

## **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 8 September 2020**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held virtually via Microsoft Teams at 11.00 am**

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Munsur Ali	Shravan Joshi
Randall Anderson	Alderswoman Susan Langley
Peter Bennett	Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Mark Bostock	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner)
Deputy Peter Dunphy	Deputy Alastair Moss
Alderman Emma Edhem	Barbara Newman
John Edwards	Graham Packham
Marianne Fredericks	Susan Pearson
Tracey Graham	Judith Pleasance
Graeme Harrower	Deputy Henry Pollard
Sheriff Christopher Hayward	James de Sausmarez
Christopher Hill	Oliver Sells QC (Deputy Chairman)
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney	William Upton QC
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	Alderman Sir David Wootton

#### **Officers:**

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Antoinette Duhaney	- Town Clerk's Department
Leanne Murphy	- Town Clerk's Department
Kate Smith	- Town Clerk's Department
Shani Annand-Baron	- Media Officer
James Gibson	- IS Services
Jenny Pitcairn	- Chamberlain's Department
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Gwyn Richards	- Interim Chief Planning Officer & Development Director
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Samantha Tharme	- Department of the Built Environment
Elisabeth Hannah	- Department of the Built Environment
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment

Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Janet Laban	- Department of the Built Environment
Richard Steele	- Department of the Built Environment
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Craig Stansfield	- Department of Built Environment
Toni Bright	- Department of the Built Environment
Gavin Felgate	- Department of the Built Environment
Stuart Wright	- Department of the Built Environment

### **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.

The Town Clerk highlighted that the meeting was being recorded as well as live streamed and would be made available on the City Corporation's YouTube page for a period of time after the meeting had concluded. With this in mind, it was confirmed that participants in the meeting had all individually agreed and given their consent to being recorded and that all personal data would be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. The Town Clerk highlighted that, for further information on this, viewers could contact the City Corporation using the details provided on the public webpages.

The Committee's most senior Member present (Barbara Newman) moved that the Committee's most senior Alderman present (Alderman Sir David Wootton) take the Chair ahead of the election of a Chairman at agenda item 4. This motion was seconded, and Sir David Wootton took the Chair.

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Henry Colthurst, Oliver Lodge and Sylvia Moys.

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

There were no declarations.

#### **3. ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

The Committee received the Order of the Court of Common Council of 16 July 2020 appointing the Committee and setting out its terms of reference for the ensuing year.

The Town Clerk highlighted that there were currently two vacancies on the Committee – one in the room of the Ward of Vintry who had chosen not to appoint this year and one in the room of the Ward of Coleman Street following the resignation of Sophie Fernandes from this Committee shortly after the July Court of Common Council meeting. Members were informed that these

vacancies would now be advertised to the full Court until such time as they were filled.

## **RECEIVED.**

### **4. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 29.

A list of Members who had expressed an interest in and were eligible to stand was read by the Town Clerk and Deputy Alastair Moss being the only Member expressing willingness to serve was duly elected Chairman for the ensuing year and took the Chair.

Deputy Moss thanked the Committee for their continued support stating that he was very aware that there were now huge challenges ahead and that it was important to continue to work collaboratively both internally and externally in the face of this continuing and unprecedented crisis. He added that the work of this Committee and its responsibility for the entirety of the built environment for the City was being closely scrutinised both regionally and nationally in terms of how policies were being applied and how the message that the City was still open for business was being promoted.

The Chair went on to offer his thanks to those Members who had recently left the Committee – Rehana Ameer, Adrian Bastow, Sophie Fernandes and Alderman Prem Goyal. He also welcomed a new member – Alderwoman Susan Langley - and congratulated Barbara Newman, a former Chairman of this Committee, on her reappointment after a short period of absence.

Finally, the Chair thanked Sheriff Christopher Hayward for his support as his Deputy Chairman over the past year where he had had major input into the work of the Committee and added that he very much looked forward to working alongside a newly appointed Deputy Chair.

### **5. ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Deputy Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 30.

A list of Members who had expressed an interest in and were eligible to stand was read by the Town Clerk.

Both Randall Anderson and Oliver Sells, QC declared a willingness to serve and the Town Clerk reported that a ballot was therefore necessary. Members were asked to vote electronically either by following the Microsoft Forms link sent to them via email or by indicating the name of the one candidate they wished to vote for via email to the Town Clerk.

Votes were cast as follows:	Randall Anderson	–	7 votes
	Oliver Sells, QC	–	20 votes

There was 1 spoilt ballot.

Oliver Sells, QC was therefore duly elected Deputy Chairman for the ensuing year.

Mr Sells thanked the Committee for their confidence and stressed that this Committee and the City generally were about to embark on a very significant and difficult period. He echoed the words of the Chair in stating that he was of the view that collaboration and co-operation would be key as would the work of this Committee's two Sub Committees.

Finally, Mr Sells also echoed the Chair's thanks to the outgoing Deputy Chair, Sheriff Christopher Hayward, who had been a very important source of support and advice. He stated that he very much looked forward to working alongside the Chair and the rest of the Committee for the ensuing year.

**6. MINUTES**

The Committee considered the public minutes and non-public summary of the virtual meeting held on 14 July 2020 and approved them as a correct record.

**7. PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the draft public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting held virtually on 7 July 2020.

A Member questioned if Frederick's Place was a public highway or a private road. Officers reported that it was public highway.

Another Member commented in relation to the use of mobility scooters and questioned whether, as well as looking at the widening of pavements, the provision of drop kerbs could also be considered as she had received representations from more than one member of the public that this was an issue. Officers responded by stating that they were aware that there some locations in the City where there were not drop kerbs in place where these would be desirable and also that there were some existing drop kerbs that were not functioning as they should do. He asked that Members report issues with any particular locations as they were made aware of them. More strategically, Members were informed that the City's Streets Accessibility Standard was soon set to be finalised and one of the actions arising from this would be an audit of City Streets so that Officers were able to flag issues such as this and develop a programme to address them. One option would be to consider the raising of the carriageway in certain locations as an alternative to installing drop kerbs. Officers went on to report that they were interacting with the City of London Access Group and Transport for All amongst others on these issues.

**RECEIVED.**

**8. APPOINTMENT OF SUB COMMITTEES**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk relative to the appointment of its Sub Committee and Working Party, their constitution and terms of reference.

A Member commented that the Chair and Deputy Chairman of the grand Committee and of both Sub Committees last year were all male as were all those appointed to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee by this Committee. She asked that Members bear in mind the need for diversity when voting for appointees this year.

### **Streets and Walkways Sub Committee**

The Town Clerk announced that, with ten Members expressing an interest in standing for the seven available spaces from the Planning and Transportation Committee, a ballot was required.

Following an electronic ballot, the Town Clerk announced that the following Members would be appointed to the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee:

- Randall Anderson
- Peter Bennett
- Deputy Keith Bottomley
- Marianne Fredericks
- Sheriff Christopher Hayward
- Shravan Joshi
- Graham Packham

### **Local Plans Sub Committee**

The Town Clerk announced that, with six Members expressing an interest in standing for the five available spaces from the Planning and Transportation Committee, a ballot was required.

Following discussion, the Committee were of the view that the membership of the Sub Committee should be expanded to incorporate six as opposed to five Members from the Planning and Transportation Committee for the ensuing year only.

***RESOLVED - That the appointment, composition and terms of reference of the sub-committees and working parties for the ensuing year are approved as follows:-***

#### **a) Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee**

The Chair and Deputy Chairman of the Grand Committee along with seven other Members as follows:

- Randall Anderson
- Peter Bennett
- Deputy Keith Bottomley
- Marianne Fredericks
- Sheriff Christopher Hayward
- Shravan Joshi
- Graham Packham

- Together with four *ex-officio* Members representing the Finance, Police and Open Spaces, City Gardens and West Ham Park and Port Health and Environmental Services Committees.

### **Terms of Reference**

The Sub Committee is responsible for:-

- (a) traffic engineering and management, maintenance of the City's streets, and the agreement of schemes affecting the City's Highways and Walkways (such as street scene enhancement, traffic schemes, pedestrian facilities, special events on the public highway and authorising Traffic Orders) in accordance with the policies and strategies of the Grand Committee;
- (b) all general matters relating to road safety;
- (c) the provision, maintenance and repair of bridges, subways and footbridges, other than the five City river bridges;
- (d) public lighting, including street lighting;
- (e) day-to-day administration of the Grand Committee's car parks
- (f) all matters relating to the Riverside Walkway, except for adjacent open spaces; and
- (g) to be responsible for advising the Grand Committee on:-
  - (i) progress in implementing the Grand Committee's plans, policies and strategies relating to the City's Highways and Walkways; and
  - (ii) the design of and strategy for providing signposts in the City
- (h) Those matters of significance will be referred to the Grand Committee to seek concurrence.

#### **b) Local Plans Sub-Committee**

The Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Grand Committee along with six (for the ensuing year only) other Members as follows:

- Randall Anderson
- Deputy Keith Bottomley
- Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
- Shravan Joshi
- Graham Packham
- William Upton, QC

Together with two *ex-officio* Members representing the Policy and Resources Committee and the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee.

### **Terms of Reference**

The Committee first appointed a Sub Committee in October 2004 with the specific task of considering the Local Development Framework (LDF), which replaced the Unitary Development Plan as the spatial planning

strategy for the City. It was later agreed that this Sub Committee would also be suitable for considering details of the traffic-related Local Implementation Plan (LIP) as well. Its Terms of Reference are simply to consider those types of documents in detail and make recommendations to the Grand Committee.

9. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

**Member Training**

A Member questioned what plans were being put in place for Member training around Planning matters generally and also questioned whether specific training around Climate and how that engaged with Planning matters might be worthwhile. The Town Clerk reported that Member training generally continued to proceed but that a training programme specific to this Committee would be managed and progressed by the Department of Built Environment.

Members requested that a paper on this matter be put to the next meeting of this Committee.

**RECEIVED.**

10. **CLIMATE ACTION STRATEGY**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk and Chief Executive containing a scoped and costed Climate Action Strategy for the City of London Corporation.

The Chair commented that this piece of work was of major corporate significance and that he and other Members, particularly the Chairman of Port Health and Environmental Services Committee, had been working closely alongside Officers in recent months to progress this.

A Member, also the serving Chairman of the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee, commented that taking action to address climate change was clearly a vitally important issue and that the development of this Strategy put the City Corporation on the front foot. He added that he had been clear from the outset that the Strategy must be impactful, deliverable and, above all, affordable. He highlighted that many Members had already attended various briefings on the Strategy in recent months and had offered their input into it for which he was very grateful. Members were informed that the report before them today was a data driven, evidence-based strategy on Climate Action that tracked all of the existing, relevant City Corporation strategies into it, not least the Transport and Air Quality strategies. At its heart was a set of target-based actions that would have a comprehensive performance and reporting framework wrapped around it. The Member went on to state that, probably for the first time, the City Corporation were looking to approve a Strategy alongside a medium-term funding plan to enable the Corporation to deliver what it set out to. He reported that there were, however, no in-year funding reallocations and it was proposed that the actions were funded from the next financial year, from

April 2021 onwards. Thereafter, funding would continue to be allocated on an annual basis in the round with Climate Action established as an important priority but certainly not the only priority. The Member conclude by highlighting that this Committee had three clear action sets set out within the paper.

In terms of Governance, Members were informed that the Strategy was to be received by a number of Committees ahead of final approval by the Policy and Resources Committee and, ultimately, the Court of Common Council in October 2020. The Strategy had also been the subject of numerous Member Briefings in recent months. Officers reported that delivery of the Strategy was to commence in April 2021 and would be regularly reviewed and monitored throughout. Members were informed that this Strategy aligned with and built on other, existing City Corporation strategies and policies including the Transportation Strategy and also picked up some of the unfunded elements of these.

A Member stated that, whilst he strongly supported the Strategy, he had some concerns around the financing of it and stated that it was important for Members to note that Capital spending injected here would mean that other Capital Projects would have to be deferred or reprioritised, at least in the medium-term.

Another Member commented that, whilst she appreciated that this was not the only corporate priority, it was important to realise its importance and the fact that it was presently the highest corporate risk to the Corporation, taking in two aspects - resilience and net-zero. She added that the proposals put forward today had already been refined by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee in recognition of the fact that there were other existing priorities within the Corporation. She added that, from a personal point of view, she was extremely supportive of the Strategy and hoped that it would be a useful starting point from which the organisation could go much further.

The Member went on to question matters specific to this Committee and referenced the fact that ambitious planning requirements had led to 75% of new commercial developments with over 20,000m<sup>2</sup> floorspace achieving at least a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating since 2014. She questioned whether this included whole life carbon and whether this Committee agreed that there should be explicit reference to the need for refurbishment as opposed to demolition wherever possible within this document. Secondly, the Member referred to the pilot study on a new logistical hub to manage and reduce freight vehicles and emissions and the money set aside for this purpose which she understood to be in the region of £400,000 and was to be funded from the Climate Action Strategy budget. She added that, under the Transport Strategy, this was supposed to have been embarked upon already and that she was therefore disappointed to see that the only reference here and the only work undertaken to date was a pilot study. She questioned whether the organisation could, instead, commit to introducing a fully functioning freight logistics hub which was clearly needed and questioned whether more money should be budgeted for this purpose.



Officers reported that the achievement of BREEAM 'Excellent' ratings on properties to date had assisted with the journey towards net zero but that the development of the Climate Action Strategy had determined that the organisation needed to go much further than this across the board, in relation to transport as well as buildings. Members were informed that BREEAM as a standard was a mixture of environmental requirements on buildings, one of which related to whole life carbon/embodied carbon, although it was quite easy to select other environmental performance criterion to achieve a rating, sometimes at the cost of whole life carbon. However, this was acknowledged and the work set out across the board to deliver this Strategy was around increasing the energy efficiency and decreasing the carbon intensity of buildings that the City Corporation operates and leases and also to encourage other building owners in the Square Mile to follow suit. It was also acknowledged that the organisation needed to develop new materials and building specifications going forward to address this point. The Member thanked Officers for their response and questioned whether this Committee was able to stipulate that they felt that there should be explicit reference to embodied carbon and the need to avoid demolition wherever possible within the Strategy. The Director of the Built Environment commented that the Local Plans Sub-Committee could be asked to consider this as embodying this within the City Plan would make it a material consideration for this Committee when making decisions. The Chair stated that he would be amenable to having reference to this in both documents.

With regard to freight consolidation, Officers commented that there were actually three aspects to this that were often conflated under the term 'consolidation' within the Transport Strategy. One of these was last mile delivery hubs (using space within the Square Mile to transfer items from vans to walking deliveries or cargo cycles). Members were informed that work was already underway on this aspect but that there had been some delay to the process due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This Committee would receive a full update on this at a future meeting. As this was a commercial opportunity no funding was required. Secondly, the Transport Strategy stated that, by 2022, a preferred supplier for consolidation would be identified to serve the City and support those businesses that want to consolidate as well as those developers that were required to consolidate as part of their planning permission. This matter was still under consideration although Members were informed that the market around consolidation had recently matured quite considerably, largely because of the City Corporation's planning requirements around it. Thirdly, Officers reported that the work referred to within the Climate Action Strategy (a sustainable logistics centre) was the largest aspect of consolidation and had a target of 2030 within the Transport Strategy although it was noted that this could be brought forward with the Climate Action Strategy providing a useful opportunity to accelerate this. This was set to result in a dedicated centre serving the City which combined not just freight consolidation and the grouping of deliveries into fewer, fuller lorries, but also things such as the potential warehousing of the most frequently ordered items. It was this piece of work that the pilot/feasibility study referenced within the Climate Action Strategy would be looking at in terms of helping Officers to understand what this should look like and the longer-term investment needed to deliver this. It was also noted that

there were likely to be commercial opportunities around this as opposed to it being a cost to the City Corporation in the long term. Officers commented that the funding identified within the Climate Action budget for this work would help to deliver this aspect slightly ahead of where it was intended to be under the Transport Strategy and was a good example of how the two strategies complemented one another.

Another Member commented that he was very supportive of this substantial piece of work. However, he expressed his fear that with lower economic activity, lower levels of construction and lower levels of people coming into the City, the organisation were potentially building up false pretences in terms of performance and progression in this field. He questioned whether Officers could therefore explain how measures around per capita or economic activity might be possible in order for Members to gauge real progress in the City. Officers reported that there were various pieces of work progressing at present across different Departments looking at City activity levels and economic levels generally all of which were feeding into the Corporate Performance Framework. Through this process, Officers would, over time, be able to triangulate. In the meantime, those guiding the Strategy would need to keep this very important point in mind. The Chair added that performance here was very much about the attractiveness and sustainability of the City and would therefore go some way to enticing people back into the Square Mile.

A Member spoke to reassure Members in terms of the finances around the Strategy and how they had been developed on a marginal costing basis and not in isolation but in tandem with other parts of the organisation as projects come forward. However, like all Strategies, these evolved over time and therefore budgets set aside from the outset may not necessarily cover what is required in future. For this reason, an annual review of the finances associated with this strategy had also been built in. This would enable the Strategy to be tweaked where necessary and for resources to be directed to the right place at the right time throughout. He added that the budget for this Strategy had been identified on top of existing commitments meaning that money would not necessarily be taken away from other priorities to fund this. He echoed the earlier words of the Chairman of the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee in saying that he believed that this was the first time that the organisation had developed an overarching Strategy such as this and also developed the funding that goes with it.

Another Member echoed the concerns of a previous speaker around false positives and underlined that he was of the view that things in the City would change significantly as a result of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic in terms of more people working from home or returning to offices on a part-time basis only. These changes would impact upon the City with those who did return in due course requiring more personal space and perhaps improved ventilation, all of which would ultimately impact on the Climate Action Strategy in the immediate future. He questioned whether the Strategy would be flexible enough to reflect this. Officers reported that public consultation had been carried out post-COVID, for a seven-week period over the Summer, throughout July and August 2020. This had generated over 2,600 responses, 44% of respondents

were City workers who had, indeed, indicated that they would like to see more space allocated for cycling and walking in the Square Mile. This was therefore already being reflected within the Strategy. Officers reassured the Committee that they would continue to engage with the public both on the Strategy as a whole and on the individual projects that sat within the delivery programme.

A Member commented that she wholeheartedly supported the Strategy and the direction of travel around Climate Action generally, noting that this was an area that was likely to evolve rapidly. Reflecting on the papers, she commented that she was particularly interested to read goal C, concerning the City of London influencing UK and overseas organisations to become climate responsible and how it would do that. When looking at all of the actions set out, she noted that the vast majority of these were very UK centric – where they were global (for example improving the transparency and global standardisation of sustainability reporting) they were very broad and grand. She therefore questioned whether the City of London Corporation's influence could really be this far reaching and global over the next five years. She also questioned whether all of the goals set out were equal in terms of priority and spend. Officers reported that this was core business for the organisation and that the core stakeholders in this context were the City and its financial services. That being said, the organisation also had an international role to play and a need to show leadership. One of the ways that this would be done was via the conference being planned for November 2020 at which this Strategy would set the bar for Climate Action. With regards to the different goals set out, Officers reported that the first two goals around net zero and resilience would enable the Corporation to continue and to do much more around the third goal. All were therefore interlinked as opposed to listed in any order of priority. The ultimate goal was the essentially the third in that the organisation wanted this to be a resilient City within a climate that worked for everyone.

Another Member commented on office lighting and the fact that the document placed a lot of emphasis on hardware and on BREEAM, but the much harder challenge would be around behaviours and teaching those within buildings how to use the hardware correctly. Secondly, he commented on the Flood Management Strategy which covered not only flooding from the River Thames but also from heavy downpours and referenced how the City ought to be designed to absorb some of this excess water. He stated that this was currently at odds with the Public Realm Manual which only contained the use of totally impermeable material. He suggested that the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee be asked to consider this. Officers responded to the point around behaviours agreeing that this would be an extremely important element in terms of implementing this Strategy and highlighting that there was clearly a need for a campaign of some sort to help people understand what role they could play in helping to drive this forward. There were also various layers of enforcement that could be considered. It was emphasised that effective control of energy would not be driven purely by new technologies and that better energy monitoring equipment had been provided for across the Strategy to enable Officers to be able to determine where demand hotspots were located. Things like building energy management systems that enabled better controls to be put in place would also be important but it was recognised that this had to be done

in concert with the operating teams of individual facilities which also brought into question things like governance, performance management and target setting. With regard to Flood Management, Officers recognised that the manuals written would need to be updated accordingly and that this Strategy would be one of the drivers for this. It was reported that Officers were already actively considering this matter and how best to update the design manual for public realm as well as the SPD that supports it.

A Member thanked Officers for a very important and coherent strategy. He went on to question how the Strategy would be implemented, who would be co-ordinating and driving the work. Secondly, he commented that this appeared to be a top-down approach and queried how the budgets for this had been established. He noted that this Committee had an allocation of £2.98m p.a. over the next 5 years but was unclear as to how this had been arrived at. Officers responded by stating that the co-ordination and implementation of the Strategy would be closely managed by the Policy and Resources Committee given that it was a key strategy for the organisation. Regular reviews and monitoring would form a part of this. Details of how this would work at Member level would be included within the report to the Policy and Resources Committee. At Officer level, conversations were underway with those leading on the Target Operating Model to ensure that the capabilities required were being built in. Relevant Chief Officers would also continue to be closely involved throughout. In terms of finances, Officers explained that the finances across the Strategy had been built up through an extensive bottom-up exercise. Officers had begun by looking at what teams were currently doing, particularly around hotspot issues such as emissions and, with the help of external consultants, identifying which actions would be most effective that also meet the affordability test. For each area, a budget had been worked up for the next 5 years around the actions required. Other metrics such as job creation, had also been factored into the paper. A Member added that finances for this particular Committee had involved looking at currently unallocated amounts of CIL and on-street parking reserve funds. There was an appreciation of the fact that this was also an investment case and that the implementation of the Strategy would drive a reduction in costs to the City Corporation that could be captured/ringfenced and put back into the Strategy to help deliver future stages.

A Member commented on Member input/oversight on the delivery and review of the Strategy and suggested that Officers consider appointing Member Climate Action Champions for this work from each of the Committees focused on this area. She noted that this was something that Friends of the Earth listed as a key recommendation in their guide for Local Authorities on Climate Action. She suggested that the Champions should not be the Chairs or Deputy Chairs of the respective Committees and that they should meet quarterly to review progress. She asked that this suggestion be put to the Policy and Resources Committee in due course. Officers reported that governance was something that was being actively considered at present and undertook to take this suggestion forward.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the report, the draft Strategy at Appendix 1 and the action sets by Committee at Appendix 2.

**11. CITY STREETS: TRANSPORTATION RESPONSE TO SUPPORT COVID-19 RECOVERY - GATEWAY 5 REPORT**

The Committee considered a Gateway 5 report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to the City Streets: Transportation response to support COVID-19 recovery.

Officers reported that there had been quite a large increase in the number of people returning to work the City in recent weeks and it was expected that this trend would now continue going forward. Members were informed that there had also been an increase in the number of responses to the City's online consultation on its on-street COVID interventions in recent weeks. The consultation would be further publicised via social media and on-street signage in the coming weeks as well as through the usual communication channels with City businesses and residents in an attempt to ensure that the feedback received was as widespread as possible. In terms of progress, Members were informed that Phases 1 and 2 had now been completed and provided more space for those walking and cycling on the City streets. Officers had also now started to transition some measures from temporary barriers to what were termed as 'temporary-plus' barriers, meaning that these were more robust physical interventions. It was hoped that this work would provide further clarity around which users should be in which spaces and which areas were footways/cycle lanes. Bus stop build outs would also be provided to allow street users to get on and off of buses in the City with greater ease.

Phase 3 works which were the complimentary measures around seating and planters would begin to be rolled out around Middlesex Street as of next week with works to the other 9 identified locations beginning in the week commencing 21 September 2020. Funding for Phase 3 had only very recently been approved and so these works had moved forward very quickly thereafter.

Finally, by way of an update on Transport for London (TfL) interventions (who were also introducing a suite of changes in and around the City in response to COVID-19), Officers reported that the bus-gates on Bishopsgate went live last week. This was a series of points closures restricted access along Bishopsgate corridor to buses only. Members were informed that TfL were also retaining the restrictions that had been put in place on London Bridge during the City's waterproofing works and that this restricted vehicle access to taxis, buses and motorcycles only Monday-Friday 7am-7pm. The City Corporation were supportive of these measures as it reduced the amount of traffic entering the Southern part of the City, allowed for segregated cycle lanes in both directions and supported an active travel return to work in the City. It was also reported that Officers understood that the London Borough of Islington and TfL were now pausing on the Old Street/Clerkenwell Road proposals and that these would not be progressing later this month as originally thought.

The Chair commented that he was pleased with the news on the Old Street/Clerkenwell Street proposals as he and other Members felt that the City Corporation ought to be given the opportunity to input into these properly before works commenced.

A Member noted the issues around barriers on Fleet Street and Ludgate Hill being moved and sought further information on this. Secondly, the Member took the opportunity to really emphasise the need for more cycling space, particularly spaces that were near on-street provisions. Failing this, there should be proper signage informing cyclists of where such provisions were located in order to help SME's in the City to begin to attract more custom. She added that Regents Street had recently created a hub for cycle provision in unused office space and questioned whether these kinds of approaches were also being considered by the City Corporation. Officers responded that the issue with barriers being moved on Fleet Street related to servicing vehicles and deliveries. This matter had been closely looked at and Officers had been looking at provisions around bus stops and tourist bus stops with designs being refined and adapted to take into account concerns and needs in this area. With regard to cycle spaces, Officers explained that they were always willing to listen to businesses about where they might want to locate these. More proactively, designs were being refined around suitable cycle spaces throughout the City, but Members were asked to contact Officers with details of any specific locations where they felt that this may be possible/beneficial so that they could be assessed.

Another Member questioned the consultation that had taken place around these measures commenting that he had had some organisations within his own Ward expressing surprise at some of the on-street interventions they had seen introduced around areas including Threadneedle Street. He asked what proactive consultation had taken place to date and what notification local businesses had received ahead of any on-street changes being implemented and the fact that these were only temporary in nature. Officers reminded Members that Appendix 5 to the report that this Committee had received at its 23 June meeting had set out the extensive consultation undertaken prior to these measures being introduced. It was noted that the consultation undertaken was not of the sort that would have been embarked upon if these measures were to be introduced on a permanent basis and that this was therefore perhaps more accurately described as an awareness and engagement exercise. All available channels of communication such as residential newsletters/associations, contacts through the City Property Advisory Team, social media, the City's public website and City AM were utilised to consult on the current changes. A letter drop to individual homes and businesses was not possible in the timeframe available. Officers reemphasised that the message here was that these measures were temporary and adaptable. In terms of defined timescales for these measures, Officers reported that no one was aware of what the requirements around social distancing would continue to be as yet but it was the intention that they would remain in place for as long as the government required individuals to maintain this. The Member came back to question whether Officers had used the City Occupiers email database used for generating Ward Lists for consultation purposes. Officers undertook to look into this and to ascertain whether the information held here differed from the details held by the City Property Advisory Team. It was noted, however, that there were some GDPR issues around using Ward lists for communications that were not related to voting.

Another Member made the point that in some City locations such as Threadneedle Street and Old Broad Street, heavy downpours had led to the flooding of some of the additional space allocated for pedestrians rendering it unusable. As winter approached this would become more of an issue. Officers commented that there may be a simple solution to these issues which could be caused by blocked gullies that needed to be flushed through. They asked that Members notify them of any ponding issues that they became aware of so that these matters could be investigated.

A Member questioned when work to convert the temporary measures to 'temporary plus' would be completed, suggesting that the temporary measures could become a health and safety hazard if it was not made entirely clear which areas were intended for which users.

Another Member echoed this point and highlighted that there were some unintended consequences of the temporary measures which, in some locations, made things less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. He asked that further consultation be carried out with cyclists on this matter fairly urgently.

A Member commented that temporary plus bollards were beginning to be installed around Bank Junction which clearly defined pedestrian and cyclist spaces in a way that the plastic, temporary bollards did not. Another issue with temporary, plastic bollards was that they could be (and frequently were) removed or kicked down, causing obstructions for vehicles and cyclists. Vehicles were also tending to reverse over them. The Member went on to comment that there was confusion around the TfL temporary build out at Gracechurch Street and whether this was intended to be for pedestrians or cyclists and that this ought to be more clearly defined going forward. This location was also particularly dark at night making it difficult to distinguish the kerbside from the carriageway which was likely to lead to further issues and confusion. Finally, the Member commented that there ought to be clear routes identified for road users and taxi drivers travelling North, South, East and West across the City that highlighted all road closures. Officers noted the points made in relation to Gracechurch Street and undertook to raise these directly with relevant colleagues at TfL. It was recognised that this amount of change was unprecedented in terms of how streets function not only in the City but across London and the Traffic Management Team had worked incredibly hard to try and coordinate TfL's work alongside the City Corporation's own work around bridge waterproofing and COVID-19 recovery measures and a significant amount of utility works. Members were informed that a map had been produced and placed on the public webpages that helped drivers to identify which routes were available and which were closed. Officers undertook to look at how this might be sent out to taxi and private hire vehicle drivers.

A Member agreed that there ought to be clarity and consistency in terms of signage for all road users including cyclists. The Chair commented that he had conducted several tours with Officers in recent months to view the temporary measures and agreed with the points being made here. Officers commented that they were certain that there were changes that could be made to signage

to help users identify which spaces were available to them and were happy to take Member feedback on this.

Another Member commented that some of the feedback received was very specific in terms of location and questioned whether a management decision/process ought to be taken here in terms of when the feedback received would translate into on-street alterations where necessary.

Officers reported that these measures had to be introduced quite quickly in mid-June with some decisions made at pace. It was always intended that this would be a two-phase approach with temporary cones and barriers like those normally erected around infrastructure or utilities work put in place initially to determine what would and would not work and to offer flexibility. It was, however, appreciated that these may have caused issues around maintenance and clarity around which road spaces were delineated for which road user. This had driven a move to temporary-plus infrastructure that were now beginning to be introduced in the City. Temporary plus measures were bolt-down materials that could not be moved such as the tall, black and white wands that were placed at 2m and 4m intervals in widened footway areas. Officers had been out on site with engineers and contractors in the past week to ensure that these were being implemented in the correct way and to identify any immediate issues. The coming weeks, which were expected to see further increases in the number of workers returning to the City, would be very important in terms of monitoring these measures and identifying any issues. Members were also informed that it was likely that an Independent Road Safety Audit would be undertaken in the next few weeks and that this would help to identify any issues independent of Officers. This feedback alongside any additional consultation feedback received online would help with the review of on-street measures, as necessary.

Reports would be brought back to future meetings of this Committee to highlight how any concerns raised had been addressed.

**RESOLVED – That, Members:**

- Note the forecast overspend pertaining to staff costs and that alternative arrangements are being explored to accommodate this in order to focus Transport for London and Department for Transport funds on delivery and;
- Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment to approve any necessary agreements with private landowners for enabling the installation of temporary cycle parking on publicly accessible private land and the carrying out of any associated works by the City Corporation.

**12. TRANSPORT STRATEGY: 2019/20 PROGRESS UPDATE AND 2020/21 - 2022/23 DELIVERY PLAN**

*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.*



The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment summarising progress with delivering the Transport Strategy in 2019/20 and setting out the Delivery Plan for 2021/22 – 2022/23.

A Member noted that the report referred to the fact that data on collisions and casualties was still pending for 2019 due to processing problems and questioned what these problems were. He also commented that, whilst 2020 figures were likely to be skewed due to the ongoing pandemic, it would be important to gain an early view as to the safety of the experimental changes installed as opposed to reflecting on these later in 2021 and questioned how these problems could be overcome. Officers responded by stating that the long-term data had encountered processing problems and that when annual statistics were published these had to be very robust and reflect on the impact of any measures put in place. It was also reported that the City Police had recently switched reporting systems for recording data and that Officers had been working hard alongside them to determine what was happening at specific locations in terms of historic data. For 2020, City of London Police had undertaken to have a very live look at what was happening on the City's streets around COVID-19 recovery measures and to feed into any recommendations on changes to these. Members were assured that this data would also be looked at in detail for next year.

Another Member made the point that per capita measures would be helpful in relation to this and mapping progress noting that City visitor numbers were likely to be very different post-COVID for some time.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report.

**13. ROAD DANGER REDUCTION & ACTIVE TRAVEL PLAN 2020/21 - 2022/23**

The Committee received a joint report of the Director of Built Environment and the Commissioner of Police setting out the Road Danger and Active Travel Plan 2020/21 and 2022/23.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report and the draft Road Danger Reduction and Active Travel Plan 2020/21 – 2022/23.

**14. CITY OF LONDON HOUSING DELIVERY TEST ACTION PLAN**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the City of London Housing Delivery Test Action Plan.

A Member questioned whether the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government accepted the conclusions of this report. Officers reported that the City Corporation had set out its case in the Action Plan and that the government did not respond directly to such plans. However, in due course, the Local Plan public examination would take into account this Plan as a background document and this would provide the organisation with the opportunity to state its case further before a planning inspector came to a view on it.

Another Member spoke to receive clarification. He stated that, as he understood it, the City Corporation had missed targets here for two consecutive years and that certain consequences would flow from this, one of those being that an Action Plan was required, another (applying a 20% buffer) which seemed to be inapplicable to this organisation and a third which involved applying an presumption around sustainable development. He added that, as he understood it, the City Corporation was now governed by this guidance and had to abide by it for a period of time until they were able to meet targets, however, the paper seemed to imply that this was not necessary. Officers responded by stating that the next test results were due to be released in November 2020 and that the consequences would apply until that time. They went on to highlight that, for reasons articulated within the report, the data on which the City Corporation had been judged last year was incorrect and that the belated inclusion of 165 units at Sugar Quay would mean that next year's result would vastly exceed requirements. The bigger picture was that this was a backward looking, 3-year time horizon assessing housing delivery when, in reality, housing strategy was set across a 10-15 year period and it was therefore felt that targets should instead be based upon average delivery across this time period. Officers reported that the government were looking to reform planning in general and that it was expected that the current test would be reviewed and refined as a result of this. In response to further questions, Officers reported that there would be no need for the City Corporation to change its current policy position in the short-term.

Another Member spoke to underline that even if the revisions had been made, the City Corporation had fallen below the required minimum figure on housing delivery. The response from the MCLG explaining why they would not amend the figure referred, in part, to the long period of time it had taken for the City to notify them of the required revisions. She therefore questioned whether this broadly indicated how low down the priority list housing was and noted that one of the consequences of the City Corporation's historic approach to housing was that, as suburban high streets began to look busy again with the easing of lockdown measures, the City lacked resilience in this respect due to its lack of sufficient local community.

The Member went on to refer to the Action Plan itself and questioned whether projections around the increase in City workers by 2036 mentioned within it needed to be reviewed in light of the ongoing pandemic. She noted that the document was dated August 2020 yet contained no reference to the matter or to the potential for a change to the presumed upwards trend in terms of workers and required office space. More broadly she stated that, whilst it seemed that the City's transport approach to the pandemic had been responsive and flexible, this did not seem to be reflected in any planning or housing delivery aspects of the work of this Committee. She suggested that a paper setting out current trends and best estimates and how priorities should be reviewed in light of these would be useful. Officers reported that the reference to 600,000 additional city workers by 2036 had been taken from the draft Local Plan and was based on pre-COVID GLA projections. In light of the changing context, it was recognised that some of the projections within the Local Plan would need to be revisited before the document was submitted for examination. The Local

Plans Sub-Committee would be called to meet later this year to consider these matters.

Ms Lloyd-Owen asked that her objection to the publication of the Plan be noted.

**RESOLVED** – That Members approve the publication of City of London Housing Delivery Test Action Plan attached at Appendix 1.

**15. PLANNING REFORM: CHANGES TO THE USE CLASSES ORDER AND PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS ANNOUNCED JULY 2020**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment setting out changes to the Use Classes Order and Permitted Development Rights announced in July 2020.

Officers clarified that this report was for information and was intended to update the Committee on changes that had already been implemented. They clarified that the two main areas of change set out were around the Uses Classes Order and how we manage changes of use between different land uses through the planning system and around Permitted Development Rights which involved the ability of developers to bring about certain changes without the need for specific planning permission. It was noted that, from the City Corporation's perspective, changes to the Uses Classes Order were the most significant of the two as most Permitted Development Rights would be subject to various caveats and requirements around prior approval processes. Members were informed that the key change to Use Classes Order was that a new use class order 'Class E' had been introduced which combined office and retail (A1/A2/A3 and some other uses) into one super-use class. The effect of this change was that the City would no longer have planning control over the change of use between these various components within the new E class as this was no longer defined as development. This would affect how changes of use were managed within the City going forward, particularly in retail clusters and would clearly have implications for the City's Local Plan. The Local Plans Sub-Committee would be asked to consider this in meetings throughout the Autumn and seek to adjust the Local Plan if necessary, in order to take account of the changing planning controls arising from these changes in planning law. It was reported that there were also wider implications for other City Departments who relied upon the planning system to flag changes in use.

The Deputy Chairman commented that he felt that this would be a significant change that developers and property owners within the Square Mile would utilise frequently. Officers noted that the changes would take away some of our local planning powers to regulate changes of use within a building in the City. However, planning powers would still remain in place for applications concerning any sort of redevelopment (demolitions and reconstructions). Where there was a proposed change of use within a building – for example from an office to a shop or vice versa – this would normally be tested against the City's plan to ascertain if this complied with planning policies – this test would no longer be relevant. There would therefore be much greater flexibility and volatility in the mix of land uses found in some of the City's retail areas as they

respond to market forces. Conversely, Members were informed that there were more restrictions than there had previously been on certain land uses with pubs and hot takeaway food premises being put into their own special class and requiring specific planning permissions. Officers underlined that other Local Authority controls would still apply with Licensing rules still in force and arguably even more important as a result of these changes.

A Member sought further explanation around the interplay on the Article 4 directions and its interplay with the Use Class Order changes. Officers clarified that Article 4 directions remove the ability of a developer to carry out development without a specific planning permission. However, it only applied to changes defined as development with a Local Authority able to take away a permitted development right under an Article 4 direction meaning that the developer would need to apply for a specific planning permission. In relation to the Use Classes Order, changes within the same use class that did not involve any development or physical changes to a building would not need planning permission and there was therefore no scope for applying an Article 4 direction.

Another Member commented that, previously, there had been a push to retain residential units within residential clusters and offices within business areas so that two were carefully distinguished. He questioned whether this would continue to be the case in light of these changes. Officers reported that they did not expect that there would be a dramatic shift in the overall balance of uses in the City. However, it was noted that there may well be a shift in the mix of commercial uses and where these were located given that this could happen without planning permission. Housing had remained unchanged in terms of Use Class Order meaning that the City still retained the same powers to influence this. It was noted that, within the report, there was reference to Permitted Development Rights and the ability to demolish, for example, a vacant office building and erect housing on the same site. There are a number of conditions attached to the new permitted development and a sieve map analysis had shown that there were few suitable sites within the City where this opportunity could be taken up.

**RESOLVED – That Members:**

- Note the publication of the revised Use Classes Order 2020 which took effect on 1 September 2020;
- Note the changes to the Permitted Development Rights published during July 2020 which took effect on 31 August 2020;
- Note that Officers will report further on detailed implications once the National Planning Practice Guidance has been amended to reflect the policy intent of the new Use Classes Order, including the detailed implications for the existing Local Plan and the draft City Plan 2036.

**16. FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN 2021-27- MEASURES**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Flood Risk Management Plan 2021-27- Measures.

**RESOLVED – That Members note the report.**

**17. 2020/21 BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE Q1**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment setting out the progress made during Q1 of the 2020/21 Departmental Business Plan.

A Member highlighted the reference to another round of consultation on the City Plan 2036 taking place in Autumn 2020 within the report and sought clarity around when this would commence and how long it would run for. Officers reported that matters discussed at today's meeting such as COVID recovery, changing growth predictions and the Planning Reform meant that some work was needed to refine and revise the document. Officers intended to bring a process report back to this Committee in late October setting out the timetable for revision. A series of Local Plans Sub Committee meetings would then be required to consider any changes ahead of them coming back to this Committee, to the Policy and Resources Committee and, ultimately, the Court of Common Council for approval. Once this cycle had been completed, consultation would then commence on the revised version of the Plan in early 2021.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report and appendices.

**18. SENIOR OFFICER RECRUITMENT**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to Senior Officer Recruitment.

A Member questioned whether internal candidates would be considered for the role as this was not necessarily clear from the language used within the report. The Chair confirmed that internal candidates would be welcomed but that the permanent position was also to be advertised externally.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report.

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

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing Members with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Department of the Built Environment are satisfactory and that they meet the requirements of the corporate Risk Management Framework.

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

**20. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 27/06/2020 – 21/08/2020.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report.

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

The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director providing Members with a list detailing development and advertisement applications determined by the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report.

22. **VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

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

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report.

23. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

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

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the report.

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

**Thames Riverside Walkway**

The Chief Commoner raised a question on the now long overdue completion of the riverside walkway in the Ward of Queenhithe and commented that he understood that there was now an issue regarding funding as TfL had had to curtail capital spending and could therefore no longer contribute in the way originally anticipated. He asked if the City Corporation had any alternative sources of funding to now ensure that this work was completed before the end of the calendar year. The Director of the Built Environment commented that she too had been disappointed to learn of this problem with regard to funding and recognised that the completion of the walkway was now long overdue with the works being entirely consistent with the ambition of the City to create additional pedestrian space. Whilst the Director was not able to make any promises at this stage, she undertook to explore every possible avenue of funding for the completion of this project.

**Running Track**

A Member commented that it had come to her attention that a Member led consultation regarding the installation of a running track on some of the City Corporation's pavements had led to some confusion among City communities. Some were of the view that this consultation was being carried out by the City Corporation and the Member expressed concern that this was the impression

created by the website set up by the Member leading on this exercise. The Member went on to ask if the Chair would therefore make it clear, in this public forum, that the consultation for this project had not been approved or even considered by any City Corporation Committee and that the Member calling for this did so in no official capacity and was merely an individual canvassing for views on his own initiative. The Chair responded to confirm that whilst this matter had been discussed previously at this Committee, they were not dealing with anything officially in this regard. A Member commented that she had asked Officers of the City Corporation's Health and Wellbeing Board to look at the Sport's Strategy and consider whether this initiative was something that could be incorporated here. She added that the consultation had obviously generated a lot of positive comments to date as well as confusion. Finally, she questioned whether this Committee might include reference within the Local Plan to the desirability of a rooftop running track on certain developments coming forward.

### **Golden Lane Estate**

A Member reported that, on 21 August 2020, Historic England had added the Golden Lane Estate designated landscape to the register of parks and gardens of special historic interest in England and that the whole site was now listed at Grade II. This was in addition to the Estates Grade II and II\* listing for each building and the specific landscape. The letter setting out the listing states that although the register in itself brings no additional statutory controls, the historic interest is established as a material planning consideration and the register provides the key means by which sites of special historic interest are identified. It drew attention to the fact that the sites included should receive special consideration if changes or proposals for development were being contemplated and Local Authorities were required to consult Historic England over any planning applications received which may affect sites graded by listed I or II\* on the register. They were also required to consult the Gardens Trust on applications which may affect any site on the register regardless of grade. With all of this in mind, the Member asked whether the Chair could confirm that Officers in the Department of Built Environment would draw this additional listing to the attention of colleagues in the Department of Community and Children's Services so that when those colleagues, acting on behalf of freeholder of Golden Lane Estate (the City Corporation) propose to carry out repairs to the hard and soft landscape will be aware of the need for such repairs to maintain the integrity of the materials and the design. The Member added that they should also be reminded of the need to make the appropriate applications and referrals before carrying out any work and that this should avoid the Corporation breaking the law as it had done recently when it installed unsuitable roof vents on Crescent House without consent.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the relevant Department and other bodies had been notified of this development and that applications were being assessed in line with the significance set out in this designation. It was noted that this was also quite timely as, as the Committee were aware, a report on the character appraisal for Golden Lane would be brought forward in November and this would provide the opportunity to embed this.

### **The Tulip Planning Inquiry**

A Member commented that she understood that the inquiry would now be held in November 2020. She reported that when the arrangements for this had originally been considered, Members had been informed that there would not be sufficient space within the Guildhall to host this however, with the freeing up of various large meeting spaces such as the Great Hall and Livery Hall as a result of COVID-19, she questioned whether this might now be revisited.

The Chair reported that he was aware that the Town Clerk's Department alongside others were currently working to identify space within Guildhall from which to host hybrid meetings as of next week and that some Members had pushed hard to seek a return to the Livery Hall for meetings of this Committee given that it could accommodate a large number of attendees. The Deputy Chairman highlighted that he intended to put forward a question at the Court of Common Council later this week on the return to use of larger meeting spaces within Guildhall as soon as possible.

The Town Clerk reported that the Chamberlain's Department were leading on a project to ensure that all Committee Rooms and larger meeting spaces such as the Livery Hall were equipped with the correct IT equipment to allow for hybrid meetings and that this was currently running behind schedule. At present, this project was yet to be completed. Members were also reminded that, regardless of room capacity, social distancing would still need to be abided by throughout the Guildhall meaning that fewer attendees could be accommodated. The Chair asked that the strength of feeling from this Committee and its desire to return to physical meetings as soon as possible be relayed.

A Member commented that she had previously served on the Establishment Committee and that past staff surveys had previously indicated that a vast majority of Officers favoured the flexibility of being able to work from home and that this should therefore be borne in mind. The Chair clarified that there were many DBE Officers now present in the City and, indeed, those who had considered to attend throughout for essential work.

With regard to the Inquiry specifically, the Chair commented that he personally felt it was undesirable to take public space out of action for an extended period of time but asked that Officers look into the possibility of hosting this at the Guildhall. Officers confirmed that the space was likely to be required over a period of six weeks and would involve multiple bookings.

### **Bank Junction**

A Member referred to the pavement extension at Bank Junction, in particular on Princes Street, highlighting that it was a very serious trip hazard with paving stones that were not of the usual flat level installed. Officers undertook to examine this when on site in the City tomorrow and to respond to the Member directly on these concerns.

### **22 Bishopsgate**



A Member reported that very large tree had been installed at 22 Bishopsgate and that these were already hitting the canopy. She therefore questioned whether there would be problems around their future growth in this location.

### **Return to Work**

A Member reported that many SME's within his own Ward and across the Square Mile were extremely concerned about trade and survival through the Autumn and Winter months. He suggested that the City Corporation should be leading by example in terms of encouraging Officers and Members back to work. He went on to question whether, in this vein, the City Corporation were making representations to TfL regarding the reopening of the Waterloo and City Line given that this was a major conduit into the City. The Chair commented that this issue had been raised with him recently and that, as far as he was concerned, TfL and National Rail ought to be returning to normal service. He added that he and the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee had written to the Secretary of State for Transport on this matter approximately six weeks ago with others such as the City Property Association also following suit. He agreed that it was part of the City Corporation's civic duty to be returning to work at this stage. The former Deputy Chairman added that he had raised the reopening of the Waterloo and City Line at a meeting earlier this morning with the All-Party Parliamentary Group for London and they had promised to lobby on this as had the MP for the City of London. He agreed that this was of vital importance.

## **25. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

### **Capital Bids**

The Chair referred to the annual Capital Bids process and reported that Officers were busy bidding on all of the items considered essential for the Department of the Built Environment. He added that he would be happy to provide further information to those who were interested in this outside of the meeting. The Committee were assured that he and the Deputy Chair had also had the benefit of considering what the current priorities were.

### **The Old Bailey**

The Chair reported that he and other Committee Chairmen had been discussing the situation concerning the Old Bailey and recent protests with relevant Officers and assessing the City Corporation's various powers in relation to these and what response might be possible.

## **26. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

<b><u>Item No(s)</u></b>	<b><u>Paragraph No(s)</u></b>
27	3
28	3 & 7
29 - 30	-

**27. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the virtual meeting held on 14 July 2020 and approved them as a correct record.

**28. NON-PUBLIC REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising Members of non-public action taken by the Town Clerk since their last meeting in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman and in accordance with Standing Order Nos 41(a) and 41(b).

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

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

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

The Chair took the opportunity to speak further on the forthcoming Tulip Inquiry.

**The meeting closed at 1.58 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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