



## Planning and Transportation Committee

### INFORMATION PACK

N.B. These matters are for information and have been marked \* and circulated separately. These 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, 21 NOVEMBER 2023

**Time:** 10.30 am

**Venue:** LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS\***

Report of the Town Clerk.

9. **PUBLIC LIFT AND ESCALATOR REPORT\***

Report of the City Surveyor.

10. **TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE - 21 JULY 2023\***

(Pages 9 - 26)

11. **TO NOTE THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE - 18 OCTOBER 2023\***

(Pages 27 - 42)

12. **TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE - 26 SEPTEMBER 2023\***

(Pages 43 - 60)

**Ian Thomas CBE**  
**Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE – OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

Item	Date	Action/ Responsible Officer	Progress Update and Date to be progressed/completed
1	17 Nov 2020 15 Dec 2020 5 Jan 2021 26 Jan 2021 16 Feb 2021 24 Feb 2021 9 March 2021 30 March 2021 22 April 2021 12 May 2021 8 June 2021 29 June 2021 20 July 2021 7 Sept 2021 21 Sept 2021 26 Oct 2021 16 Nov 2021 14 Dec 2021 11 Jan 2022 1 Feb 2022 22 Feb 2022 26 April 2022 17 May 2022 7 June 2022 1 July 2022 19 July 2022 20 Sept 2022 11 Oct 2022 1 Nov 2022 10 Jan 2023 7 March 2023 11 May 2023 18 July 2023	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Member Training</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chief Planning Officer and Development Director / Director of the Built Environment</b></p> <p>A Member questioned whether there would be further training provided on Daylight/Sunlight and other relevant planning matters going forward. She stated that she was aware that other local authorities offered more extensive training and induction for Planning Committee members and also requested that those sitting on the Planning Committee signed dispensations stating that they had received adequate training.</p> <p>The Chair asked that the relevant Chief Officers consider how best to take this forward. He also highlighted that the request from the Town Clerk to all Ward Deputies seeking their nominations on to Ward Committees states that Members of the Planning &amp; Transportation Committee are expected to undertake regular training.</p>	<p><b>UPDATE: (21 November 2023):</b>                      New Committee Members are provided with training on key aspects. A programme of wider Member training is being implemented in 2023. The first of the recordings (regarding Material Planning Considerations) were sent to members with a Q&amp;A on this topic prior to the 11 May 2023 Planning and Transportation Committee meeting. The next member training material on fire safety is in the process of being organised.</p>

2.	<p>11 Jan 2022  1 Feb 2022  22 Feb 2022  26 April 2022  17 May 2022  7 June 2022  1 July 2022  19 July 2022  20 Sept 2022  11 Oct 2022  1 Nov 2022  10 Jan 2023  7 March 2023  11 May 2023  18 July 2023  3 October 2023</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Sustainability SPD</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chief Planning Officer and Development Director</b></p> <p>A Member questioned whether the production of a Sustainability SPD could feature on the list of outstanding actions.</p> <p>The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that he would be liaising with his sustainability officers to provide a more targeted timeline around the production of the Sustainability SPD and agreed to include this information in the list of outstanding actions.</p>	<p><b>UPDATE (3 OCTOBER 2023):</b></p> <p>The Sustainability SPD is being developed and will be brought to the Committee in December 2023, before public consultation.</p>
3.	<p>18 July 2023  3 October 2023</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Emission Data Monitoring In Major Planning Applications</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Planning and Development Director</b></p> <p>A Member asked if consideration was being given to the scope for schemes the City had permitted and whether this could feature on the list of outstanding actions.</p>	<p><b>UPDATE (21 November 2023):</b></p> <p>Data relating to operational carbon intensity, embodied carbon intensity and whole life-cycle carbon emissions from major applications approved in 2021 and 2022 have been published on the CAS dashboard.</p>

# Agenda Item 9

<b>Committee(s):</b> Planning and transportation committee – For Information	<b>Dated:</b> 3 November 2023
<b>Subject:</b> Public Lift & Escalator Report	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	Shape outstanding Environments – Our spaces are secure, resilient, and well-maintained
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	n/a
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	n/a
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?</b>	
<b>Report of:</b> City Surveyor	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Matt Baker – Head of Facilities Management	

## Summary

This report outlines the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyor’s, in the reporting period 19 Sep 2023 to 3 November 2023. The reporting period is driven by the committee meeting cycle and the associated reporting deadlines.

In this reporting period, publicly accessible lifts and escalators were available for **92%** of the time.

A detailed summary of individual lifts/escalators performance is provided within this report along with the associated actions being undertaken to improve availability where applicable.

## Main Report

1. There are 16 public lifts/escalators in the City of London portfolio, which are monitored and maintained by City Surveyor’s. Table 1.0 provides a breakdown of availability during the reporting period and the availability over the previous 12 months.

**Table 1.0**

Asset Reference	Name	Availability in last reporting period	12 Month Availability	Trend
SC6458963	Tower Place Scenic Lift	100.00%	99.97%	↑
SC6459146	Speed House Glass/Public Lift	100.00%	98.78%	↑
SC6458968	Moor House	100.00%	98.66%	↑
SC6458959	London Wall Up Escalator	100.00%	52.53%	↑
SC6458958	London Wall Down Escalator	100.00%	50.00%	↑
SC6458969	Pilgrim Street Lift	100.00%	84.79%	↑
SC6458964	London Wall East	100.00%	96.73%	↓
SC6458970	Wood Street Public Lift	99.00%	85.00%	↑
CL24	Duchess Walk Public Lift	96.00%	98.72%	↓
SC6458962	Tower Place Public Lift	96.00%	97.50%	↓
SC6458967	Little Britain	93.00%	96.79%	↓
SC6459244	Glass South Tower	87.00%	93.60%	↓
SC6462850	33 King William Street	87.00%	56.04%	↓
SC6462771	Blackfriars Bridge	82.00%	84.19%	↓
SC6458966	Atlantic House	77.00%	83.41%	↓
SC6458965	London Wall West	64.00%	80.93%	↓

2. Glass South Tower. Debris causing doors to jam on 2 occasions.
3. 33 King William Street has experienced a safety gear failure with significant access issues and lead time on parts to rectify. This work is now completed.
4. The Atlantic House lift is currently under warranty with the project contractor who conducted the modernisation works in February 2023. They have been instructed to attend site and rectify the issue. The control panel issues are now rectified but the speed of response was unacceptable from the project contractor.
5. London Wall West. Control panel failure. Downtime is exacerbated by lift motor room located within 1 London Wall. Despite an agreement being in place, gaining access via site security team is not always forthcoming.
6. It is worth noting that the industry continues to face significant challenges in the availability of and lead times on parts ordered. Previously “off the shelf” items are now on reasonably long lead times.
7. Table 3.0 categorises the causes of faults/outages in this reporting period.

**Table 3.0**

Category	No of call outs
External/Environmental factors	2
Equipment faults/failure	9
Planned Insurance Inspections	0
Planned Repairs	0
Resets following emergency button press or safety sensor activation	0
Damage/misuse/vandalism	0
Autodialler faults	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

8. Table 4.0 categorises the causes of faults/outages over the last 12 months.

**Table 4.0**

Category	No of call outs
External/Environmental factors	20
Equipment faults/failure	129
Planned Insurance Inspections	17
Planned Repairs	26
Resets following emergency button press or safety stop equipment activation	15
Damage/misuse/vandalism	21
Autodialler faults	6

9. Projects. Table 5.0 summarises planned projects with approved funding that will support the ongoing improvement in lift & escalator availability.

**Table 5.0**

Lift/Escalator	Project	Status	Expected Completion
London Wall Up Escalator	Modernisation Project	Contract Awarded	Complete
London Wall Down Escalator	Modernisation Project	Contract Awarded	Complete
Pilgrim Street Lift	Modernisation Project	Complete	Complete
Little Britain Lift	Modernisation Project	Contract Awarded	Complete
Atlantic House Lift	Modernisation Project	Complete	Complete

This page is intentionally left blank



**PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**Friday, 21 July 2023**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Friday, 21 July 2023 at 10.30 am

**Present**

**Members:**

Deputy Shравan Joshi (Chairman)  
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Randall Anderson  
Brendan Barns  
John Edwards  
Anthony David Fitzpatrick  
Deputy John Fletcher  
Jaspreet Hodgson  
Deborah Oliver  
Alderswoman Susan Pearson  
Judith Pleasance  
Ian Seaton  
Hugh Selka  
Luis Felipe Tilleria  
William Upton KC  
Alderman Sir David Wootton

**Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	– Town Clerk’s Department
Fleur Francis	– Comptroller and City Solicitor’s Department
Catherine Evans	– Environment Department
David Horkan	– Environment Department
Kurt Gagen	– Environment Department
Rob McNicol	– Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	– Environment Department
Bob Roberts	– Environment Department

-

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Mary Durcan, Dawn Frampton, Deputy Marian Fredericks, Deputy Brian Mooney, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Michael Cassidy, Deputy Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Deputy Alastair Moss and Shailendra Umrada.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the public minutes of the last meeting held on 27 June 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

4. **55 BISHOPSGATE**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning demolition of the existing building and the erection of a part-63 storey (284.68 AOD) and part-22 storey (112.30 AOD) building plus basement, including office use (Class E); a publicly accessible multi-purpose space at ground floor level, part Level 02 and part Level 03 for a flexible use including: retail, food and beverage, drinking establishment, learning, community use, exhibition and/or performance space (Sui Generis); a public viewing gallery (Sui Generis), public realm improvements, cycle parking, servicing, vehicle lifts, refuse facilities and other works associated with the development including access and highways works.

The Town Clerk referred to those papers set out within the main agenda pack as well as the Officer presentation slides and an addendum that had been separately circulated and published.

Officers presented the application, highlighting that the application site was located on the west side of Bishopsgate adjacent to Tower 42, within the Eastern Cluster in the current Local Plan and also within the Eastern Cluster in the emerging Local Plan. It was also in the Renewal Opportunity Area.

Members were shown images of the existing cluster showing the nature of tall buildings in the immediate vicinity and the future Eastern Cluster with permitted schemes. Members were informed that 8 Bishopsgate had recently opened and 40 Leadenhall was close to completion. The Officer stated that the site was not in a conservation area but on the opposite side of Bishopsgate was St Helen's Place Conservation area and there were other listed buildings and heritage assets in the immediate vicinity.

Members were informed that the existing building was built in the late 1980s and early 1990s. It was a well-mannered building in this location and was typical of many commercial buildings in the City and across London. There had been some objections relating to the loss of this building, but it was not considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and therefore if it was lost, in townscape terms, it was considered acceptable.

The Officer stated that the proposal sought a 63-storey tower together with a 22-storey satellite tower adjacent to it. The proposal was predominantly for office use with 103,000sqm of space but also included cultural uses at the lower floors and at the top floor.

Members were shown the front elevation from Bishopsgate which showed the green wall stitching the two buildings together and the southern elevation where the green wall extended along the southern façade. Members were also shown an image of the proposed front of the building which showed the ground floor being given over to the public realm with 2,344 sqm of new public realm. Members were also shown the existing ground floor plan which was built to the extent of the site so there was no public realm within the existing building.

The Sub-Committee were shown the proposed ground floor plan with the core in the middle as the main element of the building. The Officer stated that this would deliver a

significant increase in public realm and would also be activated in terms of having pop-up retail situated around the core, a landscaped seating area and it would be a destination for cultural pop-up events.

Members were informed that there would be landscaping water features all around the site. At the front of the site on Bishopsgate, the landscape design was designed as hostile vehicle mitigation so would enhance the overall streetscape without the use of bollards.

The Officer stated that underneath the satellite building, as had been approved in many other City schemes, the delivery and servicing areas would be accessed by two vehicle platform lifts. During the day, when they were not in use, this would create an extended area of public realm and this could be used for pop-up activity.

The Sub-Committee was informed that by opening up the frontages, the pedestrian comfort levels and the movement of people in and around the building would be improved, despite the increase in the population within the new development. The Officer stated that Transport for London (TfL) sought C+ as the standard for street pedestrian comfort levels but the City required a higher standard of B+. There would be A's, B+'s and one B- so there would be significant improvement in terms of pedestrian flows. In addition, TfL had advised they would be making permanent their temporary footway widening scheme which was delivered during the Covid period. The footway would be widened immediately adjacent to the site and also along the Bishopsgate corridor so this would result in a further improvement in comfort levels. Officers were satisfied that pedestrian comfort would be enhanced.

Members were shown images of the new pedestrian routes and capillaries being formed within the development site. These would future proof pedestrian flow if schemes came forward on adjoining sites as they would allow connection to these sites and create new routes, improving pedestrian flows in and around the site.

The Officer stated that the cycle parking provision met the London Plan and City standards. There would be short stay cycle parking on the ground floor and additional short term cycle parking at the lower ground floor accessed by the cycle lifts and a ramp stair if necessary. Longer stay cycle parking would be provided at the lower ground floor and basement levels. The short-term cycle parking exceeded the requirements for the London Plan policy with 116 spaces being required and 122 being delivered.

The Officer stated that there would be two vehicle lifts so that the space could be used for public realm during the day with servicing occurring between 10pm and 7am. This would be consolidated and capped at a maximum of 136 vehicles per day during this servicing period. Any deliveries during the day would only be delivered by cargo bikes.

Members were shown the first-floor plan which showed the main office reception accessed by two escalators either side of the core and the lift access. Above this there were the office floors.

The Sub-Committee were shown images of the public realm. The Officer outlined the rich textual timber soffit of the building, the sculpted element of the proposed columns and the bronze finish. He stated the core itself would be brick and porcelain and the area would be welcoming to the public and would not have a corporate feel. Members were shown images of the water feature and how the area could be used for pop-up cultural events. Members were informed that it was intended that there would be a cultural operator that would curate and operate all the cultural elements within the

scheme to include both the ground-floor public realm and also the upper floors and the conservatory on the top floor. The Officer stated that the applicants had been in discussions with New London Architecture about being the operator of this space.

Members were shown images of the auditorium at the lower floors of the satellite building. The Officer stated that the lower level of the auditorium faced outwards towards Bishopsgate. He also stated that Level 3 was the main exhibition area which was a flexible space for learning, the community and a café as well as providing access to the upper level of the auditorium.

Members were shown an image of how the auditorium would look from the street scheme and were advised that it would extend the activation of the ground floor from the public realm to the upper floors.

The Sub-Committee were shown an image of the fourth floor level which was proposed to be a co-working space. The Officer stated that 5% of this space would be affordable workspace which would equate to approximately 50 desks. This would potentially be operated by the cultural operator.

Members were shown a cross-section image showing how the floorspaces fitted together and the circulation around them. They were also shown images of the conservatory which was a unique environment created at the top of the building in the triple height space with capacity for 300 visitors. Members were informed that it would be open from 10am to 7pm or nautical dusk, whichever was later. It would provide learning and educational opportunities which would be curated by the operator of the floor space.

Members were shown images of the viewing platform above the conservatory which would deliver views across London and St Paul's Cathedral. They were also shown images of the landscaping at ground floor, the conservatory at the top and the extensive green wall provided between the two buildings which would be between Level 4 and Level 22. Members were informed that the green wall would provide a striking feature in the street scene and also deliver benefits in terms of biodiversity, urban cooling and benefits to visitors and occupiers of the building.

The Officer stated that the rest of the building would be for office use. Existing and emerging policies sought to deliver a significant increase in Grade A floor space and the cluster was seen as the strategic location to deliver that floor space. This scheme would deliver 103,000sqm of floor space which equated to 14% of the office requirement for the planned period up to 2036. This would be a significant contribution towards this strategic objective.

Members were informed that the proposal was for a tall building within the cluster identified as the place to accommodate tall buildings. The building would be 63 storeys tall and would be 284m in height. Members were shown images of the cluster, including the cumulative image of the cluster where 1 Undershaft and 100 Leadenhall could be seen. Members were shown how the proposal would fit in and consolidate the cluster. It stepped down from 1 Undershaft and 22 Bishopsgate in keeping with the general curve of the cluster form. The elegant, tapered edge provided a well-considered addition to the cluster. The proposed development was considered to be of the highest quality architectural design. Biometric geometry based on the Fibonacci sequence, a geometry found in nature, had been used, creating an elegant design solution and the building had a very efficient structure, which reduced the carbon required for the construction.

The Officer stated that the proposal would enhance the overall longer distance views of the cluster. Members were shown strategic views from Blackheath Point and Parliament Hill. Members were informed that there had been some objections to some of the strategic views, in particular from Historic England and from Westminster City Council.

There were views where Officers had identified there would be some degree of harm but in all cases it was considered to be at the low level of less than substantial harm. These views were St James's Park looking back to Whitehall Court, the War Office and Horseguards. In this view the proposal was visible behind the island in the park. Guidance stated that it should not protrude above the central part of the island and the proposal was considered offset and its tapering design provided a softer form. It had been designed in keeping with the spires of Whitehall Court so whilst it did appear in this view, it was considered to be a low level of less than substantial harm. Members were shown the cumulative impact with other developments outside of the city e.g. The London Eye which at night dominated the view in terms of its appearance and lighting. The subdued appearance with the tapering form of the proposed building and the lighting strategy would ensure that the upper floors were lit up accordingly so as not to be too prominent.

Members were shown a view from the Golden Jubilee/Hungerford Footbridge and were informed that the proposed building would draw the cluster slightly closer to St Paul's Cathedral but it had been designed with the tapering form arcing away from St Paul's. The height dropping down from 22 Bishopsgate and 1 Undershaft was in keeping with the ethos of the cluster to fall down towards St Paul's to diminish the cluster's appearance. Whilst there was considered to be a low level of less than substantial harm, the building itself had been designed to mediate that harm.

The Sub-Committee were shown images of views from Waterloo Bridge which were kinetic view but had a strategic gap between St Paul's and the cluster. From this view, the design which arced away, mediated the impact on St Paul's.

Members were shown views from further east along the river which showed the scheme fitting within the cluster, and the view from Bankside where the building dropped in height from 22 Bishopsgate. Members were informed that when viewed from London Bridge, the cluster fitted in between Tower 42 and 22 Bishopsgate. Members were shown the view from Queen's Walk at City Hall and were informed that the proposed building did not appear from this view.

The Sub-Committee were shown the views from the north bastion of Tower Bridge and the Tower of London from which the proposed building could be seen embedded within the cluster. Historic Royal Palaces had confirmed that had considered that the proposal did not affect the world heritage site. In the cumulative scenario, the proposal would not appear in the view from the Tower of London. Members were shown the view from the Golden Gallery of St Paul's, which showed the proposal fitting in to the cluster.

Members were shown an image from St Helen's Place, which was within the conservation area. This showed the proposed building appearing in the background behind a listed building. The Officer stated that this was part of the striking juxtaposition of the City and one of the dynamic viewpoints seen all around the cluster with the old and new symbolising the continuous success of the square mile and the evolution of the city. There was no change to the cumulative impact in this view.

Members were shown further townscape views showing how the development would fit in within the overall concept of the cluster, looking east from London Wall and looking from Bank Junction where the cluster fitted in behind Bank Junction. From Bartholomew Lane, the tall buildings of 100 Bishopsgate and Tower 42 could be seen in the background and the elegance of the design, the strong form of the exoskeleton and the way in which the building tapered away, could be seen. This was also a dynamic viewpoint. In an image from Copthall Avenue, the sculptural quality of the building could be seen as well as the green wall.

Members were shown an image from Sun Street Passage southwards, in which the proposal consolidated the form of the cluster. One Undershaft could be seen in the cumulative view.

Members were shown an image from Bishopsgate, looking south, in which the tall buildings could be seen on the eastern side of Bishopsgate with the proposal fitting in in front of 99 Bishopsgate and Tower 42 consolidating the overall cluster.

The Officer stated that the proposal would involve the demolition of the existing building and it was recognised that this created the most embodied carbon but the applicant had been through the whole life cycle carbon optioneering process and this had been independently reviewed in accordance with the Planning Advice Note. In order to deliver the strategic increase in floor space and the significant public realm benefits, the demolition, in this case was considered acceptable. The architects had designed the development to minimise carbon emissions in the construction process. There would be careful deconstruction to maximise the reuse of materials, the sourcing and use of recycled materials would take place where possible, it would be a structurally efficient building to minimise carbon and there would be an effective heating and cooling system to minimise operational carbon. The demolition would meet the GLA benchmark for carbon emissions and the building would meet BREEAM outstanding and Platinum WELL. It would also meet the highest levels of other environmental charters. Overall, the circle economy and sustainability of the schemes was considered acceptable.

The Officer stated that in terms of microclimate, the scheme had been extensively tested and had been designed to mitigate impacts as much as possible. There were two existing breaches on Great St Helens and they would remain as part of the development. There was one additional breach on Great St Helen's but it was only a very marginal breach. The threshold was 15 metres per second squared wind speeds over a period of 1.9 hours for a whole year. This resulted in 15.2 metres per second squared wind speeds in this location for 1.9 hours across the whole year so was considered to be a very marginal exceedance. Great St Helen's was also a pedestrian environment so there was less conflict in terms of vehicles and pedestrians.

Members were informed that the scheme would deliver improvements in terms of the microclimate conditions on Bishopsgate, Wormwood Street and Chamomile Street. It improved wind conditions so it would be safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The microclimate conditions were considered acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight. A significant number of properties were assessed in a wide area around the site. One key building was 50 Bishopsgate which was opposite the site and had residential use on the second, third and fourth floors. The existing levels of lights to this building was low so the percentage reduction was disproportionate in terms of impact. Each of the units had two windows serving each room at the front of the building and were dual aspect units and therefore the impact was considered acceptable. The second key building was 33 Great St Helen's which was tucked in behind the existing building. It would not have any direct visibility of the proposed development. The windows that

would be affected were on the back of the building so up against the adjoining commercial development. Three out of the four rooms affected were bedrooms with low existing levels so the percentage reduction was disproportionate. These units, and the living rooms, were dual aspect.

The Officer stated that paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework required that where there was identified heritage harm, consideration must be given to whether there were any public benefits that outweighed that harm. The economic benefit was the delivery of over 100,000sqm of Grade A office floorspace which was a significant contribution to inward investment in the square mile. Also, the cultural offer would provide a visitor attraction supporting the local economy. There would be significant public realm improvements including improved environments for pedestrians and cyclists and there would be Section 106 contributions of £200,000 to St Paul's lighting scheme and £250,000 for the renovation of the Golden Ball and Cross project which was a joint project with Goldsmiths to include apprenticeships and the renovation of the Golden Ball and Cross project. Where less than substantial harm to St Paul's had been identified, this was a direct contribution to mitigate against this and reinforce the pre-eminence of St Paul's with these works. There would be enhanced public realm for workers, residents and visitors, a significant cultural offer and a visitor attraction together with learning and education opportunities.

The Officer informed Members that some of the key Section 106 Heads of Terms were; an affordable housing contribution of £4.8m; a local training and job brokerage of £2.9m; contribution of security measures for the Eastern Cluster of £976,000; and a TfL cycle hire contribution of £220,000 for a new docking station. In addition to the regular S278 requirements for wider TfL highway improvements to the Bishopsgate corridor, the applicant was also providing £1.5m to TfL for wider improvements and highway improvements along the Bishopsgate corridor.

The Officer stated that in conclusion, the building had been strategically sited within the heart of the City Cluster which had been a plan-led approach to consolidating tall buildings and growth in a manner which would be the least impactful on strategic heritage assets. The development was considered to be an exemplary architectural response to a complicated site that had been designed with sustainability, micro-climate, streets, people and spaces in mind and presented an elegant design solution which made an effective use of limited resources. The development would provide a unique and distinctive addition to the City Cluster and would deliver significant public benefits flowing from the enhanced public realm and the creation of a cultural attraction making a stunning contribution to Destination City. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman explained that there were no registered objectors to address the meeting on this occasion and he therefore invited the applicant to speak.

Mr Makoto Fukui, Schrodgers, speaking on behalf of the applicant, 55 Bishopsgate Unit Trust, advised that this was a unique opportunity to deliver on many of the mutual objectives of the City in the wider built environment. The proposal included over 100,000sqm of best-in-class office floorspace for the City which would support approximately 7,500 city-based new jobs. The brief of the project, which was started 5 years ago, was to achieve high quality architecture, exemplary sustainability, performance and positive engagement with the community. Consequently, the scheme proposed a significant increase in activated public realm on the ground floor as well as a unique rooftop experience, both of which would be open to the public. There would be affordable workspace and a dedicated cultural space on the second and third floors. The cultural strategy had been prepared in collaboration with New London Architecture

(NLA) to provide a permanent home for the London Centre. The intention was to commence works in 2024 with the new building targeting completion in 2029. A best-in-class project team led by development manager Stanhope and Architects AFK had been appointed.

Mr Nick McKeough, co-founder and Chief Executive of the NLA, advised that the NLA was the membership organisation for London's built environment community. He stated that there were over 500 member organisations spanning public and private sectors including the GLA, City of London and 29 London boroughs. As well as supporting the development of skills across the professions, the goal was to engage the widest possible audience in the future of London's built environment, from school children to politicians, from community groups to international visitors and investors, through unique London models and public galleries. For the last 15 years, these had been based in two locations but there was an aim to bring them together. In April 2023, the London Centre opened in the Guildhall West Wing. Through a collaboration with Shroders Stanhope and AFK, a purpose-built facility had been designed at 55 Bishopsgate, which would allow for over 500,000 visitors per year. This had been backed up by a financial commitment from Shroders to invest in fitting out the space, providing discounted rent for the first 10 years of occupation and supporting the development of key parts of the programme in advance of opening. This would include committing to invest in content development, schools learning programme and international outreach.

Mr Benjamin O'Connor, Director at NLA stated that NLA had worked closely with the team at AFK and Stanhope and believed that the location, design, content and programme for the London Centre at 55 Bishopsgate would fulfil the vision to create an open, welcoming, egalitarian space for all Londoners to engage in the discussion and debate around the future of their city through exciting, seasonal activation in an aspirational environment. Mr O'Connor stated that ground floor access was unobstructed and would utilise soft, warm, inviting materials with no physical or human barrier to access and there would be a new public amenity in the form of a Place Lab, activated with new public installations, testing out innovative ideas for the public realm e.g. small-scale pavilions and street furniture to kinetic LED paving and smart lighting. The public realm would be flanked by a kiosk-style food and beverage offer with multiple units providing seasonal options for city workers that could be programmed to shift focus on evenings and weekends. The core London Centre offer would include a 20,000 square foot public space with models of the city and a dynamic series of exhibitions with a café and learning offer operating seven days a week alongside the public realm. A double height 250 seat lecture space would be programmed throughout the year, with access to occupiers and city businesses. The space would be flexible with the ability to host large events, dinners and community events. The rooftop experience would combine a garden viewing platform and event space for schools and technology would be used to allow visitors to get a sense of the future in their city.

Mr Earle Arney, AFK stated that it had been an honour to design the extensive cultural floor space and public realm in partnership with the NLA to accommodate the new home of the London Centre. The aspiration was to deliver a world-class building for the city which would be elegant, with sustainability at its heart. This started with an innovative approach to the



structure which mimicked nature and was informed by the fibonacci sequence, the highly efficient organising principle found throughout nature. In doing so, the embodied carbon material needed for construction had been minimised whilst expressing the structure externally and defining the architectural aesthetic. Mr Arney stated that BREAMM Outstanding had been achieved, which was the highest possible rating obtainable. Neighbours 5.5 out of a possible score of 6 had been achieved as had a Platinum rating for the World Building Standard which was the highest available. An Urban Greening Factor of 0.3 had been achieved and there was a target of 850kg of carbon per square metre. Mr Arney informed Members that the Officer report had stated that the proposed scheme achieved outstanding sustainability credentials. This included third party verification. Whole life carbon optioneering had been carried out in accordance with the City's recent carbon options guidance. The architecture, height and form of the proposal had been carried out in accordance with the regard to townscape, views, heritage and the London skyline enriching the composition of the City Cluster as expressed in the elegant, tapered form.

Chris Gascoigne, DP9 Planning Consultants, stated that the site was within the City Cluster which was identified in the adopted and emerging City Plan as being a location with a renewal opportunity area appropriate for tall buildings. He informed Members that the proposals had been designed with careful regard to townscape views and the overall composition of the emerging cluster, with the building tapering down in height from the taller buildings in the cluster – the consented scheme at 1 Undershaft and the completed 22 Bishopsgate. Mr Gascoigne informed Members that the proposals offered a thorough and wide-ranging planning and public benefits package. This included delivering over 100,000 square metres of office floorspace representing 14% of the City's office targets and supporting over 1,200 construction jobs and 7,500 end user jobs. The proposals would result in a combined Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy package over £34.5m in addition to the provision of on-site affordable workspace. There would be over 2,300 square metres of increased and activated public realm, improving pedestrian comfort and facilitating new routes. In addition, there would be over 4,300 square metres of dedicated cultural floorspace at Levels 2 and 3 and the unique 360 degree rooftop conservatory experience that would be free to access for the public between 10am and 7pm or nautical dusk. The cultural strategy was underpinned by the partnership with the NLA as the home for the New London Centre. The proposal was based on outstanding sustainability credentials. It was also subject to extensive community engagement in accordance with the City's Statement of Community Involvement Strategy.

Mr Gascoigne stated that there were few public comments and no one registered to speak against the application which was testament to how well the proposals had been received. In conclusion, he stated that the proposals sought to sustainably optimise the potential of the site for office growth, in accordance with the development plan whilst embracing the Destination City objectives.

The Chairman thanked the applicant team for their contributions and invited questions of them from the Sub-Committee.

In response to a question from a Member about the commitment to the partnership between the applicant and the NLA, the applicant stated that there were a number of consequential conditions that had to be met and extensive discussions were taking place with the NLA with terms including financial parameters agreed. Mr Nick McKeough, NLA confirmed that there was a heads of terms agreement in place.

A Member raised concern about the short-stay parking being below ground which would make it more difficult to access. She also raised concern about the difficulty in finding a cycle parking space near the site, and she asked about the size of the lifts. The applicant stated that in terms of short-stay cycle parking, there was a combination of Sheffield stands and provision at lower ground levels which were accessible by the lifts. The parking provision had been split following discussions with Officers to ensure there was extensive public realm. The lifts were 1.8m by 2.5m which exceeded the lift size requirements for the London Cycling Design Standards. They had capacity for at least one accessible cycle per lift or three conventional cycles per lift. The two lifts would operate independently and in terms of peak-hour movement there would be capacity for about 87 accessible cycles per hour or combined capacity for conventional cycles of about 262 cycles per hour. This was sufficient to cater for 100% of the peak-hour cycle demand. The cycle parking within the lower ground floor was fully accessible by the cycle lifts. Splitting the cycle parking obtained a balance both in terms of maximising the public realm within the ground floor but still providing an element of short-stay parking for ad hoc trips to the units within the ground floor as well as other trips within the site. It was also acknowledged that the type of trip to the conservatory, for example, would be of a longer duration. Parking provision at the lower ground floor would ensure that short-stay cycle parking was available at all times. Cycle parking in the area was heavily used and cycle parking within the site would not be on the public realm and would be secure.

A Member asked about servicing and blue badge parking. The applicant stated that access would be via the lifts. It would be pre-booked and there would be a banks person to escort the driver through to one of the lifts. It would be a managed process from kerbside down to the basement and up again. There would also be a barrier providing protection to public realm users as the lift descended from, and ascended to, the public realm. The vehicle mitigation bollards by the dropped kerbs would recess into the ground to enable access to blue badge holders.

In response to a Member's comment that the City was trying to enhance activities through Destination City, and that more creative activity would be welcomed, the applicant stated that the space would be programmed by the applicant but there would also be partnerships with the City, with the Destination City campaign, and with other cultural organisations. The public space at ground floor level would be activated through competitions processes, changing on a quarterly basis, with active events and installations and testing out new public realm ideas. The second and third floor spaces would provide options to collaborate on events and activities including learning workshops.

A Member asked whether the architectural design team would be involved from start to finish as suggested in the London Plan. The applicant stated they had been working with AFK Architects, a best-in-class design team, since 2018. They had led the design process throughout and would be delivering an exceptional architectural building.

A Member asked about emergency back-up powering. The applicant stated that as with a number of the larger buildings in the City, they were connected to a newer part of the UK Power Network. The building would have two power suppliers in line with some of the more newer buildings in the City. Discussions were taking place with the fire brigade about the provision of back-up power for life safety. Currently the plan was to use generators to provide that. However, technologies were changing and the situation would be monitored. It was possible that as the scheme was developed, the two power supplies could be relied on without the use of generators.

A Member asked how temperature would be controlled given the large amount of glass in the conservatory. The applicant stated that it was not a close controlled environment and it would react to the external environment. It would be double glazed so there would be no condensation. The temperatures would flow and behave in a similar manner to the external environment. In winter, solar energy would allow the space to be warmed up. In the summer, a series of automated vents would be opened to let the warm air out preventing an overheating effect. There would be a large movement of air as the vents were opened and the space cooled through the stack effect.

A Member asked about the benefits of the innovative exoskeleton approach. The applicant stated that the approach was to broaden and make a more economical vertical cantilever by putting the structure on the outside of the building rather than relying solely on the concrete core. The building was a slender building in terms of height to width ratio at about seven times multiplier. Buildings of this ratio and above that were only stabilised by a concrete core had a high density of concrete. This proposal would use a combined exoskeleton and concrete core. The main benefit of the exoskeleton was that the core did not need to do so much work and less concrete was required in the core and the concrete strength requirement could also be reduced. This would mean there were substantial embodied carbon advantages with the embodied carbon reduced by approximately 10%. Extensive optimisation studies using the most contemporary methods and computer technology meant there were more efficient relationships of geometry than the conventional x-frame shape exoskeletons and these could yield further savings of about 7% steel. There were also advancements in the embodied carbon in steel with the steel sector working to decarbonise the supply chain. Work had taken place with the design team to look at ways reused scrap steel could be used as the primary steel for the exoskeleton and to look at steel created with renewable energy sources. The low embodied carbon exoskeleton had been further optimised by approximately 40% in terms of the steel embodied carbon through the optimisation process.

A Member asked for clarification on how the vents and the mechanical ventilation heat recovery systems would coexist. The applicant stated that the

two elements were part of the same system. On each floor there was a ventilation slot that ran around the building and that would be used for taking air in and exhausting air out from the office floors. There would be enough movement of external air past the building to allow this to work correctly. In traditional buildings, there were large central air systems that used large shafts and large handling units to deliver large volumes of air and these used a significant amount of energy. Having a floor-by-floor approach meant the systems could be designed to be specific for the use on each floor. There would be a series of heat recovery units around the floor which would be connected to the façade. When air was brought in, it would be used on the floor and when rejected, any heat would be retained from that and would be transferred back into the supply airflow. The applicant confirmed that the vents could not be opened by individuals using the space, however there was a strategy to look at free cooling where the external conditions were acceptable so that fan energy could be minimised.

In response to a Member's question about deliveries and the modelling for expected deliveries during the night period, the applicant stated that there would be four loading bays within the service yard and extensive calculations had been undertaken in relation to the average duration of stay in these bays. The constraints of the site were such that the size of the vehicles would be restricted to 8 metres. Smaller vehicles would deliver fewer goods and therefore the duration of stay would be shorter. The capacity of the service yard would be about 15-17 vehicles per hour. The maximum number of vehicles which could be accommodated from 10pm to 7am was 136 vehicles. This was the shortest delivery period that the development could accommodate. The movement of vehicles would be heavily managed and all vehicles would be required to have a pre-booked slot. The lifts had been set back to ensure vehicles could enter the site without having to wait on the footway. A stage one safety audit did not raise any concerns with regards to movements across the footway.

Seeing no further questions of the applicant, the Chair sought out any remaining questions of Officers.

A Member asked about the microclimate and the wind changes at street level, especially at Camomile Street. An Officer stated that the microclimate assessments had demonstrated that there would be improvements in the wind conditions along Bishopsgate, Wormwood Street and Camomile Street. Currently winds wrapped around 100 Bishopsgate and these created a crosswind which affected cyclists. The proposal would create a more linear nature of the wind direction making it safer for cyclists and would reduce the extent of the wind improving the overall microclimate for pedestrians and cyclists.

A Member asked Officers for clarification on the local training and job brokerage of £2.9m, how this would be monitored and the effectiveness measured. An Officer stated that the £2.9m was part of the local training and job brokerage package secured through the Section 106. As was the case with many other schemes, the expenditure of money was delivered by the skills team in innovation and growth and specific projects were considered and steered by the Policy and Resources Committee. In previous years, this had helped to fund projects such as the Socioeconomic Diversity Taskforce and the Financial Services Skills Commission as well as jobs on City

construction sites and local apprenticeships, as well as the Skills for a Sustainable Skyline Taskforce. A report would be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee to secure funding from Section 106 for specific projects over the coming years.

A Member asked if the proposal fitted in with the Local Plan in terms of tall buildings and the skyline. An Officer stated that in terms of the 3D modelling and capacities massing studies carried out as part of the Local Plan review, the proposal fitted comfortably within the modelled envelope.

A Member asked whether modelling of pedestrian movement had taken place. An Officer stated that the application was accompanied by a transport assessment and Space Syntax had also produced a pedestrian flow analysis and the immediate site and its surroundings had been considered. Opening up the public realm would increase the size of the footways immediately around the building. The growth in the number of people visiting the site and moving along Bishopsgate and through various routes had been taken into account. Therefore, with the increase in occupancy of the building and with the increased pedestrian flows, the widening of the footways was enhanced and would make the conditions more comfortable than currently. TfL's proposals to widen the footway even further than modelled would result in further improvements in terms of pedestrian flows in the wider area.

A Member asked how Thames Water concerns that there was not enough water for a building of the proposed size, would impact the development. An Officer stated that one of the conditions attached to the proposal was requested by Thames Water and was that the applicant must undertake capacity modelling and submit this to demonstrate that there was a sufficient water supply.

In response to a Member's question about having an architectural retention condition, an Officer stated that this condition was added where it was considered necessary to monitor the design quality.

A Member asked for clarification on the office floor space and the evidence base given the figures were from 2017, prior to the pandemic and changes in working patterns. An Officer stated that the most up to date assessment of additional capacity set a requirement for about 2 million square metres between 2016 and 2036. This was based on GLA employment projections that were published in 2017. These had been superseded by more recent GLA employment projections. The City had recently commissioned Arup and Knight Frank to undertake an evidence piece looking at future demand for office requirements in the square mile. They had provided a report setting out three scenarios for office capacity based on office attendance and a number of other factors. The upper range scenario set out demand for an additional 1.9 million square metres, the mid-range demand was just over 1 million square metres and the lower range was approximately 570,000 square metres of additional floorspace. The study had not yet been formally incorporated into the City Plan that would be considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee in Autumn 2023. However, it was a robust and up-to-date piece of evidence work that was based on the latest GLA employment projections and modelled a number of different scenarios. The Officer stated that the 2 million square metre projection was from 2016 and therefore much of this capacity had already been delivered through planning decisions. The mid-range scenario was considered to be the one that most closely currently matched the trends of midweek attendance and the rate of office attendance. The most recent evidence corroborated broadly the previous evidence that informed the 2 million square metre requirement that was set out in the City Plan.

A Member referred to the recent appeal decision in relation to Marks and Spencer, Oxford Street, Westminster and asked if this decision changed how City Officers would advise Members in relation to embodied carbon and retaining buildings. An Officer stated that each case had to be understood on its merits and the appeal decision should not be applied directly to other schemes. The Officer also stated that there could be a legal challenge to the appeal decision. He further stated that the Secretary of State's decision concluded that that particular development did not accord with the development plan as a whole and he gave consideration to the balance of material considerations. Carbon was one of these material considerations and that specifically was informed by a lack of robust consideration of different options. Consideration was given to the balance of heritage harm and weight was given to some aspects of the heritage implications.

In response to a Member's question about the impact of the development on St Paul's Cathedral, an Officer stated that the application went through a significant pre-application process and the application had been amended. The original scheme was higher than that currently proposed and the reduction in height had a material impact in terms of the impact on St Paul's and also the impact in the wider context. The current scheme lessened the substantial harm to the significance of St Paul's. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) all the public benefits arising from the proposed scheme had to be considered and it had to be established whether these outweighed that particular harm. In this case, the benefits and the harm were set out in the report. Officers had concluded that the harm was outweighed by the significant public benefits. A number of conditions and Section 106 obligations required the Cultural Plan to be delivered, there to be a cultural operator and the public realm, ground floor auditorium and exhibition space would all be for flexible use and that the conservatory would be delivered.

A Member asked for confirmation that the public benefits would be provided for the life of the building. An Officer stated that any change would require a deed of variation to the Section 106 or a new planning permission for a change of use.

The Sub-Committee then moved to debate the application.

A Member commented that the striking, elegant design, public realm proposals and substantial pedestrian permeability improvements were welcome additions to the City.

A Member welcomed the permeability at ground floor level and cultural offering and stated that this would be a new iconic landmark in the City.

A Member commented that this was a good scheme, with a good design, cultural offering and it fitted in with the cluster.

A Member commented that whilst she could see the benefits of the proposal, she had concerns about whole life carbon and the demolition of a 40-year-old building which could be refurbished.

A Member stated he also had concerns about the building being demolished but considering the building being demolished was small in comparison with the size of the proposal, he considered this to be acceptable. He also welcomed the building style.

A Member welcomed the creative design of the building that reduced embodied carbon and thanked Officers for their detailed presentation.

A Member welcomed the cultural elements of the scheme and the design of the building.

The Chairman summed up the points made and stated that this site was the right home for the NLA. He had seen firsthand the work done at the London Centre with school children, exciting them about the built environment and architecture and the careers available to them. Moving to this building would further inspire them. The NLA had also done work on social mobility. Adding inclusivity to the building would enhance that offer further. The building would sit at the heart of the Eastern Cluster, in the middle of the area defined as suitable for tall buildings. In terms of the future requirements for square footage, this building would be an important part of the ecosystem of towers in the City and essential for the growth of the square mile.

A Member who had asked for either an architectural retention condition, or for this to be included as part of the legal agreement, stated that he was content for Officers to decide which way to progress this. Officers confirmed this would be added to either the conditions or legal agreement.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 14 votes  
OPPOSED – 1 vote  
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Mr Hugh Selka, who had not been present for the whole agenda item, did not vote.

**RESOLVED -**

1. That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to:
  - (a) The application be referred to the Mayor of London to decide whether to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission as recommended, or to direct refusal, or to determine the application himself (Article 5(1)(a) of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008);
  - (b) The application being referred to the Secretary of State pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) Direction 2021 and the application not being called in under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
2. That Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any necessary

agreement under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed; and;

3. That Officers be authorised to provide the information required by regulations 29 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and to inform the public and the Secretary of State as required by regulation 30 of those regulations.

5. **\* 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.

6. **\* 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.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

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

A Member stated that on the planning portal, the application noted in the current list for Cripplegate for “repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing of Crescent House, including stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single glazing with vacuum glazing panels and associated works” had a number of objections.

The Member stated that a year ago, the Committee had approved a pilot project to test three options for the window and facade refurbishment of the Grade II\* listed Crescent House. She stated that the project was yet to deliver any results and the heritage glass had yet to arrive on site to enable the first part of the pilot to be completed and tested. The Member stated that residents felt they had waited for the pilot project proposed by the applicant and it was premature for an application to be submitted and considered before the results were known and Historic England, The Twentieth Century Society and residents have seen the results.

The Member asked Officers to advise on the position of the pilot project, the requirement for it to be completed and the timeline for the new application, including whether it was likely to come to Committee before phase one of the pilot was completed and tested.



An Officer stated that the pilot project was being considered and worked through in tandem with the current application and was focussing on the vacuum glazing. Samples would be delivered on site later in the summer and there would be an opportunity at that time, for Officers, the Twentieth Century Society, Historic England and residents to view these samples in situ. Depending on the outcomes of the testing and the aesthetics of the proposal, the current application which had been submitted would be submitted to Committee after the assessment.

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**  
There were no additional urgent items of business for consideration.

**The meeting ended at 12.15 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis**  
**[zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**LOCAL PLANS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, 18 October 2023**

Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation)  
 Committee held at Committee Room 3 - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on  
 Wednesday, 18 October 2023 at 1.45 pm

**Present**

**Members:**

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)  
 Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)  
 Deputy Randall Anderson  
 John Edwards  
 Deputy Alastair Moss  
 Alderwoman Susan Pearson  
 Deputy Elizabeth King (Ex-Officio Member)

**Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	–	Town Clerk’s Department
John Harte	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	–	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	–	Environment Department
Garima Nayyar	–	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	–	Environment Department
Michelle Rowland	–	Environment Department
Lisa Russell	–	Environment Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Christopher Hayward and Deputy Edward Lord.

2. **MEMBER DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes of the last meeting held on 20 June 2023 be approved as a correct record.

4. **CITY PLAN 2040**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director, which set out the direction of the City Plan and summarised the main changes to policies to reflect the findings of evidence, to take into account the engagement responses received, and to align the Plan with updated corporate strategies.

An Officer outlined the City Plan timetable stating that following the Sub-Committee's consideration of the text of the Plan, on 21 November, the Planning and Transportation Committee would consider the full plan proposed for submission to the Secretary of State. This would then be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee followed by the Court of Common Council in January 2024. If approved, there would then be a Regulation 19 Consultation on the City Plan in February and March 2024. The Plan would then be submitted to the Secretary of State along with the consultation responses and other relevant documents in Summer 2024. There was an aim to have public examination hearings towards the end of 2024, an Inspector's report in Spring 2025 and adoption in mid-2025.

Members were informed that Officers had sought to ensure that where contents overlapped, they had been combined, with less repetition. The overall spatial strategy had remained similar to that in the previous plan. The spatial parts of the polices had been separated from the more thematic parts. This work had been informed by the work of the Sub-Committee and extensive engagement carried out over the summer with various stakeholders.

The Officer outlined the substantive changes made to each section as outlined in the Officer report and Members were invited to comment.

The following comments were made in each section:

### **Health, Inclusion and Safety**

#### **Strategic Policy S1 – Healthy and Inclusive City**

##### Policy HL5

In reference to the replacement facilities being equivalent to those being replaced, a Member stated that this should be the minimum requirement.

##### Policy HL2

A Member raised concern that the policy previously stated that developers would be expected to install non-combustion energy technology but this had been changed and developers were expected to avoid the use of diesel power generators. He stated that this could encourage gasoline power generators. The Officer advised that environmental health colleagues would be consulted on the wording to ensure the wording did not result in negative outcomes.

##### Policy HL5

A Member commented that there should be an impetus on developments providing public toilets and if provided externally, the developers should be responsible for maintaining them. Concern was raised that toilets were being

provided in developments with viewing galleries but these could only be used by those with tickets. The Officer stated that this policy sought to require the provision of public toilets in major retail, leisure and transport development particularly near visitor attractions, public open space etc. There were also policies around requiring major new developments to be contributing to the life of the City e.g., cultural attractions, roof terraces and viewing galleries. The Officer stated that the provision of public toilets in the right buildings in the right locations could be a valuable addition to these facilities. Officers would consider the wording of the policies to ensure this was appropriately referenced and was being secured through appropriate schemes. The Officer stated that many of the largest developments were focussed in a particular area so appropriate locations should be considered to prevent overprovision in certain areas.

## Policy HL2

A Member stated that the policy should seek to drive down local sources of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and particulates. A Member also commented that standby generators were required to be tested monthly and each time they entered a start-up phase which resulted in higher particulate emissions. The Chairman stated that there were difficulties setting policy on areas which were difficult to implement without legislation. A Member stated that if a development was connected to two substations it would not need a back-up generator and suggested that this could be mandated. A Member suggested that the particulates of a new development could be evaluated alongside carbon.

An Officer stated that this policy required developments to be at least air quality neutral and for major developments to maximise credits for BREAM assessments related to on-site NOx emissions. The Officer stated that the largest developments were subject to an environmental impact assessment to adopt an air quality positive approach and this had changed from being 'wherever possible' to being a requirement. There was also London Plan guidance. Members were advised that Officers would look closely at this and understand how it related to aspects such as the heating of buildings and the movement of construction materials. The Officer stated that Construction Logistics Plans were also undertaken to secure improvements. Members were informed that Officers understood Members' concerns and would take these away to ensure that a high bar was being set in relation to the air quality of new developments.

## Policies HL7 and HL8

A Member stated that the word 'free' should be included in the reference on page 38 of the report to the network of outdoor sporting facilities. He also stated that there could be a reference to the possibility in some cases of combining HL7 and HL8. He commented that there were successful examples in other boroughs where adult exercise facilities had been combined with children's play

areas so parents and carers could watch their children while exercising and children could learn from seeing their parents and carers from exercising. An Officer stated that some to this would be included in the design of particular sites as schemes came forward. There was also work underway in the City to look at the potential of certain sites and this could be cross referenced in the Plan.

In response to a Member's query about whether events such as Formula 1 would be classified as recreation, an Officer stated that from a strict planning perspective, this would be considered to be a leisure type which would fall within retail and leisure.

### Strategic Policy S2 - Safe and Secure City

#### Policy SA3

A Member stated that in relation to hostile vehicle mitigation (HVM), the words 'designed to minimise the need for HVM on the public highway' should be replaced with significantly stronger wording to strongly discourage HVM on the public highway, except from where this could not be avoided. A Member stated that there was guidance on this that the building line was never at the point where the HVM started and finished but was further forward of that and therefore there could be difficulties in managing this through policy.

The Chairman stated that the Plan was looking forward to 2040 and much could change in this time. An Officer stated that incorporating HVM measures within the design of buildings was generally the preferred approach and that if it was necessary on the public realm, this should be well designed. There were also measures that could be taken to manage the potential for HVM working in partnership outside the red line boundary and with other developers as well and this was encouraged. Officers noted the concerns raised and would look at the wording to check the balance was right.

A Member commented that the amount the developer was required to contribute should be more specific and should be 100% if connected to their building, with a lower contribution if the HVM was towards the wider area. An Officer stated that this policy was working in conjunction with other policies. There was a policy on developer contributions which identified the various aspects of financial contributions that developers would need to be making in relation to a number of policy areas including this one. The language in this policy was deliberately vague because the detail of how the cost was identified was set out in the planning obligations supplementary planning document (SPD). This gave the flexibility to update and amend that when reviewed. Where a development had an impact or could have an impact in the wider public realm, these costs were offset through contributions such as 278 agreements to improve the wider public realm. Officers would ensure that security aspects were included in this.

### Housing

### Strategic Policy S3 – Housing

A Member raised concern that the City Plan was until 2040 but the Housing Plan was to 2029. An Officer stated that the final year of the housing requirement was 2039-40. Before then changes in the City, might mean there would need to be a review of the City Plan but it set the framework for that time frame, bearing in mind what was known now.

A Member stated that certain buildings should be able to be converted from office to residential more easily than policy would permit. A Member informed the Sub-Committee of two office to residential conversions that had recently been granted planning permission under delegated authority. The Officer stated that Policy OF2 was a lynchpin policy. In relation to residential proposals, this policy took a more flexible approach to residential proposals than the adopted Local Plan. The policy still required proposals that would result in a loss of office and conversion to residential, to undertake a 12-month marketing exercise and for it to not be considered a strategically important office site. However, within and immediately adjacent to residential areas, it did allow the conversion of offices to residential. The Officer advised that over the last 10 years, the City had been relatively successful at supporting residential schemes on particular sites, often in older historic buildings.

A Member suggested that 7.1.6 mentioned the work done outside the City and should be moved to the front of the Housing section to make it more prominent.

The Chairman stated that the Local Plan was to set a generic perspective on the policies rather than look at individual examples. The Committee could then look at individual cases.

A Member raised concern that if the housing target was not met this could be problematic when the Plan was submitted for inspection. The Officer stated that Officers were confident about the number. It had been developed through looking at both the London Plan requirement which set out the requirement up to 2028-29 and this was 146 dwellings on average per year on average. Beyond this time period, the government's national algorithm was used for calculating housing requirements and the City was in line with this and also the GLA's housing figures which were capacity based. The London Plan stated that the City of London should be promoting office development and seeking substantial additional provision of office development. The Officer stated that if the housing target was revised upwards this could lead to a non-conformity issue with the London Plan by virtue of not providing sufficient sites for office development.

### **Offices**

#### Strategic Policy 54 – Offices

Policy OF2 – A Member commented that the policy stated that the loss of office floor space would be resisted unless it could be demonstrated that the proposed development would not lead to the loss of office floorspace. He stated that this wording therefore needed amending as any alternate use other than

office would lead to the loss of floor space. An Officer stated that the wording would be considered to ensure it was clear.

Members discussed the importance of not sterilising the land and there being uses which could compromise other uses. The Chairman stated that an ecosystem of cafes, retail and other uses was important to ensure office demand did not drop away. An Officer stated that there were a number of ways that a development could compromise the potential for an office development on a site nearby e.g., there could be issues of light and overshadowing to a residential development sterilising a potentially substantial office development site. The Officer stated that the supporting text could be amended to be clearer about the bar being set and stated that the policy would not encourage the micromanagement of sites. A Member commented that the City had spent a significant sum on Elizabeth Line and the sites around the stations were attractive for Offices. Leveraging those sites for that type of activity was better value than having residential developments there. A Member commented that the policies were about the proper stewardship of space.

In response to a question from a Member about whether there should be an assessment of what a development would provide to the ecosystem of types of development included in the policy, an Officer stated that there were other parts of the plan e.g. design polices which ensured that development was contributing to the life of the city and also the inclusion of active frontages.

A Member queried whether laboratories were classified as offices. An Officer stated that certain laboratory development would be difficult to find appropriate spaces for within the square mile. These tended to be very large, secure facilities with blank frontages. There were other areas around the City that were developing sites. Whilst the City was continuing to support life sciences, there was not a focus on having laboratory developments in the City.

The Chairman stated that the inclusion of laboratory sites, would not be in line with other policies, Destination City and creating an ecosystem feeling. He commented that it was important to remain sector agnostic and although there were a lot of financial and professional services in the City, this was quite a generic area. The Chairman stated that he and the Director of Planning and Development had met with the life science industry about laboratory space. He advised that the City had a large role to play in that sector and financial support was provided out of the square mile. The Chairman also stated that there was a wide spectrum of types of laboratory sites.

### Policy OF3

A Member stated the importance of temporary 'meanwhile' uses and having a policy that insisted on these to prevent the sterilisation of a site prior to the development of a site. An Officer stated that the wording of Policy OF3 had been strengthened to now state 'firm encouragement'. In addition, where a major development would affect existing ground floor or podium level active



uses, these units should be kept in active use for as long as possible prior to development taking place and cultural plans should set out how this would be achieved. Officers would push developers on this but also had to be mindful of the legislative framework.

A Member raised concern about the inclusion of cultural plan in the temporary uses without other possible temporary uses being included e.g., temporary market garden or sporting facility. The Officer stated that cultural plans could include a wide range of different uses. The word 'vibrancy' was suggested as improved terminology.

A Member suggested that the business rate change could mean business owners would cover the cost of most of the temporary use. Officers would consult the Chamberlain's Department and if appropriate would reference this as an additional incentive.

## **Retail**

### **Strategic Policy S5 – Retail and active frontages**

The Chairman requested that wording be included about working in partnership with the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) to gain their perspective.

A Member queried how retail and other relevant uses would be encouraged to open at evenings and weekends particularly in areas around key attractions. The Officer stated that this could not be a requirement so would be through encouragement. He also advised that work could be undertaken with developers on their cultural plans or strategies to consider evening and weekend operation. The Officer stated that work would continue to take place with the BIDS, landowners and other partners to enrich the ground floor economy.

A Member asked whether it would be possible to discourage certain types of retail especially near St Paul's Cathedral. An Officer stated this was difficult and engagement had taken with a borough with similar issues. A range of interventions could be used, working with landowners and businesses and taking enforcement action where necessary. The Officer stated that part of the Plan was to extend the principle shopping centre frontage from Fleet Street up to the front of St Paul's Cathedral. This recognised the value these frontages played in the tourism and visitor economy. It also sent a signal to the retail industry that this was an area considered to be important locally. A Member encouraged work with the BIDs to encourage businesses to curate retail spaces. The Officer stated that any substantial owners of retail space should be thinking of curating spaces to get the right mix of retail.

In response to a Member's question about Leadenhall Market, the Officer stated that changes had been made to the principle shopping centre aspect that discussed Leadenhall Market, firmly encouraging the transformation into a

destination. Work was taking place with City Surveyors, Destination City colleagues and BIDs.

## **Culture and Visitors**

### **Strategic Policy S6 – Culture and visitors**

A Member stated there should be reference made to how it was expected that the demographics of the visitor mix would change. This would include more families with children. The Officer stated that Destination City colleagues were undertaking an extensive insights programme looking to secure data on who was currently visiting the City, who might visit in the future and how this could be achieved. This would be put into relevant policies at the relevant time but was not available to be put into the Plan at this time. If the work did line up with the Plan, more information could be added. The Officer added that the Plan was clear that there would be an expected increase in the amount of visitors and it was planned that this would include a wide range of people. There were a number of different policy areas, particularly the spatial ones, and a need for additional play space and visitor facilities for families had been recognised. An Officer stated that social and economic inclusivity could be woven into the Plan to reflect the City becoming a more welcoming destination for all communities.

The Chairman stated that the City Property Association (CPA) had launched their visualisation of Destination City so third parties were understanding the policies and would attract different types of people to the City. An Officer stated that the Inclusion Policy was at the front of the Plan. It was recognised that the City needed to become more inclusive. Officers would look into whether shifting demographics should be mentioned.

## **Infrastructure**

### **Strategic Policy S7 – Infrastructure and Utilities**

A Member suggested that new developments should be required to include a piece of tunnel under their developments so that when there were enough sites, they could be connected. An Officer stated the City Operation's Team could be consulted. There would need to be alignment with the Utility Strategy. The Member stated that the costs would be less than putting tunnels under the street.

### **Strategic Policy S8 – Design**

The Chairman stated that many of the points raised were encompassed in this policy.

Policy DE5

A Member commented that viewing galleries were expensive for developers to install and alternative public amenities could be of value. The Officer stated that DE5 Part 3 stated that all tall buildings or major developments were required to provide free to enter publicly accessible elevated spaces which might include roof gardens, or public viewing galleries or other retail or leisure facilities to create attractive destinations for people to enjoy the City's spectacular skyline. This recognised the demand for a range of different experiences. The Officer added that the benefit of tall buildings was an opportunity for experiences at height. It did not necessarily mean the top of the building every time. This tied into the London Plan which had a requirement for viewing galleries to be considered and also the Culture policies for major developments to make a substantial contribution to culture and leisure destinations. Developers were required to look at the cultural planning of offers and look at retail and leisure facilities where appropriate.

An Officer advised that the demand was there for more viewing galleries, however it was important to have a diverse selection of offers. Often when there was a tall building next to a residential building, it was not appropriate to have a viewing gallery. An example of this was at 2-3 Finsbury Avenue had a ground floor triple height community skills training space. The Officer suggested that whilst two viewing galleries had opened in the last few months, there was a whole plethora of different elevated public areas as ground floor public realm could not be provided in the cluster due to the strategic nature of these sites.

A Member questioned whether requiring a ticket meant the viewing galleries were public amenities as they did not replace the public realm that could not be provided at ground floor level. An Officer stated that no visitors without a ticket had been turned away from the viewing galleries since they had opened. It was anticipated that when there were more viewing galleries and supply met demand, visitors to viewing galleries would not need to book.

A Member commented that the aesthetics of buildings was important and expectations should be included in the Plan. An Officer stated that the City sought the highest quality of architecture, the buildings were prominent buildings on the London skyline. Officers would look at the wording to ensure the requirement for exemplary architecture was emphasised.

A Member queried why HVM was included in the section about roof terraces. An Officer stated that HVM was only required where necessary e.g., where there was a public entrance to a roof terrace and this had the potential to turn into a busy place and create a particular vulnerability. Officers liaised with the City of London Police on this.

#### Policy DE8

A Member advocated the consideration of the cumulative effects of the loss of daylight and sunlight. An Officer stated that a planning advice note was being developed to cover the updated approaches to radiance and ensure that the

latest building research establishment guidance on daylight and sunlight was being reflected. Cumulative issues should be covered in this. The Officer stated that setting arbitrary time limits could result in developments delaying when they were brought forward. A Member raised concern about just having a forward-looking policy. An Officer stated that this would be included in the supplementary planning document which was likely to be presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee by the end of 2023, however work would need to be undertaken in line with BRE guidelines.

A Member commented that if public realm was lost to bollards at pavement level required for roof gardens, this was net loss to most people who moved around the area. An Officer stated that having large ground floor entrances queuing did not take place on the public highway.

## **Transport**

### **Strategic Policy S9: Transport**

A Member asked how the City ensured that lifts provided as part of an application were maintained and kept in use for the public to use. An Officer stated that where lifts were required as part of a planning application, they would be secured through the S106. If it was subsequently found that the lifts were not being run in accordance with this, work would be undertaken with the developer to ensure this was rectified.

In response to a Member's question about the prohibition of on-street shredding, an Officer stated that this just applied to new developments as it was not possible, within the planning system to require existing buildings to do this. In response to the Chairman's suggestion that a voluntary charter could be introduced, an Officer stated that he would raise this with transport strategy colleagues.

A Member asked about wayfinding and suggested that as most people used Smartphones rather than signage to navigate around the City, engaging with providers to ensure their apps located interesting destinations in the City should be explored. An Officer stated that discussions were taking place between transport strategy colleagues and the Destination City team and providers. Offers could look at policy to see if developers could be encouraged to engage with the providers of various different apps. A Member stated that three-dimensional signage was required for multi-dimensional public spaces. An Officer stated that this was included in Strategic Policy S10: Active travel and healthy streets. The Officer stated that wayfinding measures could include design consideration of how to reveal spaces and lighting could be used.

In response to a Member's concern about anecdotal evidence that there could be safety issues around the changing on e-scooters, an Officer stated that this level of detail would not be in the City Plan but it could be raised with transport strategy colleagues to ensure any guidance issued was clear about maintaining fire safety when e-scooters were charging.

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

### **Active Travel and Healthy Streets**

#### **Strategic Policy S10: Active Travel and Healthy Streets**

Policy AT3

In response to a Member's concerns about discarded hire bikes, an Officer stated this could not be tackled through the City Plan as it was not a planning matter.

### **Heritage and Tall Buildings**

#### **Strategic Policy S11: Historic Environment**

The Chairman stated that it was important not to suggest that it was right to fill the tall tower cluster area of Fleet Valley area with developments and also not to suggest that developments could not take place in an area that was outside of these areas. An Officer stated that the wording would be considered to ensure it was clear. He also stated that Officers had worked to ensure a context led approach was being taken towards development. Within the key areas of change policies, more detail had been provided about how different parts of the City might reflect their heritage and the potential of the area.

### **Tall Buildings**

#### **Strategic Policy S12 – Tall Buildings**

There were no comments on this section.

### **Protected Views**

#### **Strategic Policy S13 – Protected views**

There were no comments on this section.

### **Open Spaces and Green Infrastructure**

#### **Strategic Policy S14 – Open Spaces and Green Infrastructure**

### Policy OS3

The Chairman stated that the provision of new honey bees, particularly where not well managed, could have an impact on biodiversity. The Officer stated that the wording should be amended to make it clear that insect hotels for solitary bees were supported.

## **Climate Resilience**

### **Strategic Policy S15 – Climate resilience and flood risk**

#### Policy CR1

In response to a Member asking for clarification on the policy, an Officer stated that where new buildings were being developed, the impact on the inside of the building and the impact on the wider world were considered. The Officer stated that urban greening could improve the cooling within the immediate vicinity, passive ventilation had an impact on the building itself and the thermal mass of buildings could help to modify some of the fluctuations in temperature. The Officer added that this would be covered in more depth within the Sustainability SPD which also covered approaches such as communal heating, joining up to wider heat networks or sharing heat.

In response to a Member's query about asking developers to ensure they had the potential to connect to heat networks in the future, an Officer stated that extensive work had been undertaken through the Local Area Energy Plan which sat outside the planning system. This set out how energy requirements would be addressed and how these would be sustainable over the longer term. The government was also introducing a requirement for heat zoning and strongly supported heat networks as a key mechanism for delivering decarbonisation nationally.

#### Policy CR3

A Member commented that using semi-permeable or permeable materials rather than granite sets would absorb more water into the ground. An Officer stated that the wording could be considered to ensure the policy did not preclude the most up-to-date thinking in relation to sustainable drainage. He also stated that there was guidance around the type of materials that should be used and work could take place with transport strategy colleagues and the public realm team to ensure that these were aligned in terms of sustainable drainage.

## **Circular Economy and Waste**

Strategic Policy S16 – Circular Economy and Waste

No comments were made on this section.

**The Temples and The Thames Policy Area**

Policy TP1

No comments were made on this section.

Strategic Policy S17 – The Thames Policy Area

No comments were made on this section.

Strategic Policy S18 – Blackfriars and Strategic Policy S19 – Pool of London

The Chairman stated that the two ends of the river within the City were neglected and there were no BIDS which included these areas. He stated that this could be an area for future development. A Member stated that there not being any major businesses with substantial footprint was a consequence of the area being neglected and therefore it would be difficult to establish a meaningful BID but that a BID could be transformative.

In response to a request from a Member, an Officer confirmed that the wording could be amended to include 'refurbishment' first and 'redevelopment' second.

Strategic Policy S20 – Aldgate, Tower and Portsoken and Strategic Policy S21 – City Cluster

No comments were made on this section.

Strategic Policy S22 – Fleet Street and Ludgate, Strategic Policy S23 – Smithfield and Barbican and Strategic Policy S24 – Smithfield

The Chairman stated that the neighbourhood forum had been included in the Plan.

A Member queried the reference to the culture mile and an Officer stated that this should refer to the Culture Mile BID. Officers would amend the wording accordingly.

A Member stated, that in relation to ensuring retention and improvement of pedestrian permeability, this could be difficult on Golden Lane estate as it was a private estate and so costs would be added to service charges. Officers would look at the wording in relation to this.

A Member referred to 17.8.9 – The cultural offer on Fleet Street and commented that this should state a ‘potentially’ strong cultural offer. An Officer stated the wording could be updated and that the policy recognised the heritage aspects in terms of the churches and the history of printing.

A Member queried the strength of the wording in relation to the resistance of residential development. An Officer clarified that this was to be narrowly applied to the area adjacent to the current market site or the future Museum of London so that a new residential development was not proposed immediately opposite the entrance to the new Museum of London. Officers would look at the wording to ensure it was clear. Members supported the restriction on residential development on this site as it could inhibit uses for the future Museum of London site which would be part of Destination City.

An Officer stated that it was acknowledged that there were residents already living in the area and that was part of the character of the area but this policy would avoid major additions of residential development adjacent to the Museum of London site.

In response to a Member’s comments that existing residents were used to noise from the market, a Member stated that the market did not trade on a Sunday so the area was quiet but in the future, there was a cultural opportunity and as part of Destination City, the area could become much busier at weekends.

#### Strategic Policy S26 – Liverpool Street

No comments were made on this section.

#### Economic Objective, Social Objective and Environmental Objective

The Officer outlined changes made to the first three chapters of the City Plan, Economic objective, Social objective and Environmental objective.

A Member asked that ‘sport’ be added into the objective – ‘creating new and enhanced culture, leisure and visitor attractions’. An Officer stated this could be considered.

The Chairman thanked Officers for their work in producing the City Plan. He also stated that the City Plan was at the heart of policymaking for the built environment. It also fitted into the Corporate Plan and the London Plan

In response to a Member’s question about the process going forward, an Officer stated that the City Plan would be amended following the discussion at this Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting and a full version of the City Plan would be submitted to the Planning and Transportation Committee on 21 November 2023. There could also be amendments made to technical aspects



of the plan through internal consultation and Members would be provided with a track change version so the changes could be easily seen.

The Chairman requested that to try and avoid repetition in the discussion at the Planning and Transportation Committee, the draft minutes of this Local Plans Sub-Committee should be circulated to Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee, in advance of that meeting.

A Member referred to the cross-cutting nature of the City Plan and the overlap with other policies. He stated that the work in the City Plan was a major part of Destination City. An Officer stated that these cross-cutting approaches would be highlighted at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting. Following a request, the Officer stated that page numbers would also be referenced in the presentation at that Committee meeting.

**RESOLVED:** - That Officers continue to progress work on the City Plan based on Members' views.

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

There were no questions.

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

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

7. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting held on 20 June 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

**The meeting ended at 4.25 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank

**STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION)  
 COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 26 September 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, 26 September 2023 at 1.45 pm

**Present**

**Members:**

Graham Packham (Chairman)  
 John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)  
 Deputy Randall Anderson  
 Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
 Deputy Alastair Moss  
 Alderwoman Susan Pearson

**Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Melanie Charalambous	-	Environment Department
Gillian Howard	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Sam Lee	-	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Bob Roberts	-	Environment Department
Clarisse Tavin	-	Environment Department
Jake Tibbetts	-	Environment Department

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Shравan Joshi, Paul Martinelli and Ian Seaton.

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

Deputy Fredericks stated that in relation to Agenda Item 4 – 100 Minorities: 278 Highway Works (Phase 1), and Public Realm Enhancements (Crescent)(Phase 2), she was a resident of Tower Ward, knew the architects of the two hotels and had attended the event currently taking place in Crescent.

**3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**, That the public minutes of the meeting of 4 July 2023 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings.

Matters Arising

#### Letter from TfL regarding the rerouting of Number 11 bus route

A Member asked if a response had been received to the letter sent to TfL. An Officer stated that a response had been received and would be circulated to Members of the Sub-Committee.

#### Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Streets Plan

A Member asked about the governance of the joint project with Islington Council. An Officer stated that a working group had been established with Officers at Islington Council and the arrangements for Member level governance had been discussed. A Member working group would be set up to inform and oversee the work to develop the proposals and these proposals would be submitted to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. Islington had fewer ward Members than the City so it was suggested that two or three representatives from the City sit on the working group. The Chairman had suggested these representatives should be Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. The Officer stated that a meeting of Chairman and Deputy Chairman plus the relevant Executive Member at Islington Council would be arranged.

In response to a Member's question about when the proposals would be submitted, an Officer stated that it was anticipated they would be submitted to the Sub-Committee in the first half of 2024 and this would be followed by the consultation.

#### Dockless Cycles

A Member asked about the performance of Lime since the new agreement had been signed. She raised concerns about the cycles constricting the pedestrian flow on Cheapside. An Officer stated that the latest statistics from the operators had not yet been received, there had been increased usage over the summer and the City would be providing additional parking spaces. The operators had been asked to help manage the issues on Cheapside including at the junction with King Street.

In response to a question from a Member, an Officer stated that TfL and London Councils were looking into having a Londonwide single dockless vehicle contract. This was currently at an early stage of development. The contract should mean there would only be a set number of operators for the whole of London and there would be a consistency of parking arrangements.

#### 4. **100 MINORIES: 278 HIGHWAY WORKS (PHASE 1), AND PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS (CRESCENT) (PHASE 2)**

Members received a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which outlined Phase 1 of the project which involved S278 funded highway works to integrate the hotel development at 100 Minories into the City's highway and Phase 2 of the project which involved public realm enhancements and the landscaping of Crescent.

The Chairman stated that a late public submission had been received and gave Members time to read it.

The Officer stated that there had been a delay in finalising the S278 agreement over several years and this had increased the costs. The costs had been reported to the hotel operator and the works could not proceed without payment. Any delays to the payment could result in further costs due to inflation.

The Officer stated that the design of the public realm enhancements had evolved following consultation and liaison with occupiers and TfL. She stated that TfL required 24 hour, 7 day a week access to their substation for the Circle and District Lines which was in Crescent and they had made comments on the design which Officers had worked to address. Officers had also worked with the Destination City team to accommodate more event activities. The team had advised that the ideal space for events and activities was 100 square metres. Officers had also worked with the relevant Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and had held a workshop to talk about possible events. She advised that Officers had held several meetings with the hotel and the hotel architects and had taken on board their comments, which had evolved over the consultation. The Officer stated that two options had been developed.

The Officer informed Members that the first option was similar to that approved in January 2023 by the Sub-Committee and the second option included more space for events. The Officer stated that consultation on this option had taken place. Numbers 6-7 and 8-11 Crescent were currently empty but contact had been made with the owner representatives and they had submitted letters of support. TfL had also submitted a letter of support and a preference for option 2. The Officer stated that the BIDs considered that Option 2 met the needs of the community and was their preferred design. She advised that, generally those in support of Option 2 were in favour of the greening and landscaping at the edges of the space. The Officer stated that Option 2 also used climate action money and incorporated sustainable urban drainage so was a better environmental and more climate resilience scheme. There was also public seating and space for events and activities. The hotel had stated that they would prefer no permanent planting. Officers considered Option 2 to be the best option for the space and had received the most letters of support.

A Member stated that the scheme had evolved since the redevelopment of 100 Minories as it had become clear that the grassed landscaping was unsuitable as there was a railway line underneath it and there were issues with load-bearing and watering, as well as the access requirements for the sub-station. The Member stated that Tower ward was not lacking space with grass, trees and benches but was lacking activity space. She stated that the Sports Strategy and Destination City had sparked the imagination of the Aldgate and EC1 Business Improvement Districts and residents. She stated that she was concerned about a lack of consultation. The Member also stated that there were a number of open spaces in the ward in need of refurbishment including Trinity Square Gardens and the fenced off play equipment in Tower Hill Gardens. The Member stated that the scheme should be paused and revisited to consult the residents who had not been consulted and stated the importance of this when the Policy Chairman had a key policy to have a reset with residents. She also stated that the padel court, although temporary, had

brought people into the area and stated that events had to be on a scale to make them viable. The Member stated that Option 2 included more space for activities but it was in the area that required constant access to the substation. She therefore raised concern that any activity equipment had to be able to move quickly if TfL required access to the substation. The Member stated that at the workshop held about the scheme, no consensus was reached and commented that the EC1 BID had concerns about the proposed trees. She suggested that a pause and deep dive would ascertain how the space could be used and during this time, funding could be put into Tower Hill Gardens to make it a welcoming entrance to the City with new play equipment and funding could be put into Vine Street's railway bridge in order to link up with the Crescent. The Member stated that whilst the hotel might favour a quiet garden, residents were concerned that other quiet spaces had turned into beer gardens.

The Chairman stated that Tower Hill Gardens was a separate issue and advised that this was a standalone project and was included under Item 10 as a proposal to be allocated Section 106 funds.

The Chairman asked Officers to outline the engagement that had taken place with residents. The Officer stated that there were not any residents close to the site. She advised that there had been a letter drop of local occupiers but this did not include residential blocks as they were not close enough to the Crescent. The Officer stated that a workshop with businesses had been held but there had not been direct engagement with residents as they were not close to the site. She stated that this was in line with the consultations undertaken with this type of proposal. The Officer stated that if there were residents interested in the design, Officers could meet them. A Member stated there was a residential block on the other side of the Minories and also one at 100 Pepys Street and she considered that as stakeholders in the area, they should be consulted.

A Member raised concern that if the Crescent scheme was implemented and then buildings on Crescent were refurbished, there would be a cost in reinstating elements of the scheme. An Officer stated that any works could be accommodated and Numbers 6-7 had completed a refurbishment and provided a written comment that they supported the design and were keen for it to progress quickly as they considered that this would help them let their buildings. Officers had met with the managing agent of Numbers 8-11 who had advised them of the plans for refurbishment and provided written responses supporting the proposal. An Officer stated that discussions had taken place about how refurbishment works could be accommodated and Officers considered this could be done quite easily as the works were almost entirely internal so there would be limited impact on the highway.

A Member commented that there were voices against Crescent being an entertainment space and voices against the permanent greening of the space. The Member stated that the proposal was a compromise and whilst it would be possible to undertake further consultation, the key stakeholders had been consulted and the BIDs would be aware of local needs.

A Member stated that in recent years there had been a renewed emphasis on keeping fit and the City had a strategy on sports which needed to be implemented. He stated that the proposal would provide a combination of greening and a place to undertake sport. The Member commented that some people wanted greening, shrubs and seats and others wanted sports. He also stated that children's playgrounds were lacking in Destination City and were required to get families into the City. The Member stated that he would like the surface of the central piece to be soft as this gave the ability to have events and also facilitate activities such as yoga. An Officer stated that having permeable paving on the north side of the space was an option but as the central area would be used for events, it would need to be hard wearing. The Officer stated that York Stone could take the weight of the vehicles that would need to drive across it to access the substation. The Member stated that hardwearing soft permeable paving was available.

The Chairman stated that the proposal aimed to strike a balance between providing space for events and leisure. If the greening was not included, there would be no climate resilience, biodiversity planting, trees, shade or sustainable drainage system. An Officer stated that from a policy perspective, Members of the Sub-Committee had challenged Officers several times to find more space for greening and more trees as the Climate Action Strategy was a relevant policy consideration. The Officer stated that this proposal allowed the Cool Streets and Greening money to be used and if hard landscaping was used, the money would be taken out of the project. There were also likely to be other areas with greater priority if some of the elements of greening could not be delivered into the space.

A Member stated that the BIDs had made it clear in the workshop that they wanted flexible space and that the EC1 BID had suggested an ice rink. The Member stated that pausing and consulting residents would enable a green element to be included but also enable flexibility and showcase the landscape design of George Dance the Younger in Crescent, which was of historical importance in the ward and in the City.

The Chairman asked Officers for more detail on the consultation. An Officer stated that there were no residents close to the site so those in the vicinity of the Crescent had been consulted. All the occupiers around the edge had been consulted, as had occupiers on Vine Street as far as America Square, as well as the two BIDS. There was a mail shot and a letter drop. Officers had undertaken research to find the owners of the empty buildings and Officers contacted them by email and letter. The Officer stated that the workshop was held in August.

An Officer stated that residents could be consulted through a letter drop. However, the design had evolved to meet every need that had been identified with event space, planting, the Crescent occupiers being satisfied, TfL being satisfied that there would not be any equipment that could not be dismantled quickly to give access to their substation and Officers did not envisage any more needs being established by doing this. Any redesign was likely to be very similar but there could be an issue of additional costs being incurred.

A Member stated that he wanted to be confident that part of the scheme would not need to be deconstructed to enable office refurbishment. An Officer stated that refurbishment works would be accommodated as part of the design development. A relationship had already been established with the managing agent for Numbers 8-11 and Officers would coordinate with them to avoid having to deconstruct any part of the scheme. She stated that this could include not planting the tree on the North side in the next planting season and planting it in the following planting season if that was in the way of the hoarding and she stated that this was the only risk that had been identified.

A Member welcomed the inclusion of trees and asked how the space would be maintained. An Officer stated that 20 years of maintenance costs were included in the project budget, the materials to be used were City palette materials so were quite easy to maintain, the planting would be climate resilient planting so that would have lower maintenance over time and the trees would be established and generally would not require watering after five years.

A Member stated that office workers had expressed concern about having active sport in front of their office. The Member stated that primarily the City was about office work and whilst sport was important, sporting facilities should be placed carefully so as not to cause issues for office workers.

A Member stated that visitors should be a main consideration as the City wanted to attract them to the City. He stated that it was difficult to ask visitors what they would like to see, so the City had to act on their behalf. The Member also stated that office workers should also be considered and attracting both groups to the City would result in more money being spent in the City.

A Member commented that the freeholder of the office block was in favour of activity space in front of the block. She raised concern that the activity zone in Option 2 was in the area where there had to be access for the substation. She suggested a pause to enable Officers to ensure all the design ideas had been captured.

The Chairman asked Officers to clarify the situation regarding access to the substation. The Officer stated that only activities with moveable equipment would be licensed. She advised that one of the issues with the current padel board court was that it was large-scale and the equipment would need dismantling if emergency access to the substation was required. In the future, licenses would be granted to smaller scale activities. Options had been considered with the Business Improvement Districts and all of these activities had dismantlable equipment.

An Officer commented that TfL had concerns about the padel board court. They were content for the license to be extended for the summer but were clear that they were not prepared to accept this permanently. The Officer stated that access to the substation was a constraint of the space and the area would be a flexible space with the ability to deliver events accommodate the needs of TfL plus the premises on the west side regarding their potential requirements for



refurbishment. Members were informed that Officers had been working on the design over the last 12-18 months and the design had evolved over time.

A Member commented that sockets could be pre-built in the ground so sporting nets could be put up and removed quickly. An Officer stated that TfL understood the City wanted to change the nature of the space in terms of a permanent design and temporary usage. Only activities which would not put at risk other key aspects e.g., the servicing of the substation, would be licensed. If proposed equipment could not be dismantled in a reasonable time period, this would be discussed with TfL to ascertain if they were prepared to accept the use. The design of equipment would be important.

Having fully debated the application, the Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 4 votes  
OPPOSED – 1 vote  
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Deputy Fredericks asked for her vote against the recommendations to be recorded.

**RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee**

1. Note the additional cost of £160,747 for Phase 1 (S278 Highway Works) to be funded in full by the owner and approve the revised total budget for Phase 1 of £705,525 (excluding costed risk);
2. That Option 2 is approved for Phase 2 (Public Realm Enhancements to Crescent);
3. That an additional budget of £47,000 is approved for Phase 2 to reach Gateway 5;
4. Agree the total estimated cost of Phase 2 at £900,000 - £1,228,000 (excluding risk);
5. Agree the funding sources for Phase 2 set out in Appendix 3 of the Officer report.

5. **CITY CLUSTER AREA - PROGRAMME UPDATE (INCLUDING LEADENHALL STREET IMPROVEMENTS)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on the delivery of the City Cluster programme.

**RESOLVED – That Members of the Sub-Committee**

1. Note and approve the content of this progress update;
2. Note the funding strategy in Appendix 2 of the Officer report, and the commitment of £1m from the EC Business Improvement District, subject to the outcome of the City's capital bid which has been submitted for consideration;

3. Approve funding of £35,000 from the S106 contribution of 40 Leadenhall Street for staff costs and fees for the management of the City Cluster programme including communications, for the next reporting period, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Officer report; and
4. Approve the following recommendations regarding the Leadenhall Street Improvement project, to enable the project to progress to Gateway 3:
  - i. Approve the progression of the project's design shown in Appendix 3 of the Officer report towards a more-detailed design with costed greening and public realm options for future consideration and approval by Members;
  - ii. Approve the increased and amended budget shown in Appendix 4 of the Officer report to enable the above work to take place and reach the next gateway, including the requested increase of £173,000 to a new overall budget of £391,000. (proposed to be funded by the 20 Fenchurch Street S106 monies);
  - iii. Approve the inclusion of a works budget line to accommodate trial holes to help validate potential greening locations along the street; and
  - iv. Approve the amended Risk Register in Appendix 5 that has been updated following the outcome of TfL's Bishopsgate Experimental Traffic Order to release the funding previously held in the register back into the project.

**6. CREECHURCH LANE AREA IMPROVEMENTS (CITY CLUSTER PROGRAMME)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning proposed public realm and highway improvements to the Creechurch Lane, Mitre Street and Bury Street area.

**RESOLVED –** That Members of the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the initiation of this project;
2. Approve the budget of £75,000 (staff costs and fees) for the project to reach the next Gateway 3/4, funded from the Section 106 agreement of 40 Leadenhall Street development;
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £500,000-£780,000 (excluding risk); and
4. Authorise officers to prepare and agree a funding letter to receive the external funding contribution from the EC Business Improvement District.

**7. ST PAUL'S CATHEDRAL EXTERNAL RE-LIGHTING**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to replace the ageing external lighting system at St Paul's Cathedral with a new innovative and energy efficient system.

The Officer stated that there would be brighter light to the dome and the upper parts of the building and this would support distant views across London. There would be softer, dimmed light to the base of the building which would contribute to the ambience of its local setting in the City. There would be an appearance of light radiating out from the main body of the cathedral to create a sense of a living building.

Members were informed that lighting tests would be carried out in the near future and the proposed lighting would be demonstrated to key stakeholders, decision makers from the City, St Paul's Cathedral, external statutory bodies and sponsors. The Officer stated that a budget of £350,000 was requested to carry out these trials, progress the design details and prepare the next gateway report which was due to be submitted in Quarter 3 of 2024. It was anticipated that the Gateway 5 report would be submitted in Quarter 1 of 2025.

The Officer stated that the report also requested approval to formalise the end of the lighting system to St Paul's Cathedral. Members were informed that the Cathedral had agreed to take on the future maintenance, running costs and management of the lighting system. It was anticipated that the new system would deliver annual savings of approximately 60% of both running costs and maintenance. It would also reduce light pollution and the carbon footprint in line with the City's Lighting Strategy, the Lighting Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the Climate Action Plan.

The Officer stated that project funding had now been secured through Section 106 contributions which were complementing the initial City contribution that was previously approved. In addition, discussions had taken place with Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and external high-profile partners. It was anticipated that if any further funding was required for the project, this would be secured through external sources. The Officer stated that if additional external funding was secured in excess of the project cost, the City Fund contribution could be reduced accordingly.

In response to a question from a Member, the Officer stated that the equipment to be used in the lighting tests would be returned afterwards so there would be no cost. However the demonstration required some equipment to be purchased. If it was considered that it could meet the needs of the final project it would be stored. If it was not suitable, it would be returned and the cost of the equipment would be reimbursed.

A Member requested that Members of the Sub-Committee be invited to attend the lighting tests and demonstration.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the updated concept design;
2. Approve the budget of an additional £350,000 to undertake the lighting tests and demonstration trials, progress the detailed design, and reach the next Gateway; funded from the £1.16m capital bid previously approved in 2021;
3. Authorise the transfer of any underspend from the previous Gateway to this Gateway budget;
4. Note the revised budget of £675,000;
5. Approve the revised project programme;

6. Approve that Officers enter into the required legal agreement with St Paul's Cathedral regarding the future maintenance and management of the lighting system; and
7. Be invited to attend the lighting tests and demonstration.

8. **MANSION HOUSE STATION ENVIRONS - LITTLE TRINITY LANE PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment, outlining the project aims to deliver an enhanced public space through increased greening, improved seating, and accessibility improvements plus additional design objectives to maximise the delivery of climate resilience measures.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve design option 2 to be taken forward to the next gateway;
2. Approve an additional budget of £37,600 from the 39-53 Cannon Street S106 to reach the next Gateway, thus increasing the available project budget to £177,607;
3. Note the revised total estimated cost of the project at £650,000-£780,00 excluding risk;
4. Delegate the approval of a Costed Risk Provision to the Interim Executive Director, Environment should one be sought at Gateway 5;
5. Delegate approval to undertake the statutory consultation that may be required in relation to the reviewed position of the Doctor's parking bay and disabled bays, to the Interim Executive Director, Environment.

9. **WIDEGATE STREET BARRIER AND OPERATION S278**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the installation of a physical barrier on Widgate Street.

In response to a Member's questions about how the bollards would be removed when the street was open, an Officer stated that there would be a legal agreement between the City and the operator, Marugame Udon, a restaurant located in Widgate Street, and they would be required to remove the bollards when the street was open.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the proposals as detailed in the Officer report; and
2. Authorise the Comptroller to enter into the S278 agreement under the Highways Act 1980, with Marugame Udon, to fund the proposals as detailed in this report, operate the removable bollards, pay for maintenance when required and the removal of the measures should they no longer be needed.

10. **ALLOCATION OF RING-FENCED S106 DEPOSITS TO PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning approval for a further allocation of ring-fenced S106 funds, consistent with previous Member approvals and corporate priorities.

An Officer stated that the money was ring-fenced as all of the Section 106 funds were either geographically restricted or restricted in purpose and had therefore been allocated, or had an allocation proposed, based on these factors.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee approve the allocation of £8,953,294 in S106 deposits to programmes and projects, as outlined in the Officer report.

11. **COMBINED SECTION 278 PROJECT INITIATION REPORT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which was a gateway 1 and 2 report for 23 separate Section 278 projects.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve project budgets for each project to reach the next gateways as set out in the tables in Section 2 of the Officer report; and
2. Authorise officers to instruct the Comptroller and City Solicitor's department to negotiate and enter into Section 278 agreements for the individual projects.

12. **COMMEMORATIVE BENCHES AND TREES POLICY**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the Commemorative Benches and Trees Policy which aimed to formalise the existing offer for benches and trees in City Gardens and Public Realm.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee approve the adoption of the draft Commemorative Benches and Trees Policy as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer report.

13. **22 BISHOPSGATE PUBLIC REALM PROJECT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to deliver new and improved public realm in Bishopsgate, Crosby Square, Great St Helen's and Undershaft under the Section 278 and Section 106 agreements associated with the development at 22 Bishopsgate.

Following a Member's comment about wind levels when exiting from Horizon 22, and asking about possible mitigation, Officers stated they would raise this with Planning Officers and report back to Members.

In response to a Member's concern that trees had been planted but one was not looking healthy, and others having been removed and not replaced, an Officer stated that under planning conditions, the trees would be replaced. He would enquire as to the species being proposed and report back to the

Member. The Officer stated that the trees that had previously been planted, had been planted by the developer with TfL approval but against Officer recommendations. He further stated that the trees planted by the City in the public realm had a very high success rate.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the delay to the completion of the S278 works associated with 22 Bishopsgate;
2. Note the 6-8 Bishopsgate S278 contribution of £105,000 towards the increased cost of the 22 Bishopsgate public realm project;
3. Approve an increase to the 22 Bishopsgate public realm project budget of £105,000 to complete the project implementation in Undershaft and note the revised total estimated project cost at £1,400,500; and
4. Approve the budget adjustment related to staff and works costs to be actioned as outlined in Table 2 Appendix 4 of the Officer report.

14. **35 VINE STREET SECTION 278 HIGHWAY WORKS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to deliver an enhanced package of Section 278 highway and public realm improvements around the new development at 35 Vine Street, including the introduction of pedestrian priority measures in part of Vine Street, new cycle parking and ten street trees.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Agree to retain £14,987 as a commuted maintenance sum for City Gardens to maintain the ten street trees;
2. Approve the budget adjustment set out in Appendix 3, Table 2 of the Officer report;
3. Approve the content of the outcome report and agree for the project to be closed;
4. Authorise the return of unspent funds to the developer.

15. **CREED COURT S.278**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to deliver public realm enhancements to the area surrounding the new development at Creed Court as outlined in the Sections 106 and 278 agreements, to accommodate the projected increase in pedestrian traffic and servicing needs of the hotel.

A Member commented that when the street was partially closed, many pedestrians were unaware the street was partially open and therefore businesses that relied on passing trade, had lost business. He advised that once Officers were informed of this, they responded quickly, putting signage on Ludgate Hill advising that the businesses were still open. He stated that this was a learning point for the future.

**RESOLVED** - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the contents of this report and agree to close this project;
2. Approve the budget adjustment related to staff costs to be actioned as outlined in Appendix 3 of the Officer report;

3. Authorise return of unused funds to the developer, including any accrued interest as per the Section 278 agreement.

**16. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out the list of Outstanding References.

**RESOLVED** – That the Beech Street Transport and Public Realm Improvements item be removed from the list of Outstanding References.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were two items of business to be considered under 18a and 18b.

**18.1 Moor Lane Environmental Enhancements**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on recent activity and the next steps for Area B (the Western side of Moor Lane). The Officer stated that Area A (the Eastern side of Moor Lane) had already been agreed in July 2022 and work would start on Area A in October 2023.

An Officer stated that the report followed concerns raised by local resident representatives regarding design. The design which had been approved in May 2023 had an outstanding element relating to the greening aspects for the Rain Gardens, planters and the Clean Air Garden. The Officer advised that the recent representations were outside of the elements delegated in that approval and that the issues raised were contained within the Officer report. She stated that Officers had proposed to pause delivery and undertake a review of the design for the Western pavement and look at whether a change of traffic management in the Healthy Streets Neighbourhood Plan would offer a greater opportunity for additional greening and planting. It was also proposed that independent advice would be sought to review the proposals and feed into an overall design review. The Officer stated that the aim of the review was to establish if there were any other options that would allow taller trees or greater planting that would be deliverable, sustainable and maintainable in the longer term. This information would then be presented back to interested stakeholders at a stakeholder progress meeting and there would then be a report back to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee in early 2024.

In response to a Member's question, the Officer stated that the constraints of the street still remained, particularly regarding London Underground and the requirement for access to the car park and 21 Moorfields.

The Chairman asked if Officers were fully aware of any limitations under the ground. An Officer stated that Officers were confident that the exact location of

the Underground structure was known and Officers were aware of the limitations of very shallow depths. She advised that extra trial holes in the Clean Air Garden on the Barbican Estate land had identified a ramp. The Officer stated that if there was an opportunity to extend the footway further, some additional trial holes could be required at each end but it was unlikely that any further trial holes would be required in the middle section where the Underground structure was located.

A Member stated that the amount of planting seemed to have decreased and there was more pavement in the latest versions of the proposal. She stated that residents understood the constraints of the site in terms of depth but it was important to define the streetscape constraints e.g. the required widths of the pavement and road to improve understanding of why certain ideas were impossible or possible. The Member commented that trees had been promised and although there were constraints about the type of trees, there should be a clear understanding of the height that plants could grow to. She stated that whilst it was acknowledged that mature plane trees could not be planted, some bushy trees and an abundance of planting would help address concerns. She stated that although residents would be disappointed in a delay, this could mean the design was future-proofed. She also stated that residents had been in discussions with the Culture Mile Business Improvement District about the possibility of additional funding to spend in the area as it was a through-route and was part of Moorgate Crossrail and she suggested that linkages should be looked at when considering public realm. The Member suggested that if the current road closure was moved along the road, the road could be divided into two as there were only five entrances in the whole street that required servicing.

The Member also stated that residents were clear that the report did not say that residents wanted to keep the Clean Air Garden (Pot Garden). They wanted the project to feel like a scheme rather than a continuation of this garden. She advised that although there was a Barbican interest in the garden, it was being looked after by people who did not live there.

A Member stated that the Clean Air Garden was intended to be temporary, and the materials chosen reflected that. He considered that there should be a uniform garden along Moor Lane. Although there were very few places a tree could be planted, it might be possible to include one in the Clean Air Garden. The Member stated there were divergent views and many residents felt their voices were not being heard. He further stated that open consultation with people in the area would help to address this and their views should be recorded and considered. The Member stated that originally, green walls that were not attached to the building, were considered and he was unclear why this was no longer possible.

The Chairman stated that although engagement with local stakeholders would lead to further delays, it was key and it was important to have a decisive majority in favour of the outcome. He also stated that there were constraints of the site and expectations had to be managed.



In response to a Member's query about the ramp, an Officer stated that it was her understanding that this was an old car park ramp. A Member stated that it was underground connection between estate and buildings there and was still used for utilities.

In response to a Member's question about whether there was a time limit to the funding, the Officer stated that under S106 each agreement was different and there was usually a time limit. She advised that Cool Streets and Greening funds had to be spent by 2025.

A Member commented on the presumption that the road had to be 6 metres wide to have two-way traffic as there were other places in the City with roads less than 6m where chicanes and priority signs were used. An Officer stated that potential options for traffic management would be considered as part of the design review. He advised that they might need to be phased into improvements as they would be unfunded and any traffic management changes would be undertaken as part of the Healthy Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman commented that if there was agreement on an endpoint which was not immediately affordable, the project could be split into phases for delivery.

An Officer stated that it was important to look at opportunities to future-proof the scheme as streets changed over time. He advised that the Healthy Neighbourhoods agenda might look at the way in which traffic could be managed across the whole area and this might provide alternatives. He stated that the proposal put forward 10 years ago was more ambitious than could be delivered and it was understandable that residents were disappointed this could not be delivered. He further stated that the way the division was now structured meant this would not happen with future schemes. The Officer advised that Officers were committed to continue the engagement on this scheme. He informed Members that the City had some of the best expertise in planting and garden maintenance with the City's microclimate and there was confidence that the Gardens Team would help to deliver the best deliverable, sustainable and maintainable scheme given the constraints. He advised that climate resilient planting would be included.

The Officer stated that following a visit to the Clean Air Garden, there would be a wider meeting to consider the options. In response to a question as to who would be consulted, Officers stated that Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, ward Members, stakeholders who had written in, such as residents of Willoughby House, Heron House, the Barbican Association and Friends of City Gardens would be consulted. The Officer stated that if Members had any further suggestions of people to invite to the site visit and progress meeting, these could be added to the list of invitees. The Officer informed Members that after the meeting, Officers would then make recommendations to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to consider.

In response to a Member's question about whether the Gardens Team should offer a consulting service to residents and businesses in relation to plants that should be planted for the City's microclimate, an Officer stated that discussions

had been taking place with planning colleagues to ensure that there were resources available to provide the expertise within the Corporation.

**RESOLVED** - That the report be noted.

## **18.2 Report of Action Taken**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out the action taken since the last meeting.

In response to a Member's question as to why the continuation of the traffic and timing mix review at Bank would cost £650,000, an Officer stated that if there was a robust reason to change the traffic order, traffic modelling would be required. Much of the money was to pay for consultants' time as well as TfL's time for the auditing of a large modelled area and £150,000 was for costed risk so was only included in the eventually that it became an issue. Therefore, £500,000 had been set aside to progress to the conclusion if there was a change to the traffic order. An Officer stated that approximately £100,000 had been committed to studies underway on taxi availability.

A Member commented that the Court of Common Council approved the need for a review, not necessarily for a change, and that wording should reflect the words of the motion.

A Member asked for a full breakdown of the costs of revisiting the mix of traffic at Bank and raised concern that the motion was not debated in Court. She also raised concern about the amount of Officers' time and resources spent on this. She raised further concern that the mix and timings of traffic might not be approved by TfL and stated that she would like the junction closed to traffic 7am-7pm and also at weekends. She stated that the closure had calmed the whole area and suggested that the Sub-Committee should undertake a review so lessons could be learnt going forward. The Member also raised concern that the decision was taken under urgency which meant the Sub-Committee could not discuss it.

An Officer stated that an update report would be submitted to the Planning and Transportation Committee in November 2023 and then an update report would be submitted to the Court of Common Council in December. He informed Members that when updates on projects were provided, a breakdown of money spent and forecast to be spent was provided and that this would be included in this report. The Officer stated that in this instance, the spend linked to the traffic and timing mix review would be differentiated as it was part of a wider budget. The Officer stated that the report on the wider traffic order review had detailed spending and this could be provided. The Officer stated that there had been an overall allocation of £500,000 for the review and it had not all been spent on the review. Some of the changes and opportunities identified were to amend traffic orders to bring them in line or deliver wider benefits and these were being implemented. The Member asked for details of the projects that had not been undertaken as a result of the time and resources spent on this review and commented that there would be increased costs as costs had been rising. She

stated that there had been a knock-on cost to developers in terms of Section 278 money.

A Member asked Officers, when showing the figures, to try and split the money into money that was spent as a result of the motion and money that would have been spent anyway as there was already a plan to have a review a year later.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

**The meeting ended at 3.40 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank