

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 17 November 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held virtually at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

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

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
John Cater	- Town Clerk's Department
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerk's Department
Antoinette Duhaney	- Town Clerk's Department
Shani Annand-Baron	- Media Officer
Aqib Hussain	- Technology Support Partner
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Richard Chamberlain	- City Surveyor's Department
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Innovation & Growth
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of the Built Environment
Gwyn Richards	- Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Bhakti Depala	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Gemma Delves	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Digby	- City of London Police

tKieran Mackay	- Department of the Built Environment
Dom Strickland	- Department of the Built Environment
Annie Hampson	- Department of the Built Environment
Rob Chipperfield	- Department of the Built Environment
Rachel Pye	- Markets and Consumer Protection

Also in Attendance:

Susan Cox – Barbican Resident
 Dr Elizabeth Simpson – Barbican resident
 Susan Hoefling - Clerk to the Worshipful Company of Information Technologists
 Bernadette Skehan – Bartholomew Close resident
 Alderman Vincent Keaveny – Alderman for the Ward of Farringdon Within and Partner at DLA Piper
 Jonathan Chenery - Beltane Asset Management
 Duncan Roe – Beltane Asset Management
 Ed Williams - Fletcher Priest Architects
 Giles Charlton - SpaceHub Landscape Architects
 William Brook - Waldrams
 Jeremy Randall -Gerald Eve

Introductions

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

A roll call of Members present was undertaken.

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

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Peter Dunphy, Tracey Graham, Andrew Mayer and James de Sausmarez.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

The Committee considered the public minutes and non-public summary of the virtual meeting held on 27 October 2020 and approved them as a correct record.

4. PLANNING PROTOCOL UPDATE

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk, the Director of the Built Environment and the Comptroller and City Solicitor recommending that the Planning Protocol be amended to reflect current case law and procedural updates, and particularly to address the recent judgement in the Holocaust Memorial case in respect of local authorities' own developments.

A Member highlighted that Members were permitted to serve on the Property Investment Board and Capital Buildings Committee from which planning applications for the City of London Corporation's own properties originate and also to serve on the Planning Committee which went on to determine those applications. He went on to state that the Corporation's Planning Protocol used to set out that a member of a property committee who also sat on the Planning Committee could not participate in the determination of a planning application made by the Corporation. However, in 2014, this provision was removed meaning that if any member of the Planning Committee who also serves on a property committee believes that they can participate in the determination of a planning application made by the Corporation they may do so. He recognised that it may be the case that members had the ability to compartmentalise their thinking and vote against an application if they felt it failed on planning grounds even though they may have spent some time supporting the plans in a property committee but added that this would generally be perceived as a conflict by most members of the public. The Member added that he did not feel that the law and public perception were distinct concepts and highlighted that the judgement of the House of Lords in the *'Magill and Porter'* case had made it clear that avoiding even a perception of bias was a principle of public law. This case was referenced within the advice received from Counsel referenced within this report.

The Member went on to state that he was aware that there was other authority for bias being interpreted as personal rather than political and that this may be relied upon by members participating in the determination of a planning application for a development which they may have supported on another committee. He added that he believed that drawing fine distinctions between conflicting legal authorities was not the path to public confidence and that the City Corporation had enough elected Members for this to not be necessary. Against this background, the Member referred to the proposed amendment to paragraph 8) e) ii) of the Planning Protocol which would have the effect of reinstating previous bans on members participating in the determination of a planning application for a development which they have supported in another committee and underlined that he welcomed this. He added that it was, however, wrong for this amendment to be presented as being an action taken solely due to the recent Holocaust Memorial case as it did not establish a new legal principle – something which the Comptroller and City Solicitor had agreed with. The Member commented that the review of the Planning Protocol triggered by this case should be one of several steps taken to improve the Corporation's planning regime.

The Member went on to comment that the suggested amendment to paragraph 4 b) of the Protocol which would require that any Member meeting an applicant or objector should now also ask an Officer to attend and make a record of the

meeting was also to be welcomed. The new wording included a statement that these meeting records would also be disclosable under the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act but the Member stated that he felt that this was problematic and questioned how a member of the public, affected by a particular application, would know that such a meeting had taken place in order to make a FOI request. He stressed that navigating the procedure involved in making such a request placed an undue burden on the public and that it would therefore be preferable for the meeting records to be placed on the planning file and published alongside all other documents. He concluded by stating that this was what was proposed within the Transparency International (TI) report that he had drawn to the attention of the Committee at its last meeting by way of a Motion but which Members had voted against taking into account as part of this Protocol Update. The Member underlined that he supported these amendments in so far as they went but would like to see these go further still in due course.

Another Member agreed with the point made on meeting records being FOIable and questioned whether the intention was actually to make these publicly available, if not, she questioned whether the Protocol could be further amended at this stage to make it so.

She noted that this practice had already been adopted by other bodies such as Westminster CC. She went on to refer to telephone discussions and stated that she felt it would be sensible for these to meet the same criteria as any other form of meeting with Officers also being involved and keeping a record of these.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor responded to the points raised by stating that she had discussed the publication of minutes with colleagues in planning who deal with such meetings on a regular basis who had confirmed that the inclination was not for these to be uploaded to the public webpages automatically alongside planning application material as this information could already be vast and it was considered that not all information around meetings, such as administrative arrangements, would be useful. Some information could also be considered exempt or confidential which would mean that not all documents could be uploaded as a matter of course. Having said that, any note which included information that was material to a decision would form part of a report and therefore readily available.

Another Member commented that she welcomed the proposed amendments but felt that other advice should also have been taken into account when reviewing the Protocol. She also questioned whether consideration was given to the audience when producing these documents – Members, Officers and members of the public - to ensure that they were provided with all of the information they might need to understand the planning process. She went on to comment that she found the LGA's Probity in Planning document for Councillors and Officers a lot clearer on certain matters where it stated that Members should attend pre-application meetings with Officers who should make a full record of the meeting with this then placed on public record with any confidential material also alluded to within the resulting report to ensure full transparency around any discussions that have taken place. She therefore felt that there should be a more fundamental review of the Planning Protocol to

make it easier to understand and incorporate all of the recommendations within the LGA's Probity in Planning document. Finally, the Member questioned whether Officers also made a record of pre-application advice and whether this was made available to the public. She questioned whether the Protocol might therefore be further reviewed by this Committee in January 2021 to take into account wider recommendations from the LGA and TI for example.

Another Member stated that he was supportive of the proposed amendments presented today. He commented on the points raised earlier in the debate as to the structure of this Committee and potential conflicts for Members who sat on both this and the Property Investment Board – himself included – and stressed that such matters were being reviewed as part of the City Corporation's Governance Review and, as such, were outside of the remit of this Committee.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor highlighted that paragraph 9 referred to the Officer pre-application meeting information which was available online and included very similar information to what was now proposed in respect of Member pre-application meetings.

RESOLVED – That the Planning and Transportation Committee :-

- (i) Recommends to the Policy and Resources Committee that the amendments to the Planning Protocol shown tracked at Annexure 1 to the report be approved; and
- (ii) Authorise the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director to prepare any necessary Regulation 64(2) Handling Note in respect of any development proposals promoted by the City.

5. **150 ALDERSGATE STREET**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding 150 Aldersgate Street, 3-4 Bartholomew Place, London EC1A, specifically:

- (i) Demolition of roof top plant enclosure, rear service ramp and removal of cladding to facilitate the refurbishment, recladding and extension of the existing Office (Class B1 (a)) building at 150 Aldersgate Street to create a basement, ground plus nine storey building, including rear and roof top extensions, infill extensions to the rear courtyard (ground plus two storeys) to link with 3-4 Bartholomew Place;
- (ii) A part change of use at ground floor from Office (Class B1) to Café (Class A1).
- (iii) Erection of a new building Office (Class B1 (a)) at 3-4 Bartholomew Place comprised of basement, ground plus three storeys;
- (iv) The amalgamation of the two buildings;
- (v) The creation of new accessible and inaccessible terraces, green roofs, hard and soft landscaping, and creation of external courtyards;
- (vi) Upgrade works to Braidwood Passage, including new lighting; and
- (vii) Reconfiguration of the loading bay and associated works.

The Town Clerk drew Members' attention to the fact that a supplementary document pack containing additional background papers had also been

circulated and published yesterday afternoon, as had an additional letter of representation from DLA Piper and a response to this representation from Gerald Eve.

Officers presented the application to Members, reporting that it involved onto Cloth Street, an 8 storey post-modernist office building fronting onto Aldersgate Street, but also with faces onto Cloth Street, Half Moon Court and Bartholomew Place, with the site sitting opposite the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate Conservation Area and only the rearmost part of the site, formerly occupied by a commercial building at 3-4 Bartholomew Place, lying within the Smithfield Conservation Area. Members were informed that the surrounding area was mixed in character with the Barbican to the east and a mixture of commercial and residential uses to the west.

The Committee were informed that the application sought permission for the refurbishment and extension of the existing building, including infill extensions to the rear to provide Grade A office floor space increasing from 11,000 square metres to 17,000 square metres together with a retail unit at ground floor level. Members were informed that 123 objections were received to the original consultation with the majority of these coming from Barbican residents but also from residents of Bartholomew Close and some surrounding streets. The majority of these objections related to the scale of the development in its context, the impact on residential amenity in terms of daylight/sunlight and overlooking and an increase in footfall from those using Bartholomew Place entrance. A letter of support had also been received and both Historic England and the City Heritage Society have stated no objection to the proposal. It was also highlighted that the owner of 9 Newbury Street, adjoining the site, had now withdrawn their objection, as detailed within the addendum report and that a further letter in support of the scheme had also been received from the Chief Executive of Helical, the developers of Barts Square, although it was noted that they were questioning the benefits of extensive urban greening. A letter of objection from the commercial owners of the adjacent building at 160 Aldersgate Street had also been separately circulated to the Committee yesterday and a response to this from the applicant had also been circulated ahead of this meeting. Officers stated that they were happy to share both of these documents on screen at the conclusion of their presentation to afford Members the opportunity to read them both in full should they so wish. Officers summarised by reporting that the grounds for objection in the letter circulated yesterday related to a loss of daylight, outlook and privacy in the commercial building at 160 Aldersgate Street. It was reported that, whilst Local Plan policies within BRE guidance refer to protecting residential amenity and not existing office buildings, it acknowledged that any development should have regard to its surroundings. In this case, the office floor space in question was dual aspect and the proposed additional floors adjacent to its flank elevation would not prevent the beneficial use of this commercial floorspace. Furthermore, given that the recent extension to the building contains windows adjacent to its boundary, it could be considered a bad neighbour and therefore there would be some expectation of a similar development on the adjacent site which was what was being presented to Members today. With regard to overlooking, Officers reported that the close proximity of office buildings was common in the City and

such mutual overlooking between commercial premises was therefore considered acceptable.

Officers went on to report that the principle of the scheme, providing Grade A office floorspace, was strongly supported together with an active frontage to compliment and serve this part of the City. Members were shown images of proposed floorplans at Ground floor, first floor, second floor, third floor, sixth floor and eighth floor.

Officers went on to state that, as the proposal was for a refurbishment and extension scheme, it embodied circular economy principles including commitments to a pre-demolition audit to identify the potential for the reuse and recycling of existing on site materials as well as an end of life strategy to ensure that the building structure, materials and services can be reused at the end of the building's life. In relation to the architecture of the proposal, it had been designed to respond to the varied character and context surrounding the site. The Aldersgate Street frontage plans would revitalise a dated and inward facing building using vertical fins to provide depth and articulation to the façade whilst also having the practical benefit of providing solar shading and restricting overlooking. The fins would comprise stone beads providing a visual richness to the façade and reflecting the overall design concept of weaving a textiles motif into the fabric of the building responding to the historic association of the site and the surroundings with the textile industry.

Next, Members were shown images of the existing and proposed street level view of the building at ground floor from Aldersgate Street. Officers commented that this would be significantly improved by providing level access and an active frontage together with significant greening, transforming the existing, inward looking, lifeless frontage. The pedestrian route of Braidwood Passage would also be enhanced with the provision of active frontage, an art wall and woven mesh edge to improve visual permeability and enhance its Culture Mile context. Members were shown images of the existing and proposed view looking from Cloth Street back to Aldersgate to illustrate these points.

With reference to the proposed additional height of the building, it was highlighted that this would match the height of 160 Aldersgate Street and provide a successful transition to the development at Long Lane, creating a natural flow and satisfactory transition.

Members were shown an illustration of the existing rear elevation of the building facing onto Smithfield and also an illustration of the proposed development from this same aspect which depicted a more animated façade incorporating a series of set backs and significant greening as well as outside space for office users. Images of the view looking down Cloth Street from Long Lane showed that the height of the proposed development would increase but Officers highlighted that it was considered to provide an improved determination of the vista from this site with the use of light coloured brick, extensive greening and an enhanced pedestrian route at the end of Cloth Street. Images depicting views from Bartholomew Close along Half Moon Court also depicted how the proposed development would provide an effective contextual design. The view

of Bartholomew Place was also shown with the proposed scheme in place with a contextual design in keeping with this particular location. Overall, it was therefore considered that this proposal would deliver a high-quality design and would make a positive contribution to the townscape of this part of the City, covering all facades.

With regard to residential amenity, Officers highlighted that a full daylight and sunlight assessment was submitted alongside the application. With particular reference to the Barbican, it was noted that a number of windows in Seddon House would experience a reduction of more than 20% but that all of the affected rooms (which were bedrooms and living rooms) had balconies above them. The BRE guidance notes that these balconies limit light from the sky such that even a small obstruction can have a disproportionate effect on daylight. In accordance with the guidance, the applicant had undertaken an additional assessment which showed that, without the balconies, the loss of light would be within BRE guidelines indicating that this was a significant factor in the loss of light. With regard to 10-30 Newbury Street, which currently contained serviced apartments, a loss of daylight to six windows which serve three living rooms was considered by BRE to be a minor adverse impact. One rooflight here would experience a greater reduction in sunlight however, the applicants mirror image assessment demonstrates that the impact would be significantly worse - indicating that a lot of sunlight outside the BRE guidelines may be expected given its location very close to the site boundary. 9 Newbury Street was currently an office use but did have an extension and planning permission for conversion to residential. The assessment here indicates that, following amendments to the scheme, the impact on windows would be minor to moderate and the owner had subsequently withdrawn their objection to the application. Finally, 10-12 Half Moon Court was currently a construction site with a new residential scheme being developed here. The impact of these proposals on a number of windows here would be major, albeit many would serve kitchens and bedrooms which would have low existing benchmarks values and therefore percentage losses would be disproportionate. Again, a mirror image assessment confirms that the adverse impact would be greater than the impact from the proposed development. Overall, it was therefore recognised that there will be some adverse impacts on a limited number of surrounding residential premises, but Local Plan policy and the BRE guidance state that the guidance should be interpreted flexibly in urban areas and it was therefore considered that the overall benefits of the scheme outweigh this harm and that the scheme sits comfortably within its urban context.

With regards to overlooking and privacy, it was recognised that there is already a degree of mutual overlooking between the existing building and those properties surrounding it. However, the new development had been designed to minimise this with the alignment of the fins on the front elevation restricting overlooking into residential properties opposite at Seddon House and Lauderdale Tower. Similarly, at the rear, extensive screening would be introduced to the proposed green roofs and terraces alongside extensive planting which would also assist in restricting any overlooking. It was, however, noted once again here that there was already a degree of mutual overlooking between the existing premises and surrounding properties.

In respect of light pollution, a condition was proposed requiring the approval of a lighting strategy which will set out both physical and management measures to ensure that the internal and external lighting did not result in undue light pollution with the applicants committing to a full study on this. With regard to pedestrian movements which had been raised in some of the objections received, the transport assessment submitted with the application concluded that the proposal would generate approximately 70 two-way pedestrian movements in the peak hour which was considered to be negligible and acceptable in respect of the number of pedestrians using the various streets in the nearby Smithfield area to the rear of the site. With regard to wider transportation issues, the removal of the onsite carpark and spaces was welcomed and the applicant had also agreed to servicing consolidation which would result in a 50% reduction in servicing vehicle movements which would also be prohibited during the peak pedestrian hours, representing a significant benefit. In terms of sustainability, the proposals would deliver a highly sustainable scheme, retaining 80% of the existing structure, achieving a minimum of BREEAM excellent rating and also resulting in a 43.5% reduction in carbon emissions, thereby exceeding the 35% policy requirements. The proposal would also achieve an urban greening factor of 0.59, almost doubling the policy requirement of 0.3, resulting in a very green building and bringing with it all of the associated benefits of this such as biodiversity, sustainable urban drainage and improved air quality.

Officers concluded by stating that it was therefore felt that the proposal would deliver a high-quality development, providing Grade A office floorspace with attractive frontages and would also make a positive contribution to the townscape in this part of the City. It was therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.

The Chair thanked Officers for their presentation and asked that they now share on screen the DLA Piper representation that had not been included within the Committee papers as well as the Gerald Eve letter in response to this. He also asked that Officers summarise the main points within these documents. Officers stated that the key points raised by DLA Piper were around loss of amenity at 160 Aldersgate Street with images showing where the proposed development would sit in relation to the top floor of this commercial property where they suggested that views would be lost/blocked in rooms here. Officers paused to allow the meeting to view the images provided for themselves. Officers clarified that the proposed development was to the north of this adjoining property and that there would therefore be no loss of sunlight to the premises. The DLA Piper representation also referred to a loss of privacy due to mutual overlooking between offices.

The applicant had responded by providing images of this same top-floor conference room and responding to the concerns raised by DLA Piper. This image demonstrated that the window on the left-hand side was looking across the site in question with the and the window to the right looking out across the Barbican and that it was therefore dual aspect and well-lit even with the proposed development abutting that side of the building.

The Town Clerk introduced five registered objectors (Susan Cox, Dr Elizabeth Simpson, Susan Hoefling, Bernadette Skehan and Alderman Vincent Keaveny) and invited them each, in turn, to address the Committee.

Ms Cox began by stating that she was speaking on behalf of the residents of the Barbican Estate to object to the application. WMs Cox stated that, with no alterations to the design and height of the building, the resubmitted plans show a total lack of acknowledgement of residents' concerns and that the proposed increase in height would have a major effect on virtually all residential amenity categories – not only a significant loss of daylight and sunlight but also light pollution, overlooking and noise and disturbance – factors clearly contrary to policies d 8) and h 3) of the draft Local Plan 2036. She went on to suggest that the proximity of the redevelopment to residential flats and the resulting loss of privacy could not be overstated, despite the limited attempts at mitigation by use of fins and that occupiers of the new development would be able to look directly into many Barbican flats facing Aldersgate and the sunlight and daylight reduction would be material, particularly in Seddon House. The applicant's response had been to state that, with balconies notionally removed, no room experiences more than a 20% reduction in daylight distribution – indicating that it is the presence of the balconies rather than the development which was the main factor in any relative light loss. She questioned, however, how balconies (some of which were actually vital fire escapes) on part of a Grade II listed building in a Conservation Area could be at fault for the significant loss of light caused by the proposed increase in height of the building located directly opposite. Ms Cox added that daylight and sunlight also had recognised health benefits and that residents' wellbeing should not be ignored in the quest for maximum commercial gain. Ms Cox stated that the applicant had also not taken the cumulative impact of individual developments into account as required by the draft Local Plan. She expressed concern that, if granted, this would pave the way for further developments on top of 140 Aldersgate, enabling further height escalations and yet further loss of residential amenity. Ms Cox concluded by stating that, whilst residents did not disagree with the concept of the development of the site per se, it was the increased height which they did object to and therefore requested that this application be rejected with the height of the building maintained at its present level.

Dr Elizabeth Simpson, a Barbican resident, began by highlighting that over 120 written objections had been submitted on the revised plans for 150 Aldersgate Street and that the additional height and mass of the building would result in a significant loss of daylight for many residents. Dr Simpson highlighted that the impact of this was greatest on west-facing Seddon House flats and that 40 affected residents here had objected to the plans. She added that the developers had failed to take into account Jane Smith's calculations as to lost daylight that were in breach of current BRE regulations for many of these flats. Dr Simpson underlined that all of the flats concerned were single aspect dwellings with one living room and one bedroom each, all facing Aldersgate Street. Indeed, the daylight and sunlight report itself conceded that, in Seddon House, 31 windows would have a reduction in daylight outside of BRE guidelines. Dr Simpson requested that the proposal therefore be rejected, and

that the height of the building be maintained at its current level. She concluded by commenting that the significant loss of amenity for Barbican residents was compounded by the failure of the developers to take into account appropriate consideration of the visual impact of the proposed building in the context of the iconic Grade II * listed Barbican Estate and the Smithfield Conservation Area as required by Policy DM12.1.

Susan Hoefling, Clerk to the Worshipful Company of Information Technologists reported that her Livery Hall was located in Bartholomew Close with the building overlooking the courtyard which was Bartholomew Place. On behalf of the businesses overlooking this area, the objection related to the planned reception entrance to the new building at 3-4 Bartholomew Place which would, in turn, lead to an internal walkway linking this building to 150 Aldersgate Street. Ms Hoefling reported that entrance to Bartholomew Place was via a narrow archway into the small courtyard and that these proposals would, inevitably, lead to an increase in the footfall through this area, particularly when the Crossrail Farringdon Station on Long Lane becomes fully occupied and occupants of the new office development choose the shortest route to their destination. Increased footfall would, in turn, create noise disturbance for surrounding businesses. In the case of the WC of Information Technologists, Ms Hoefling highlighted that the company hired out a number of rooms within their building for external events and that any noise disturbance would impact the quality of this offering and, consequently, have a detrimental impact on a quality source of income. Secondly, there were concerns around the courtyard becoming an unofficial smoking area for the occupants of the planned development creating not only further noise disturbance but also an unpleasant environment. Banning smoking in this area would be a solution but would also inevitably push smokers into Bartholomew Close thereby impacting businesses and residents here. In summary, Ms Hoefling stated that her Company believed that providing limited or emergency access only to and from Bartholomew Place would mitigate against their concerns and provide a more acceptable solution for local businesses.

Ms Skehan began by stating that, as well being a resident in Bartholomew Close, she was also a patient at the Neaman Practice, sited in Half Moon Court, backing on to Bartholomew Place. Ms Skehan highlighted that the Neaman Practice served approximately 9,000 patients from all over EC1 and that in a normal, pre-COVID, year the practice would see approximately 17,500 visits, up to 80 per day over 220 weekdays throughout the year. She added that the majority of these visits would involve movement on foot through the narrow lanes in and around Bartholomew Close and that some visitors would also rely on the use of wheelchairs and walking aids. Adding a second reception for 150 Aldersgate Street from Bartholomew Place would no doubt increase vehicle traffic from taxis and other drop-offs as well as footfall in the Close and the surrounding lanes. Ms Skehan added that Bartholomew Close had no height demarcation between the pavements and the highway but did have several 90-degree bends where visibility is very poor. She stated that wheelchair users often had to veer onto the highway as, in places, the pavements were simply too narrow for them to pass and construction and other vehicles also frequently blocked the pathways. Introducing even greater vehicle use in the area would

have a detrimental effect on pedestrian safety, particularly for elderly or mobility challenged patients accessing the Practice. Ms Skehan pointed out that several objectors had pointed out that, if the scheme were to go ahead, the second reception plan ought to be re-thought with Bartholomew Place used as a security pass led or emergency exit only. Ms Skehan asked that the application be rejected today and re-thought.

Finally, Alderman Keaveny spoke in objection. He began by stating that he had originally intended to address this meeting in his capacity as Alderman for the Ward of Farringdon Within only but, unfortunately, his DLA Piper planning colleague who had also intended to speak had been informed that this would not be possible on technical grounds. He would now, therefore speak in his capacity as a partner for DLA Piper (a world-leading business law firm and occupant of 160 Aldersgate Street, adjacent to the proposed development) too. A brief presentation was shared with the meeting on behalf of DLA Piper with the Alderman highlighting that the company were sympathetic to the need for enhanced office provision to meet the demands of 21st century businesses and to ensure that the wider City remains an attractive place for world-leading businesses to locate. However, the development of new office space could not be at the expense or to the detriment of existing high-quality office space. He went on to state that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the meeting rooms and offices on the 7th and 8th floors of 160 Aldersgate Street. The Committee were shown images of the unimpeded vistas of two north facing meeting rooms on the 7th and 8th floors of 160 Aldersgate Street – if the proposed development were to be approved, both of these rooms would look directly onto a blank wall which would sit just 1 meter away. The Alderman suggested that the applicant's assertion that it had always been the intention that a new wall would be built here was wholly inaccurate. It was also highlighted that not all of the affected rooms are dual aspect and that the Officers report today appeared to gloss over the fact that overlooking remained a serious issue under these proposals and the fact that the daylight and sunlight assessments did not cover the impact on 160 Aldersgate Street. The Alderman went on to agree, as Ward Alderman, with the points made by the previous speaker in respect of the impact that this development and the considerable increase in footfall will have on the entrance of Bartholomew Place and the narrow area of Bartholomew Close. He also shared concerns expressed about the height and massing effect of the building on both the Conservation Area to its rear and on the residents on the other side of Aldersgate Street. He therefore asked the Committee to reject this currently envisaged development which was not appropriate for the location concerned.

The Chair thanked all objectors for their contributions and invited questions of the objectors from the Committee. Not seeing any questions, the Chair asked that those speaking on behalf of the applicant be introduced.

The Town Clerk reported that Jonathan Chenery of Beltane would be addressing the Committee and that they would be accompanied by Duncan Roe, Beltane, Ed Williams, Fletcher Priest Architects, Giles Charlton, SpaceHub Landscape Architects, William Brook, Waldrams and Jeremy Randall of Gerald Eve who would be on hand to respond to questions only.

Mr Chenery introduced himself as a founding member of Beltane Asset Management, the developer on this project alongside their partners, Arundel Properties Ltd. Mr Chenery reported that Beltane had been founded in 2010 with a focus on City of London commercial property and, since then, had delivered twelve commercial schemes in the Square Mile – all of them extensive refurbishments like the one presented today. Beltane had most recently completed 55 Gresham Street which had now been let to Investec Asset Management as its new London Headquarters. In July, Beltane had been granted consent to redevelop Millennium Bridge House from this Committee and that it was hoped that this scheme would be delivered in 2022 and that there was already tentative interest in the site from a global occupier who would not normally consider the City for their home, even in these troubled times.

Mr Chenery stated that the plans presented today had been designed by award winning practices Fletcher Priest Architects and SpaceHub Landscape Architects and followed more than a year of work by the design team. It was reported that Fletcher Priest had previously worked on the adjacent site at 160 Aldersgate Street as well as on the 55 Gresham Street scheme. Beltane's partners, Arundel, were a private UK business and had owned 150 Aldersgate Street for many years. Beltane had joined forces with Arundel in 2019 and had acquired the freehold of 3-4 Bartholomew Place at the rear of 150 Aldersgate Street to provide important connectivity through the scheme to the West, linking with Barts Square, Crossrail and the Culture Mile. Mr Chenery asserted that Beltane's refurbishment was highly sustainable with approximately 80% of the original structure and sub-structure being retained – thereby supporting the circular economy and minimising disruption and demolition. Members were informed that a pre-demolition material audit would maximise opportunities for the re-use and recycling of all demolition waste. Mr Chenery reported that the team had designed a mixed mode, all electric building which would be highly energy efficient. The replacement facades would use high-quality, natural materials and take inspiration from the site's history as a textile factory. Urban greening had been incorporated as a fundamental element of the design and SpaceHub had woven the planting into the fabric of the building to ensure that this would thrive long-term. The proposals achieve an urban greening factor of 0.59 – almost double the City's current target – making a significant contribution to improved biodiversity and air quality in this very urban environment. The scheme would also deliver Grade A office accommodation that was flexible to respond to the changes in the demands of occupiers, with a focus on wellbeing and providing natural ventilation throughout with openable windows and outdoor amenity space. A café was also proposed on Aldersgate Street to provide an additional amenity for both tenants and the local area. The site is on the periphery of the Culture Mile and would therefore provide public realm benefits through major improvements to Braidwood Passage including a textured art wall and significant opportunities to include public art within this thoroughfare.

Mr Chenery went on to explain that the secondary entrance on Bartholomew Place was fundamental to the vision and would reconnect two buildings which had, historically, been linked and would increase permeability through the site

whilst removing servicing and all vehicle movement from Bartholomew Place. Mr Chenery stated that he recognised that development always had potential impacts on neighbours and that Beltane had sought to carefully manage this through design consultation with City of London Officers to mitigate light pollution, privacy and overlooking, albeit that they were dealing with an existing office building. However, commercial developments also created jobs and it was crucial to the future of the City that existing office stock could be refurbished to meet future business needs if it were to remain a powerhouse of the UK and global economy. Mr Chenery confirmed that this project was fully funded and that the existing office building at 150 Aldersgate Street was now vacant. With this Committee's approval, the developer was ready to start on site to deliver this exciting scheme. He concluded that the refurbishment would provide a world-class, occupier-focused, environmentally sensitive commercial building. He hoped that the application would be supported to enable Beltane to invest in this building and in the City for the future.

The Chair thanked Mr Chenery for his contribution and invited questions of the applicant from Members.

A Member questioned how it was proposed that cyclists get their bikes to and from the bike store given that this would appear to involve navigating a staircase. The Member also referred to the entrance from Cloth Street, stating that she had concerns about the passageway here being used as a cycleway. The Member went on to state that there were plans for 14 visitor cycle spaces. She stated that these would take up a fair amount of space and questioned where these would be situated. Finally, the Member commented that there was no reference to disabled parking at all within the plans and questioned why this was.

Another Member spoke to refer to the late response from Gerald Eve to DLA Piper's objection noting that the objection was lodged in July 2020. She questioned why the objection had not been included within the background papers for today's meeting. The Member noted that the DLA Piper objections referred to loss of light and views from their office building. In the Gerald Eve response to these concerns, it was clearly stated that the architect who had designed 160 Aldersgate Street had also designed this scheme – the Member questioned whether they could therefore confirm that 160 Aldersgate Street was always at least two or three storeys higher than 150 and that there had always been a step down from 160 to 150 to 140 Aldersgate Street. With this in mind, it appeared unnatural to raise the roof level of 150 Aldersgate Street to meet that of 160. The Member went on to speak of the greening of the proposed building upon which the applicant had placed a lot of importance. She stated that she was concerned about the maintenance of the green roofs and green walls and asked that the applicant explain who would be responsible for this and how planting would be maintained.

Another Member also referred to the DLA Piper objection which had been lodged in July 2020 and featured on the public webpages but not within today's agenda pack. He also questioned why it had taken so long for the applicant to come back on these points and why 160 Aldersgate Street was not addressed

within their daylight/sunlight report or within their design and access statement . He added that he would also like to understand from the architect, if this were the same architect for both 150 and 160 Aldersgate Street, why a set back was no longer proposed . The Member noted that, from the North side of this development, there would still be a step down, yet, on the part joining 160 Aldersgate Street, there was none.

A Member commented that Braidwood Passage was a very narrow and poorly lit space at present and that any works to widen this and illuminate the area would be welcomed. She was, however, concerned as to cycle access here and questioned if this was what was proposed. With regard to the proposed art wall, the Member cautioned that some artwork had been installed at the crossing nearby as part of the Culture Mile and that many local residents had mistaken this for graffiti.

Mr Chenery responded to each of the points raised in turn. He began by explaining that long-term cycle parking would be accessed through the loading bay at the end of Cloth Street and not off of Braidwood Passage. In terms of short-term cycle parking, Mr Chenery noted that it was important that this was practical as well as a matter of policy. The applicant would therefore like to provide as much of this as possible at ground floor level in and around the building with their aspiration being to provide cycle parking within Bartholomew Close – something which was still part of ongoing discussions with the City of London Corporation. It was explained that there were also aspirations for cycle parking at Half Moon Court.

Ed Williams of Fletcher Priest Architects added that the cycle access to long-term cycle parking in the basement was through the loading bay at Cloth Street and was via a separate safe route which did not conflict with vehicles utilising stairs and lift in the basement. Within the basement, there would be London Plan levels of provision for changing/showering and cycle storage as well as some folding cycle storage provision. Members were assured that the space was easily accessible. Mr Chenery

Reported that there were disabled parking spaces on Cloth Street which were deemed by Officers to meet the need in the local area.

With regard to the design of 160 Aldersgate Street, Ed Williams reported that the glazing on the northern side of this building had been set back in anticipation of the potential for an extended building to the North. He added that the proposals were opaque and that there should not be any issues with overlooking with the northern aspect of the glazing although it was recognised that there would be some loss of light and amenity on this northern edge. Members were informed that the building at 150 Aldersgate Street stepped down to 140 Aldersgate Street.

With regard to the management of the urban greening, Mr Chenery reported that urban greening was a very important concept to the City. Giles Charlton of SpaceHub Landscape Architects reported that the greening had been a very important part of the design evolution of the building and that it was very much about being an integrated piece of architecture, engineering and landscape.

Critical to the longer term viability of the planting and the ability to maintain it was having the right conditions in the first place and very detailed co-ordination and consideration had therefore taken place to ensure that optimum conditions were achieved through a very robust system involving things such as soil volumes which had been integrated in and allowed for within the engineering and design of the building. The building would have integrated irrigation systems to enable any planting to survive and flourish in the longer term with minimal maintenance. In terms of access maintenance, direct access would be available to all areas of planting. Responsibility for maintenance would depend upon how the building was let and would be part of the ongoing management strategy.

Mr Chenery added that, with regard to the provision of public art, this would involve consultation with both the local community and the City of London Corporation.

Another Member stated that he would be interested in getting a feel for the applicant's plans for pedestrian movement/flow around both the main and the secondary entrance. Secondly, the Member commented that he was interested to see the applicant's brochure mention the need for office accommodation to keep pace with the growing business needs and to capitalise on transport improvements and asked the applicant to comment on how robust this was in terms of plans for the future use of this space.

Another Member questioned whether the cumulative effects of lighting from 160 and 150 Aldersgate Street had been considered.

A Member questioned how the increased footfall through both proposed entrances would impact on other local businesses and also whether the use of the outdoor areas at ground floor level for smoking and the like had been considered.

Another Member referred to short-stay cycle parking and questioned where this might be situated should Bartholomew Close not be made available for this purpose. If Bartholomew Close were to be made available, the Member questioned whether this would effectively be the reallocation of what could have been additional cycle parking space to this application.

Another Member commented that he liked the proposals for reuse and recycling within the scheme. He questioned whether the setting back of the top floors of the building had really been looked at and whether the proposed increase in height for 150 Aldersgate Street was absolutely necessary. He also questioned what provisions would be put in place at Bartholomew Place to deal with smokers. Lastly, given the strength of feeling from both local residents and business, the Member questioned what efforts had been made to consult with them directly to date.

A Member spoke to mention the cumulative impact of the development on the local area in broader terms and asked what consideration had been given to this.

Mr Randall of Gerald Eve responded to the points on pedestrian movement reporting that the applicant had examined pedestrian flows as well as bus and rail movements as part of the application. This had revealed that, in the morning peak, there was expected to be 410 two-way movements to the principal entrance on Aldersgate Street, compared with 70 to-way movements in the morning peak from Bartholomew Place. The movements specifically from Bartholomew Place were 54 to rail, 9 to bus and 7 on foot. It was highlighted that there were a number of means by which occupants could arrive at the building with National Rail stations located to the north, south, east and west of the site and the Crossrail station and Farringdon Thames Link also coming forward. The Barbican Tube station was located to the north and St Paul's to the south. It was expected that office workers from these stations would arrive at the principal entrance as would bus users.

With regard to the applicant's approach to the office environment both post-pandemic and beyond, Mr Chenery reported that the design for this building had been in the design pipeline for approximately 18 months now. However, in order to future proof a number of buildings that Beltane were currently working on, they had begun to change the way that these would be serviced in making greater use of natural ventilation/fresh air which had only very recently been shown by the BCO to be a much more preferable approach in offices. Outdoor amenity space was also being incorporated as part of the working environment as part of the wider wellness agenda. Occupiers were now also looking at density and planning for less crowded offices which could actually translate into a requirement for more office space and not less in the City in the longer term.

With regard to daylight/sunlight impact, William Brook of Waldrams reported that the analysis for the cumulative impact of Long Lane or 160 Aldersgate Street hadn't been included but that these cumulative impacts had been reviewed in detail particularly for Long Lane which was being built at a similar time. He added that the daylight and sunlight impact of the Long Lane development had been worked through in some detail, particularly in terms of its potential impact on Seddon House and Lauderdale Tower where reports showed that the impact to windows here was almost negligible. In terms of similar windows impacted by the 150 Aldersgate proposals, this too was almost negligible and so reference to the cumulative impact of Long Lane was considered unnecessary for this reason. With regard to 160 Aldersgate Street, it was highlighted that this had been in situ for some time now and was used as a baseline for the analysis. However, it was noted that, because of the articulation between Thomas Moore and Seddon House, with the main windows within Seddon House facing north-west and within Thomas Moore facing 160 Aldersgate Street, there was a very clear break between the impact of 150 and 160 Aldersgate Street. The impacts of 160 on Mountjoy House and Thomas Moore which had been analysed as part of this application had been deemed acceptable at the time and the impact of these would be relatively limited, if not entirely negligible to the west face of Seddon House. In terms of the cumulative impact of both 160 and 150 Aldersgate Street to the space under Seddon House, the impact of the current proposals for 150 to that space was 1% of the test set out by the BRE and would therefore be marginal – as

such, further analysis of any cumulative impact had not been deemed appropriate.

On smoking, Mr Chenery reported that any commercial space would be deemed 'non-smoking' as required by law and that any space under Beltane's direct control would also be non-smoking. Any occupiers would be discouraged from smoking around the building by an on-site security presence and the applicant was very happy to tackle this matter in greater detail within a Management Plan.

Finally, Mr Chenery and Mr Randall confirmed that the public consultation on the scheme had been extensive. Mr Randall confirmed that consultation had begun in early 2020 and, as such, face to face meetings, briefings and a public consultation exercise had been possible in February and were well attended. An exhibition was manned by the consultant team and a Statement of Community Involvement had been submitted alongside this planning application. Mr Randall reiterated that the architect for this building had also worked on the neighbouring building and this therefore enabled the design team to learn from them in terms of the planning history of the site and help inform the design process/proposals.

With regard to the technicalities of provide short-stay cycle parking and its location with the City, Mr Randall stated that this provision was a perennial problem for schemes in the Square Mile. There was clearly a policy requirement around this, but a balance also needed to be struck in terms of street furniture and avoiding clutter. In this instance, it was highlighted that there were a number of opportunities to provide short-stay cycle parking at various highway points to the building, but a precise location was yet to be settled on. The applicant had agreed with Officers to accept a planning condition and to provide further details and a finalised solution on this.

The Chair asked that Members now move to debate the application as well as to raise any outstanding questions they might have of Officers. He asked that Members speak only once in the interests of efficient meeting management.

A Member stated that it was clear that a lot of thought had gone into this scheme and that there were many benefits, but it did still seem that the concerns of DLA Piper had been overlooked. He therefore sought to understand from Officers why this letter of objection, received in July 2020, had not been included within background papers for today's meeting and what their advice was on this. The relationship of 150 Aldersgate to 160 was clearly of vital importance.

Another Member spoke on various points raised in the objections. He began by stating that many of the objections referred to office light pollution from 160 Aldersgate Street and that the latest renovation to this building included the installation of hardware for computer controlled, motion activated lighting but that this had proved to not go far enough in addressing the problem and achieving a suitable reduction in light pollution from this building. These proposals therefore had a condition attached which would require a lighting

strategy to be submitted to the Corporation and would mitigate the impact of office lights which was a significant step towards addressing this issue. The Member thanked Officers for introducing this new condition for future developments. Secondly, the Member referred to concerns raised around what some residents had described as incessant construction works, particularly around Barts Square. He stated that he was sympathetic to this but also highlighted that the Court of Common Council had recently committed to a Climate Action Strategy which involved improving the fabric and surface design of existing buildings and which would therefore require works to achieve this at least in the short to medium term. Thirdly, many residents to the west of the building had raised concerns around increased footfall, however, the Member highlighted that there was already a secondary entrance to 160 Aldersgate Street in existence which had, oddly, not been referred to within the objections.

The Chief Commoner spoke to state that he broadly supported this development but stated that he did still have some concerns around daylight/sunlight and overlooking and the fact that some residents could be seemingly penalised due to having balconies. He sought further clarification on this point from Officers.

Another Member spoke to state that this application for the refurbishment of a tired office block was, in his view, unobjectionable, except that it would involve an increase in the height of the building by two storeys which would cause a significant loss of daylight to many nearby flats in a major residential area as well as other adverse consequences. The Member continued by stating that if the benefits of an additional two storeys on top of an existing seven storey office block (particularly at a time when future office space requirements in the City may be less not more) were pitted against the real harm that would be done by those extra storeys to the daylight enjoyed by local residents and the adverse effects on neighbouring business amenity, the balance must tilt against the application being granted in its present form. The applicant could then resubmit the plans without the addition of these extra storeys in the expectation that it would be approved. The Member went on to question why refusal had not been recommended to the Committee today. He noted that the applicant had been careful to include some token greening which would make no noticeable improvement to the environment and that there was an enthusiastic yet vague reference to links with the Culture Mile which should not be used as a pass to grant planning permission to commercial developments within the vicinity. He added that he did not feel that the excuses provided around loss of daylight should be accepted - noting that, whenever any loss fell within the accepted limits of BRE guidelines, Members are told that approval should be granted but, whenever it did not, they were told that the guidelines should be disregarded as they were not appropriate for a dense, urban environment. The Committee were also being told that the loss of daylight was acceptable as the affected flats had balconies although these could not be removed given that they were part of a listed building. The Member concluded by stating that planning decisions were ultimately judgement calls and that good judgement involved seeing through pretence and not accepting rationalisations about daylight and exaggerations about public benefits. It involved striking a fair balance between two competing planning considerations – new office

development/refurbishment and residential/business amenity. In this case, the balance was easily struck with two unnecessary extra storeys on an existing office building versus the quality of residents' lives and neighbouring business amenity. The Member added that if this Committee were to strike the wrong judgement it may yet be a judgement on them, noting that City residents had been patient thus far but that this would not always be the case.

Another Member stated that, in his view, this application had a number of drawbacks but also had several benefits when compared to the existing structure. However, a favourable comparison to a disappointing building was not good enough and showed a lack of ambition. This development was within and near to two Conservation Areas and a site of growing significance and sensitivity, in an area that is about to be transformed. In addition to the concerns raised by those neighbouring the site, there were also points raised within the report as to the adequacy of the provision of retail and the treatment of Bartholomew Place. The report acknowledged that the new elevation in Bartholomew Place would be reminiscent of the previous building, which was very unsightly and, fortunately, had now been demolished. He therefore suggested that something reminiscent of this should not be erected here. Furthermore, the Member stated that it was very disappointing that, if planning permission were to be granted, this building would have more than 50% more space than it previously had yet failed to provide any additional pedestrian space. Whilst reference had been made today to the widening of Braidwood Passage this did not appear to be reflected within the report. Paragraph 140 stated that the pedestrian experience would be slightly worsened but would remain at B+ there was, however, no indication that this also took into account the transformation of the wider area including the re-positioning of the Museum of London, the transformation of Smithfield Market, the opening of the Crossrail station or the creation of the Culture Mile.

Another Member commented on the consultation and exhibitions that had taken place and stated that she was surprised that a compromise had not been reached with those living nearby. She added that 150 Aldersgate Street was much nearer to Seddon House and the corner of Thomas Moore House and would therefore have a greater impact in terms of loss of light and overlooking to windows serving bedrooms, living rooms and kitchens. The Member also enquired as to what sort of lighting arrangements would be in place at the proposed development given that Barbican residents had experienced ongoing issues with this from other nearby office buildings in the evening.

The Chair asked, at this stage, that Members speak to raise new points only.

A Member stated that she had a number of concerns, particularly around the scale and visual impact of the Bartholomew Place elevation which she felt would be overwhelming. The proposed light grey brick work at the Cloth Street entrance against the surrounding red brickwork of all other building here also appeared to be problematic. The Member stated that she did not feel that the concerns of residents had been given appropriate weight and that she felt that the proposed greening was a problem in that it was simply a token offering as

street level. Finally, the Member expressed concerns around roof height 'creep' and highlighted that considerable extra space could be provided within the existing building minus this additional two storeys. She suggested that the applicant return to the drawing board on these plans.

Another Member stated that he was disappointed to learn that 160 Aldersgate Street had been taken as a baseline and that the cumulative impact of 150 and 160 had not been assessed. He stated that he recalled the debate on 160 and that this had included reference to the likely future development of 150 and the fact that the two buildings would then need to be considered cumulatively, as our policies require. He questioned why this had not been the case. He also felt that the existing plans went too far in seeking an additional two storeys. Otherwise, he felt that there was much to be commended in these plans which would improve the existing building.

The Deputy Chairman recognised that this was not a perfect scheme but stated that he felt that it was a commendable scheme in the circumstances and strived to do what a building should do which was to be long-lasting, fill the space appropriately, provide space for pedestrians and cyclists as per the Transport Strategy. He added that new lighting requirements had also been incorporated in an attempt to address the ongoing blight of lit windows at night. He concluded by stating that he felt that this was a reasonable proposal that he hoped the Committee would support.

Another Member stated that he was disappointed not to have been able to undertake a site visit as this was a much bigger development than just on Aldersgate Street as had already been alluded to by previous speakers. He stated that he did not feel that any adequate case had been presented to justify the addition of two storeys which would have a huge impact on residential communities nearby and asked Officers to therefore elaborate on this point. He was of the view that the plans should be withdrawn and resubmitted on a smaller scale and that, in its present form, it should be refused.

A Member moved a Motion that the question now be put given that many points were now simply being repeated. Another Member spoke in objection to the motion stating that there were still a number of points that she would like to ask of Officers. The motion was seconded.

The Town Clerk confirmed that, as the Motion had now been put and seconded, the Committee would need to vote on this. The terms of the Motion were as follows:

MOTION - *That Members now proceed to vote on the application without further debate, in accordance with Standing Order No 37 (3).*

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Motion. The vote was conducted by rollcall led by the Town Clerk with Members called to vote alphabetically by surname, with the exception of the Chair and Deputy Chairmen who were called to vote last.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 15 Votes
OPPOSED – 13 Votes
There were no abstentions.

A Member sought advice from the Comptroller and City Solicitor as to the validity and appropriateness of the Motion. The Comptroller and City Solicitor stated that if the majority of the Committee had reached the view that they had all the information it needed to reach a conclusion at this stage then this was a reasonable approach to take in light of the report, the debate and the representations it had heard.

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

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them within the report. The vote was conducted by rollcall led by the Town Clerk with those Members present and eligible to vote asked to also confirm that they had been present for and able to hear the entirety of this item.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 14 Votes
OPPOSED – 12 Votes
There were 2 abstentions.

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED – That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to: Planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed.

6. **CITY PLAN 2036: REVISIONS TO PROPOSED SUBMISSION DRAFT PLAN**
The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment detailing revisions to the Proposed Submission Draft City Plan 2036.

Officers reminded the Committee that the Court of Common Council had approved the Plan for consultation in May. However, this consultation could not then take place due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and related restrictions. The City Corporation was now in a position for a revised consultation to take place but, before doing so, the Plan needed updating to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order and Officers had also taken the opportunity to update the document in reference to the Climate Action Strategy and to incorporate references to the impact of COVID. With regard to COVID, Officers reminded Members that the Plan was looking at a 15 year period until 2036 and that, although there were very significant impacts due to the pandemic in the short-term in the City, it was felt that the evidence as it currently stood suggested that the City would recover and that the Plan would

provide a strong and stable strategy for enabling the City to continue to be a world leading financial and professional services centre going forward.

The schedule of changes being put to Members today would, if approved, also go to the Policy and Resources Committee and finally the Court of Common Council for approval prior to being put out for consultation. The schedule had been considered in detail and agreed by the Local Plans Sub Committee.

Officers went on to suggest that some of the recommendations set out within the report be amended. The recommendations had been written on the basis that Government guidance was very clear that consultation on a Plan at this stage meant that it should not subsequently be amended and should be submitted by the local authority to the inspector with the representations received. Officers were, however, aware that there may be a circumstance where the Committee may wish to look again at the Plan if material changes are required following consultation. With this in mind, an amendment to the recommendations was suggested such that a new recommendation was inserted to seek Member agreement to any material change required to the Plan following consultation should be brought back to this Committee for consideration. Officers would then subsequently amend the following recommendation such that only non-material changes to the Plan could be agreed by the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee.

The Chair thanked a Member who had suggested this change prior to the meeting and asked if he wished to add anything further at this stage. The Member stated that he was keen to see a Plan in place if possible and one that was looking to the longer-term, beyond any immediate difficulties over the coming months. He was also keen to hear back from consultees and to leave it so that this Committee could consider again any material changes required.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Agree the proposed changes to the Proposed Submission draft Local Plan set out in Appendix 1 and that it be published for consultation, subject to the approval of the Policy and Resources Committee and Court of Common Council;
- Agree that, following consultation, the Plan, the public representations and other supporting documentation be submitted to the Secretary of State, for Examination;
- Agree that any material changes required to the Plan following consultation should be brought back to this Committee for consideration;
- Authorise the Director of the Built Environment, in liaison with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning & Transportation Committee, to compile a list of further non-material changes to the Local Plan in response to public representations and submit this to the Secretary of State; and
- Authorise the Director of the Built Environment to make further non-material amendments and editorial changes prior to public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State.

7. **RECOVERY TASK FORCE: PLACEMAKING FOR A WORLD-LEADING SQUARE MILE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth providing Members with an overview of the proposed Recovery Task Force.

The Director of Innovation and Growth explained that the ongoing pandemic had introduced new challenges and accelerated local trends and it was clear that the cities who could adapt to and help shape this would thrive in the future. Member were informed that the City Corporation had a vital role to play in terms of speeding up the City's evolution towards being the most innovative, inclusive, sustainable, global financial centre. This report represented a first step in the aim to produce an actionable five-year blueprint, it built on the London Recharged Report which had had huge input from across the City and beyond and had also received very good coverage.

In terms of governance, the Director explained that primacy on this work would sit with both the Policy and Resources Committee and this Committee but that Officers would also seek to adopt the same approach as had been taken with the Climate Action Strategy in terms of input from relevant Chairs and broader discussions with all Members. A draft interim report would be presented to this Committee in January 2021 and a draft final report a few months later.

The Director concluded by stating that he would welcome any steer that Members may have on this work at this stage.

RESOLVED – That Planning and Transportation Committee Members agree to the project start up and next steps.

8. **GATEWAY 4C - TOWER BRIDGE HV SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AND INCREASING RESILIENCE**

The Committee considered a Gateway 4C Detailed Design (Complex) report of the City Surveyor relative to Tower Bridge HV System Replacement and Increasing Resilience.

RESOLVED – That Members:

1. Approve additional budget of £128,115 for professional fees to progress from Gateway 4C to Gateway 5;
2. Approve a Costed Risk Provision of £335,000 to progress from Gateway 4C to Gateway 5 (to be drawn down via deletion to Chief Officer);
3. Note the revised project budget of £888,270 (excluding risk);
4. Note the total estimated cost of the project of £5,687,003 (excluding costed risk); this is a decrease of £112,997 since the previous report;
5. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £7,872,003 (including £2,185,000 costed risk); this is a decrease of £527,997 since the previous report.

9. **PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE**

9a) 20 OCTOBER 2020

The Committee received the public minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting held virtually on 20 October 2020.

9b) 4 NOVEMBER 2020

The Committee received the draft public minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting held virtually on 4 November 2020.

10. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area SPD

A Member noted that there would now be a further delay in this document being presented to the Committee. The Town Clerk reported that the further delay was to allow for sufficient time for consultation to take place with the Barbican Centre Board, the Barbican Residential Committee and the Barbican Residents Consultation Committee. Consultation would also take place with Golden Lane Estate residents and this was being facilitated by a Member of this Committee.

A Member questioned whether it might also be possible to include Tudor Rose Court Residents Association in the consultation process. The Member facilitating the Golden Lane consultation stated that she was very happy to include Tudor Rose Court residents in a forthcoming Zoom meeting that she was organising on this matter if this was considered appropriate. The Chair thanked the Member for all of her work on this.

Member Training

The Town Clerk reported that a six-month training schedule would be circulated to the Committee at the conclusion of this meeting.

A Member commented that the Planning Protocol examined today effectively created a requirement for Members of this Committee to undertake training both on appointment and periodically thereafter. She questioned whether it was still customary for new Members of the Committee to receive this and noted that this matter had been on the outstanding actions list for over a year now. The Chair reported that he personally met with all new Members of the Committee upon appointment and had discussed with them their training requirements.

The Town Clerk reported that, in addition to the training schedule which had now been produced for all members of the Committee, all newly appointed members were invited to meet with not only the Chair but also with the Chief Planning Officer and the Director of the Built Environment to discuss any key issues. The Town Clerk recognised that there was scope for improvement in terms of the training offered for Members of this Committee and that this was what Members should now see going forward. The Member responded that it would be preferable to have a more formal arrangement in place for the training

of newly appointed Members as was the case with the Licensing Committee. This training should also be documented so that the Committee were able to clearly uphold the principles of its Planning Protocol.

Another Member stated that she had not been offered formal training or the opportunity to meet informally with Chief Officers since joining the Committee. She added that informal arrangements such as these also placed a lot of pressure on new Members to identify any gaps in their own knowledge. The Member went on to question why the training schedule had not been brought to the Committee today as set out within the Outstanding Actions list as she felt that this was something that should be published. If some Members felt that they did not require certain training, then a short statement from them setting out that they had assessed their own competencies and did not feel it appropriate to attend should be sufficient and transparent.

11. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 08/10/2020 – 26/10/2020.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

12. DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13. VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

14. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

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

The Chair commented that he and the Deputy Chair had considerably shortened the agenda for this meeting in the interests of efficiency and good meeting management and yet this had still resulted in a very lengthy meeting. For transparency, the Chair reported that this would mean that more decisions

would have to be taken under these Standing Orders and subsequently reported back to the Committee.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

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

There were no questions.

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

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

17. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

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

18. **GATEWAY 5 REPORT - SECURE CITY PROGRAMME (SCP) - CCTV & TELECOMMUNICATIONS WORKSTREAM**

The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the Commissioner, City of London Police relative to the Secure City Programme (SCP) – CCTV and telecommunications workstream.

19. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX 3 TO AGENDA ITEM X - GATEWAY 4C - TOWER BRIDGE HV SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AND INCREASING RESILIENCE**

The Committee received a non-public appendix which was considered in conjunction with Item 8.

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

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

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

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting closed at 1.01 pm

Chair

Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk