



Planning and Transportation Committee

ADDENDUM

N.B. Items marked * will be taken without discussion, unless the Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting.

Date: TUESDAY, 18 JULY 2023

Time: 10.30 am

Venue: LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

6. **PROPOSED BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM AND AREA**

Report of the Planning and Development Director (Pages 3-36)

21. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE***

- c) To note the draft minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 27 June 2023* (Pages 37 - 48)

23. **MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE***

- b) To note the draft minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting on 4 July 2023* (Pages 49 - 60)

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Committee(s) Planning and Transportation Committee	Dated: 18/07/2023
Subject: Addendum Report no. 1 for Agenda item 6 Proposed Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum and Area	Public

Withdrawal of Representation

Representatives of the owners of One Silk Street have provided a revised representation of support (13 July 2023) and wish to withdraw the previous letter of objection (21 June 2023).

The 21 June letter posed concerns that the proposed Neighbourhood Area would undermine the Development Plan requirements to optimise One Silk Street and wished to remove the site from the proposed Neighbourhood Area. The revised 13 July letter notes that there is no longer a desire to promote the removal of the site from the Neighbourhood Area. The owners of One Silk Street propose to work collaboratively with the proposed Neighbourhood Forum.

Additional Letter:

Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum Area Addendum 1 18 07 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

[REDACTED]

13th July 2023

**Development Plans Team
City of London Corporation
Guildhall
PO Box 270
London
EC2P 2JE**

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

Registered No. 05092507

telephone 020 7004 1700
facsimile 020 7004 1790

www.dp9.co.uk

By email to: PlanningPolicyConsultations@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION'S CONSULTATION ON THE REQUEST TO DESIGNATE THE BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM AND AREA

We write in relation to the above-mentioned consultation on behalf of our client, One Silk Street LLP, owners of 1 Silk Street, EC2Y 8HQ ('the site') which is located within the proposed Neighbourhood area. These representations update (and effectively supersede) those submitted on 21st June 2023.

Following the submission of our original representations, we have engaged with the Barbican Association in relation to the site and in order to better understand the role and purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan and Forum. We are working with them to establish the local community's aspirations and objectives for the site, and to work with them to define and shape the contribution it can make to the neighbourhood.

As a consequence, we no longer wish to promote the removal of our site from the Neighbourhood area, and propose to work collaboratively with the Forum if it is established in the manner proposed. Specifically in respect of the CIL monies that would be due in relation to any redevelopment of the site, we have no objection to the Neighbourhood Forum assuming responsibility for their due allocation. We respectfully request that our representations are taken into account when the matter is considered at the Planning & Transportation Committee on Tuesday 18th July.

Should you wish to discuss any aspect of these representations, please contact Jonathan Smith of this office.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

DP9 Ltd.

This page is intentionally left blank

Barbican and Golden Lane Consultation Comments

<p>We want your views on the proposed neighbourhood forum.</p>	<p>We want your views on the proposed neighbourhood area</p>
<p>I support this initiative and applaud those who have got the application to this stage. There is obviously a lot more to be done, and one area that I believe needs further clarification is the criteria for Business and Community Group Members.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Support the creation of a neighbourhood forum. In the execution of the view that creation of appropriate and balanced governance structures are critical to ensure voices are heard in an unbiased and balanced manner and this should be a key focus for the next stage.</p>	<p>One important comment on the boundary. I propose that the boundary in Moor Lane run to the pavement rather than down the middle of the road. This is because Moor Lane is a quiet cycle lane, is about to be greened as part of neighbourhood greening and wellbeing and hence there is a strong argument to include the road and pavement in the boundary.</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I welcome this initiative</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I fully support the proposal for a Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area.</p>

<p>I agree with the proposal which is long overdue</p>	<p>I agree with this proposal extending as marked on the map but within the City of London boundaries.</p>
<p>It is a great development for the area. Completely support.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area looks appropriate. I'm glad that residents in blocks neighbouring the Barbican and Golden lane estates are included as they are part of our community. Completely support.</p>
<p>This is a brilliant idea. It's high time the residents of the City of London had some recognition and this will help.</p>	<p>It seems entirely sensible. All those within this area share the same interest in maintaining and improving quality of life.</p>
<p>This is an excellent idea and long overdue . The Barbican and Golden Lane estates were originally conceived as an oasis in the heart of the city to encourage people to come back and move where they work . In the last 38 years during which we've lived here we've seen the interests and needs of such residents increasingly ignored by the City planners in every area. We don't have a coherent and a constructive voice to promote the benefits of having a vibrant residential community in the heart of the City and this will help to provide this</p>	<p>It's a great idea to develop a coherent and long term plan for residential areas in the heart of the business community which balances the needs and interests of both communities and provides a useful touchstone for those making planning applications from both. Relations between residents and the City have become quite toxic over the last few years and it is time to engage in constructive debate and create a helpful set of principles to facilitate further consultation and decisionmaking on critical issues such as traffic management, environmental matters and of course development .</p>

I support the formation of the Neighbourhood Forum. The constitution document is, however, vague (to the point of silence) as to how its activities will be financed. Presumably the instigators know that a grant for neighbourhood planning expenses is available from Locality. For example, no membership fee is proposed (probably rightly). I wonder whether the option was considered of forming a civil parish within the City, with universal suffrage and elected parish councillors rather than directors, and with the civil parish area forming the neighbourhood plan area, and with a council tax precept financing the parish council (including a paid parish clerk).

1. The City's draft plan also sees residential development at 'Smithfield'; it might be a good idea to include the rest of the Farringdon Within ward (Barts Square etc) in the neighbourhood area, as this is hard by the Barbican and includes Barbican tube station. In particular, buildings/developments on the west side of Aldersgate St have a huge impact on the Barbican environment, and so it would be beneficial to have neighbourhood plan policies that covered that location.

2. Similarly the eastern end of the Barbican is heavily affected by buildings/development on the eastern side of Moor Lane and in the vicinity of London Wall Place. I would like to see the neighbourhood plan area extended south to London Wall (where it doesn't currently reach there), and east to Moorfields or even Moorgate. After all, the Culture Mile trail extends east to Moorgate Station, which is also the premier transport interchange for the Barbican.

<p>A good idea if this can give more voice to residents in the City.</p>	<p>As a Barbican resident I think the area should be expanded to include Barts Square and Bartholomew Close as residents there will also be affected by significant changes that are on the horizon.</p> <p>With the opening of the London Museum in West Smithfield and the development of the meat market once it moves, the 'culture mile' corridor from the new museum to the Elizabeth Line station entrance in Long Lane and to the Barbican needs to be considered as a whole. It appears that not much thought has been given to movement of people and traffic across this area.</p>
<p>It looks well conceived and likely to be very helpful.</p>	<p>This area makes a huge amount of sense given the location of residential buildings and community assets such as churches and open spaces.</p>
<p>I am supportive of the forum because it builds on existing good community organisations representing individual local buildings.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area because it reads logically as a neighbourhood. It includes buildings and blocks that have a genuine community and feeling of being a mutually shared place.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Plans are effective at putting the voices of communities into planning law and community initiatives - so I support this.</p>	<p>The area makes sense - it will always seem somewhat arbitrary - but it is centres on the Barbican.</p>

<p>It is my view that this is an excellent idea. The proposed area is coherent, has a wide range of planning needs and will benefit from a well-coordinated approach.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area is logical and relevant to the needs of this community.</p>
<p>Its a good idea</p>	<p>Looks about right</p>
<p>A good idea if it includes both positive and negative requests</p>	<p>To increase the amount if local neighbourhood facilities. Lots of empty shops that could provide services for community. Farmers food market on a weekend - not just supermarket stuff.</p>
<p>Opposed. No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane have their own separate associations.</p>	<p>No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane should be considered separately.</p>
<p>I support the formation of a Neighbourhood Forum. As a resident I support any initiative which promotes collaboration between the residential and working population of the City of London and the Planning authorities.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood area looks exactly right. I support the inclusion of the green spaces in the area, including Postman's park and the Barbican Wildlife Garden.</p>
<p>Yes, this is an excellent idea.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>The creation of a Neighbourhood Forum is important to collate and represent the views of the people living in the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates along with adjoining buildings.</p> <p>The residential area is very special because of its location - but that also leads to particular pressures being put upon it when the needs of residents are up against corporate interests.</p> <p>Without these residential areas the City of London would lose an important part of its character and ability the culture and visitors which enrich it. So it is important that the needs of the residents can be represented coherently and appropriately in local development and planning matters.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed neighbourhood area</p>
<p>It is high-time the community took advantage of the legislation to afford it a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhood.</p> <p>More information on the emerging forum can be found on their recently launched website- https://bglneighbours.wordpress.com</p>	<p>The proposed area follows the City of London wards of Cripplegate and Aldersgate with a few residential blocks added. These wards are predominantly residential and have a thriving local community.</p>
<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood forum.</p>	<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood area encompassing the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates.</p>
<p>Why not?</p>	<p>To whom would its members be accountable? How would they be elected/appointed? What would they do?</p>
<p>I enthusiastically support the creation of the Neighbourhood Forum for this amazing place in which to both live and work and believe that the forum will do much to bring diverse people and institutions together to co-create a positive and imaginative shared future that benefits us all.</p>	<p>-</p>

I support this. Sounds like a great idea and surprising we don't have one already in line with other London boroughs & counties. It makes you wonder under legislation what else we don't have here that we have a right to.

I hope this forum has more weight and does not become yet another exclusive working group.

How quickly can this be up and running?

Can the Forum be renamed? eg North City Neighbourhood Forum. There are residential areas which are not part of either estate in the green area eg bridgewater house, Denizen, Tudor rose court. Naming a Forum to be inclusive of all residents is key to the inclusion of voices to feel they are allowed to participate. Or if the area is marked by Cripplegate & Aldersgate Ward to be named as such, eg Cripplegate & Aldersgate neighbourhood forum.

Can the green boundary be extended to the west to include the developments in Barts square?

How will it be clear to public this is different to the existing NHS Neighbourhood forums, of eg City & Shoreditch Park Neighbourhood forum.

<https://cityandhackneyneighbourhoods.org.uk/>

<p>I strongly support the setting up of the Forum, for the proposed Neighbourhood area. It will provide a strong vehicle for the voices of those who live and work in the area and provide a forum for proactive engagement in local planning (rather than simply reactive)</p>	<p>The area makes sense as a discrete coherent neighbourhood within the City's wider "key area of change" Barbican and Smithfield outlined in the emerging Local Plan. It will help keep the neighbourhood's distinctiveness as a residential and cultural area within the City. It recognises the biggest cluster of residences within the City. Can't see any point in extending it to Islington, which is a much more residential borough anyway and doesn't have the same geographically tight relationship between residences and cultural establishments</p>
<p>It is a really good idea and has clear benefits for the local area.</p>	<p>The boundary includes all of the main residential areas in close proximity to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates - an excellent inclusive approach. It is best not to include those areas that lie within Islington as liaising across 2 local authorities would be complicated and very difficult.</p>
<p>I strongly support this proposal, The area fo the forum has a rich and diverse body of stakeholders who are interested in working collaboratively to enhance all aspects of the area. I would personally feel more involved once this exists</p>	<p>This area already has some cohesion and thus stands as an area but with strong links to the rest of the City and surrounding areas. As an ex planner I have engaged where I felt I could add value but this would enhance that ability</p>

<p>This is an excellent proposal that stands to support change towards a strong future residential element so fundamental to a great historical city such that the City of London is. Particularly at the time of great change that is upon us: not only the catastrophic impact of global warming and the collapse of non-human species, but the advent of artificial intelligence that will largely eliminate jobs in financial services, universities, and other intellectual-based service roles where humans simply cannot compete (as calculators were to doing arithmetic, AI is to doing intellectual work). At this time we need to shift to people focussed representation that guides us as to how this great city will look and function for residents in the future.</p>	-
<p>I think it is a good idea</p>	Seems fine
<p>Hello, first I have some questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who decided to launch this project? 2. Who chose the people to approach to become the first members? 3. Who appointed or chose the steering group members? <p>And who are all these two sets of people as I only know two individuals from among them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. What activities for this forum do these two groups propose to take up, who will decide which ones to accept and carry out, and which ones to reject, and who will carry out the accepted ones? 4. What role(s) do the rest of us have in this picture? <p>This long, detailed text says almost nothing about "what change do we want to bring about" and "what improvements do we want to implement", and "who will be in charge of implementing them and "who will carry them out", and "how will they be funded and managed". With these answers, I would hope to be able to form an opinion.</p>	<p>My questions above need to be answered first, sorry.</p>
<p>I think is a great idea and fully support it's establishment as soon as possible</p>	-

<p>I think it's a great idea and about time the City had a neighbourhood forum within its boundaries</p>	<p>This makes sense. It is our neighbourhood and contains the majority of the City's residential population, a lot of SMEs, community groups and others. It covers Cripplegate and Aldersgate wards.</p>
<p>Yes definitely. It is important that Barbican and Golden Lane residents can present their views.</p>	<p>Excellent idea - fully supportive</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>An interesting idea, but if it is to include the life of those who live around here, should it look to include all the new flats behind Barts, to the south of Long Lane</p>
<p>Given the small numbers requesting this, compared to the large numbers who reside in the area, they are not representative of the vast majority who live in the area. The mention of somebody in Little Britain also perhaps explains the strange shape of the proposed area, extending south-west to include Little Britain and also many business premises. Also the area to the north-east covers building.</p> <p>There are already enough groups representing residents in these areas, and even those existing ones are in a minority.</p> <p>I lived for 10 years in the Barbican so I know the area well, and now reside in another residential property in the City of London, which also has a resident's committee consisting of a small percentage of the residents, most who are unaware of it's existence.</p> <p>Better would be the City Of London to judge planning application properly and take note of umpteen resident complaints and facts. One example being 150 Aldersgate where a a report wrongly stated there would be no loss of natural light if the balconies/fire escapes were ignored. No more automatic rubber-stamping of all new developments, particularly office, and high-end residential.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>It sounds like a very good idea.</p>	<p>Combining the areas of Barbican and Golden Lane makes sense.</p>
<p>The proposed area contains a large proportion of non-residential spaces such as schools, offices, arts, and businesses. It is not clear that this in an appropriate forum in which to address the needs of these stakeholders as well as residents.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>This is a sound proposal that will give a stronger voice to the local community.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I think this is a good idea coming just as we move to the new era of recycling, renovating, retrofitting and conserving nature in our neighbourhoods. I would only say I think that the park just east of and next to Golden Lane and the primary school both have an important function for this neighbourhood that should somehow get reflected even if outside the area. Could the head teacher add comments for example? And people comment on how they use the little park - it is a useful cut through route for example.</p>	<p>See the comment above re the Plan content being used to also reflect on things of local importance just outside the area.</p>
<p>I support the proposed forum.</p>	<p>This is the wrong area to achieve the stated purposes. London Wall is the natural Southern boundary. The legislation specifically provides for neighbourhood areas to span local authority boundaries. The Northern boundary should include Prior Weston school, Cherry Tree Walk and adjacent offices.</p>
<p>The Worshipful Company of Plaisterers Hall falls within this proposed area. We would wish to understand the implications of being within this area as they pertain to running a busy Hall that is rented out. We would also wish to understand the reason for the SW boundary goes south of London Wall.</p>	<p>-</p>

I generally support the proposal, which will go a small way to mitigating the democratic deficit for residents of the City of London, which is overwhelmingly governed by representatives with a large business mandate. I am aware that the SMEs and residents in this neighbourhood have more in common with each other than either have with the large and multinational businesses that predominate in the rest of the City. The Neighbourhood Forum is timely as the proposals for the Culture Mile BID have set an aspiration to increase by a step change the visitor footfall in the area. Whilst the regeneration dividend of Culture Mile is potentially of great value to residents and local businesses, there is also a risk that establishing a national visitor destination on our doorstep will have dis-benefits for residents and certain categories of small business if it not carefully planned and managed. A forum anchored in the neighbourhood could be an important balance in policy and implementation of the Culture Mile, to avoid conflicts that have arisen elsewhere with central London destinations with high residential populations (e.g. Covent Garden, Shoreditch, Fitzrovia). The redevelopment of the Smithfield market buildings once relocated, and the re-opening of the Museum of London on its new site have the capacity to bring about radical change fast. The issues of the Golden Lane and Barbican area (and the other residential pockets adjoining) are quite distinct from the rest of the Square Mile, and receive inadequate consideration and attention in City policy making and decision trees. There is a risk that non-residents and businesses primarily based outside the area will have a preponderance. The proposed constitution (clause 16.1) deploys the idea of 'demonstrably resident' and 'demonstrably working' in the area without setting a test for demonstrably. I would prefer to see the phrases 'whose principal place of residence' and 'whose principal place of business' here to help reduce the risk of undue influence from absentee landlords and businesses primarily based elsewhere, even elsewhere in the city. This is because the Neighbourhood Forum should be founded on localism. In recent decades the City of London has not been good at consulting its residents and SMEs and has sometimes shown itself to be seriously out of touch with residents, the numbers of which are rapidly growing, as a matter of policy, from a low base. The Neighbourhood Forum has the potential to contribute to a better balance and a more equitable City.

I am not clear why the residential pockets around St Bartholemew the Great church have been excluded whilst those in Little Britain have been included. Other excluded pockets of primarily residential property (most with SME uses on the ground floor) are along Aldersgate Street and Long Lane. I consider these should be included too to engage both residents and SMEs. These areas as also a part of the setting for the large scale cityscapes of the Barbican and Golden Lane estates. These areas (and those already included) have more in common with each other than either have with the rest of the Square Mile.

-	In general the boundary seems sensible, though it seems odd that Alban Gate is not included
-	Why are only some properties, across roads from the estates, included in the proposed area?
The proposal is sound and reflects the commitment of local residents to shaping their neighborhood as real place.	-
It sounds cohesive, relevant, and ticking all the bureaucratic boxes. A good way to foreground residents voices.	It appears to incorporate all the relevant sub-communities.
-	I am in support of any effort to empower residents to influence their material environment. My Quaker Meeting is located nearby and we find the gross high-rise intrusions of buildings in the City and in our area of Islington (City Road & Old Street roundabout) ominously threatening, odious.
This seems a sensible way of allowing local views to be heard from the residents and small businesses in an important and vibrant area. The current arrangements have until this proposal appeared to discount and undervalue such views.	The area is closely linked and includes a significant proportion of the residential accommodation in the City of London
Great idea. Democratic input from people living/working within the neighbourhood makes complete sense.	It seems to be inclusive enough

<p>The area residents should have a voice. I support this idea</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>I</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>As a local councillor for Aldersgate, I support the application. I am not clear whether the Forum would input to the City Police Barbican Cluster liaison, but would encourage that - if relevant.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I am very supportive of the proposal in order to have a say in planning decisions and greater influence on CIL funding outcomes. In 2022 Shakespeare Tower House Group applied for CIL funding to support its efforts of refurbishing its lobby, which is part of the historic fabric of the Barbican. Sadly it was rejected which is doubly disappointing considering that the CIL pot was heavily underutilised and was often used for less deserving initiatives. With the Barbican Podium Works, Beech Street Zero Emission Zone and Barbican Renewal Projects all underway, it is crucial that local residents can better voice their concerns and participate in the planning and decision making process.</p>	<p>Consideration could be given to include neighbouring areas all the way to Farringdon/Smithfield (e.g. Barts Square) to improve the collective bargaining power.</p>
<p>It's a great idea and I completely support setting up this forum. The community is very strong here and we would value representation and a voice</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>What is the purpose and/or benefit(s) of this further body?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I fully support this application. I am a resident living in Stanley Cohen House, with links with friends in the Barbican Estate and Cloth Fair as well as my immediate neighbours here on the Golden Lane Estate</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>I fully support the proposed neighbourhood forum as a way for the residents and workers in this area to have more of a voice in the vision for our area and how CIL money is spent in our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed area which aligns with City of London boundaries and takes in both major residential complexes.</p>
<p>I strongly support this proposal which will have significant benefits for the people living in the area.</p>	<p>The area appears relevant and proportionate.</p>
<p>I think this is an excellent initiative for a cohesive community to have a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhoods. Residents's associations don't have this and it is long overdue. Neighbourhood forums have been around since 2011/12. The fact that the City is a one of 8 neighbourhood deserts speaks volumes. This has my full support.</p>	<p>I think this is an excellent initiative for a cohesive community to have a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhoods. Residents's associations don't have this and it is long overdue. Neighbourhood forums have been around since 2011/12. The fact that the City is a one of 8 neighbourhood deserts speaks volumes. This has my full support.</p>
<p>I support the application in relation to both the creation of a neighbourhood area and forum.</p>	<p>I support the application in relation to both the creation of a neighbourhood area and forum.</p>
<p>This is a good idea. The Corporation needs to listen to its residents.</p>	<p>Exclude the offices to the South East of the London Wall roundabout.</p>
<p>I fully support the proposed Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>The boundary strikes a good balance between commercial/office and residential development.</p>

<p>I fully support the proposed forum. We need to find a way to strengthen our local community and give it a more active voice that the City of London will listen to in all areas of activity, regulation, development and expenditure that affect our lives.</p>	<p>This is a vibrant local area with a wonderfully diverse mix of residents and to recognise it as a neighbourhood area will only strengthen the community. Bringing together Golden Lane and the Barbican in this way is eminently sensible and I hope will be the beginning of a process that local residents feel invested in and will contribute to.</p>
<p>I am in favour of this.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposal.</p>
<p>.</p>	<p>All residential of course except for the area of office blocks south east of Museum of London?</p>
<p>try it for a period, say 2 years, and then assess its value objectively.</p>	<p>a good concept</p>
<p>I am in favour</p>	<p>I agree with one caveat. The boundary along Moor Lane should include both the road and the pavement along the East side. The move toward greater greening of the neighbourhood should be encouraged; extending the boundary to include the pavement would allow the neighbourhood to fully embrace this objective.</p>
<p>Seems a good idea for an area where the corporation tends not to take the interests of residents as seriously as those of businesses</p>	<p>Seems logical given the focus of residential development in this area</p>

<p>I support this initiative and applaud those who have got the application to this stage. There is obviously a lot more to be done, and one area that I believe needs further clarification is the criteria for Business and Community Group Members.</p>	-
<p>Support the creation of a neighbourhood forum. In the execution of the view that creation of appropriate</p>	<p>One important comment on the boundary.</p>
-	*****
<p>I welcome this initiative</p>	-
<p>I fully support the proposal for a Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area.</p>
<p>I agree with the proposal which is long overdue</p>	<p>I agree with this proposal extending as marked on the map but within the City of London boundaries.</p>
<p>It is a great development for the area. Completely support.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area looks appropriate. I'm glad that residents in blocks neighbouring the Barbican and Golden lane estates are included as they are part of our community. Completely support.</p>
<p>This is a brilliant idea. It's high time the residents of the City of London had some recognition and this will help.</p>	<p>It seems entirely sensible. All those within this area share the same interest in maintaining and improving quality of life.</p>

This is an excellent idea and long overdue . The Barbican and Golden Lane estates were originally conceived as an oasis in the heart of the city to encourage people to come back and move where they work . In the last 38 years during which weâ€™ve lived here weâ€™ve seen the interests and needs of such residents increasingly ignored by the City planners in every area. We donâ€™t have a coherent and a constructive voice to promote the benefits of having a vibrant residential community in the heart of the City and this will help to provide this

Itâ€™s a great idea to develop a coherent and long term plan for residential areas in the heart of the business community which balances the needs and interests of both communities and provides a useful touchstone for those making planning applications from both. Relations between residents and the City have become quite toxic over the last few years and it is time to engage in constructive debate and create a helpful set of principles to facilitate further consultation and decisionmaking on critical issues such as traffic management, environmental matters and of course development .

I support the formation of the Neighbourhood Forum. The constitution document is, however, vague (to the point of silence) as to how its activities will be financed. Presumably the instigators know that a grant for neighbourhood planning expenses is available from Locality. For example, no membership fee is proposed (probably rightly). I wonder whether the option was considered of forming a civil parish within the City, with universal suffrage and elected parish councillors rather than directors, and with the civil parish area forming the neighbourhood plan area, and with a council tax precept financing the parish council (including a paid parish clerk).

1. The City's draft plan also sees residential development at 'Smithfield'; it might be a good idea to include the rest of the Farringdon Within ward (Barts Square etc) in the neighbourhood area, as this is hard by the Barbican and includes Barbican tube station. In particular, buildings/developments on the west side of Aldersgate St have a huge impact on the Barbican environment, and so it would be beneficial to have neighbourhood plan policies that covered that location.

2. Similarly the eastern end of the Barbican is heavily affected by buildings/development on the eastern side of Moor Lane and in the vicinity of London Wall Place. I would like to see the neighbourhood plan area extended south to London Wall (where it doesn't currently reach there), and east to Moorfields or even Moorgate. After all, the Culture Mile trail extends east to Moorgate Station, which is also the premier transport interchange for the Barbican.

<p>A good idea if this can give more voice to residents in the City.</p>	<p>As a Barbican resident I think the area should be expanded to include Barts Square and Bartholomew Close as residents there will also be affected by significant changes that are on the horizon.</p> <p>With the opening of the London Museum in West Smithfield and the development of the meat market once it moves, the 'culture mile' corridor from the new museum to the Elizabeth Line station entrance in Long Lane and to the Barbican needs to be considered as a whole. It appears that not much thought has been given to movement of people and traffic across this area.</p>
<p>It looks well conceived and likely to be very helpful.</p>	<p>This area makes a huge amount of sense given the location of residential buildings and community assets such as churches and open spaces.</p>
<p>I am supportive of the forum because it builds on existing good community organisations representing individual local buildings.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area because it reads logically as a neighbourhood. It includes buildings and blocks that have a genuine community and feeling of being a mutually shared place.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Plans are effective at putting the voices of communities into planning law and community initiatives - so I support this.</p>	<p>The area makes sense - it will always seem somewhat arbitrary - but it is centres on the Barbican.</p>

<p>It is my view that this is an excellent idea. The proposed area is coherent, has a wide range of planning needs and will benefit from a well-coordinated approach.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area is logical and relevant to the needs of this community.</p>
<p>Its a good idea</p>	<p>Looks about right</p>
<p>A good idea if it includes both positive and negative requests</p>	<p>To increase the amount if local neighbourhood facilities. Lots of empty shops that could provide services for community. Farmers food market on a weekend - not just supermarket stuff.</p>
<p>Opposed. No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane have their own separate associations.</p>	<p>No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane should be considered separately.</p>
<p>I support the formation of a Neighbourhood Forum. As a resident I support any initiative which promotes collaboration between the residential and working population of the City of London and the Planning authorities.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood area looks exactly right. I support the inclusion of the green spaces in the area, including Postman's park and the Barbican Wildlife Garden.</p>
<p>Yes, this is an excellent idea.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>The creation of a Neighbourhood Forum is important to collate and represent the views of the people living in the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates along with adjoining buildings.</p> <p>The residential area is very special because of its location - but that also leads to particular pressures being put upon it when the needs of residents are up against corporate interests.</p> <p>Without these residential areas the City of London would lose an important part of its character and ability the culture and visitors which enrich it. So it is important that the needs of the residents can be represented coherently and appropriately in local development and planning matters.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed neighbourhood area</p>
<p>It is high-time the community took advantage of the legislation to afford it a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhood.</p> <p>More information on the emerging forum can be found on their recently launched website- https://bglneighbours.wordpress.com</p>	<p>The proposed area follows the City of London wards of Cripplegate and Aldersgate with a few residential blocks added. These wards are predominantly residential and have a thriving local community.</p>
<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood forum.</p>	<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood area encompassing the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates.</p>
<p>Why not?</p>	<p>To whom would its members be accountable? How would they be elected/appointed? What would they do?</p>
<p>I enthusiastically support the creation of the Neighbourhood Forum for this amazing place in which to both live and work and believe that the forum will do much to bring diverse people and institutions together to co-create a positive and imaginative shared future that benefits us all.</p>	<p>-</p>

I support this. Sounds like a great idea and surprising we don't have one already in line with other London boroughs & counties. It makes you wonder under legislation what else we don't have here that we have a right to.

I hope this forum has more weight and does not become yet another exclusive working group.

How quickly can this be up and running?

Can the Forum be renamed? eg North City Neighbourhood Forum. There are residential areas which are not part of either estate in the green area eg bridgewater house, Denizen, Tudor rose court. Naming a Forum to be inclusive of all residents is key to the inclusion of voices to feel they are allowed to participate. Or if the area is marked by Cripplegate & Aldersgate Ward to be named as such, eg Cripplegate & Aldersgate neighbourhood forum.

Can the green boundary be extended to the west to include the developments in Barts square?

How will it be clear to public this is different to the existing NHS Neighbour hood forums, of eg City & Shoreditch Park Neighbourhood forum.

<https://cityandhackneyneighbourhoods.org.uk/>

<p>I strongly support the setting up of the Forum, for the proposed Neighbourhood area. It will provide a strong vehicle for the voices of those who live and work in the area and provide a forum for proactive engagement in local planning (rather than simply reactive)</p>	<p>The area makes sense as a discrete coherent neighbourhood within the City's wider "key area of change" Barbican and Smithfield outlined in the emerging Local Plan. It will help keep the neighbourhood's distinctiveness as a residential and cultural area within the City. It recognises the biggest cluster of residences within the City. Can't see any point in extending it to Islington, which is a much more residential borough anyway and doesn't have the same geographically tight relationship between residences and cultural establishments</p>
<p>It is a really good idea and has clear benefits for the local area.</p>	<p>The boundary includes all of the main residential areas in close proximity to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates - an excellent inclusive approach. It is best not to include those areas that lie within Islington as liaising across 2 local authorities would be complicated and very difficult.</p>
<p>I strongly support this proposal, The area fo the forum has a rich and diverse body of stakeholders who are interested in working collaboratively to enhance all aspects of the area. I would personally feel more involved once this exists</p>	<p>This area already has some cohesion and thus stands as an area but with strong links to the rest of the City and surrounding areas. As an ex planner I have engaged where I felt I could add value but this would enhance that ability</p>

<p>This is an excellent proposal that stands to support change towards a strong future residential element so fundamental to a great historical city such that the City of London is. Particularly at the time of great change that is upon us: not only the catastrophic impact of global warming and the collapse of non-human species, but the advent of artificial intelligence that will largely eliminate jobs in financial services, universities, and other intellectual-based service roles where humans simply cannot compete (as calculators were to doing arithmetic, AI is to doing intellectual work). At this time we need to shift to people focussed representation that guides us as to how this great city will look and function for residents in the future.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I think it is a good idea</p>	<p>Seems fine</p>
<p>Hello, first I have some questions: 1. Who decided to launch this project? 2. Who chose the people to approach to become the first members? 3. Who appointed or chose the steering group members? And who are all these two sets of people as I only know two individuals from among them. 3. What activities for this forum do these two groups propose to take up, who will decide which ones to accept and carry out, and which ones to reject, and who will carry out the accepted ones? 4. What role(s) do the rest of us have in this picture?</p> <p>This long, detailed text says almost nothing about "what change do we want to bring about" and "what improvements do we want to implement", and "who will be in charge of implementing them and "who will carry them out", and "how will they be funded and managed". With these answers, I would hope to be able to form an opinion.</p>	<p>My questions above need to be answered first, sorry.</p>
<p>I think is a great idea and fully support it's establishment as soon as possible</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>I think it's a great idea and about time the City had a neighbourhood forum within its boundaries</p>	<p>This makes sense. It is our neighbourhood and contains the majority of the City's residential population, a lot of SMEs, community groups and others. It covers Cripplegate and Aldersgate wards.</p>
<p>Yes definitely. It is important that Barbican and Golden Lane residents can present their views.</p>	<p>Excellent idea - fully supportive</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>An interesting idea, but if it is to include the life of those who live around here, should it look to include all the new flats behind Barts, to the south of Long Lane</p>
<p>Given the small numbers requesting this, compared to the large numbers who reside in the area, they are not representative of the vast majority who live in the area. The mention of somebody in Little Britain also perhaps explains the strange shape of the proposed area, extending south-west to include Little Britain and also many business premises. Also the area to the north-east covers building.</p> <p>There are already enough groups representing residents in these areas, and even those existing ones are in a minority.</p> <p>I lived for 10 years in the Barbican so I know the area well, and now reside in another residential property in the City of London, which also has a resident's committee consisting of a small percentage of the residents, most who are unaware of it's existence.</p> <p>Better would be the City Of London to judge planning application properly and take note of umpteen resident complaints and facts. One example being 150 Aldersgate where a a report wrongly stated there would be no loss of natural light if the balconies/fire escapes were ignored. No more automatic rubber-stamping of all new developments, particularly office, and high-end residential.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>It sounds like a very good idea.</p>	<p>Combining the areas of Barbican and Golden Lane makes sense.</p>
<p>The proposed area contains a large proportion of non-residential spaces such as schools, offices, arts, and businesses. It is not clear that this in an appropriate forum in which to address the needs of these stakeholders as well as residents.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>This is a sound proposal that will give a stronger voice to the local community.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I think this is a good idea coming just as we move to the new era of recycling, renovating, retrofitting and conserving nature in our neighbourhoods. I would only say I think that the park just east of and next to Golden Lane and the primary school both have an important function for this neighbourhood that should somehow get reflected even if outside the area. Could the head teacher add comments for example? And people comment on how they use the little park - it is a useful cut through route for example.</p>	<p>See the comment above re the Plan content being used to also reflect on things of local importance just outside the area.</p>
<p>I support the proposed forum.</p>	<p>This is the wrong area to achieve the stated purposes. London Wall is the natural Southern boundary. The legislation specifically provides for neighbourhood areas to span local authority boundaries. The Northern boundary should include Prior Weston school, Cherry Tree Walk and adjacent offices.</p>
<p>The Worshipful Company of Plaisterers Hall falls within this proposed area. We would wish to understand the implications of being within this area as they pertain to running a busy Hall that is rented out. We would also wish to understand the reason for the SW boundary goes south of London Wall.</p>	<p>-</p>

I generally support the proposal, which will go a small way to mitigating the democratic deficit for residents of the City of London, which is overwhelmingly governed by representatives with a large business mandate. I am aware that the SMEs and residents in this neighbourhood have more in common with each other than either have with the large and multinational businesses that predominate in the rest of the City. The Neighbourhood Forum is timely as the proposals for the Culture Mile BID have set an aspiration to increase by a step change the visitor footfall in the area. Whilst the regeneration dividend of Culture Mile is potentially of great value to residents and local businesses, there is also a risk that establishing a national visitor destination on our doorstep will have dis-benefits for residents and certain categories of small business if it not carefully planned and managed. A forum anchored in the neighbourhood could be an important balance in policy and implementation of the Culture Mile, to avoid conflicts that have arisen elsewhere with central London destinations with high residential populations (e.g. Covent Garden, Shoreditch, Fitzrovia). The redevelopment of the Smithfield market buildings once relocated, and the re-opening of the Museum of London on its new site have the capacity to bring about radical change fast. The issues of the Golden Lane and Barbican area (and the other residential pockets adjoining) are quite distinct from the rest of the Square Mile, and receive inadequate consideration and attention in City policy making and decision trees. There is a risk that non-residents and businesses primarily based outside the area will have a preponderance. The proposed constitution (clause 16.1) deploys the idea of 'demonstrably resident' and 'demonstrably working' in the area without setting a test for demonstrably. I would prefer to see the phrases 'whose principal place of residence' and 'whose principal place of business' here to help reduce the risk of undue influence from absentee landlords and businesses primarily based elsewhere, even elsewhere in the city. This is because the Neighbourhood Forum should be founded on localism. In recent decades the City of London has not been good at consulting its residents and SMEs and has sometimes shown itself to be seriously out of touch with residents, the numbers of which are rapidly growing, as a matter of policy, from a low base. The Neighbourhood Forum has the potential to contribute to a better balance and a more equitable City.

I am not clear why the residential pockets around St Bartholemew the Great church have been excluded whilst those in Little Britain have been included. Other excluded pockets of primarily residential property (most with SME uses on the ground floor) are along Aldersgate Street and Long Lane. I consider these should be included too to engage both residents and SMEs. These areas as also a part of the setting for the large scale cityscapes of the Barbican and Golden Lane estates. These areas (and those already included) have more in common with each other than either have with the rest of the Square Mile.

-	In general the boundary seems sensible, though it seems odd that Alban Gate is not included
-	Why are only some properties, across roads from the estates, included in the proposed area?
The proposal is sound and reflects the commitment of local residents to shaping their neighborhood as real place.	-
It sounds cohesive, relevant, and ticking all the bureaucratic boxes. A good way to foreground residents voices.	It appears to incorporate all the relevant sub-communities.
-	I am in support of any effort to empower residents to influence their material environment. My Quaker Meeting is located nearby and we find the gross high-rise intrusions of buildings in the City and in our area of Islington (City Road & Old Street roundabout) ominously threatening, odious.
See written letter	
See written letter	
See email response	
See written letter	
See written letter	
See email response	

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE Tuesday, 27 June 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 27 June 2023 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Graham Packham (Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Brendan Barns
Ian Bishop-Laggett
Deputy Michael Cassidy
John Edwards
Anthony David Fitzpatrick
Deputy John Fletcher
Dawn Frampton
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Antony Manchester
Deputy Brian Mooney
Deborah Oliver
Alderswoman Susan Pearson
Deputy Henry Pollard
Ian Seaton
William Upton KC

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	– Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Stokley	– Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	– Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
David Horkan	– Environment Department
Bruce McVean	– Environment Department
Joanna Parker	– Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	– Environment Department
Jessica Robinson	– Environment Department
Peter Wilson	– Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Mary Durcan, Deputy Marian Fredericks, Alderman Ian Luder, Deputy Shravan Joshi, Deputy Alastair Moss, Judith Pleasance, Shailendra Umradia and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

The Town Clerk advised that Deputy Fredericks had asked that the reason for her apologies be recorded. The Clerk stated that Under paragraph 8e of the Planning Protocol, Members who had been involved in promoting a project

should not also participate in making decisions on the planning application for the project, in order to maintain separation of functions between the developer and local planning authority (“LPA”) roles and Deputy Fredericks was at the Policy and Resources Committee which considered a report on the project on 7th of July 2022.

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

Deputy Anderson declared a disclosable pecuniary interest relative to Agenda Items 4 and 5 as he lived in the area of the application. He confirmed he would not be speaking or voting on these items.

Ms Oliver declared a disclosable pecuniary interest relative to Agenda Items 4 and 5 as she lived in Shakespeare Tower and was a member of Shakespeare Tower House Group. She confirmed she would not be speaking or voting on these items.

Deputy Lloyd-Owen stated that she was a resident of the Barbican but lived on the London Wall side of Gilbert House, she had taken advice and was not considered to have a disclosable pecuniary interest. She confirmed she would take part in the consideration of Agenda Items 4 and 5.

3. **MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the public minutes of the last meeting held on 20 March 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

4. **BARBICAN ESTATE, LONDON, EC2Y 8EN**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning a proposal for Barbican Podium Phase 2 for the installation of new waterproofing and drainage infrastructure. Works would comprise the removal of existing tiled hard surfaces, membranes and soft landscaping, demolition of existing link building between Ben Jonson House and Frobisher Crescent, alterations to the existing entrance to Exhibition Hall including the construction of a new entrance portal, installation of a new waterproofing membrane across the site and the repair and replacement of the drainage system and the reinstatement of a new tiled hard surface with a new soft landscaping layout (including raised planters, grassed areas, trees, community growing planters, new lighting, seating, wayfinding, informal play and exercise area and relocation of existing and installation of new public art).

The Town Clerk referred to those papers set out within the main agenda pack as well as the Officer presentation slides, and three addenda containing additional/late representations plus amended conditions that had been separately circulated and published.

Officers presented the application, stating that the most recent addendum circulated related to standard conditions regarding the circular economy, managing the reuse of existing materials on site and the content of recyclable material in new materials. The Officer explained that the site was in the north-eastern part of the City. The application was for Phase 2 of the waterproofing

programme on the Barbican Estate and was an ongoing Children and Community Service's project. Members were informed that Children and Community Services were the applicants.

An Officer stated that the Barbican Estate had important designations. It was in a conservation area, was a Grade 2 listed building and was a registered historic park and garden Grade 2*. It was designated as a Highwalk and largest public space in the Square Mile.

Members were shown images of the area under consideration to the North and South of Ben Jonson House, areas to the east and west of Breton House and the area to the north of Frobisher Crescent and down the steps to Speed House and Speed High Walk.

Members were also shown images of the completed Phase 1 of the waterproofing project. There had been some failings with Phase 1 as the remedial works did not go down to the substructure and issues with the drains were not resolved. Subsequently, there had been further issues with leakages and efflorescence. The Phase 1 project had been recognised for its award-winning planting.

Members were informed that the application was essentially a waterproofing project. Members were shown photographs taken in the rain to show pooling which translated into leakages. Below the podium, 106 out of 109 downpipes were blocked and the water was pooling on site resulting in tiles becoming loose and surfaces becoming slippery. The Officer stated that there was a clear and convincing justification for the need to address the waterproofing.

Members were informed that when the scheme was first conceived, it was a much harder landscape and under an influential landscape designer, it had become slightly softer. Members were shown photographs of some of the key components within the more residential area of the estate. These included tables in pavements, vents, globe lights, sweeping edge details, concrete upstands, sculptures, water features and ventilation funnels. The pavements were an overriding defining aspect which united all the space.

Members were shown photographs of the various gardens around the Barbican and were informed that the quietest spaces were to the north of Ben Jonson House. They were also informed that the pavements united all of the hard surfaces and swept under the residential blocks.

Members were shown an image of the existing planting. Some areas had little planting and some areas had no planting. The Officer stated that the delivery of the waterproofing project required works to the substrate level and this would require the removal of all the soft and hard surfaces on site to include planting, pavements and existing membranes. Only the superstructure would be retained.

The Officer stated that a positive aspect of the scheme would be the removal of the yellow link block which was a later intervention into the landscape. This would provide many opportunities for improving the levels across the site and

more areas would become accessible. There would also be clear access running east-west. Members were informed that under the proposed plan, there was a significant increase in the amount of planting, particularly around the eastern areas and around the concrete ventilation shafts. The new planters would reproduce key details which were intrinsic to the Barbican character. Along the east-west route there would be planting with trees, shrubby grasslands and a woodland edge. There would also be some social spaces.

Members were shown an image of the more active area of the central vista. They were informed that there would be four small play spaces integrated into the planting, there would be more seating within the paved tiles and the water feature and the amphitheatre would be reproduced.

The Sub-Committee were shown an image of the area to the north of Ben Jonson House where the water feature would be reproduced. Members were informed that it was intended to have communal planters in this area and it was intended to be quieter and more tranquil.

Members were shown an image of the northeast, where planting would be blended into the area, there would be a small play area, the link building would be removed and there would be a new entrance into the exhibition hall which would be simple in design. Seating would be concentrated in the central zone area and in the quieter spaces there would be less seating.

The Sub-Committee were shown an image of the area near Cromwell Tower where one of the two small exercise areas was proposed. This would be integrated into the planting. It was also proposed to have lawn in this area.

Members were shown an image of the area near the Conservatory where there was currently no planting. The location of planters had been designed not to compromise any future plans for the Conservatory itself.

Members were also shown elevations to show the size and spacing of trees and the new entrance into the exhibition space. They were also shown images of the play and exercise furniture. There would be incidental play trails with low level, wooden, simple, natural, play equipment. The exercise areas would be located near Shakespeare Tower and near Cromwell Tower. They were integrated into the landscape as requested by Historic England. There would be an increase in seven seats overall and that would be within the main access area. The furniture would be more usable, there would be better accessibility and an overall enhancement to the current mismatch of materials and types of seating.

Members were shown two sculptures, one of two dolphins and the other, an abstract piece, currently within the Barbican, which would be restaged as part of the renewal work. Work was taking place with Barbican Renewal and a steering group had been set up to manage the introduction of three new public art pieces. These would be part of the wayfinding strategy. The Officer stated that the sculptures and the removal of the link block would give people a better sense of navigating through the Barbican.

Members were informed that Condition 11 required the applicant to work with other stakeholders to produce a final wayfinding strategy and template that could be rolled out across the estate, particularly focusing on entry points into the Barbican. The Officer stated that within the application there were two ramps, one at Whitecross Street and one from Golden Lane.

The Officer stated that the proposal had a holistic approach and the scheme represented an investment in, and the continued transformation, of the podium. It was a key public space in the City of London for residents, workers and visitors. The Officer further stated that the Barbican was a brutalist jewel in the square mile. She also stated that fundamentally the proposals would resolve waterproofing issues and secure the future of a prized, designated heritage asset in a forensic and imaginative manner working collaboratively with Historic England, 20th Century Society and the Gardens Trust as well as Officers and engaging with residents. The proposals would continue the award-winning, modern, biodiverse planting of Phase 1 with a 70% increase in urban greening and a 238% increase in biodiversity. The Officer stated that the application was a holistic response to heritage, climate resilience, user wellness, improved inclusion and accessibility. Members were informed that long-term it would deliver a functional but delightful public space which would align with Destination City aspirations and the City's Climate Action Plan. Members were informed that Officers recommended the planning application and listed building consent for approval.

The Chairman explained that there was one registered objector to address the meeting and he invited the objector to speak.

Mr Alexander Wilson stated that he did not consider that the podium needed to be renewed. He informed Members that he was not against the project in principle, however there were certain features in the design that caused him and many other residents of the Barbican great concern because they believed it would increase the noise levels for residents both from intended use and more importantly, from unintended use.

Mr Wilson stated that currently the use of the podium by the general public was almost imperceptible, except in instances of anti-social behaviour which were well-documented in the Barbican Estate Security Committee's website. He informed Members that the impact of noise on the podium between Ben Johnson Tower and Shakespeare Tower was exacerbated by two effects. There was an echo chamber effect of the architecture with noise bouncing off concrete and the flats in the Barbican were not air-conditioned and during the summer, windows had to be open for a through-flow of air.

Mr Wilson advised that he lived in Shakespeare Tower. He stated that the dolphin fountain had been a magnet for anti-social behaviour with groups of youths using it for water fights and drinking. He informed Members that at one stage, it was going to be removed but in the proposed plan, there would be a new bespoke fountain in roughly the same place. Mr Wilson requested that the Sub-Committee ensure that this fountain could not be used for paddling and

water fights by covering it with a grid or changing it to the form of the fountain on the north side of Ben Jonson Tower where the output water cascaded down a stone, convex structure and no paddling pool existed. Mr Wilson stated that this would eliminate one of the major sources of anti-social behaviour that took place in the summer.

Mr Wilson raised concern about the number of areas throughout the estate for play and exercise. He stated that Shakespeare Tower would have an almost continuous line of these along its north face. He stated that these had been a source of concern since the start of the consultation and many residents were concerned about the potential for noise generation from anti-social behaviour. Mr Wilson raised concern that despite objectors raising concerns, the number of play areas had been increased. He stated that noise from children playing was acceptable if impromptu, but the new areas were part of a City of London mandate to use these particular areas for play and exercise which would generate subsequent noise. Mr Wilson stated the play and exercise areas would attract youths, who would congregate there, drinking and shouting. This was based on his experience of living on the Barbican Estate over the last six years. He suggested that significantly reducing the number of City of London designated play and exercise areas would help to eliminate almost all of the complaints of residents.

Mr Wilson stated that parkour, the jumping between concrete structures, had been an issue on the estate. He had previously suggested there be no grassy areas next to concrete walls. He stated this had been taken on board and there was now planting beside concrete walls, however this planting was too narrow which meant the walls could still be used for parkour.

Mr Wilson asked for reassurance that the new Barbican Hall Exhibition Centre access would not become a major entrance.

The Chairman invited Members to question the objectors. As there were no questions, he invited the applicants to speak.

Mr Michael Glasgow, Associate Planner, Atkins, stated that the scheme would be transformational for the future of the Barbican. He informed Members that when the project started, it was purely focused on the maintenance and repairs across this part of the Barbican Podium, stopping the leaks from causing further damage to the occupied spaces below, safeguarding the integrity of the structures themselves and preventing the accumulation of water across the podium which had become hazardous to users.

Mr Glasgow stated that this phase of work formed a continuation of work that had been undertaken previously. Phase 1 to the west of the site at Beech Gardens had provided a platform for the development of this proposal. Lessons had been learned from that scheme in terms of technical and landscape design and the approach to engagement.

Since the inception of the project, the initial brief had evolved significantly to reflect and address some of the ambitions articulated in other strategies across

the City. In particular, the City's Biodiversity Action Plan and Climate Action Strategy had helped to steer the scheme to achieve much more than the original brief. The landscaping strategy had been further adapted to facilitate and deliver initiatives including the Global City for Sports and Destination City. Mr Glasgow stated that the project was a unique opportunity to redesign one of the world's most iconic cultural estates.

Members were informed that the removal of the link building would reconnect two sides of the podium landscape, restoring a central vista that was true to the original design intent for the space. It would improve legibility, passive surveillance, safety and accessibility across the podium landscape and would reconnect one of the main arterial routes through the Barbican estate. Increasing greening was at the heart of the proposal and brought a multitude of environmental and social benefits. The landscaping approach represented a 70% increase in greening across this part of the podium and a 235% increase in biodiversity net gain. The scheme would deliver improved water management and surface water runoff, reduce solar radiation, mitigate wind speeds and provide a more climate resilient planting landscape that would attract more wildlife to the podium.

Mr Glasgow stated that the scheme would bring urban greening to the heart of the City to reconnect people in nature. There had been technical constraints to overcome. It was a unique Grade 2 listed structure and a Grade 2* landscape and sat within a densely populated residential estate.

Members were informed that, aligned to the technical design development there had been an extensive programme of public engagement with a wide range of stakeholders throughout the pre-application process. The consultation had included over 6,000 flyers being distributed, approximately 7,000 unique visitors to the Barbican website, and a series of webinars, site visits and walkovers had taken place. There had been dedicated meetings with a host of statutory consultants including Historic England, the 20th Century Society, the Gardens Trust and local amenity societies, residents' groups and local schools. The extent and variety of the engagement had benefitted the scheme greatly. The proposal would create a more functional space and improve the podium infrastructure as well as create a more attractive, inclusive and accessible amenity space for all groups. The design was developed to include elements including improved lighting, wayfinding, play and exercise space, seating, planting.

In summary, Mr Glasgow stated that a programme for repairs and refurbishment had been developed which would safeguard the listed structure and spaces within this part of the Barbican for the longer term. Also, the ambitious solution would deliver environmental and social benefits to the Barbican estate and created a thriving plan for people in nature at the heart of the City of London.

The Chairman invited questions from Members of the Sub-Committee to the applicant team.

A Member asked why the exercise areas had not been located by the Conservatory where there were no homes. The applicants stated that the location of the exercise equipment was constrained by the limited structural build-up. Therefore, equipment had to be located in the raised areas of planting. The applicants advised that it was expected that the Barbican renewal project would look at how the Conservatory related to the podium landscape in more detail and the Barbican podium landscape interventions were designed to future proof other projects.

A Member raised concern that the height of the specified trees and location close to Ben Jonson House could reduce light to residents' living rooms. She asked if trees could be selected with a maximum growth height of 8m. The applicants stated that the trees were quite sparse along the podium landscape. The majority of tree species planted would be small and would sit below the balcony height of the first floor properties. Where they did protrude above that line, the species selected had relatively sparse canopies and there was not expected to be any impact on daylight or sunlight levels in these properties. The applicants added that the majority of trees were between four and eight metres tall with eight metres being the proposed maximum height. The blossom trees would add to the biodiversity. A Member asked if the trees would be deciduous and would therefore have less impact in winter, the applicants confirmed that they would be.

A Member referred to one of the key concerns raised by objectors throughout the consultation about the play areas and their location and asked why the plan appeared not to have addressed these. The applicants stated that one of the biggest challenges was how to balance the twin ambitions of creating a space at the heart of the City of London which was a public space and would be used by those working and visiting the area and would not just be a garden for residents whilst acknowledging that an important function of the space was to have a direct relationship with residents. These competing ambitions had been balanced, looking closely at the detailed design. Incidental play areas had been proposed rather than a consolidated play area which would have created a hive of activity at one point. These were spread evenly throughout the landscape. Other stakeholders had encouraged the health and wellbeing benefits of the increased use of this space to be recognised and as part of the Climate Action Strategy, the City had a clear ambition around urban greening and making the most of the City's assets. There was a delicate balance which had been reconciled through landscape design but this would continue to be considered as the conditions were discharged and the scheme was delivered.

A Member asked whether the reuse of some trees was possible. The applicants stated that the specification for this phase had been carefully curated to replicate the award-winning scheme from Phase 1. However, an addendum had added a condition around circular economy principles and how some material might be reused across the site. The submitted sustainability statement referred to the potential reuse of the hard landscaping including tiles, trees and soil. As the scheme was delivered, the opportunities to reuse material as part of the design, or where not possible, across the wider estate would be explored.

In response to a Member's question about the location of seating to the west side of Ben Jonson Tower, the applicants stated that, at the start of the process, an inclusive design audit had been commissioned to look at the existing conditions across this part of the podium and the wider estate in terms of inclusivity and recommendations were made. One of the principles was that there should be seating every 40 metres to make this a landscape that people felt comfortable and could rest in. The bench around the fountain, the one at the top of the ramp and the one opposite the communal planters had particular purposes.

A Member asked if the play areas alongside Shakespeare House could be planted on the walkway side to mitigate noise and the impact on Shakespeare House residents. The applicants stated that there were existing vents along the planter line and there was concern about the structural holding of these and the work that would be involved in bridging over these so that they could take the weight of play equipment. Also, the planting would not be on the scale necessary to mitigate against noise.

The Chairman stated that Members of the Sub-Committee could ask questions of Officers.

A Member asked how many people used the podium and commented that the police has stated that anti-social behaviour was only likely to reduce if more people used the podium. He also referred to the amount of public money spent on Phase 1 which although award winning, had footfall measured at less than one hundred an hour which was one tenth of any other typical gardens in the City. The Member suggested that footfall could be measured after the works and then the access signage could be adjusted and marketing take place. This would provide a feedback mechanism. An Officer stated that Children and Community Services would be undertaking their own monitoring of footfall following completion. There would also be a Communications piece on the completion of the project and a general promotion as part of the Destination City work.

The Chairman suggested that the Sub-Committee request the Planning and Transportation Committee to instruct the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to have an oversight role in the project, particularly with regard to wayfinding, signage and marketing. This motion was agreed by a show of hands.

In response to a Member's question about the contents of the management plan, including the management of the growth of the planting, an Officer stated that Condition 8 was specifically about managing the planting. Condition 12 was about the management of hard and soft landscaping and this included planting and maintenance. Members were informed that Officers could ensure the continual management of the heights of the trees next to Ben Jonson House and their canopies were managed.

A Member referred to the condition requiring the play equipment to be approved and asked that the equipment be silent e.g. a static bridge rather than

a clutter bridge as she was concerned about noise if people, other than the children it was intended for, used it, especially at night when noise would echo more. An Officer stated that the noise issues would be discussed with Environmental Health Officers to mitigate against noise nuisance.

A Member asked when the consultations took place and how many residential units were contacted. An Officer stated that there had been two consultation periods. One consultation was when the application was first received and the second covered the amendments to the scheme. In both consultations 2,774 letters were distributed. The Officer stated that the consultation responses listed in the agenda, covered both rounds of consultation.

A Member asked if the ecological impact assessment undertaken by the consultants was independently reviewed. An Officer stated that the current development plan policy did not require external consideration of the ecological impact assessments but this would be changing with the next Local Plan. The Open Spaces Officer and Planning Officers had received the assessment and were satisfied that it met the tests of the policies. They were also satisfied with the rigor of the assessment including the databases.

Seeing no further questions of Officers, the Chairman asked that Members now move to debate the application.

A Member stated that the photographs had shown that action had to be taken and he was supportive of the plan.

Having fully considered the application, the Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

The Committee voted on these recommendations alongside those set out under Agenda Item 5.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 13 Votes
OPPOSED – none
There were 2 abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Deputy Randall and Ms Oliver who had declared disclosable pecuniary interests in this item, did not vote.

RESOLVED -

- 1) That Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent be granted for the above proposals in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.
- 2) That the Planning and Transportation Committee be requested to instruct the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to have an oversight role in the project, particularly with regard to wayfinding, signage and marketing.

5. **BARBICAN ESTATE, LONDON, EC2Y 8EN - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director regarding Barbican Estate London EC2Y 8EN - Listed Building Consent for Barbican Podium Phase 2- specifically for the installation of new waterproofing and drainage infrastructure. Works comprise the removal of existing tiled hard surfaces, membranes and soft landscaping, demolition of existing link building between Ben Jonson House and Frobisher Crescent, alterations to the existing entrance to Exhibition Hall including the construction of a new entrance portal, installation of a new waterproofing membrane across the site and the repair and replacement of drainage system and the reinstatement of a new tiled hard surface with a new soft landscaping layout (including raised planters, grassed areas, trees, community growing planters, new lighting, seating, wayfinding, informal play and exercise area and relocation of existing and installation of new public art).

The Committee voted on these recommendations alongside those set out under Agenda Item 4.

Having fully considered the application, the Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 13 Votes
OPPOSED – None
There were 2 abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Deputy Randall and Ms Oliver who had declared disclosable pecuniary interests in this item, did not vote.

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

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

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

A Member stated that there had been the successful conversion of a number of office units to residential use. He stated that these were very narrow, low, Victorian buildings and were in conservation areas. He further stated that it

would not be possible to convert these to A Grade Office use and they had been vacant for some time.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

A Member welcomed the inclusion of third-party ecological assessment and asked if consideration would be given to having an ecologist as part of the City staff. An Officer advised that there were ecological experts within the City. An information report could be submitted to the next meeting of the Planning and Transportation Sub-Committee.

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

There were no additional urgent items of business for consideration.

The meeting ended at 11.35 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis
zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 4 July 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held at Committee Room 2 - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 4 July 2023 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Graham Packham (Chairman)
John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Deputy Shravan Joshi
Alderman Susan Pearson
Ian Seaton
Alderman Ian David Luder (Ex-Officio Member)
Paul Martinelli (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Luke Major	-	Town Clerk's Department
Simon Bradbury	-	Environment Department
Gillian Howard	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Beth Humphrey	-	Environment Department
Joe Kingston	-	Environment Department
Daniel Laybourn	-	Environment Department
Sam Lee	-	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Paul Monaghan	-	Environment Department
Kristian Turner	-	Environment Department
Giacomo Vecia	-	Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Alastair Moss.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED, That the public minutes of the meeting of 23 May 2023 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings subject to an addition being

made to the discussion on Item 5 in relation to commercial Apps being used to report issues. (see below).

Matters Arising

Rerouting of Number 11 Bus

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that he was not aware of the Policy Chairman having received a response from TfL to his letter about changes to the Number 11 bus route. The Officer would check this. The Member suggested that if a response had not been received, a letter be sent to a senior officer at TfL for a response. In response to the Chairman's question, the Member advised that the bus had been rerouted and the letter was requesting it be routed back to the previous route.

Use of Commercial Apps to Report Issues

In response to the amendment to the minutes of 23 May 2023, an Officer stated that there were a number of routes which complaints, reports and queries came through and this was being streamlined. There was no intention to develop a City App and the preferred approach would be to leverage 3rd party smartphone Apps as the primary reporting channel.

4. **BEECH STREET TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC REALM PROJECT (PHASE 1 - ZERO EMISSION SCHEME)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which was a Gateway 5 report informing Members on the results of the public consultation and seeking approval for the recommended option. An Officer stated that the linked Gateway 3 report for the Healthy Neighbourhood Plan was Item 5 on the agenda.

Members were informed that there were two distinct options for consideration. Option 1 would make the zero-emissions scheme permanent. Option 2 was recommended by Officers. This option was not to make the zero-emissions scheme permanent with Beech Street and Golden Lane continuing to operate as currently.

The Officer stated that the traffic had returned to 2019 levels, even though traffic across the City was at 85% of 2019 levels. Two-thirds of the Beech Street traffic was through-traffic that did not stop. Air quality had been measured for 12 months across 2022 and it showed a marginal breach of the national legal limits. The value was now 41 micrograms of Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) per metre cubed.

Members were informed that the consultation results showed an even split between those who were supportive and not supportive of the proposals.

The Officer outlined the reasons why Officers supported Option 2. He informed Members that the air quality breach was marginal and was a significant improvement on the 2019 levels which were over 60 micrograms of NO₂ per cubic metre. There was an expectation that as air quality in London improved, as electric vehicle take up increased the tunnel air quality would continue to improve. There were disbenefits to some residents in terms of access and

deliveries with the previous zero-emission scheme and support amongst City residents was only 46%.

Members were provided with a revised Appendix 2 which corrected errors on some of the budgeted figures. They were advised the overall budget remained the same.

A Member commented on the traffic data in relation to Fore Street and stated that this road had been closed for much of the year which would have affected the figures. The Officer stated that he would check if a road closure was in place at the time the traffic count was undertaken.

A Member stated that the report showed the benefit of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) scheme and that was a significant contributor to air quality improvement in Beech Street and elsewhere and that an enhancement of the scrappage scheme would reduce the number of more polluting non-compliant vehicles using the roads.

A Member asked about the reuse of cameras. An Officer stated that they would be repurposed for the enforcement of the City-wide HGV restriction. In response to a Member's question about the costs of the cameras, an Officer stated that they cost between £12,500 and £15,000 each.

A Member stated he was in support of the wider scheme and if it was not possible to advance this with Islington Council in the near future, Officers should see how to proceed within the City boundaries.

A Member asked about exposure and stated that as people did not spend much time in the tunnel, their exposure would be lower, whereas there were more issues with polluted areas outside of the tunnel where people spent more time. An Officer stated that there was an hourly limit for nitrogen dioxide which was 200 micrograms per cubic meter. She advised that in general, people would walk along, rather than spend time on Beech Street. Anywhere that averaged out to over 60 micrograms per cubic metre per year was concerning from a health perspective. The Officer stated that Appendix 9 of the report showed the diffusion tube data. The nitrogen dioxide monitors were close to the roadside and a tool developed by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs showed nitrogen dioxide levels dropped off with distance from roads i.e. towards the facades of buildings in which people spent more time.

A Member commented on the Golden Lane flats which were built over the pavement with their windows at the kerb line. The Officer stated that there was still distance to be factored in in terms of height, as NO_x concentrations reduced when measured at increasing heights above roads. A study had been undertaken with some residents of the Barbican and Golden Lane estate. Residents across both estates were asked to measure air pollution using diffusion tubes in their doorways and balconies and this had shown an average decrease in air pollution of 46% between 2014 to 2022.

A Member stated that working with Islington Council would benefit the area as pollution was a cross borough issue and taking a micro-project perspective would not work.

A Member stated that of those who responded to the consultation, 54% of the City residents opposed the proposal opposed to 45% of non-residents. However, many of the respondents had opposed it as they said the scheme did not do enough to reduce traffic and air quality.

A Member commented that in some cities, air quality measurements were taken before approval of residential planning applications and before residents moved in. This was not currently undertaken in the City and it was suggested that this could be added to the checklist of considerations.

A Member stated that the most heavily congested areas in the City were alongside social housing. She stated that Mansell Street Estate and the Golden Lane Estate had a high concentration of residents, including children and Golden Lane had two schools. The Member stated that air pollution was damaging to young children and their brain development. She considered that more should be done in the wider area and traffic should be reduced along Golden Lane.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Agree Option 2 – to not make the zero-emission scheme permanent, with Beech Street and Golden Lane continuing to operate as currently;
 2. Note that work would continue with LB Islington to develop the Barbican, Bunhill and Golden Lane Healthy Neighbourhood Plan;
 3. Approve the adjusted project budget (Revised Appendix 2 of the Officer report);
 4. Approve the updated Costed Risk Register (Appendix 4 of the Officer report); and
 5. Be provided with the report of the residential study of air quality.
5. **BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE HEALTHY STREETS PLAN**
The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 3 report of the Executive Director, Environment which asked Members to note the feedback from the public engagements run in parallel with the Beech Street consultation. The report also sought approval for increasing the project budget to continue to develop the plan with Islington Council.

Members were advised there had been 189 respondents to the consultation, making 895 comments in total.

In response to questions from a Member about the programme, progress to date and when the project would be delivered, an Officer stated that there

would be an initial meeting with Islington to set out the programme. It was estimated it would take 8-12 months to fully develop the plan including any required traffic modelling, and working with TfL if there were any implications on bus journey times etc.

In response to the Chairman's questions about how the project would be staffed and the methodology for joint project oversight and reporting, an Officer stated that both the City governance and committee processes would be followed and in Islington, their governance and committee processes would be followed. Concepts and ideas would be developed at a work shop. Islington had a dedicated half time Officer, and with the budget increase, the City would have resources to progress this through the next 12 months with a dedicated project manager. The Chairman stated that these details must be worked out at the start of the project and agreed with elected members in both Local Authorities to avoid any unnecessary complexity, delay and expense.

A Member suggested that the Chairman and Deputy Chairman have an initial meeting with Officers and the relevant Cabinet Member at Islington Council and Councillors from Bunhill ward so there was Member level agreement in the methodology to be followed and the outcomes to be achieved. There could then be further meetings at interim stages. He suggested these meetings could help avoid unnecessary delays and expense.

A Member asked about the air quality measures. An Officer stated that whilst Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5 and PM 10 were still measured at multiple locations across the square mile, they were not considered targets in any specific project due to the nature of PM dispersing much more than Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂). Members were informed that 96% of the PM in the square mile came from other boroughs and even outside the country so there was little control over it. NO₂ was a target as it could be controlled within a few metres of its source.

A Member asked whether PM should be a target, as vehicles, especially electric vehicles, emitted particulate matter. He raised concern that this was damaging for health, especially as the particulate matter dispersed. The Officer stated that there was no way to measure it as a target. Although the number of vehicles could be measured, there was no way of ascertaining whether the source was local. The Chairman asked if a pan-London approach would be helpful in addressing this. The Officer stated that a pan-London approach would be beneficial but there was also a need for a national approach and an international approach. An Officer stated that the City had its own strategic approach and there was a London-wide strategic approach to not just have cleaner vehicles on the roads, but also fewer vehicles on the roads.

A Member asked whether the consultation process and the plan development would consider all options including Beech Street potentially being a zero-emissions street. The Officer stated that Beech Street and Chiswell Street attracted a lot of traffic as an east-west route. Traffic had returned to 2019 levels on Beech Street and this was likely to be for a variety of reasons. It was likely that a traffic restriction measure would be necessary. There were fewer

people walking on Beech Street than in 2019 and the southern footway was rated F in terms of pedestrian comfort so was below the targets in the Transport Strategy. The Officer confirmed work would need to be done but this would not necessarily be through a zero-emissions street.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the change in the project name and the extent of the project area from Gateway 2 as shown in Figure 1 of the Officer report;
2. Note the findings of the Public Engagement;
3. Approve joint working with Islington Council to develop the Healthy Neighbourhood Plan; and
4. Approve the budget increase of £109,000 from £141,00 to £250,000 to reach the next Gateway, funded from the City Fund CIL receipts as detailed in Table 3 Appendix 3 of the Officer report.

6. **ALDGATE HIGHWAY CHANGES AND PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 6 Outcome report of the Executive Director, Environment.

The Chairman commented on the successful outcome of the project and stated that there were several learning points which could be usefully applied to the Newgate Square project.

A Member stated that the partnership approach in this project was positive. This included support from TfL of £8m. The Member stated that this was one of the largest projects the City had undertaken. There was also a side project to transform Aldgate and The Minories. She stated the contractors had dealt well when walls and burial sites were found whilst digging and there had been problems filling in the underpasses. The Member stated that Officers had reacted in a dynamic way to keep the programme on track. The Member raised concerns about the Pavilion but stated these were outside the remit of the Sub-Committee. She stated that the project had transformed the area and residents on the east side of the city now had a yard in which to hold events and bring the community together. She thanked Officers and Members on the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee at the time and stated she would welcome more of this type of project.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Note and approve the content of the outcome report;
2. Authorise Officers to complete the final account for the project;
3. Note that the unspent Section 106 funds were to be reallocated to other projects in accordance with the requirements of their related legal agreements and a separate report would be brought to Members that sets out details of the proposed reallocations; and

4. Agree to close the project.

7. **EXTENDED REVIEW OF DOCKLESS OPERATOR LIME**

Members considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, which outlined the results of the extended review into dockless operator, Lime.

Members were informed that a review had taken place of both dockless operators, Lime and Human Forest following complaints regarding their performance around their operations in the City. In January 2023, it was decided to reapprove Human Forest to continue operating in the City but to extend the review into Lime to assess whether they were able to meet the City's standards and requirements.

The Officer stated that the report summarised the results of the extended review and recommended that following a satisfactory review and extensive engagement with Lime, that Lime be approved to continue to operate in the City whilst maintaining ongoing performance reviews. This approach would enable further engagement and for work to be undertaken to improve operations in the City, especially whilst awaiting additional powers in the form of primary legislation to help regulate the industry. Members were informed that the report and recommendations did not propose any changes to the current approach to dockless cycles more generally, other than to recommend a limited trial of allowing users to end their journeys in some Sheffield stands and bike racks.

There was concern expressed from a Member that the City was judging the performance of the dockless cycle-hire vendors using statistics provided by the vendors themselves, and whether there was independent verification of their performance from Officers. An officer responded that Officer verification would be the ideal, but there were constraints due to the Officer time required for this.

In response to a Member's question about the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), the Officer stated that Officers had worked with Human Forest and Lime to set agreed KPIs and they had also carried over some KPIs used in the pan-London e-scooter trial. The Member raised concern about their methodology of reporting based on anecdotal observations of Lime bikes being left for extended periods of time but stated that working with Lime should be beneficial. He stated that if additional powers in the form of primary legislation were introduced, there should be a discussion about how these would be used.

A Member stated that he supported the use of Sheffield stands and bike racks as this would provide more opportunities for people to park the bikes correctly. Another Member raised concern that although there were often spaces in the cycle stands, they were not in the places that Lime bikes were likely to be left. She stated that the survey of the usage of existing bike stands was important to ensure that commuters had the opportunity to park near their workplace or meeting place. An Officer stated that an independent auditor would undertake this work and it would be funded by the operators. Strict requirements would be set for what was considered spare capacity in a Sheffield stand as sufficient space should be retained for regular users. There was also a risk that the

stands could reach capacity and that dockless bikes would then be parked in adjacent spaces. Therefore, locations would be chosen carefully based on data.

A Member suggested that more car parking spaces could be turned into space for bike stands. An Officer stated that consideration was being given to moving the location of some of some of the existing bays to more desirable locations without the loss of a car parking space, by swapping bays. The Officer stated that, as outlined in the report, it was proposed to install additional bays in adjacent or underutilised carriageway space. Further discussion would be required to identify additional space and how these bays would be funded. Work was taking place with operators to identify voluntary financial contributions to recover the costs of installing the bays.

A Member stated that there were likely to be some residents undertaking monitoring.

A Member commented on bikes being left along the boundaries with Islington and Tower Hamlets and also around tourist sites such as the Tower of London. She asked how often a user had to repeatedly park inappropriately in order to be banned. An Officer stated that Human Forest and Lime had both outlined their banning process. Both involved a warning in the first instance and then an escalating fine over several instances of inappropriate parking, followed by a ban on the next instance. The ban would be for Lime's entire network internationally. Human Forest had a similar process but fewer instances of inappropriate parking to be banned. Lime had provided statistics on bans and this was a significant number.

A Member raised concern that once the extension had been approved, performance could decrease. This could present particular difficulties for those with sight disabilities, mobility difficulties or those with pushchairs or wheelchairs. She stated that operators should pay for the parking spaces for their bikes, move the bikes quickly and have a method for people to report bikes left in inappropriate locations. The Officer informed Members that voluntary financial contributions were being sought but there was no formal contractual arrangement with them. The approval status could be rescinded at any time if performance was not considered to be satisfactory under the ongoing performance reviews. However, this would not necessarily prohibit them for operating in the City. Continuing to engage and influence Lime should lead to improvements.

The Chairman stated that he and the Chairman of Planning and Transportation Committee had met with Lime and believed that they were taking effective action to address the issues. He advocated continuing to work with them.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Agree to renew Lime's operational status in the City, subject to ongoing performance reviews.

2. Agree the limited use of Sheffield stands and City bike parking racks as additional dockless parking on a trial basis.

8. **TFL'S PROPOSALS FOR ARTHUR STREET**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which outlined TfL's proposals for Arthur Street.

The Officer stated that Arthur Street had been closed since 2015 to facilitate the Bank Station capacity upgrade. Since this time, users had had to use alternative options and travel routes and there had not been any significant issues with this. There was now the opportunity to consider whether or not Arthur Street should be reopened back to vehicles.

Members were informed that in the last year, Officers had had been in discussions with TfL to discuss the proposals to improve the Junction at King William Street. This would involve closing it to all vehicles except pedal cycles and emergency services vehicles. There had also been discussions about the junction at Upper Thames Street. The proposal also included a re-routing of the 344 bus route but since the report was written, TfL had decided that the southbound route could remain on Southwark Bridge but the northbound route would be re-routed to London Bridge.

A Member raised concern about the potential of the existing scheme to damage Southwark Bridge and asked if the Bridge House Estates had been fully consulted. An Officer stated that they had been consulted and there was concern about the structure of the bridge because of the additional traffic and heavy goods vehicles that might divert across to Southwark Bridge. The Officer assessment was that the volume of vehicles of 18 tonnes or over, likely to divert onto Southwark Bridge, was minimal and therefore on balance Officers considered that the impacts and benefits of the scheme outweighed the disbenefits.

An Officer raised concern about Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) using Tower Bridge. Although there was no breakdown of HGVs diverting onto other bridges, they created a disproportionate wearing effect. Looking at the routes available for HGVs to cross the river and travel eastwards, these were limited and becoming more difficult, especially as they also had to avoid Central London.

The Chairman stated that this reinforced the desirability of repurposing the cameras at Beech Street for the monitoring and enforcement of HGVs that should not be entering the City.

A Member asked if the layout of the road would allow the road to be used if it needed to be e.g. if there was an incident further down Lower Thames Street and the traffic needed to be moved, whether it could be opened and utilised. The Member also asked if it could be used for abnormal loads when required. An Officer stated that under normal circumstances, using the road as an abnormal route should be avoided due to the impact with pedestrians crossing and cycle traffic but if these abnormal loads were random and off-peak, this should be possible. There could, however, be an issue with how much space would have

to be redesigned to accommodate these vehicles especially if they required large turning circles. As the road was being designed to allow for emergency use, it would be able to be used in the event of diversions but these should be kept to a minimum.

An officer stated that non-standard vehicles such as big low loaders and mobile cranes had to notify their route each time they used it so there was not a standard route as the whole route had to be approved. Southwark Bridge was not a preferred one but the weight limit was unrestricted so it could take every abnormal movement. The Officer informed Members that the city was often a destination but it was also a route from the east where much of the equipment was stored, to the centre and south and west of London. Many of these vehicles came through the City on Upper and Lower Thames Street. Many of them had to go into Westminster to get across the river whereas using London Bridge and Arthur Street would be a simpler route.

An Officer stated that the Bridge House Estate Board could challenge the recommended traffic order once the consultation process began. The Officer also stated that before TfL decided Arthur Street should be shut, they undertook modelling work as outlined in the report. They had predicted that Blackfriars Bridge would take most of the diverted traffic and negligible traffic would be diverted to Tower Bridge.

In response to a Member's question. An Officer stated that Blackfriars Bridge was suitable for accommodating all vehicles and that Blackfriars, Southwark and London Bridges could take all normal road going vehicles. In order of capacity for abnormal vehicles, Southwark Bridge was the least capable, then Blackfriars Bridge with London Bridge able to take any vehicle. Blackfriars Bridge was a north-south route as it was not possible to get onto Upper and Lower Thames Street without going through the local network. Southwark Bridge had a high proportion of normal HGVs going across it because they could turn right or left along Upper and Lower Thames Street.

When the City agreed to the loss of Arthur Street prior to Bank Station works, the benefit to the City was that all the HGVs delivering to that site would enter along Upper and Lower Thames Street and turn right into Arthur Street with no impact to the City network. At the time there were no restrictions on the heavier vehicles and abnormal vehicles using London Bridge.

The Chairman asked if, once the street was closed, there would be any opportunities for greening and making the street more accessible. The Officer stated that if this option was agreed, there would be further discussions with TfL to see how much they could further improve the layout including, greening, seating and materials. A requirement could be imposed before the traffic order was made.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Agree and support TfL's proposal as detailed under paragraph 10 of the Officer report.

2. Agree to commence the promotion of a traffic order to close Arthur Street at its junction with King William Street to all vehicles except pedal cycles.
3. Authorise the Executive Director Environment to consider responses to the traffic order consultation and if they consider it appropriate, to make the Order.
4. Agree that a requirement be imposed that improvements to the layout including greening, seating and materials take place prior to the traffic order being made.

9. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Chairman stated that dockless vehicles and Beech Street had been discussed. Bank Junction would be discussed at the next Court of Common Council meeting.

RECEIVED.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no urgent items.

12. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

The Committee agreed to exclude the public from the Non-Public part of the meeting in line with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

13. **EXTENDED REVIEW OF DOCKLESS OPERATOR, LIME - NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX**

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee notes the non-public appendix.

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

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no urgent business to be considered in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 3.00 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis
Zoe.Lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk