

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 7 September 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair) | Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark |
| Oliver Sells QC (Deputy Chairman) | Shravan Joshi |
| Randall Anderson | Alderman Alastair King |
| Douglas Barrow | Oliver Lodge |
| Peter Bennett | Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen |
| Mark Bostock | Alderman Bronek Masojada |
| Deputy Keith Bottomley | Andrew Mayer |
| Deputy Peter Dunphy | Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner) |
| John Edwards | Deputy Barbara Newman |
| Marianne Fredericks | Graham Packham |
| Tracey Graham | Susan Pearson |
| Graeme Harrower | Judith Pleasance |
| Sheriff Christopher Hayward | Deputy Henry Pollard |
| Christopher Hill | Alderman Sir David Wootton |
| Deputy Tom Hoffman | |

Officers:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Angela Roach | - Assistant Town Clerk |
| Gemma Stokley | - Town Clerk's Department |
| John Cater | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Bukola Soyombo | - Technology Support Partner |
| James Gibson | - Technology Support Partner |
| Shani Annand-Baron | - Media Officer |
| Deborah Cluett | - Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department |
| Fleur Francis | - Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department |
| Dipti Patel | - Chamberlain's Department |
| Juliemma McLoughlin | - Executive Director, Environment |
| Gwyn Richards | - Chief Planning Officer and Development Director |
| David Horkan | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Paul Beckett | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Ian Hughes | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Bhakti Depala | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Bruce McVean | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Liam Hart | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Neel Devlia | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Elisabeth Hannah | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Gordon Roy | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Gideon Stothard | - Department of the Built Environment |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Peter Shadbolt | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Gemma Delves | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Lucy Foreman | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Kerstin Kane | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Tom Nancollas | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Emmanuel Ojugo | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Kathryn Stubbs | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Joanna Parker | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Rosalina Banfield | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Toni Bright | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Rachel Pye | - Department of Markets and Consumer Protection |
| Robin Whitehouse | - Department of Markets and Consumer Protection |

Also Present:

- Barnaby Collins – DP9 – on behalf of the applicant
- Tom Hawkey – DP9 – on behalf of the applicant
- Maxwell Shand – Yard Nine – on behalf of the applicant
- Ed Williams – Fletcher Priest Architects – on behalf of the applicant
- Andrew Cartmell – Point 2 Surveyors – on behalf of the applicant
- Sophie Murray – Waterman Group – on behalf of the applicant
- Mark Cook – Waterman Group – on behalf of the applicant
- Mark Powers – Waterman Group – on behalf of the applicant
- Andrew Proud – RWDI – on behalf of the applicant
- Laurent Frederic – BeauMont Real Estate Capital – on behalf of the applicant

Introductions

The Town Clerk opened the meeting by introducing herself.

A roll call of Members present was undertaken.

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

The Town Clerk also reminded Members, and any members of the public observing the meeting on-line, that this was an informal meeting and that any views reached by the Committee today would therefore have to be considered by the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection or those deputising for him after the meeting in accordance with the Court of Common Council’s COVID Approval Procedure and that they would make a formal decision having considered all relevant matters. The Town Clerk highlighted that this process reflected the current position in respect of the holding of formal Local Authority meetings and the Court of Common Council’s decision of 15th April 2021 to continue with virtual meetings and take formal decisions through a delegation to

the Town Clerk and other officers nominated by him after the informal meeting has taken place and the will of the Committee was known in open session. Details of all decisions taken under the COVID Approval Procedure would be available online via the City Corporation's webpages.

New Executive Director, Environment

The Chair took the opportunity to introduce the new Executive Director, Environment - Juliemma McLoughlin - and welcomed her to her first meeting of this Committee. He reported that Juliemma would be charged with heading up the Department which now brought together Built Environment, Public Protection, Port Health and Environmental Services and Open Spaces. It was reported that Juliemma had previously worked at Northumberland County Council and had also served as Development Director and Chief Planner at the Greater London Authority. Ms McLoughlin thanked the Committee for their kind welcome and stated that she was very much looking forward to working with the City.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from John Fletcher, Alderwoman Susan Langley, James de Sausmarez and William Upton QC.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

The public minutes and summary of the informal, hybrid meeting held on 20 July 2021 were considered and approved as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Panel Arrangements – Wider Consultation (page 7) – A Member questioned whether any progress had been made in terms of the engagement strategy referred to by the Chair at the previous meeting and secondly he questioned when a further report on Panels would be put to this Committee, offering Members a further opportunity to vote according to their preferences.

The Chair reported that he and the Deputy Chairman were due to hold informal engagements meetings with approximately ten stakeholders across the City, beginning on Wednesday 15 September. Following these meetings, Officers had been asked to bring forward a report to this Committee in the first instance.

Another Member questioned who had been invited to attend the meetings. The Chair reported that they included representatives from the development community as well as most of the major Residents Associations in the City. The Chair asked that the full list of those invited be circulated to all Members of the Committee via email at the conclusion of the meeting. Another Member requested that the full list of invitees also feature in the minutes for full transparency. She added that this might also encourage others who were not represented to come forward with their views.

A Member reported that the matter of how this Committee operated going forward was being considered alongside but also outside of the main Lisvane recommendations around the wider governance of the City Corporation.

Another Member questioned how City residents who were not part of Residents Associations were to be represented in these engagement sessions. The Chair stated that only those Residents Associations that were formally constituted had been invited to attend and that he and the Deputy Chairman had reviewed the list of invitees and were satisfied that they represented a broad range of interests across the City.

In response to a question around who would take the final decision on Panels, the Town Clerk reported that a report would come forward to this Committee, before being sent to the Policy and Resources Committee and, ultimately, the Court of Common Council. The Chair underlined that the Court were keen to hear the views of this Committee as part of the process.

A Member questioned why wider, public, formal consultation was not being undertaken on this matter. She also expressed concern at the fact that it appeared that this exercise would sort City residents into those who were considered to be major stakeholders and those who were not. She stressed that every City resident had an equal and valid view which should be sought. The Chair reiterated that those invited to these meetings were believed to represent the main residential areas of the City as well as other stakeholders. He added that these sessions were not about making planning policy and that it was therefore important that they were informal and a space where all invited could express their views openly and honestly about how this Committee works and how they might like it to work in the future. The Chair went on to underline that all members of this Committee, the Policy and Resources Committee and the Court were representative of their respective Wards and interests would therefore be represented in this way.

A Member reminded the Chair of the petition which, amongst other things, opposed the formation of Planning Panels and suggested that it would also be useful for him meet separately with the sponsors for this petition on the matter. The Chair responded to state that he believed that there were already plans in place for this to happen.

A Member spoke in support of the Chair's approach to this matter and reiterated that the final decision on this matter would be taken by all 125 elected Members of the City Corporation.

Beech Street (page 18) – A Member requested a further update on the Beech Street zero emissions project. Officers responded to state that all members of this Committee should have received the update that went to all residents and local businesses on Beech Street on this matter via email. This set out the next steps which were, essentially, that the experimental scheme would conclude on 18 September which marked the end of 18 months and the maximum period for which the experimental traffic order could run for. On 19 September Beech Street would therefore revert back to its previous state and reopen to all traffic.

Officers reported that they had begun the process of engaging with local residents' associations and others with a view to developing options for the next stage for Beech Street. This was likely to continue until the end of the year with the intention being to take a report to the December 2021 meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and seek a final decision on this and approval to launch the consultation.

Officers went on to recognise that there had been comments received around the need to consider changes across the wider Barbican and Golden Lane area as well as to Beech Street itself and they confirmed that they were in the process of initiating a project to develop a Healthy Streets Plan for this area which was one of the proposals set out within the Transport Strategy and would incorporate consideration of the potential zero emission zone.

The Member spoke again to ask if there was a case here for setting out lessons learnt, particularly around costs and consultation. Officers stated that it would be possible to reflect on this within an Issues/Update report but reassured Members that lessons had already been learned with a much more robust process now in place around the signing off of traffic orders. It was recognised that the first legal challenge on this had revealed two procedural errors on the City Corporation's part meaning that the organisation was unable to then take the truncated route to transitioning from an experimental to a permanent order. Steps had now already been taken to avoid a repeat of this in future. It was confirmed that this project had enabled Officers to learn lots of lessons that would help shape future schemes on Beech Street and the surrounding area as well as for other projects aimed at improving air quality.

A Member stated that she had previously raised questions around the gaps in the central reservation that had been instated to allow people to turn into the car parks and forecourts during the trial period and whether these could be retained. Officers undertook to report back to the Member on this matter and the progress of the road safety audits here.

Members asked that the interim report on lessons learned be shared with both the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and this Committee in due course.

4. 100 AND 108 FETTER LANE LONDON EC4A 1ES - OPTION A

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director relating to 100 and 108 Fetter Lane London EC4A 1ES – specifically the demolition of 100 and 108 Fetter Lane and construction of a new building for office use (Class E) and a public house comprising a basement level, ground, mezzanine and 12 upper storeys plus roof plant, creation of a new pedestrian route and pocket square at ground level, ancillary cycle parking, servicing, plant and enabling works. (Option A).

The Town Clerk introduced the report and referenced the presentation pack and two further addendums containing additional, late representations that had also been published and circulated.

Officers presented the applications (Option A and Option B / agenda Items 4 and 4a) and confirmed that the issues addressed by the late representations were addressed within the addendum report. Officers confirmed that both applications were identical in terms of massing and height with the main differences being at lower level. It was highlighted that Option A proposed to relocate the existing White Swan public house to the north eastern corner of the site whereas Option B would see this retained in its existing location with a new flexible, commercial unit proposed at the north eastern corner of the site.

Officers shared the site location plan, noting that there were two residential blocks in close proximity to the site. It was noted that the building was not listed or located in a Conservation Area, however the Chancery Lane Conservation Area was situated to the north and west. There was also a Grade II listed building immediately west of the site at 2 Greystoke Place which comprised office and residential use. Members were also shown a photograph of the existing building – an early 1950s building rising to seven storeys, made of brickwork with punched window openings and Portland stone ground floor treatment.

Officers went on to speak more about the White Swan public house, located along Fetter Lane which they described as a four-storey brick elevation and was considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. They also gave mention to Greystoke Place – a pedestrian passageway that was currently very dark and uninviting and therefore in need of improvement. The Committee were also shown images of the view along Mac's Place and the steps from here leading to St Dunstan Garden. Officers noted that this area was gated and was currently the only area providing direct access onto Breams Building. These gates were closed at 7pm or dusk each evening.

Officers talked the Committee through existing and proposed floor plans. At ground floor Officers remarked that there was currently very little active frontage. The proposals within Option A would see the entire building demolished and replaced with a new 12 storey office building, including retail elements at ground floor. This proposal would provide an uplift of more than 7,000 square meters of high-quality, grade A, flexible office floorspace. This would see the public house relocated to the north eastern corner of the site with a new café proposed for the front of Breams Building. The reconfiguration of the ground floor would create a new north-south route, linking Greystoke Place and Mac's Place to Breams Building. This would also be incorporating a sunken garden, 3.5 meters in width and 5.5 meters in height. Officers reported that these proposals would transform the public realm around the site and create 226 square meters of public realm at ground floor.

A new office entrance on the south eastern corner would be chamfered back and enable the junction here between Fetter Lane and Breams Buildings to be opened up further. It was highlighted that there would be no stopping up or loss of highway.

Members were shown artists impressions of the new sunken garden and also of Greystoke Place where the elevation of the newly relocated public house

would be pushed back by one meter in order to widen this area. Further along Greystoke Place, the height would be increased from 2.7 meters to 4.1 meters. As well as these spatial improvements, Greystoke Place would incorporate glazed feature tiles to match the public house elevations and incorporate subtle lighting to much improve this pedestrian route.

Officers reiterated that, under Option A, the public house would be demolished and replaced with a new public house of significant architectural quality. The façade would be treated with electric blue glazed brick and was considered to be an improvement over the existing public house. The new public house would offer an increase in the amount of tradeable floor space and wider floor plates at basement, ground and mezzanine levels as well as providing active frontages on both Fetter Lane and Greystoke Place. The setting back of the pub would provide an external amenity space for patrons to use. A condition was recommended here to require an Operation Management Plan and details of how the unit would be managed to minimise any noise disturbance and the dispersal of those entering and exiting the pub.

Officers went on to explain that, with regard to servicing, the situation would remain the same as it was at present, although improvements would be secured with regard to this in terms of the number of vehicles that can service the buildings per day which would be set at no more than fourteen. There would also be restrictions prohibiting deliveries during the morning, lunchtime and evening peaks. Night-time servicing would also not be permitted, something that would be secured by condition.

The proposal would provide long-stay cycle parking spaces at ground floor level which would be policy compliant, with two cycle parking entrances situated off of Fetter Lane and Mac's Place. Associated cycle parking facilities such as showers and lockers would be located at mezzanine level. Policy compliant short stay cycle parking would also be provided at ground floor level along Mac's Place and also along Greystoke Place – all spaces would be external and accessible to all visitors and office users.

Members were then shown images of typical floor plans within the proposed new building at lower level up to level four. Here, Officers commented that the floorplates were much wider which would help provide for more flexible office workspace that could then be divided into smaller spaces if required. This would go some way towards meeting the aspirations of the London Recharge Report, shaping the future City and encouraging the provision of more adaptable office floor spaces for small to medium size businesses. Proposals for the fifth floor onwards saw the introduction of roof terraces for use by office occupiers – something that was considered key to the wellbeing of office workers, particularly post-pandemic. The Committee were shown the proposed roof plan in illustrative form showing the extensive greening and generous number of outdoor terraces.

Officers showed images of the existing and proposed north, south, east and west elevations. Officers reported that the building would take the form of four individual blocks with the fourth building being the public house elevation on

Fetter Lane. The development would vary in height and form to respond to its townscape setting and local context. An illustration of the proposed south elevation showed the low-rise historic buildings and open spaces located to the west and the taller, more modern office buildings to the east. The illustration of this elevation also depicted the tallest, most prominent element of the proposed building or the 'main block' where the building entrance would also be located. The proposed east elevation illustration also showed the main block as well as the proposed new public house (under Option A) or new flexible commercial unit under Option B. It was reported that the main block facades would be arranged on a grid system with metal columns and thick horizontal concrete bands in an orange hue and recessed apertures and aluminium fins. Brise soleils were also proposed to mitigate against the sunlight. The main core of the building would be located against the inner face of the stairwell, allowing the staircase to be visible through the glazed façade. The proposed west elevation depicted how the proposed building would drop down in scale towards the Grade II listed Greystoke Place. Between the main block and the pavilion building there would be a north-south bay which would mediate between the two buildings in terms of height. Officers considered that the proposed development would enhance the setting of the listed building by replacing an inactive frontage. It was considered that the sunken garden would also relate well to the setting of the burial ground.

In terms of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring occupiers, the applicants had provided a full BRE assessment and, upon request, had also undertaken radiance analysis which was considered to be acceptable. Members were shown an illustration of the impact on the residential properties at 2 Greystoke Place where there were eastern windows facing the site which would experience major, adverse impacts. However, it was reported that these windows were high-level, slot windows serving living, kitchen and dining rooms but that these rooms were also served by windows on the northern and southern elevations which remained minimally affected. The impact here was therefore considered to be acceptable and in line with BRE guidelines.

With regards to sustainability, it was highlighted that the existing site would be demolished and rebuilt. At application stage, Officers asked the applicant to undertake a detailed analysis of refurbishment options to avoid demolition from a circular economy perspective. However, the existing structure was found to be extremely complicated to adapt, with the typical approaches used to secure flexible, high quality, sought after office floor spaces being quite difficult, inefficient and carbon intensive to achieve. Officers therefore felt that the proposal to demolish the existing building was acceptable. That being said, the proposed building would achieve BREEAM outstanding and the building design would respond well to climate change by incorporating passive ventilation, water saving measures, use of low carbon materials, extensive urban greening (achieving an urban greening factor of 0.35) and positively applying circular economy principles.

Officers shared images of some local views around the site – both existing and proposed. In terms of some more distant, LVMF views, it was highlighted that the proposed development, as a result of its height, would be located within the

background, wider setting consultation area of the LVMF view from Greenwich Park. It would, however, be entirely obscured in this view by the existing buildings at 12 New Fetter Lane and 6 New Street Square. The development would be visible from Gabriel's Wharf but would be located at such a distance from the Cathedral that it would preserve its townscape setting. The magnitude of change in both of these views were considered to be negligible and therefore acceptable.

Officers went on to confirm that the main differences under Option B were the retention of the public house in its existing location with a new flexible, commercial unit placed at the north eastern corner of the site. New roof terraces for office occupiers would also be introduced at lower levels allowing more light to get into the pub's upper floors.

Officers concluded by stating that, overall, the proposed development would result in a significant aesthetic enhancement to the Fetter Lane locality through the use of high-quality material and would be an appropriate, sympathetic neighbour in architectural terms. Under Option A the proposal would provide over seven thousand square meters of grade A, high quality, flexible office floorspace which was ideal for small and medium sized businesses and would also meet the aspirations of the London Recharge Report. The proposals included numerous outdoor terraces for use by office occupiers which was considered to be key post-pandemic. The building would adopt excellent sustainability credentials and principles and the provision of high-quality public realm at ground floor level would optimise pedestrian movements by providing new and improved public routes and a new pocket park. There would also be a new, diverse retail offer, providing more vibrant active frontages. Under Option A, the relocation of the public house would result in a better-quality public house. Under Option B the public house would be retained in its existing location but, equally, the new, flexible commercial unit would be welcomed in the north eastern corner. Officers stated that it was for all of these reasons that the application was recommended for approval.

The Chair thanked Officers for their presentation and welcomed Barnaby Collins of DP9 to address the Committee on behalf of the applicant and in support of the applications. Mr Collins began by explaining that, from the outset, the key themes of the brief had been to deliver a post COVID workplace that maximised sustainability standards and catered for a wide range of future wellbeing conscious occupiers. Mr Collins explained that the applicant was fully attuned to this Committee's requirements that circular economy and whole life carbon objectives are met, and both of these were therefore embedded in the brief. It was reported that the existing building had undergone rigorous reuse testing before redevelopment was considered. It was concluded that the existing building really is at the end of its beneficial, operational and functional life, is extremely difficult to adapt and would be unsuitable for modern use. Instead, a new building would allow for design based on longevity and adaptability and would also allow for the incorporation of low carbon materials and 95% recyclability of construction and demolition waste. It would also allow for natural ventilation, a blue roof and extensive greening. The project intended to reinvent a City pub and relocate this, however, the proposals at Option B

catered for the circumstances should the applicant be unable to conclude terms with the current public house – although it was noted that discussions here were progressing very positively.

Mr Collins went on to highlight that the applicant was also very sensitive to the City's normal servicing requirements but that, in order to secure the new public space, passage and the sunken garden, this was not able to be on site. Instead, it had been agreed that on-street servicing should continue but with reduced impact, utilising consolidation and restrictions on numbers and timings of deliveries. Further, the applicant believed that the public realm benefits offered by the development were substantial, humanising the western elevation and enhancing the courts and alleys context synonymous with the locality. Finally, Mr Collins reiterated that full long and short stay cycle parking provision had been incorporated into the plans. In terms of the design overall, the applicant had enjoyed a very engaging process with Officers and endorsed their recommendation that these plans now be approved. Members were informed that thorough consultation exercises had been undertaken both pre-application and post-application but that, sadly, the applicant had been unable to secure the support of two commercial neighbours. They were, however, content that their concerns had been properly considered and addressed.

Mr Collins concluded by commending these exemplary plans that he felt would be an exciting addition to midtown, designed for a post-COVID world. He reported that the applicant intended to commence construction as soon as possible.

The Chair thanked Mr Collins for his contribution and invited any questions that Members might now have of him and the applicant team.

A Member sought further information around the servicing of the new development. He noted that the proposals intended to provide some 7,000 additional square meters of space and therefore presumably a substantially increased population occupying the building when compared with the existing situation. He questioned whether, if servicing were to be restricted to the same number of daily deliveries, it could be assumed that the vehicles making these deliveries would now be much larger and, if so, what the impact of this was likely to be on Fetter Lane. Mr Collins responded to state that he was confident that, through consolidation, fourteen deliveries per week would be more than adequate to cater for the delivery cycle.

Another Member questioned the provision of disabled parking with the report setting out that the applicant was willing to explore the provision of a blue badge space within the vicinity of the site. With regard to whole life carbon she also questioned whether there were any papers detailing the efforts of the applicant to look at reusing the existing building. Mr Collins responded to confirm that Transport for London had requested that the applicant explore the provision of a blue badge space as part of the Section 278 agreement which would follow the decision of this Committee. He confirmed that they were happy to continue to explore this with TfL should they deem it necessary to provide this. Sophie Murray of Waterman Group responded to state that it had been

concluded that it would not be possible to reuse the existing building due to technical constraints. What the applicant had therefore done was to focus on reducing the whole life carbon of the new development as far as possible. The focus had primarily been on the earlier, a1-a5 emissions and where the biggest impact could be made here on the substructure and superstructure of the building. The longevity of the building had also been worked on as part of the circular economy approach. The Member came back to say that she found it difficult to understand exactly where the development fell in terms of whole life carbon impact. She noted that the papers referenced a carbon reduction shortfall but added that she wanted to know more about the whole life carbon impact of the proposed new building versus what was there currently. She questioned whether this assessment had been done. Ms Murray responded to state that no whole life carbon assessment had been carried out for the existing building given that it had been deemed unsuitable for redevelopment for a number of technical reasons. The focus had therefore been on the whole life carbon impact of the new development and how the associated, embodied carbon could be reduced as far as possible. The Member interjected to stress that the Committee were therefore not in a position to be able to compare the whole life carbon impact of things how they were at present with that of the proposed new 12 storey building. Mr Collins confirmed that the technical difficulties in reusing the existing building were addressed in the Design and Access statement but that this did not include a whole life carbon assessment of the building.

Seeing no more questions of the applicant team, the Chair suggested that the Committee now move to any questions they may have of Officers and to the general debate.

A Member spoke to recognise that this development would result in an additional 6-7000 square meters of office space under Options A and B, respectively. He went on to question why office space would be approved at a time when demand for that space was falling. He noted that the report stated that 'despite the short-term uncertainty about the pace and scale of future growth in the City following the immediate impacts of COVID-19, the longer-term, geographical, economic and social fundamentals underpinning demand remain in place' but highlighted that there was no evidence provided to support this statement and that, to his mind, there could not be given that the evidence was to the contrary. The Member went on to question why developers were building bigger office blocks and stated that he felt that the reason for this was that there would soon be a flight to quality from older buildings to new ones. However, he was of the view that those fleeing to quality would be leaving behind space that would not be filled due to falling demand. He highlighted his concern that this would lead to a City with a few, modern, oversized blocks that were fully occupied and a lot of older, empty buildings. He stressed that it was the responsibility of this Committee to focus on the refurbishment and repurposing of existing buildings and not simply to approve larger ones.

The Member went on to state that another fundamental flaw with these applications was that the new building would cause a significant loss of light to the office building opposite, however, the Officers report dismissed this

consequence on the ground that the overshadowed building was commercial not residential. The Member commented that depriving office workers of daylight throughout the working day did not sit well with the Corporation's promotion of health and wellbeing. He added that, in his opinion, it also did not sit well with the statement in paragraph 67 that 'floorplates in the new building had been designed to have good daylight conditions'. He argued that, if good daylight in offices was not important and why Members had been told that the loss of light to the office building opposite did not matter, the Officers report should not mention good daylight as a factor in favour of the new building. The Member felt that the applications employed the usual gimmicks such as token greening and trivial public realm features to secure approval. He went on to state that a case in point was the claimed permeability achieved by creating a new walkway at the rear of the building – an area that was already permeable. The Member stated that he could envisage a proposal for the redevelopment of this site that would be a true improvement. The Member concluded by commenting on the proposal under Option A to demolish the existing public house and 'reimagine it' at the corner of the new building. He underlined that the public house had interior decoration, including wood panelling that would not be found in a modern establishment and was part of London's fast disappearing heritage. He likened this proposal to a national gallery replacing all of its pictures with copies, stressing that people wanted authenticity. Under these proposals, the reimagined public house would have nothing in common with the original except its name. He also expressed concerns that placing a public house next to the newly proposed walkway at the back of the building could lead to this area being used for urination.

Another Member stated that she was also concerned about the Corporation's understanding of what office buildings were needed in the City going forward and the movement of workers from currently occupied buildings into newer builds. She went on to state that Chapter 14 of the NFPPF which related to meeting the challenge of climate change specifically said that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future and changing climate. She also highlighted that paragraph 55 of the report referred to footfall in the City and the number of people working in the City but quoted many figures from 2017 which were now four years out of date and did not factor in 18 months of a pandemic. She felt that a caveat should therefore feature here and stated that reference to growing business needs should be accompanied by a post-pandemic evidence base for this. In terms of whole life carbon impact, the Member asked if Officers could clarify/quantify what the impact of approving this application would be in carbon tonnes bearing in mind the Corporation's net zero commitment. Finally, the Member also sought clarity as to page 93 of the report and mention here of carbon reduction shortfall and whether, in carbon terms, this was a net loss and a bad thing for sustainability.

With regard to office floorspace, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that these were clearly unprecedented times and that there was therefore a level of uncertainty. It was reported that Officers were monitoring developments in the market and demand on a weekly basis and there was increasing optimism and increasing evidence that there was a very healthy demand for additional floorspace. It was reported that Officers were also

increasingly hearing about the shortfall in Grade A office floorspace in the next 3-4 years which was evidenced by a big upturn in letting activity and the extremely high workload for the Planning team in terms of pre-application discussions on future commercial floor space.

Officers went on to address the points made around sustainability and underlined that there was a comprehensive justification for not retaining the existing building within the application documentation which was summarised within paragraphs 171-175. It was reported that the structure, design and materials of the existing buildings were not likely to be suitable for a new building by way of extension for example. Any improvement of the existing structure would therefore have an enormous carbon impact, hence the decision to propose a new building that was both adaptable and flexible. In terms of whole life cycle carbon impact, Officers highlighted that there was a spreadsheet submitted with the application quantifying this and it was confirmed that the figure would comply with the GLA benchmark set out within the whole life cycle carbon assessment guidance of the London Plan. Officers were of the view that the approach proposed was acceptable but, given that the current design was based on intentions and assumptions with regard to details of materials, the detailed design stage would explore these aspects and structural solutions in greater depth with a view to further improving the overall carbon impact of the building.

The Member spoke again to ask whether, in simple terms, approving this application would increase carbon emissions in the City. She suggested that it would be helpful in future and where the figures were available to set this out as a line within the application report – would carbon emissions be increased and, if so, by how much. She felt that, at some stage, the City Corporation would need to carry out a cumulative exercise on the effect of granting planning applications on carbon emissions in the City since the introduction of a Climate Action Strategy and understood that a Freedom of Information request may already have been submitted on this very point. Officers responded to this to clarify that the existing building was currently unoccupied and that the whole life carbon impact of existing buildings was not normally assessed as it was regarded as spent carbon emissions. Replacing the building with a larger building would clearly lead to a larger whole life cycle carbon impact but it would also hopefully then introduce a building that was being used and was flexible, adaptable and futureproof.

Another Member commented that these proposals involved a doubling of office space and expressed concerns around servicing and the proposed ground floor layout. The member also echoed concerns around developers being able to pay to offset their carbon shortfall and expressed a preference for only demolishing structures that were dangerous and not just those that were difficult to transform. The Member stated that she was pleased to see that cyclists had been catered for under these plans but argued that the location of the cycle store was in the wrong place as it could only be accessed through the pedestrian alleyways that were only to be marginally widened at the location of the proposed new public house. She stressed that cyclists were likely to cycle down these alleyways to reach the store and make it more hazardous for

pedestrians. The Member argued that short-term cycle parking spaces were needed on the street at this location and not in the additional public realm, concealed behind the building making it harder to find and less secure. With regard to servicing, the Member stressed that this was her biggest concern – the report recognised that Policy DM 16.5 of the Local Plan required on-street loading bays for off-street servicing for deliveries and on-street loading bays only where this was not possible. It then continued to say that the applicant was required to show that servicing could be contained within the site to make the proposals compliant. However, it was suggested that, if the servicing were to be contained within the site, the new pedestrian route would not be viable due to space limitations. The Member stressed that she found it unusual that a creative developer could not find a solution to this given that this Committee had approved, in recent months, applications that incorporated lifts to move vehicles to servicing areas using very little ground space. She therefore found it more likely that a solution would lose commercial income at ground level and incur cost, whereas the provision of a pedestrian route would cost very little and could be sold as an enhancement. The Member went on to question the value of the pedestrian route stating that she could find none. She commented that, walking south down Fetter Lane towards Bream Building it would be quicker and more pleasant to continue walking along the pavement than to walk down what would be a still narrow Greystoke Place, around the building and doubling back under the new building before emerging in Brems Place Building. The Member continued by stating that having proper off-street servicing was vital for the smooth and safe running of the City – if this were not so then why was it asked for. She reported that Fetter Lane was very narrow and that the parking of large delivery vehicles for a minimum of five minutes to load or unload would cause considerable problems for drivers or cyclists using the street and issues for pedestrians trying to cross. With regard to the suggestion of consolidation, the Member assumed that this meant that vehicles were likely to be larger and having to load and unload more. Fourteen vehicles equated to a minimum of over two hours of loading time during the day and could lead to a lot of congestion. The Member therefore suggested a redesign of the ground floor to include servicing is the minimum that this Committee should request.

On servicing, Officers reported that they considered that the cap on the number of vehicles at no more than 14 and the ban on servicing during peak times and night-time as a significant improvement over the existing situation on site. Officers also took the opportunity to highlight to the Committee that the routes provided would be fully accessible and step free – something that was very welcome given that existing access to St Dunstan's Garden was stepped access. It was also reported that the route would be open from 6am-12 midnight.

Another Member spoke to state that he also felt that there was an important future debate to be had around the need for additional office space in the City going forward but accepted that this was not entirely clear at present. He went on to state that it was his belief that this Committee was obliged to implement existing policies and not work on the basis of speculation around what these may be in future years. He went on to speak specifically on the proposals for the public house and was pleased to see that the developer had sought to

retain this given that this type of traditional hospitality was an important part of city life. He went on to say that he did not have any concerns around the fabric of this particular pub and was not of the view that it would lose any of its authenticity under the proposals to reimagine it.

A Member spoke in support of the application and was of the view that the City would bounce back as it always had done. He felt that this was a healthy building fit for the future.

Another Member also spoke in support of the proposals and reminded the Committee that, throughout the course of the pandemic, they had approved significant amounts of additional office space put forward by developers and investors. He echoed the views of a previous speaker in underlining that the Committee could only act in the spirit of its current planning policies. He was of the view that these proposals appeared to feature a vast improvement on the existing stock on site. The Member reported that letting levels were very significant at present and that he felt that the likelihood was that there would be a need for additional, Grade A office space in years to come. He recognised that it may well be that the space would be used differently with the continuation of hybrid working or staggered working hours, but this did not necessarily translate to a need for less space. With regard to the public house, the Member stated that he was in favour of retaining heritage assets but argued that this could hardly be described as such.

A Member spoke to comment on and commend the illustrations which depicted the new staircase designed to encourage people to use this as opposed to taking a lift. He suggested that this approach should be encouraged with other developers who might also consider introducing an incentive for using the stairs going forward. Another Member commented that not all users were able to use stairs and that any move here should not be discriminatory.

Another Member spoke to suggest that, for the reasons outlined by previous speakers, he found this application more finely balanced than Officers did. On balance, he felt more inclined to support Option B but not Option A, stating that, in his opinion the fundamental problem with Option A was that it needlessly increased the detriment to the amenity of nearby offices and residents. He was of the view that the public house should be left in situ and kept as far away from other users as possible.

A Member questioned the scale of the likely increased office population that could be expected when the new building was fully occupied. He went on to focus on the pictures of the planned open space and expressed disappointment that there appeared to be plans to install railings between the existing burial ground and the new sunken garden which would seem to negate the benefit of having an enlarged space here. Next, the Member returned to the issue of servicing and the suggestion that there would be the same number of vehicles as at present. He stated that he felt that there would be implications here would around the size of vehicle making these deliveries in a very narrow street and questioned what controls would be put on the scale of vehicles parking in Fetter Lane to service the new building. Finally, the Member

questioned pedestrian movement highlighting that Policy DM 16.1 mentioned a requirement to know about the impact on pedestrian movement but stressing that he could not find this information in the report. He added that, in the circumstance that there were patrons drinking outside of the public house and large vehicles parked on-street for deliveries, there could be incidents where through pedestrians would need to navigate both of these things by stepping into the middle of the road. He did not feel that, at present, there were sufficient controls or studies of this problem.

Officers reported that the new building would welcome 650-700 occupiers. On the point around the relationship between the burial ground and the route, Officers reported that they had asked the applicant to explore opportunities to integrate the two but had found that there were quite significant level differences between the two and also certain constraints and sensitivities around the burial ground. The separation of the two was therefore felt to be the most appropriate way forward. Officers went on to highlight that a Delivery Servicing Plan would be required by conditional planning obligation for the site and that they would also be able to restrict the size of vehicles using this Plan.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the papers went into quite a lot of detail in terms of pedestrian comfort levels which seemed to be acceptable. In terms of any potential issues outside of the public house, the Committee were assured that there was a conditional Operational Management Plan which would cover external drinking to ensure that there was not any conflict in this respect.

Another Member spoke to state that she felt it was the responsibility of this Committee, as delegated by the Court, to approve the kind of buildings that the business City needed and not to second guess what may or may not be needed going forward. She stressed that the industry and developers just as attune to this as Members and would no doubt take decisions about when and where it was right to build. The Chair concurred with this point and stressed that the Corporation had left this to developers to decide and reported that this had resulted in a huge amount of applications coming forward, a large number of buildings being constructed and developers approaching Officers, the Chair and Deputy Chairman amongst others with the full intention to develop buildings in the City immediately. The market therefore demonstrated full confidence in the City and 'business as usual' at present. He also underlined that the Corporation's policies were pro development and reacted to the market whilst taking into consideration all relevant planning considerations, the views of objectors etc.

Another Member stressed that the Corporation could not be pro-development at any cost and certainly not to the detriment of surrounding occupiers and their amenities which was the whole purpose around having planning policies. She went on to state that she felt that this application was falling foul of current policies, and questioned what kind of City the Corporation wanted people to return to - a City where there was amenity space that could be enjoyed by all occupiers? She stated that commercial occupiers should also have the right to voice their concerns when their amenity was severely impacted. The Member

added that she felt that this application ignored current policy around on-site servicing and sought to permit on-street servicing during the day in a narrow road. She went on to state that the planning application stated that there were currently 40 building occupants and that this would increase to 1,093 with the new building. She went on to question whether the pavement was adequate to cater for such increased footfall. Once again, there were policies around this, but they had been seemingly ignored. The Member went on to state that she did not feel that entrances into the office building, public house and café, constituted an 'active frontage', neither did she feel that these proposals offered the 'significant public realm enhancements' claimed. What was being proposed was an office site which would double in size and something that would have a hugely detrimental impact on neighbouring commercial properties. In terms of the Health Impact Assessment – policy stated that this should also improve the health and wellbeing of the wider community – something that was certainly not the case here with light being taken away from nearby office occupiers and their terraces. The Member continued by underlining that she also had concerns around the terrace spaces, stating that it was difficult to see what protection was proposed here from the drawings provided. The Member stressed that she did not support the moving of the public house and felt that this would lead to problems such as urination in the alleyway. In conclusion, the Member stated that she felt unable to support either of the options presented today and expressed disappointment that the applicant had not taken the opportunity to redesign a building that was clearly in need of this and seemingly ignored policies.

The Chair recognised that the Member had repeatedly referred to policies being ignored but disagreed with this, highlighting that relevant policies had been addressed in the officer reports and had been raised and debated repeatedly in this Committee. He stressed that the Committee were dealing with a combination of adopted and emerging policies, that the Plan included a wide range of policies, that there was very rarely an application that satisfied all of these, and that the Plan should be read as a whole. It was the role of this Committee to evaluate the pros and cons of each application in the context of Plan policy and other material considerations. The Member responded to state that she felt that Officers should be encouraged and supported in their negotiations with applicants to request that they adhere to policies and thereby offer better solutions for the wider community.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director also refuted the idea that policies had been ignored with this application. He underlined that policies were set out in great detail within the report in terms of pedestrian comfort levels and movement and on-street servicing. He reiterated that the existing building was serviced on-street and it was believed that the conditions in terms of consolidation, off-peak deliveries (morning, afternoon and evening) and the management plan improved upon the current situation on site.

With regard to the terraces, Officers reported that the mitigation of any potential suicide risk or risk of falling was foremost in the mind of Officers and a specific condition would be applied which would require further details on the

balustrading and landscaping here. It was also underlined that these would be private and not public terraces.

A Member spoke in support of the applications and highlighted the need to consider applications within existing policies which were not rigid rules and required interpretation. With regard to future office requirements, the Member stated that developers surely had to have a better understanding of this than any member of this Committee and would not risk investing otherwise. With regard to the public house, the Member questioned whether a planning condition could be applied to restrict outside drinking and thereby restrict noise nuisance.

Another Member spoke to underline that the City's office supply was not homogeneous and included a range of quality from older buildings to newer, more modern buildings. He spoke of this with positivity, stating that it offered real flexibility for the future for the City itself and for this Committee to enable future changes if so required. He went on to say that he fully supported today's proposals which, if developed, would provide modern, good quality space and would make way for older buildings being vacated by firms moving up the chain quality wise. The older buildings were then released and became opportunities for the future, either as offices or for other uses. He added that this ongoing cycle and allowing developers to make judgements was exactly what the City should be doing.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them within this 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 – 20 Votes
OPPOSED – 6 Votes*.
There was one abstention.

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) Planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed.
- (2) That your Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.

- (3) The Mayor of London be given 14 days to decide whether or not to direct the council to refuse planning permission (under Article 5) 1(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008) .

** In accordance with Standing Order No. 38, those Members who had voted against the recommendation asked that their names be recorded in the minutes – they were Randall Anderson, Mark Bostock, Marianne Fredericks, Graeme Harrower, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Susan Pearson.*

4a. **100 AND 108 FETTER LANE LONDON EC4A 1ES - OPTION B**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding 100 and 108 Fetter Lane London EC41 1ES – specifically, demolition of 100 Fetter Lane and construction of a new building for office use (Class E) and a flexible commercial unit (Class E(a)(b)(c)(d)), comprising a basement level, ground, mezzanine and 12 upper storeys plus roof plant level, creation of a new pedestrian route and pocket square at ground level, ancillary cycle parking, servicing plant and enabling works – Option B.

Having fully debated each Option, the Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them within this 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 – 21 Votes
OPPOSED – 5 Votes*.
There was one abstention.

RESOLVED -

- (1) That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to:
- (b) Planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed.
- (2) That your Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in “Planning Obligations” under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.
- (3) The Mayor of London be given 14 days to decide whether or not to direct the council to refuse planning permission (under Article 5) 1(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008) .

**In accordance with Standing Order No. 38, those Members who had voted against the recommendation asked that their names be recorded in the minutes*

– they were Marianne Fredericks, Graeme Harrower, Christopher Hill, Natasha Lloyd-Owen and Susan Pearson.

5. **TRANSPORT STRATEGY: TIMETABLE FOR REVIEW**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Environment updating Members on the Transport Strategy and the timetable for review.

Sheriff Christopher Hayward declared an interest in this item as a consultant to WSP and stated that he would not contribute to the discussion or vote on this item.

A Member expressed some concern that, by 2023, targets for various things such as the provision of charging points would have moved on considerably and stated that he felt that the Corporation should therefore be acting sooner rather than later. He questioned whether more could be done around the sustainability agenda in the interim.

Another Member stressed that there was no suggestion that the implementation of the Strategy would be halted. Officers clarified that there would be no delay in delivery as a result of the review period being extended and that this would be continuing as per the strategy to also include the action plan around electric vehicle charging. Officers underlined that they felt that there was enough certainty from the work carried out to date and feedback through the Recovery Taskforce that continuing and, where appropriate, accelerating areas of this work was the correct approach.

A Member reported that, at a recent Court meeting, Members had posed questions around taxis and Officers undertook to report back on this matter. She questioned what progress had been made on this. Officers clarified that the debate here had been around the pedestrian priority programme and the undertaking had been to consult with relevant Ward members in advance of any recommendations on this coming forward. It was confirmed that these meetings had been scheduled and would take place in the week commencing 20 September and would provide these Members with the opportunity to set out their concerns and aspirations.

Another Member spoke to raise a query on taxi access to Bishopsgate and other areas outside of peak times and stated that he understood that the Chair was to meet with the Taxi Association to discuss the longevity of some of the current barriers that were in place. He confirmed that he had said at the time that he thought it was important to allow access to black cabs. Secondly, the Member questioned plans for moving from temporary to permanent barriers on the City's bridges and a timescale for this in light of previous attacks. Officers responded to state that Bishopsgate was part of the TfL road network and that they were the highway authority for this. However, Officers were working with them on the next steps for the Bishopsgate scheme and indications at present were that they intended to move towards an experimental traffic order based on the current arrangement. Officers would continue to liaise with TfL around access on Bishopsgate and in terms of a best fit around the City Corporation's projects, plans and aspirations. With regard to vehicle access more generally

on those streets where this was otherwise restricted, Officers confirmed that this was to be reviewed as part of the review of the temporary measures delivered and conversations with Ward members before any of these were potentially made permanent.

With regard to security barriers on bridges, Officers requested that this be dealt with in non-public session as part of the public realm security programme report already featured here.

Another Member took the opportunity to highlight that consultants had again recommended physical outdoor exercise facilities installed in the City and questioned whether, at some stage, Officers would therefore be bringing forward a report around how this idea could be implemented.

A Member spoke again to state that he was not suggesting that implementation of this plan would be paused, more that, in a new plan, certain aspects were likely to be significantly enhanced. In particular, the Member underlined that it was probably universally accepted that the previous plan was not sufficiently aggressive on things such as charging infrastructure for electric vehicles and was encouraged to hear that this could potentially be accelerated as he felt that the City were now falling behind other boroughs with this work.

The Chair highlighted that Appendix 3 detailed the organogram and governance structure and, in particular, the Strategy Board which was next meeting in October and was made up of leading experts who also regarded the City as leaders on this. Officers clarified that there were plans to increase the number of publicly available charging points with a particular focus on rapid chargers for taxis and servicing vehicles and charging in residential car parks. It was also stressed that part of the reasoning for keeping strategies under review was to assess which areas might need to be delivered faster than others.

RESOLVED – That Members note the one-year extension of the current Transport Strategy review period to Spring 2023.

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.

6. DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT RISK MANAGEMENT - QUARTERLY REPORT

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

A Member underlined that the highest risk the Department had was around road safety and the issue of limited space in the City's medieval street network versus the increased use of the highway by vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. The Member expressed concern that this was simply being set out and then

seemingly ignored when this Committee repeatedly enabled and approved proposals around greater business populations in the City. He argued that this should seriously be taken into account when it was highly relevant to an application. The Chair recognised the importance of this risk and highlighted that it was something that he kept a very close overview of. He added that this Committee had debated the reputational risks associated with not correctly addressing this and that he was sure that it was also foremost in the minds of Officers too when applications were brought forward. Officers reported that, from a transportation perspective, this was taken incredibly seriously and that they were fully committed to mitigating this risk as quickly as possible and, ultimately, to achieving 'vision zero' as set out within the Transport Strategy. Members were also informed that there was a deep dive report being prepared on this risk to go to the Audit and Risk Management Committee in October and it was suggested that this also be shared with this Committee for information.

Another Member supported the point made by the previous speaker and stressed that the whole purpose of having risk assessments and policies was so that the Committee could have a holistic view of issues to know what to do to ensure that the City worked well for everyone. She added that seemingly ignoring certain policies around, for example, on-street servicing could lead to certain risks like this one increasing.

The Chair once again refuted the point that policies were ignored. Officers reported that risk was very high on the agenda for both the Department and the Senior Leadership Team and that the risk register was reviewed on a regular basis as well as being considered when planning applications were received. It was recognised that the risk score in terms of road safety was still high and it was felt that this was appropriate until such time that the Transport Strategy had been delivered and vision zero achieved. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director felt that the suggestion that policies were ignored did a disservice to the schemes that this Committee had granted over the past year in particular and explained that, from the very outset of negotiations, planning officers always sought to maximise public realm and new routes. With specific reference to the recently approved developments at 70 Gracechurch, 55 Gracechurch, 2-3 Finsbury Avenue, 50 Fenchurch Street and City Place House, it was highlighted that all of these schemes provided new routes, wider routes, and a substantial increase in new public realm with a view to enabling pedestrian flows to be eased in recognised pressure points.

A Member noted reference to Cycle Skills Training and reported increasing issues with cyclists mounting pavements and behaving aggressively in the City. She therefore questioned how initiatives such as these were being promoted to help mitigate this. Officers highlighted that the training would be used as an opportunity to reinforce the need for safe and considerate cycling in the City. It was reported that there was also a Road Danger Reduction Partnership in place which included the City of London Police and focused on bringing forward various campaigns and engagement opportunities as well as enforcement.

Another Member reported that she had been taking every opportunity available to promote the Cycle Skills Training sessions but was frequently told that no

one was aware of these. She suggested that an advertisement for this be included in the next newsletter or other relevant communication circulated to various stakeholders. The Chair suggested that this be taken forward by relevant Officers from the Department of the Built Environment and from Comms.

Another Member raised a question around electric scooters and the ongoing trial. She referred to a lot of scooters also using the pavement and questioned how users were notified of how these should be used. Officers reported that when users signed up to hire an e-scooter they would also receive repeated messaging around appropriate use. It was added that all scooters had individual numbers to make them readily identifiable and that some had already had their ability to hire them revoked by the operators due to continued inappropriate use or behaviour. Officers reported that not all e-scooters on the City's streets were part of the trial with trial scooters tending to be smaller and heavily branded. It was underlined that private e-scooter use was still not legal on the street but that, dependant on any future decisions and national legislation around their use, there would no doubt be a focus on specific campaigns around this in conjunction with the City of London Police.

Another Member commented that rental bikes and scooters were frequently being left on the pavement, posing particular problems for those with sight issues and other disabled users.

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

7. **PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**
The Committee received the draft public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting held virtually on 8 July 2021.

RECEIVED.

8. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk regarding the Outstanding Actions.

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area SPD

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that a significant number of consultation responses had been received, some of which were very detailed and would now require additional meetings with some stakeholders. The final document would then have to be presented to the three Barbican Committees for input before being finalised by this Committee. It was therefore expected that the document would now be submitted to the 1 February 2022 meeting of this Committee.

A Member commented that he was disappointed to learn that this work would be further delayed and highlighted that, in communications received from Officers, it had been suggested that this work had to be tied in with the SPD for

the Barbican Arts Centre. He questioned why this was the case. Officers clarified that this was not strictly necessary but seemed to be a logical approach to discuss both at the same time given that they were part of the same complex.

The Chair stressed the need for and importance of proper consultation and engagement on this piece of work.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

9. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 03/07/2021 – 20/08/2021.

RESOLVED - That Members note the report.

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

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

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

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

The Committee received a report of the 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.

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

Riverside Walkway

A Member referred to a recent email received from Officers regarding the completion of the Riverside Walkway in Queenhithe – something which he had been campaigning on for 22 years now and which was due for completion this Autumn. The email recently received suggested that the budget was in place to raise orders for the next design stage but that the Corporate Finance Team had blocked these orders due to the project programme dates in the financial system having expired. It recognised that recent Committee reports had set out a programme for delivery in Autumn/Winter 2021 but that this issue may now cause slippage. The Committee supported the Member in stating that this was unacceptable. The Chair stated that he would be happy to deal with this matter under urgency if that would help to resolve it.

Officers commented that they were aware of the issue and that an urgent meeting had been called with colleagues in the Corporate Project Team and the Chamberlain's Department to discuss this further and seek to resolve at pace. The Chairman of the Finance Committee also undertook to raise this with the Chamberlain at a meeting later today.

Refurbishment versus Redevelopment

A Member commented that, when considering applications, the Committee were increasingly told by Officers that refurbishment had been looked at initially but subsequently decided against in favour of redevelopment. He questioned whether it might be possible to establish some sort of qualifying criteria for proposals coming forward so that Members could better understand where the line between refurbishment and redevelopment was crossed. Another Member agreed that this would be helpful but also suggested that this should take account of other valid factors such as land utilisation, economics and whole life carbon impact. Another Member stated that part of the problem here was that many existing buildings, such as that involved in today's application, had undergone undocumented modifications to their structure which made it difficult to adopt a homogenous approach to this. Another Member spoke to agree that this was not simple but underlined that it was for this very reason that Members needed to be able to better understand the issues and limitations before weighing up any pros and cons. She also added that the information presented on each application seemed to differ each time and called for metrics to be presented consistently wherever possible. The Member went on to request a future paper for this Committee setting out the whole life carbon impact of the buildings approved since the Climate Action Strategy had been implemented (to the extent that it was known). Her understanding was that the City Corporation had already received a Freedom of Information request in relation to this and that Officers had responded to say that it was not possible to provide this. She stressed that it was important for this Committee to understand the cumulative impact of their decisions, much like they had done recently with cycling provision which had enabled Members to express a firm view to Officers that could, in turn, be fed through to developers and ensure that their proposals were compliant. The Chair responded to state that the London Plan mentioned this. He reported that the City Corporation were dealing with emerging policy here but that when he met with any applicant his starting point was always to stress that it should not be assumed that any building in the City could be demolished and that, where technically possible, it should be retained if justified by the evidence relating to environmental, social and economic sustainability. The Chair stated that he had heard the wish of the Committee whereby each application was presented from a refurbishment or partial redevelopment point of view with details of this also included within the Officers report alongside the differing whole life carbon impacts so that the Committee could fully understand why a building might need to be demolished.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director spoke to state that he thought that what was being proposed was entirely sensible and appropriate. He reassured the Committee that the first few meetings of any PPA was to look at exactly this and the options around refurbishment and embedded carbon implications etc. He accepted he argument that this information should come

through to Members as part of the application and that there should be more discipline and clarity in the process. He undertook to discuss the possibility of developing a toolkit/planning advice note to provide a clear picture on all of the options and how these had been explored with sustainability officers.

Construction Works

A Member commented that she had first raised this as an issue several years ago and noted that it still featured on the Committee's list of outstanding actions. She reiterated her request for this piece of work to be formalised, stressing that residents and businesses in the City had to face the impact of developments approved by this Committee which could be quite considerable. She went on to report that residents were now also receiving last minute notice letters informing them of works that were to be carried out throughout the whole weekend and late into the night with no consultation and called for communications to be improved. She also called for policies around enforcing and monitoring construction sites and building works to be tightened and implemented.

The Chair added that there was also a wider point here around dovetailing works and, if there were to be Construction Management Plans, looking at any cumulative effects on residential areas in particular and intervening where necessary/appropriate.

The Development Liaison Manager reported that since she had been in post, from October 2020, she had been working in the background to coordinate efforts between Transport, Environmental Health and Planning to identify which schemes were coming forward in terms of construction to ascertain how the impact of these could be better and more efficiently managed, ensuring that residents were liaised with at an early stage. Officers undertook to bring forward a report to this Committee next month setting out all of the work happening around this.

The Deputy Chairman reported that, from his own recent experience of ongoing construction works at the Temple, he had been very impressed by the way in which City Officers had worked with the developers to minimise the disruption of this and, where appropriate, intervene and use their powers to enforce policy. The Member responded to report that, in her Ward, there were residents living just 3 meters from construction sites and being told that the developer had agreed with the City Corporation that they were able to work on site until 11pm. Saturday working hours had also been extended and residents were now asking at what point they had a say in this and were entitled to enjoy amenities with no noise disturbance. The Member recognised that Officers were doing their best to try and resolve the issues, but it was clear that the issues were mounting with residents reporting that some developers were not adhering to the agreed hours of work. The Chair stated that if any Members were experiencing particular issues within their Wards, he and the Deputy Chairman would like to be made aware of these. The Chair reported that he had intervened on various sites during the lockdown period where issues had been reported. Officers also stressed that they should be informed of any particular issues so that these could be fully investigated. Officers stated that

they were aware of the particular site being referred to where extended hours had been requested by the developer to ensure that works were completed as soon as possible around school term time. However, it was underlined that these should still be compliant with what Environmental Health had agreed.

Another Member reported that she had experienced issues with a nearby construction site recently and had reported this to Officers who had responded to and resolved this very quickly. She added that, despite agreements made with developers, there would frequently be issues with contractors not adhering to this which could be difficult to control.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

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

14. 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> |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| 15 | 3 |
| 16 | 7 |
| 17-18 | - |

15. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The Committee considered the non- public minutes of the informal meeting held virtually on 20 July 2021 and approved them as a correct record.

16. ISSUES REPORT: PUBLIC REALM SECURITY PROGRAMME - CONTINUED DELEGATED AUTHORITY

The Committee considered and approved an issue report of the Director of the Built Environment relating to the Public Realm Security Programme and continued delegated authority.

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

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

18. 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 1.30 pm

Chair

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