accepted that this point could have been made clearer in the report and that there was no urgency around approving the application in relation to funding as this was not a relevant planning consideration.

Another Member spoke to comment on the fact that these proposals were around a very clearly underdeveloped and underutilised part of the City which many would like to see rejuvenated, enlivened and brought to greater public and social benefit. He added that it was very important now that Officers were absolutely clear as to what could practically and realistically be conditioned in so far as coexistence was concerned. His specific question, given the embracing and acceleration of the use of active transport, was around the provision for short stay cycle parking. He remarked that, bearing in mind the projection for 2 million visitors a year, this scheme needed to work a lot harder to provide for this. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that the key part of this scheme to enable coexistence was the Section 278 works which would be refined to ensure that these broad stakeholders were taken into account. The information contained within the transport addendum was one potential solution and the scheme would have a 5-year condition. In terms of short-term cycle spaces, Officers reported that cycle parking had now become much more critical in current circumstances with people needing to avoid public transport in a way that was not previously the case. As a result, including significant amounts of public cycle parking around the museum and around the Culture Mile area more broadly would be a

key consideration in developing both the Section 278 and the Culture Mile proposals.

The Chief Commoner spoke to report that he had campaigned for over two decades now to get the meat market moved from the centre of London to a more suitable location. He commented that, beyond planning, this was also a huge political issue and that he had sympathy with the SMTA's views that this application was premature. He asked that the Chair consider discussing this matter with the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee and others to ask that negotiations take place with all of the Smithfield Traders so that an overall positive political climate in which to foster and advance plans for the market could be established. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that he did not feel that there were grounds for deferral of this application on the grounds that it was premature.

The Chair interjected to clarify that the Committee were here to decide on this planning application and to weigh up the public benefits versus the loss of some of the market and market facilities as very clearly summarised by the Chief Interim Planning Officer and Development Director in concluding his original presentation. The working of the market alongside the museum, if consent was granted, was an important planning consideration but was a separate matter in relation to the physical space given to those various elements. He added that it appeared that Officers were indicating that there was some latitude as to the facilities that could be afforded to the market in terms of relocation and asked that they clarified this point or whether Members were actually faced with a decision as to the potential loss of these facilities to be weighed up against any overall public benefits. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that Officers could come up with a Grampian condition to ensure that the future of these facilities was satisfactorily addressed prior to the commencement of works. The Chair asked that the details of this be clarified for Members in due course.

Another Member spoke to commend Officers on a very comprehensive report and reported that he had also written to request some of the supporting information around the transport assessment. He went on to state that his main concern was that the Committee seemed to be considering a planning application for a very interesting project but one that was done in isolation in terms of the public realm and wider proposals for West Smithfield and that he would have liked to have seen a sort of Masterplan in terms of this. He added that much of the public realm appeared to be confined to a small area around the market and the Annexe buildings and would be subject to a Section 278 agreement which had not yet been agreed. Officers made reference to this at paragraph 443 of the report and indicated the areas they hoped to reach agreement on but the Member stated that he was surprised that there were not proposals for the pedestrianisation of the west part of Smithfield Road (the road between the new museum and the Annexe buildings) as he felt that this could help ensure the safety of visitors, particularly school parties. He concluded by stating that this was pre-emptive in a sense as a lot of the short stay cycle bays were being situated around the Rotunda.

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

Officers reported that the concept for the Section 278 works were being done in close coordination and cooperation with the emerging public realm in this area. The Museum had been in close contact with the Culture Mile team and those designing the public realm to ensure that the bigger picture was not lost sight of. The proposals were operating at slightly different timescales, but this did not mean that they could not and would not be appropriately coordinated. In terms of changes to the public realm and the highways that were being considered as a result of the museum's application, these fell into two categories – one was essential, including the facilitating of school children circulating safely around the site and a second category of changes that was desirable in terms of creating a world-class public realm around a world-class museum. It was unclear at this stage whether this second category of changes would be delivered as part of the initial Section 278 agreement, a subsequent 278 agreement or as part of the Culture Mile proposal. This would depend, to some extent, on the timing around these proposals being brought forward and the timing of the markets move to Barking if that were to proceed as currently planned. The second category of desirable but not necessary works would include the pedestrianisation of west Smithfield and it was recognised that this was probably not achievable in the first instance where significant HGV access would still be required to the museum. This had therefore been assessed specifically and Officers considered that widening the footways would allow the museum and the market to coexist safely without necessarily needing to pedestrianise the area. The Chair added that a Public Realm Working Party had also been established for this area which he was chairing and was taking a wholistic approach to how this area should look and feel with work moving at pace.

The Deputy Chairman stated that he was of the view that this was one of the most important and exciting cultural applications that this Committee had considered during his tenure. If supported today, the scheme would contribute hugely to the regeneration of a fundamental part of the City that this organisation had backed as the Culture Mile. He commended the applicant on the very sensitive ways that they were planning to use these remarkable buildings to create a huge visitor attraction for the City, the rest of London and beyond. He commented that it was rare for this Committee to be presented with a scheme that had so many public benefits and underlined that it was important for Members to focus on the application before them today. A lot of important debate had been engaged upon thus far around issues that were fundamentally important to many different stakeholders but were not the scheme presented today. This was not a phased proposal or an application for some of the buildings to be used and not others. He stated that he was very conscious, as were all Members, that there were major negotiations underway with the market tenants in the background but that those were not issues for this Committee to consider today. Political leadership was, indeed, needed over these issues as the Chief Commoner had suggested. The Deputy Chair went on to note that the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director had made reference

to the Act and that Members had subsequently debated this but that this was also not relevant to the Committee's deliberations. Often planning consent was granted where other issues still needed to be resolved outside of the planning process before works could ever commence and this would undoubtedly be one such scheme where this applied. He concluded by stating that he believed that this application should be granted and that, if it were, it would add to the City Corporation's global status not only as a business city but also as a number one cultural destination.

Another Member spoke to reiterate that she thought that this was a fantastic vision for one of the most appropriate buildings in London. She did, however, still have concerns around the need to coexist with a busy market which was the current situation on site and could well be for some time. She agreed with the points already made by other Members around the application being premature and also around the great extent of the planning application which now included the still functioning Poultry Market. According to one of the representations, the City had now stopped leasing units in the Poultry Market which she found concerning. In fact, the Market may, in due course, need to expand because of increased business demand and there appeared to be a void of information as to how the market and the new museum would operate side by side successfully with this factored in or, indeed, if the facilities that were vital to the running of the market were to be relocated if the Museum was to expand into the Poultry Market. She added that the piecemeal approach being taken to the public realm also seemed to be a missed opportunity. Members needed to ensure that what was granted was deliverable and that both operations – the market and a new museum – could safely coexist and thrive given that the market itself was clearly a huge public benefit. She concluded by stating that she was of the view that this application was premature for all of the reasons she had outlined.

Officers robustly reiterated that they did not consider this application to be in any way premature and underlined that the Committee should not underestimate the vast amount of work undertaken by the applicant to ensure that, operationally, the market and museum could coexist without compromising one another. This had also been agreed with the Superintendent of the Market who oversee the operation of the market. Officers went on to read the suggested wording of the Grampian condition that they would be happy to impose concerning the ancillary market uses which currently exist within the Poultry Market. It was proposed that this read: "That no development take place in respect of the Poultry Market until the supporting facilities (which include but are not limited to APP facility, ancillary office areas, workshop stores, welfare areas, palette and packaging collection and forklift storage) have been satisfactorily relocated to an equivalent level of provision". Officers requested delegated authority to finalise the wording of the condition in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman. A Member commented that, as the Deputy Chairman also sat on the Capital Buildings Committee where this scheme had already been debated, the wording of the condition should be negotiated with the Chair and another Member to avoid any potential misunderstanding from objectors. The Deputy Chairman commented that had he felt that there was any bias or predetermination on his part he would not have taken part in this debate

and would not vote, as he intended to, on this application. He added that he was absolutely clear that the Capital Buildings Committee had looked at the scheme from the City Corporation's perspective but did not get involved in any planning deliberations whatsoever. He therefore felt able to be part of this debate/vote and subsequently the consultation around a Grampian condition and ensuring that this was carried out.

In order to provide further assurances around concerns about prematurity, the Comptroller and City Solicitor reiterated that it was not unusual for many planning applications to have background issues that needed to be resolved ahead of development commencing. In terms of any concerns around existing leaseholders still being present on site, it was highlighted that this was also often the case and that, often, the granting of planning consent was conducive to moving forward any negotiations that were relevant to the site but outside of planning considerations. With regard to ancillary facilities and the issue of coexistence, Officers had proposed what was felt to be an enforceable planning obligation that should address Members concerns.

The Member came back to state that there were traders in the Poultry Market at present and that there was not scope for them to move into the east or west market. She questioned whether this matter would also, therefore be conditioned, so that existing traders would not be displaced until such time as adequate space was found for them to allow them to continue their business. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director clarified that this condition was not being proposed and that the report was very clear that there would be a diminishment in the traders from the Poultry Market. The Markets Team were trying to find alternative locations for the traders but had been unable to do so to date. The Chair added that Members were balancing the loss of some of the market against wider public benefit.

A Member spoke to state that he felt that this an incredibly exciting project, not least in educational terms, for what he felt was a rather unsung institution. However, he was struggling with this application for all of the reasons already outlined and also felt that it was therefore premature in coming forward. If, as he understood it, there was no scope for deferral, even for a short period, to resolve these points he would find it very difficult to support the application. Officers reiterated that the work already undertaken to date provided sufficient comfort to them on all of the points raised today and stressed that this work would continue under Section 278. The application was therefore for decision today.

Another Member spoke to state that he disagreed that this application was premature. He spoke on the current state of the building which he described as terrible and underlined that he therefore did not think that the Committee should delay a decision as this would only lead to the further deterioration of the building and the historic fabric.

Another Member spoke to express concern that many Members seemed to still be referring to issues that were not planning considerations. He underlined that planning permission could be put forward for land that an applicant did not yet

own. Clearly if there was legislation that needed to be overcome in order for the development to proceed then that was the case, but it was not for this Committee to hold up the application on the basis that that legislative obstacle needed to be otherwise overcome. He added that he did not think deferring the application was an option and that he would be voting in favour for it today, putting aside non-planning considerations.

A Member highlighted that the report illustrated the sensitivity of the site and the strong feelings around its development. The issues for the meat traders needed to be resolved but, as had now been made clear by many, were not planning considerations. He added that these proposals would safeguard the future of these buildings after a hiatus of some 30 years and would bring significant social, cultural, educational and economic benefits to London and the UK. He urged fellow Members to join with him in strongly supporting this application.

A Member spoke again to make a point on the general application, noting that the report stated that “the scheme is driven by conservation and enhancement of the existing buildings which will be repaired and renewed to best conservation practice”. He commented that this preservation of our heritage which lies at the heart of the scheme, and is rightly celebrated, was not attributable to the City Corporation. He went on to state that, in the recent past, this Committee granted planning permission to demolish the General Market and Annexe – buildings that were saved by the intervention of the campaigning organisation Save Britain’s Heritage and, ultimately central government who overrode the City Corporation’s decision. Since Save Britain’s Heritage had been instrumental here, he asked that this Committee listen carefully to the views of this organisation on any future applications that come before Members.

The Chief Commoner spoke again to seek assurances from the Chair and the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director that they would really seek to re-engage with the SMTA so that, should this application be approved, a harmonious relationship was established. The Chair stated that, whilst he clearly agreed with the sentiment of what the Chief Commoner was saying, it had been made clear via Officer advice and by a number of Members now that this Committee were here to make planning decisions and it was his task to shepherd this debate along these lines. He added that he was involved in the Public Realm Working Party as he had previously stated and offered Members his assurance that a wholistic approach was being taken to this. However, again, at this stage, it was not appropriate for the Committee to look beyond the application in this regard, other than to note that the City Corporation had very large aspirations in this regard in its transportation capacity.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them. The Town Clerk noted that Judith Pleasance and Oliver Sells QC had indicated that they would not be participating in this vote. The vote was conducted by rollcall led by the Town Clerk with those Members present and eligible to vote asked to also confirm that they had been present for and able to hear the entirety of this item.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 20 votes

OPPOSED – 2 votes

There were 3 abstentions – 1 Member who had missed part of the Officers presentation due to connectivity issues and 2 Members who had joined the meeting in the middle of the debate .

RESOLVED - That:

- (1) Planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the schedule attached to the report and subject to:
 - (a) the Mayor of London being given 14 days to decide whether to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission as recommended, or to direct refusal, or to determine the application himself (Article 5(1)(a) of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008);
 - (b) planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed.
- (2) Agreement in principle be granted that the land affected by the building, currently public highway and land over which the public have right of access, including West Poultry Avenue, may be Stopped Up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers be instructed to proceed with arrangements for advertising and making of a Stopping-up Order for the various areas under the delegation arrangements approved by the Court of Common Council.

(NB: The consideration of the Listed Building Consent application (19/01344/LBC) was set out in the report for the planning application, but the recommendation and draft decision were not set out in the Committee papers and therefore this application for LBC will be determined under delegated authority pursuant to the Scheme of Delegations to Officers (Adopted 18th July 2019).

7. 81 NEWGATE STREET LONDON EC1A 7AJ

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of 81 Newgate Street, London EC1A 7AJ - Part refurbishment and part demolition, excavation and redevelopment involving the erection of an additional four storeys to provide a ground plus 13 storey building with publicly accessible route through the site, incorporating gym and swimming pool (Use Class D2) at basement levels, gym and flexible floor area uses (Use Classes A1-A5, B1, D2) at basement level, retail (A1-A5) at ground floor level with access to offices and rooftop restaurant and public viewing gallery, office accommodation (Use Class B1a) from levels 1-13, roof

top restaurant (Use Class A3) and publicly and privately accessible roof terraces, landscaping and other associated works.

Officers presented the scheme highlighting that it supports the circular economy as it part adaptation and part new build, retaining the super structure and floor plates in so far as possible, reusing materials and working with existing foundations. This would all be secured by conditions. The scheme would be reimagining an existing, dated building, turning it into an animated, outward facing development in a pivotal location, maximising the opportunities of the gateway to the Culture Mile and the north/south route from the Tate Modern.

With regard to plans to the existing and proposed plans for ground floor level, in the north-east and southern elements, the curved corners were retained as part of the existing buildings that is adapted. In the south-west corner, the staggered footprint of the newly proposed intervention was visible. The vehicle loading area which currently existed on Angel Street was to be reused and there was also a cycle entrance on the Angel Street elevation. Three atria defined the entrances on the south, east and west and an important new public route from Saint Martins-Le-Grand to King Edward Street would also be established. Members were presented with some flexible floor layouts for approval to respond to market conditions, with retail offerings which would wrap around the south, east and west and plans showing how the development could be more robust by dividing into smaller retail units which would also include a north-south public route if it was felt that sub-division would respond better to market demands. The public routes would be open from 6am – midnight every day and would be covered by Section 106. At the southern end of the plans was dedicated public access to the public roof terrace.

Escalators would take visitors up to the first floor with office space intended from 1st-12th floor. Cycling storage and a gym would be situated at the lower ground floor.

Basement level plans were fully compliant with the London Plan in terms of secure cycle parking storage and showers.

Proposed first floor plans showed that escalators would take visitors up via escalators, through a secure entrance to the office lobby, then into lifts that would take office workers up to all other levels. Office space would look down on to the retail area at ground floor as well as the public through route and the Grade I listed Greyfriars church.

Floorplans for other levels showed that the retained/adapted envelope of the existing building would be consistently visible as would the stepping back of the south-west corner where there would be multiple roof terraces with greening. Visitors to the dedicated public access roof terrace would exit lifts at 12th floor level and would then follow a staircase upwards to access the roof terrace area. The public roof terrace would be 568 square meters and could accommodate 120 users. There would also be a meadow to the right of this which is the largest outdoor space at roof level. This would not be accessible but would be

very visually attractive. Roof level would also include a restaurant and office terrace area. The roof terrace would mirror the 50 Fenchurch Street model within Section 106 as set out within paragraph 18 of the report and would be open from 10am -7pm or nautical dusk. A management plan would be established for the public roof terrace and the restaurant terrace area within Section 106.

With regard to the public realm and trees, Members were shown images of the trees to be removed and replaced at ground floor level – three of these were on the west side of the site, on private land. They were plain, category A trees which had been underperforming in this location and had not reached their full maturity. There were also four trees on the Angel Street elevation at ground floor level which were underperforming Beech trees and would also be removed and replaced. There were four existing trees on the south-west corner of the site that would be retained and supplemented by the planting of 19 new trees. This would result in a total of 30 trees around the site on a mixture of private and highways space as detailed at paragraph 4 of the report, turning what was currently a quite hostile island site into a much greener area particularly when coupled with additional planting as part of public realm around the south western corner.

Members were shown elevations to provide a sense of the massing increase on site. The west elevation, on the left-hand side, showed the retained architecture and extended architecture which had a much more vertical feel. The right-hand side depicted a more dynamic series of tiered volumes. The most pronounced increase in massing and height was primarily to the north part of the site towards the Angel Street elevation. The east elevation showed a stepping down in massing from the north down towards Newgate Street. The south elevation facing Newgate Street also showed the fusion between the new architecture and the adapted/retained building. The Committee were also shown sections of the building – the east/west section which showed a 2-3 storey increase in some parts of the building. There would also be a curated art wall in this location. The north/south route was also shown. It was noted that there was no impact on St Paul's depths in this particular view.

With regard to St Paul's heights, Members were shown a 3D visual of the western elevation of the site facing Greyfriars church and where the existing building broke through the St Paul's Heights policy area. It was highlighted that, whilst there would still be some exceedance in this area, this development would actually reduce this. Some areas of existing exceedances in the St Paul's heights policy area would be entirely removed, opening up a new vista of St Paul's and its dome. In relation to other views, Officers highlighted that the existing building was within the existing area/viewing threshold for Alexandra Palace. The proposed building would also therefore break through the threshold in terms of a quantitative assessment. In terms of the qualitative assessment, the proposed building would come slightly closer in closure to St Paul's but, when looking at the context of other emerging developments such as the Aylesbury Estate buildings, the harm caused would be negligible in the view of Officers with the appreciation of St Paul's retained. The view from Blackfriars Bridge was not an LVMF view and, at present, to the north west

tower, one could see Bastion House which sat quite low and in proximity to the north west towers of St Pauls. In the proposed view, the development would sit in front of Bastion House but not in front of St Pauls creating a very slight change of setting with a negligible impact. There would also be a slight impact on the view from Southwark Bridge which is an LVMF view. At present, the tower of St Augustine church near St Paul's was visible, in the proposed view there would be some massing appearing in the background behind this. St Paul's Cathedral would, however, remain appreciated and very distinctive in this view, with Officers therefore concluding that there would be no demonstrable harm caused. Officers went on to report that the view from Millennium Bridge was another important view, where the proposed view depicted some massing including the balustrades for the roof terraces, below the silhouette of St Paul's.

Proposed views from King Edwards Street depicted the larger glazed features of the new development and new geometric bays introduced to complement the curved architecture of the building. The greening of the elevations was also clearly appreciable in this view.

Officers depicted a number of other existing and proposed views of the new development including from Cheapside, Newgate Street, Greyfriars churchyard, Gresham Street and Saint Martins-le-Grand and finally the Golden Gallery.

Officers concluded by stating that the benefits of this application were multiple – it embraces the circular economy through a creative adaptation, was targeting an outstanding BREEAM rating and exceeding the urban greening factor. A free public roof terrace would be introduced, providing a cultural dimension which would be supported further by the installation of a new digital art wall in the public route. The public route itself was another benefit of the scheme. The development would also bring economic benefits in terms of the active retail offerings which would complement and support the Cheapside retail offerings. The development would offer increased office space and the architectural changes would result in a much more aesthetically pleasing design in this important part of the City. Finally, Section 278 works would support some hugely beneficial pedestrian enhancements around the site. The scheme would therefore bring social, environmental, economic, architectural and cultural benefits and was recommended to Members for approval today.

The Chair thanked Officers for their presentation and, in the absence of any registered objectors, invited his fellow Ward Member Tijs Broeke, speaking in favour of the development, to address the Committee.

Mr Broeke, Common Councillor for the Ward of Cheap began by stating that he had been impressed by how the team had worked alongside local stakeholders to develop and evolve the scheme. In particular, he felt that the links to Culture Mile, the improved connections through creating a new public route and the creation of a free public roof terrace would all constitute a significant improvement to the current site and surrounding area. He clarified that there were four main reasons why he was speaking in support of the transformation plans – firstly, the transformation approach is reducing the environmental

impact associated with a full demolition or rebuild scheme whilst also introducing sustainability improvements to the existing building. The design also enhanced the public realm and was much more attractive for the local area and created new, modern office space. At the same time, the transformation would create a new retail experience on the ground floor connecting the site to One New Change and Cheapside through a new public route and, importantly, linking it as a gateway to the Culture Mile. Most of all, the transformation of 81 Newgate Street would allow City workers, residents and visitors to see London from a new perspective. The transformed building would create additional space for retail, culture and leisure, including the new roof terrace with spectacular views of St Pauls.

The Chair thanked Mr Broeke for his contributions and opened the debate on the application.

A Member questioned the accessibility at ground floor levels, stating that it looked from the plans as though the main entrance and retail units were all accessible by stairs from street level. In general, she stated that she applauded the fact that this was a refurbishment and not a wholesale demolition scheme and that the stone façade was to be reused – as such she intended to support the application and its improvements to public realm with additional planting a– however, she added that she did find the gratuitous use of greening disappointing which was possibly not appropriate in the City and this location. She went on to comment that a lot of planting on buildings to date had mutated from biodiversity to survival of the fittest and she hoped that, in the execution of this scheme, the planting was well considered and constrained. With regard to access, Officers confirmed that the east/west route would be ramped at grade through the building and that there were entrances to retail units via this route. Because this was a circular economy scheme, the economy would have to work with the existing building levels which made it difficult and, at present, there was a difference on the east, west and south elevations where the pavement levels were higher than the interior spaces. Where there were entrances on those elevations, there were steps into retail space and lifts were also situated at each of these locations. The Member questioned whether this was legal. Officers reported that there was a condition imposed that the whole development needed to provide level access to all parts and confirmed that it was fully accessible but would rely on the use of lifts in certain locations, it did therefore comply with all legal requirements in terms of accessibility. With regard to greening, Members were informed that there were conditions around the maintenance of this in perpetuity.

Another Member stated that the City Corporation had, in the past, seriously considered eliminating the gyratory and bringing Angel Street back into better use. He questioned whether this scheme would preclude this. Officers reported that this scheme had been very much designed as flexible and able to link into an enhancement to St Pauls Gyratory should this come to fruition in the future. This was set out in paragraph 19 and would be fed into Section 278.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them. The vote was conducted by rollcall led by the Town Clerk with those Members

present and eligible to vote asked to also confirm that they had been present for and able to hear the entirety of this item.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 23 votes
OPPOSED – 0 votes
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 and subject to:

- a) Planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report; the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed.
- b) 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 Highways Act 1980.

8. **CITY STREETS: TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE TO SUPPORT COVID-19 RECOVERY - PHASE 3**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment in respect of the Transportation response to support Covid-19 recovery (Phase 3): City Streets.

A Member congratulated Officers on their rapid progress, creativity and agility in this area and questioned whether if, as anticipated, social distancing guidelines were to be imminently amended from 2m to 1m, what changes, if any, would be made to existing Phase 1 works and whether this would also have implications for phases 2 and 3. He went on to note that this report made no mention of Guildhall Yard which was a substantial space with small permanent and temporary seating provisions available and questioned whether this was therefore an oversight. The Chair reported that the Prime Minister had just announced that social distancing was to be reduced from 2m to 1m as of 4 July 2020. Officers highlighted that this was the change that all had anticipated. In terms of Phase 1 works, Officers were moving towards changing the initial, coned areas established to more semi-permanent measures which could still be easily removed if required. This would also offer the opportunity to revise or tweak these in accordance with today's announcement. Similarly, as Phase 2 works began to be rolled out, these could be assessed as they progressed. Officers clarified that they did not, however, think that this change in social distancing would make a significant difference to plans for Phases 1 and 2. Even on streets with wider pavements such as Cheapside, additional space would be needed to accommodate queuing outside premises as well as space for pedestrians to pass by at a safe distance. In terms of Phase 3 proposals, adequate space and seating would still need to be identified to help support food and drinks retailers regardless of any relaxations. With regards to Guildhall Yard, Officers were aware of the need to look at this site, but this would not be

an on-street change and was not therefore covered by these proposals. However, the City Corporation would be looking internally at opportunities to increase the use of this space.

Another Member questioned what the current pedestrian utilisation of streets under consideration was and what that use was in normal times. He went on to note that the City had recently put out a statement saying that only one in twenty five people who normally use the City were travelling in at present under current social distancing and other measures introduced on public transport. There was no evidence yet that walking, and cycling had in any way displaced that form of commuting into the City. He went on to ask what increases were expected if there was to be a change in social distancing rules which was obviously now highly relevant and, given the answers to these questions, he asked whether there was any reasonable prospect of any of the City's current streetscape being insufficiently wide to provide safe access for expected levels of utilisation. Finally, he noted that the Retail Alliance had made it very clear that the change in social distancing measures would mean utilisation rates would increase to approximately 70% in retail spaces. He could not therefore imagine that this change in policy would not be extremely helpful and reduce the need to introduce extensive measures. Officers reported that they did not collect live data on utilisation at present but that they were actively looking at other data sources to gain an understanding of what was happening in the City. It was, however, safe to say that numbers were well below what they would usually be. For example, the number of people entering and exiting underground stations last week was just 7.6% of the comparable date in 2019. These figures were increasing on a weekly basis albeit quite gradually at the moment. Officers went on to state that it was difficult to predict how the City would fare and how people would start to return although conversations that the City Corporation had been having with City businesses suggest that at least a quarter of the City's workforce would have returned to the City by the Autumn (approximately 125,000 people). In terms of the impact of the relaxation of social distancing requirements, this may well reduce the need for queuing outside of premises and the space required for this but it was expected that it would also accelerate the rate at which people would return to the City, not least because it will also increase capacity on public transport, which was currently one of the biggest obstacles in terms of people returning to the workplace. With regard to whether pavements in the City were sufficiently wide, Officers reported that there were many streets in the City (many of which were included within Phase 1 and Phase 2 proposals) where pavements are less than 3m, and in some cases 2m wide so the need to reallocate space was still there although this would be kept under review as the works were rolled out with each Phase intended to be both flexible and adaptable with the ability to scale up or down as necessary.

The Member responded to reluctantly speak against these proposals adding that, in the long-term, he would like to see more pedestrianisation and a greater use of green spaces in the City but he did not agree with the fact that these works were being seemingly rushed through under what amounted to emergency powers without much scrutiny beyond that provided by Officers and without consulting residents. The reasons set out within the report as to why

these interventions were essential was not an evidence based case and there was no evidence at all that this was needed in order to make the City safe for people to return in the context of social distancing and COVID-19. What was clear, three months into lockdown, was that the principal barrier to people returning is public transport. Again, there was no evidence that people would opt for walking or cycling into work in place of this and this was certainly not what had occurred to date. People were opting, instead, to stay home. He asked that Officers therefore rethink this approach, particularly the need for consultation, to ensure that these changes, whether temporary or not, did not create unintended consequences or cause harm. Specifically, about 30-40% of the real economy was currently shut down, which would cause devastating damage over the next year with many businesses and therefore the servicing of those businesses not returning, the last thing those businesses therefore needed were road closures which they had not been properly consulted on. He concluded by stating that he remained unassured that this had been taken seriously and, on that basis, would oppose the recommendations. Officers spoke to clarify both the pace that these works were moving at and the approach to engagement/consultation. It was highlighted that it was made clear from the outset that these works were moving quickly and that this was in response to the need to provide safe space and social distancing. The challenge here was how much of this should be provided in anticipation of a possible return to the City and how much should be reactive to a situation. At present, works were very much preparatory to ensure that people were confident that they would have safe space on their return. Officers added that it was fair to say that in discussions that had been had with businesses to date, they were largely supportive of the overall approach, albeit with potential concerns around particular changes on particular streets. With regard to wider consultation, Officers reported that the online portal to gather public feedback would be launched imminently and promoted to local businesses and residents. This feedback would, if necessary, translate to changes on the streets – indeed this had already happened in some Phase 1 locations in response to feedback from businesses and construction sites on affected streets. The Chair added that, from his perspective, the City Corporation could not be distracted by the fact that National Rail Services and other routes into the City were not currently ideal. Statistics showed that approximately 140,000 people live close enough to use active travel to get into the City and, as was well known, the majority of those without access needs would use walking and cycling to reach their eventual destination. The major public policy issue at present was perceptions of safety and the City Corporation had a statutory duty imposed by the DfT that we create this safe space. The messaging around this therefore needed to be very strong that the City is open for business and that as many people as needed to return would be able to do so as soon as Government guidance changes. This was fundamentally about increasing public space, something which had been identified pre-COVID as part of the Transport Strategy. The Chair stressed that work on this should not be deflected by the fact that the evidence was not yet available in relation to this as this would come in time. As Officers had clarified, the City Corporation was not afraid to have to change and adapt these measures where necessary and the Chair highlighted that this had been the way in which transport changes in the City had recently been

successfully introduced – via experimental schemes that were subsequently tweaked and adapted as required.

A Member commented that the report seemed to indicate that Phase 1 works on Cannon Street were complete but the signage here did not seem to be finished and it was not clear that what had been installed was a two way cycle path with some interpreting this as one lane for cycling and one for pedestrians. He also questioned whether there was any way that Officers could ensure that any newly installed planters were not used by smokers for the disposal of cigarettes as was the case elsewhere in the City. Officers clarified that they could look again at signage on Cannon Street but clarified that what was installed this was intended to be a cycle contraflow with a one-way cycle route and the extra space there provided for footway widening. In terms of cigarette disposal, Officers were working with colleagues in Open Spaces to look at how they should design and plant planters so this could be factored into the design process. Officers were also working alongside colleagues in Cleansing on the layout of all of these schemes to understand how they would impact on cleansing regimes and this point could also be explored further with them.

Another Member stated that she was very interested in the City Corporation's role in helping to get retail and hospitality open again and very much welcomed the news today around the relaxation of social distancing measures. She questioned whether Officers could use connections with the City network of HR professionals to build forecasts of how and when staff would return to work. It was felt that this would be extremely helpful to businesses planning for when large scale numbers would return to the City. Officers thanked the Member for a helpful suggestion. They reported that they had been working with Officers in Innovation and Growth to try and understand what a return to work would look like but would discuss with them the possibility of reaching out to HR networks in the City on this point.

A Member commented that she was pleased to hear that some carparking spaces would be repurposed for cycle parking spaces and questioned whether she could also urge that the existing cycle spaces that were situated on pavements were also similarly relocated. She went on to comment on space outside of tube stations and asked whether this had been looked at across the City. At some locations, such as Bank, pavements had been widened but places like Barbican with just one exit, a pedestrian crossing and a bus stop could mean that the arrival of even a half empty tube would lead to pedestrian congestion here. Officers reported that they would keep the location of current dockless cycle bays under review both longer-term and as part of these immediate measures to aid the City's recovery. At the moment proposals were to create additional bays in addition to those already in existence. In terms of tube entrances and exits, Officers reported that whilst this was the third phase of these proposed works it was possibly not the final phase and some future proposals would need to drill down into specific locations and look at providing smaller pockets of additional space where this was needed. Members were informed that the Barbican had been flagged in discussions as being one such area already.

Another Member spoke further on the importance of a well-informed, data driven base of information and highlighted that the Commissioner had quoted some comprehensive statistics based on a broad engagement with City businesses on the numbers of people that they were expecting to return to the workplace at a meeting of the Police Authority Board yesterday. He questioned whether Officers could confirm that this data was coming from the Police on a regular basis and avoid any duplication of efforts in terms of approaching businesses. Officers confirmed that Innovation and Growth and CPAT colleagues were leading in terms of engagement with businesses and undertook to look into whether this data was also being shared with the Police or vice versa. They commented that data gathered to date was beginning to provide a good picture of what a return to work would look like by the Autumn.

A Member commented that, whilst she realised that this was a dynamic situation, the point on consultation was a very important one. The lessening of social distancing requirements and announcements around the reopening of pubs and restaurants from 4 July 2020 would also bring up once more the question of outside space requirements. Pubs with off-sales and punters drinking outside needed to be allocated sufficient space whilst still ensuring that pavements were accessible (particularly for those with disabilities) and everything possible needed to be done to assist these businesses in reopening and thriving. For this reason, the Member asked that Officers look at the matter more holistically and plan quickly and accordingly for a return to normal.

A Member stressed that, whilst work was being undertaken to facilitate safe movement around the City, spaces also needed to be actively and flexibly created to assist with and support the reopening of businesses.

RESOLVED – That :

1. The budget for Phase 3 be approved in principle, at a maximum of £650,500, subject to the confirmation of funding at Gateway 5.
2. The overall forecast project budget for all three phases of £1,699,244 (excluding risk) be noted.
3. The proposal for a review report on all measures be submitted to committee after six months of the first measures being implemented (in December 2020), as set out in paragraphs 18-19 of the report.
4. Up to 1,900 new cycle parking locations, at a maximum cost of £82,000, be approved in principle, split by:
 - a. A maximum of 50 car parking spaces within the City's five car parks being reallocated to provide up to 500 cycle parking spaces, as set out in paragraphs 48-49 of the report.
 - b. A maximum of 81 on street parking bays/motorcycle bays to be reallocated to temporary cycle parking and/or seating as part of Phase 3, as set out in paragraphs 50-55 of the report. NB: This

equates to a maximum 13% reduction in on-street parking bays to provide up to 650 cycle spaces.

- c. The reallocation of other carriageway and possibly footway space to provide up to a further 650 spaces, and potentially up to 100 spaces on private but publicly accessible land, subject to necessary legal agreements and consents being obtained.
 5. The 12 seating/greening locations listed in table 2 in section 12 of the report and the proposed interventions be approved, the indicative total cost of £480,500 to deliver all of the interventions be noted and; it be noted that if full funding is not available to deliver all locations, they will be prioritised in the order shown in the report.
 6. The implications of approving recommendations 4 and 5 above be agreed; i.e. - that this may result in the possible reduction of up to £336K of parking income being transferred to the Parking Reserve Account (if the temporary measures are in place for six months).
 7. The procurement route to purchase the infrastructure to enable seating, greening and activation via the City Corporation's Highways Term Contract be approved, accepting an additional mark-up 8-10% on the total cost, as set out in paragraph 86 of the report.
 8. The proposal to introduce a "school street", which involves closing the street outside Charterhouse Square School during the school starting and finishing times, using an Experimental Traffic Order be approved and, if successful, this be made permanent.
 9. Approval for design, for making of Orders and Notices and related procedures and for implementation and operation for Phase 3 be delegated to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman of Planning & Transportation Committee and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee, subject to the receipt of funding.
9. **TABLES AND CHAIRS - ASSESSMENT CRITERIA, FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND PROCESSES IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19 LOCKDOWN AND EASING THEREOF**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection in respect of the assessment criteria, financial implications and processes in response to COVID-19 lockdown and easing thereof in respect of tables and chairs licences, which had been suspended during lockdown.

A Member commented that Officers needed to ensure that any interaction with businesses was expedited as granting these licences would be an existential issue for many food and beverage outlets. Whilst not wishing in any way to slow the process down, he also questioned whether there could be any Member oversight of applications. Officers reported that they had already proactively reached out to businesses during lockdown in this respect and had

listened keenly to their concerns. They were obviously keen to maximise their opportunities and work in partnership with the City Corporation in order to do so. Once Members had reached a decision today, site by site decisions would be turned around very quickly and fed back to businesses so that they were able to use this in their planning. Officers also undertook to look at introducing Member visibility to the process.

Another Member encouraged a more positive and proactive as opposed to a regulatory approach in terms of identifying sites that could be used for tables and chairs and those businesses looking to introduce these opportunities to get the City back up and running. The Chair noted that this report was written from the perspective of those businesses that already had licences and would like to see them reintroduced but there were, of course, those premises who had not traded using outside space previously, that also needed to be proactively targeted which Officers had undertaken to do.

A Member stated that he hoped that Officers could very quickly understand where they may be additional opportunities in this respect but added that he did not understand why the report referred to only 40 of 107 existing licences being reintroduced. Officers reported that this was an estimate based on a paper-based analysis. However, this week, Officers would be on-street to ascertain what else could be facilitated in the context of public safety, queuing space and safe passage. Other spaces such as reallocated carriageway spaces were also being actively worked on by both Licensing and Transportation teams to determine which of these might be appropriate for tables and chairs and engaging with businesses in these locations. This was very much a work in progress. The Chair added that businesses also required sufficient lead in time in order to reopen and that it was therefore very important not to make false promises.

Another Member questioned whether a change in national legislation on licensing and other legal provisions for drinking outdoors played into this. Members were informed that Officers had anticipated the changes in relation to off-sales although this would not necessarily impact on what was being done in terms of tables and chairs licences as this was essentially about the allocation of highway space. The off-sales point would be looked at from a licensing perspective and what impacts this may have. The Chair stated that some London Boroughs were, however, facing issues of the conflation of off-sales and tables and chairs on the street so it would be important to take into account.

A Member stressed that she hoped that, in terms of guiding principles, Officers were looking to legislation and not government guidelines. She added that the reduction in social distancing requirements from 2m to 1m should also help more than 40 businesses to re-establish tables and chairs licences. She added that she had requested, at the outset, for Officers to actively identify space for tables and chairs and stressed that premises would only be able to reopen and be profitable with the use of outside space. In terms of off-sales, if there was no current condition on licences prohibiting this, it would be permissible and space for this therefore needed to be secured.

A Member spoke again to suggest that he felt there was a need to pool resources across the Corporation to actively identify these spaces. He mentioned, for example, the CPAT team who worked directly with and acted on behalf of businesses, working alongside Licensing and DBE to provide a full picture as quickly as possible.

RESOLVED – That:

1. The criteria officers will apply in line with the five principles, when reinstating tables and chairs licences to the City over the coming phases of lockdown easing, as outlined in Appendix 2 of this report, be agreed.
2. The proposed way forward, as outlined in paragraphs 16 and 17 of this report be agreed.
3. The financial implications as outlined in paragraph 19 of this report be noted.

10. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor regarding public lift operations.

A Member commented that this was at least the second time that the Silk Street lift had experienced an extensive outage due to the BT telephone circuit. He questioned whether Officers had looked into making this a wireless connection to overcome this issue. The City Surveyor reported that this was exactly what Officers were investigating at present.

The City Surveyor confirmed that all other lifts were now back in service with the exception of the London Wall Up escalator which continued to be worked on and would be in service by the end of this week.

A Member referred to the Blackfriars Bridge escalator being out of service at present. The Chair asked that Officers discuss this matter further with the Member offline.

RECEIVED.

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

The Committee received a report of the Interim 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 DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

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

RECEIVED.

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

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising Members of action taken by the Town Clerk since the last formal meeting of the Committee, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order No. 41.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

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

There were no questions.

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

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

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 of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act as follows:-

<u>Item No(s)</u>	<u>Paragraph No(s)</u>
17	3
18	7
19	3 & 5
20 – 21	-

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the virtual meeting held on 2 June 2020 and approved them as a correct record.

18. **SECURE CITY PROGRAMME - GATEWAY 4C REPORT**

The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the Secure City Programme.

19. **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES STRATEGIC REVIEW - UPDATE FOUR**

The Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk and Chief Executive and The Chief Grants Officer and Director of City Bridge Trust providing Members with an update on the work that has been undertaken as part of the Bridge House Estates strategic governance review since the last report in December 2019/January 2020.

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

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

21. 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 1.32 pm

Chairman

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