

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 14 December 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	Alderwoman Susan Langley
Douglas Barrow	Deputy Edward Lord
Mark Bostock	Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner)
Deputy Peter Dunphy	Deputy Barbara Newman
John Edwards	Graham Packham
John Fletcher	Susan Pearson
Marianne Fredericks	Judith Pleasance
Christopher Hill	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Deputy Tom Hoffman	

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Aqib Hussain	- Technology Support Partner
Shani Annand-Baron	- Media Officer
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Nicholas Welland	- City Surveyor's Department
Gwyn Richards	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Juliemma McLoughlin	- Executive Director, Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Elisabeth Hannah	- Department of the Built Environment
Samantha Tharme	- Department of the Built Environment
Neel Devlia	- Department of the Built Environment
Adrian Roche	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Kieran Mackay	- Department of the Built Environment
Kerstin Kane	- Department of the Built Environment

Maureen Joyce	- Department of the Built Environment
Janet Laban	- Department of the Built Environment
Kathryn Stubbs	- Department of the Built Environment
Amrith Sehmi	- Department of the Built Environment
Philip Carroll	- Department of the Built Environment
Lara Sims	- Department of the Built Environment
Amy Williams	- Department of the Built Environment
Rachel Pye	- Department of Markets and Consumer Protection
Robin Whitehouse	- Department of Markets and Consumer Protection

Welcome

The Chair welcomed Deputy Edward Lord to their first meeting of the Committee as the new representative of Farringdon Without in place of William Upton QC. He noted that they had spent time earlier this week undertaking the necessary refresher training with Officers.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Peter Bennett, Deputy Keith Bottomley, Graeme Harrower, Christopher Hayward*, Alderman Alistair King, Oliver Lodge, Alderwoman Susan Langley, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Alderman Bronek Masojada, Andrew Mayer, Deputy Henry Pollard and James de Sausmarez.

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

*Christopher Hayward has tendered his apologies for the meeting as a result of a conflict of interest in relation to the application to be considered at Item 4 (14-21 Holborn Viaduct 32-33 & 34-35 Farringdon Street London EC1A 2AT).

For the avoidance of doubt, Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he is a member of the Clothworker's Company and noted that the papers at Agenda Item 5 were in the name of the Clothworker's Company Limited which was one removed from this.

3. MINUTES

The Committee considered the public minutes of the last meeting held on 16 November 2021 and approved them as a correct record.

4. 14-21 HOLBORN VIADUCT 32-33 & 34-35 FARRINGDON STREET LONDON EC1A 2AT

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director concerning 14-21 Holborn Viaduct, 32-33 & 34-35 Farringdon Street London EC1A 2AT – specifically demolition of existing buildings at 14-21 Holborn Viaduct, 34-35 and 32-33A Farringdon Street, and construction of a new building arranged over 2 basement levels, ground and 10 upper floors to Holborn Viaduct and 12 upper floors to Farringdon Street to provide a new Commercial, Business and Service (Class E) building; new publicly accessible lift to provide step-free access between Holborn Viaduct and

Farringdon Street, hard and soft landscaping works and other works incidental to the development.

The Town Clerk introduced the item and also referenced the Officer slide pack and two late addendums published and circulated.

Officers presented the application highlighting that the site comprised three existing buildings which fronted onto both Holborn Viaduct and Farringdon Street. One of these – Kimberley House – was described as an unremarkable 12 storey 1970s office building with some retail at ground floor level with 32-35 Farringdon Street comprising a pair of six storey office buildings dating from the 1920s which, whilst of some character, were considered to be of low historic and architectural significance. Members were informed that the site did not sit within a Conservation Area and that none of the buildings concerned were listed. However, the adjoining gatehouse and Holborn Viaduct itself are both Grade II listed. It was highlighted that Turnagain Lane and Newcastle Close were both areas of public highway, albeit used for servicing buildings only and not providing through routes. Officers reiterated that planning permission was sought for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a single new office building consisting of a ground floor and ten upper storeys on Holborn Viaduct and 12 upper storeys on Farringdon Street. Turnagain Lane would, under these proposals, be stopped up with Newcastle Close retained to provide servicing access to the proposed development and the adjoining site of One Fleet Place to the rear of the development site. Two new areas of public realm would be created adjacent to the two main entrances on Holborn Viaduct and on Farringdon Street and a new lift access would be provided within the site adjacent to the gatehouse to provide an accessible public route between Farringdon Street and Holborn Viaduct.

Members were shown a proposed ground floor plan on the Farringdon Street frontage depicting the new area of public realm to be created here in front of the proposed new entrance. Access to the public lift was also shown which would take users up to Holborn Viaduct. Next, the proposed ground floor plan on Holborn Viaduct was shared showing a second new area of public realm and the area where the public lift would exit – in full visibility of pedestrians using Holborn Viaduct. Officers shared some upper floor plans which provided a sense of the proposed setbacks which would have no impact upon strategic views. Members were shown graphics of the proposed front elevation from Farringdon Street with Officers commenting that the scheme proposed an uplift of 19,000 square meters of office floorspace which would result in a building of 36,000 square meters, commercial floorspace which was welcomed and in accordance with existing and emerging policy and, as stated in the report, it was intended that the building would be occupied by a single tenant as a headquarters building. Officers went on to state that the building design would incorporate nine digital screens on both the Holborn Viaduct and Farringdon Street facades which would incorporate artwork as part of the cultural offer. Given the proximity of the site to the proposed new Museum of London site, the applicant had also undertaken to digitise the artifact collection of the Museum which would take the form of digital public art across the site and would provide vibrant and engaging active frontages. It was noted that the digital screens

would be significant in scale. The proposed elevation from Holborn Viaduct again depicted the new digital screens as well as the cut-out area of new public realm and associated greening adjacent to the gatehouse.

In terms of representations received, it was noted that a number of historic amenities societies including the 20th Century Society had objected to the demolition of the Farringdon Street buildings due to their contribution to the townscape as non-designated heritage assets. It was reported that Historic England had made no comment on the application and that letters of support had been received from the Fleet Street Quarter, the Museum of London and the Central District Alliance. Addendum reports also contained late representations received – one from a City resident, the grounds of which were addressed within the report and also from the London Borough of Islington who had expressed concerns as to the height and bulk of the development. Officers stated that, as set out within the report, the height, bulk and massing of the proposals were considered acceptable. A second addendum circulated contained a response to the first addendum report from the same City resident but did not raise any substantive new issues.

In terms of the design of the proposed scheme, Members were shown an existing image taken from Holborn Viaduct depicting Kimberley House which was described as unremarkable and as providing a poor setting for the existing gatehouse. Its demolition was therefore considered acceptable. It was recognised that the Farringdon Street buildings were of some character and were therefore considered to be non-designated heritage assets, albeit with a low level of architectural and historic significance. It was highlighted that the applicant had explored the reuse options which demonstrated that the existing buildings were unsuitable for being transformed into an attractive and sustainable development for a 60 plus year period. It was reported that the sustainability credentials, combined with the modest historic and architectural significance of the buildings were therefore considered to warrant their redevelopment with a high-quality replacement scheme. Members were shown a CGI of the proposed development from this same viewpoint. It was stated that the proposed development would respond in both scale and context to both the historic gatehouse and the surrounding large commercial developments. The stone-based fronting on Farringdon Street would provide a successful townscape datum height with the gatehouse and the façade would be richly articulated with new and reclaimed Portland stone from the existing buildings. The curved façade had been designed to accommodate the canopy of the existing mature plane trees and create a new area of public realm on Farringdon Street. Above the base, a curved, linear façade of glass and metal fins would wrap continuously around both Farringdon Street and Holborn Viaduct frontages and these fins would be perforated to allow for passive ventilation as well as to provide solar shading and wind mitigation. It was reported that the upper pavilion section would be set back and include extensive vertical greening, maintaining the vertical rhythm across the development and also reinforcing the classical hierarchy of the proposed development itself.

Officers talked the Committee through some before and after CGIs to provide a better overall sense of the proposed scheme and the quality of the architecture being proposed. Members were shown images from Farringdon Street looking south, depicting Kimberley House behind the gatehouse. From here, the shoulder height of the proposed development was shown as correlating to Bath House on the opposite side of Holborn Viaduct. Images from Holborn Viaduct looking back towards the site depicted the proposed development with a very subtle and refined façade to provide a very neutral and appropriate backdrop to the gatehouse building. From Farringdon Street looking north with the application site on the right-hand side, one could see the two existing plane trees which were to be retained. From here the curved linear façade would curve away so that it would be invisible in this view, making Bath House visible in the background. From Holborn Viaduct with City Thameslink on the left-hand side and Kimberley House just beyond, the scale of the proposed development with its setbacks and pavilion at the top which was very much recessed and diminished was fully visible. A closer image from Holborn Viaduct showed the digital screens and the impact that they would have on the vibrant street frontage as well as the green wall which would be adjacent to the listed gatehouse.

Members were shown an aerial view of the proposed development depicting how the overall scale had been developed in this part of the City, sitting with Goldman Sachs opposite Farringdon Street and Bath House on the opposite side of Holborn Viaduct as well as New Street Square and the taller buildings in this location.

With regard to the proposed stopping up of Turnagain Lane, Officers remarked that this was an historic street and was the remnant of a street pattern which had been altered with the construction of Holborn Viaduct and the Fleet Valley improvements. It was noted that the existing, dead-end road was of low quality in terms of visual amenity, accessibility and permeability, used principally for service vehicles and contributing little to the City's public realm. By contrast, the new area of public realm would incorporate artistic, cultural and educational digital art displays which would enliven the space and provide a greater understanding of historical development of the area and its historic street pattern. The new route through the site and public lift bridging the level change between Holborn Viaduct and Farringdon Street with step free access would be a significant benefit offered by the development, as would the removal of the existing service vehicle crossover point. As such, the loss of Turnagain Lane public realm was considered to be compensated for and justified by the gain of a new attractive and inclusive accessible route through the site and the merits of the proposed development itself. Whilst there would be a net loss in public highway of 122 square meters, there would in fact be an overall net gain in public realm of 10 square meters. Members were shown further images depicting the quality and generosity of the space proposed in front of the entrance on Farringdon Street with the existing trees alongside additional planting to create a place to dwell. It was noted that there were also very generous street greening proposals (up to 29 planters) along Farringdon Street towards Ludgate Circus.

Officers went on to explain that, in applying the planning balance to the proposals, the identified harm to the designated and non-designated heritage assets were fully detailed within the report and had been given great weight in this case but it was considered that the overall, less than substantial harm, was outweighed by the wider public benefits. The principal benefits were set out within the report but included the new public lift providing an accessible route between Farringdon Street and Holborn Viaduct, the cultural offer of the extensive public art displays and digitisation of the Museum of London collection, the proposed public realm improvements and extent of street greening, enhancements to the listed gatehouse including lighting and CCTV to enhance the vertical pedestrian route and finally a local Community Outreach Programme secured through a Section 106 agreement and would include engaging with local schools for access to career insight sessions, education and employability workshops. It would also include hosting sustainable education programmes for local schools, including access to the roof terraces and biodiversity training as well as hosting green skills training for SMEs in association with organisations such as Heart of the City.

In terms of sustainability, Members were informed that the proposal demonstrated that whole life cycle carbon emissions were significantly reduced, exceeding industry benchmarks including the GLA's aspirational benchmark. It was reported that the existing buildings on site had been assessed and found to be unsuitable to be transformed into an attractive and sustainable development for a 60 plus year period. However, significant operational carbon savings could be achieved over the lifetime of the proposed building and circular economy principles had therefore been positively applied to achieve an exemplary long-term, low-carbon, flexible and adaptable development. The scheme would achieve BREEAM 'outstanding', with the building design also addressing climate change resilience by reducing solar gain, incorporating natural ventilation, water saving measures and various opportunities for urban greening and biodiversity whilst passive energy saving measures and low energy technologies would be employed to significantly reduce operational carbon emissions beyond London Plan requirements. In conclusion it was therefore considered that the proposal would deliver a scheme of high-quality architectural design, creating a sustainable 21st century workplace with extensive public realm improvements and a cultural offer that would provide vibrant and engaging active frontages and a strong connection to the wider cultural context of this part of the Square Mile. Officers consequently recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions of the Section 106 agreement as set out within the papers.

The Town Clerk confirmed that there were no objectors registered to address the meeting and went on to introduce the applicant team who would be speaking – Mr Philip Sutton, Head of Development at Royal London Asset Management, Mr Lee Polisano, founder and president of PLP Architecture, Mr Vince Ugarow, Design Director at environmental engineering consultants Hilson Moran and Ms Sherry Dobbin, partner at Future City.

Mr Sutton began by explaining that Royal London was the UK's largest mutual insurance company with a property portfolio currently valued at circa £10 billion,

including a large estate in central London. He went on to state that Royal London believed that the site in question had the potential to make a much greater contribution to the City's position as a global business centre, whilst also becoming a highly sustainable development with a wide-ranging set of public benefits. He stated that the proposals responded to proven demand and that Royal London had agreed terms and were in advanced discussions with Hogan Lovells for a pre-let. As noted in Hogan Lovell's letter of support, they viewed this development as key to their future in the City. Mr Sutton explained that all refurbishment and redevelopment options had been considered with a focus on delivering the broadest possible set of sustainability benefits – BREEAM 'outstanding', implementation of circular economy principles and an urban greening factor of 0.44 (well in excess of the policy requirements). Mr Sutton enthused that this project provided the ability to transform the public realm through a new step-free connection between Farringdon Street and Holborn Viaduct, with new public spaces, public art, culture, community outreach and landscaping providing long lasting benefits for this area. He underlined that Royal London had a track record of responsible property development, with market-leading sustainability standards. He added that they were committed to ensuring the long-term future of their development was highly sustainable and was the reason why they had appointed a best-in-class, internationally renowned team with a proven track record in London to design and deliver this project.

Mr Polisano spoke of how this project marked a gateway to the cultural mile through high-quality architecture and active frontages and would serve as a platform for cultural engagement and community learning. He added that the development would deliver world-class, sustainable, adaptable and healthy new workplace environments. He reported that a holistic approach had been taken to sustainability and reducing carbon emissions with circular economy principles embedded in the design decisions. He explained that, in this instance, the qualitative benefits and future adaptability of the new build far outweighed the refurbishment alternatives and that, at the heart of these proposals, was human comfort and well-being which were considered paramount for creating sustainable environments that enhanced people's health, foster creativity and spark innovation. He reiterated that the project would deliver a BREEAM 'outstanding' rating and would be a WELL platinum building where tenants would have access to adaptable modern workplace environments, openable windows for natural ventilation, biodiverse green terraces promoting outdoor working and high-quality facilities for fitness, cycling and active commuting. He added that the high-quality architecture was a response to the special context and was shaped to enhance the setting of the listed gatehouse. Portland stone would be reused from the existing buildings to form a new masonry base on Farringdon Street and weave the gatehouse back into the streetscape. Both the massing and the façade articulation had been informed by passive design principles with the façade depth and details minimising solar gain, maximising daylight and providing natural ventilation. The proposals had been designed for long-term adaptability and disassembly by adapting a layered design and installation approach to the building's components which would allow individual elements to be adapted and replaced in response to changing climate and future occupational requirements. He

stressed that the design delivered transformable public realm improvements well beyond the application's boundaries. Two new high-quality public spaces were to be delivered on Holborn Viaduct and Farringdon Street, connected by a new public lift that would significantly enhance accessibility across this nine-meter height difference. The existing mature plane trees that sat at the heart of the scheme would inform the introduction of meaningful and accessible urban greening that would substantially exceed the City's and the GLA's requirements. Mr Positano stated that consenting this scheme would allow for the realisation of this exemplar for a high-quality, sustainable development befitting of the City of London.

Mr Ugarow reported that the whole team, including the clients and the prospective tenants, had worked closely together to design a building that maximised the contribution to sustainability. He stated that an extensive whole-life carbon assessment had been undertaken considering a number of alternative refurbishment and extension possibilities alongside the option to redevelop this site. He underlined that the comparative results confirmed that all options, including the proposed redevelopment scheme before the Committee today, would meet the London Plan's embodied carbon benchmark of 900 kilograms of carbon per square meter. He highlighted that, crucially, they had worked incredibly hard to ensure that the predicted whole-life carbon emissions for the proposed development were very similar to the assessed alternative refurbish and extend options. He stressed that this was the case even when ignoring the structural constraints of the existing buildings which could only support one or two additional floors. Taking into account the additional qualitative benefits that this proposal could provide, it had been concluded by both City Corporation Officers and the GLA that it represented the most appropriate approach to redevelopment in terms of sustainability, future adaptability and accessibility. Mr Ugarow stated that pertinent features of the proposal that warranted mentioning at this stage was the fact that the scheme would minimise waste generation during the dismantling and construction process by prioritising reuse of materials and components and recycling programmes. He explained that the applicant was targeting 95% of strip out demolition, construction and fit out waste to be diverted from landfill. He reported that key circular economy strategies included reuse of foundations, repurposing of existing stone façade elements, minimising finishes and reuse of internal materials such as raised floor tiles, specifying responsibly sourced materials which consider the lowest carbon options including low environmental impact concrete and developing a material passport system to intelligently inform how materials and components can be reused and recycled in the future. In conclusion, Mr Ugarow reiterated that what would be delivered was a BREAAAM 'outstanding' building with exemplar sustainability credentials that would optimise the development of the site and realise the wider environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits in comparison to any alternatives.

Finally, Ms Dobbin reported that Future City had examined the cultural sustainability for this area through a collaborative and a research-based approach to place making and public art commissioning. She explained that a cultural plan focused on a public art strategy that defined location as a creative and identifiable beacon for the Cultural Mile, to engage and captivate

audiences and to maximise the exposure of the culture found locally and within Smithfield, the new home for the Museum of London. It would do so via the high visibility contemporary public art and the investment for the needed roles. The intention was for the development to become a gallery without walls with the permanent installation of the large digital murals spanning the nine high quality screens on both Holborn Viaduct and Farringdon Street ground floors. It would also fund a new, needed, four-year post for a Digital Archivist to accelerate the digitisation of the Museum of London collection. This content would then be used by an artist to create the art for the digital mural and leave an open online resource for all age learning. There would be funding for artist in residence who would build upon the legacy of Smithfield public realm artists in residence to help secure the cultural objectives for the long-term. There would be commissioning for the local wayfinding and street furniture that would reference the heritage of the river fleet, Turnagain Lane and the building of Holborn Viaduct. The further Cultural Management Plan would secure the benefits of the work and detail the governance, including how the public could access the new auditorium and the process for commissioning and maintaining the art to ensure long-term success. Ms Dobbin explained that the plan established the site as the Culture Mile gateway with the digital art mural, the street furniture commissions and a new online permanent exhibition bringing the Museum of London's artifacts to a much wider audience. A new digital archivist and artists in residence would sustainably celebrate the culture and commerce of the City of London for all.

The Chair thanked the speakers for their contributions and invited any questions that Members might now have of the applicant team.

A Member raised concerns as to the proposed nine digital screens and questioned whether the maintenance and brightness of these would be conditioned. He also questioned what would happen should the screens need to be removed at some point in the building's 60 plus year life and queried the building finish underneath these. Finally, he questioned whether the displays would be passive or animated and expressed concern around the potential for them to distract drivers and be overbearing. Ms Dobbin responded to state that the digital murals would be displayed in accordance with highway conditions and that stipulations within the Section 106 agreement specified and demonstrated a commitment to the ongoing maintenance of the screens. The way that the screens were to be positioned would see them sat slightly underneath the overhang of the building to avoid them being overbearing. The digital technology to be employed would allow the content of the screens to be changed regularly and the City Arts initiative as well as other cultural institutions would feed into this to ensure the quality of what was displayed. Essentially, it was intended to be a digital display to bring the Museum of London to the wider public. If there was ever a strong desire to move away from the screen display, Ms Dobbin assured the Committee that this could easily be transformed into something like a mosaic and not adversely affect the aesthetics of the building as a whole.

Another Member focused on the proposals for Turnagain Lane and questioned whether the developer might be willing to install a plaque on the new building to

record that this was where the Lane was once situated. Ms Dobbin responded to state that this was part of what the applicant wanted to do with the commissions for the street furniture and the public realm here and provide a deeper sense of the history of this site that the public could engage with.

Another Member posed a question on Newcastle Close and asked whether any ventilation was proposed here to mitigate against air pollution now that the space was to be enclosed. Mr Tim Hall of DP9 reported that there was no ventilation proposed but that the over sail here was just over 7 metres high with open air at both ends.

The Chair asked that the Committee now move to debate the application and to ask any outstanding questions that they might have of Officers.

A Member remarked that Officers had described the proposed building as subtle within their presentation – something which he strongly disagreed with, describing the massing of the building as massive and something that would dwarf the nearby Goldman Sachs building and be at least two storeys higher than buildings on the opposite side of Holborn Viaduct. He questioned why it was felt that this was appropriate. Secondly, he questioned the proposed overhang on Holborn Viaduct and why this was being permitted when the effect of this would be to bring forward, beyond the Thameslink Station building to the east, and to completely obscure the view of the listed gatehouse from Holborn Viaduct. Finally, he questioned whether the proposed art screens were desirable on Farringdon Street. The Member clarified that he was of the view that the site was in desperate need of redevelopment but questioned why Officers were not taking a more robust approach with developers to prevent them from taking these extra inches in terms of overhang and the like and rendering their proposals too overbearing. The Chief Planning Officer reported that this application had been the subject of very long and detailed discussions on the height and massing and that it had been reduced and nuanced down as a result of these. Officers were now therefore comfortable that the bulk and height and massing of this scheme was appropriate to its townscape context. Members were informed that this was also the result of a very rigorous views assessment throughout. Officers were keen to ensure that the scheme did not over dominate the gatehouse and highlighted that a fairly neutral canvass was therefore proposed to sit behind this. Officers felt that the design proposed was appropriate and restrained in this regard. In terms of the screens, it was reported that the Section 106 agreement was a very robust tool to be able to control the light levels and content and it was felt by Officers that this would be a very dynamic element and a gateway to the Culture Mile as one approached the Museum of London allowing all of the artefacts held here and currently hidden from public view to be widely celebrated.

Another Member echoed these points and questioned whether the Chief Planning Officer was concerned that the west end of the City was being over bulked by this and other previously approved applications in the same area.

A Member stated that he was generally favourably disposed to this application but added that he had some concern as to the loss of retail proposed here

given that retail had already been lost along Farringdon Street. He questioned why Officers felt that this was a good idea. Officers highlighted that details on the loss of retail were set out within the report and had been discussed at the pre-application stage where Officers worked with the developer to try and ensure that the frontage was as active as possible and that there was as much permeability as possible through to the new public access lift. Public outreach and engagement were also an important part of the negotiations and ensuring that the auditorium and roof were opened to local schools and also SMEs. Whilst it was therefore recognised that the loss of retail was a compromise in terms of policy, the numerous other benefits that had been negotiated had led to the conclusion that this was acceptable on balance.

Another Member questioned sustainability and when the building would 'break even' in terms of carbon emissions. She went on to question whether, when applications were presented to the Committee in future, Officers could always use the same metrics around this so that they could be more easily compared and understood by Members. With regard to the wider point around how sustainability information was presented, Officers undertook to reflect on this and work on a consistent approach. Members were reminded that a Sustainability SPD was currently being developed at present and that this could appropriately address this point for developers and Officers/Members alike. Officers went on to state that details on the whole-life cycle carbon of the building were detailed within the report (paragraph 331) .

Another Member requested that the Sustainability SPD also address the change in utilisation of the land as well as the recycling of materials/recycling plans. Officers agreed that this information around the circular economy should feature and was routinely requested from applicants at the early design stage before being secured by condition.

A Member stated that he welcomed the emphasis on culture and was of the view that this particular location created a wonderful opportunity to create a western gate into what he hoped would develop into a major cultural quarter for London. He went on to seek assurances from Officers that the commitment that the applicant had made in terms of managing and financing this cultural offer were firmly secured by condition. Officers assured the Committee that the Section 106 agreement would be very detailed in terms of the provision, maintenance and ongoing obligations.

Another Member referred to the abandoned arches under Farringdon Street, recognising that Officers had spent a lot of time exploring how these might be accessed through this building but had concluded that this was not possible. He was keen, however, that this issue should not be forgotten given the amount of space here that was currently vacant. Officers reiterated that this had been extensively discussed throughout the process and that, whilst it could not be processed as part of this scheme, they undertook to liaise with the City Surveyor to look at the use of the vaults separately.

Another Member commented on the loss of retail which she viewed as a more serious issue given that city workers using the Thameslink station would have relied upon this.

A Member spoke to express concerns at the height, mass and bulking of the building, describing it as 'greedy' given that it would not only overhang Holborn Viaduct by 2.4 meters but would also over sail Newcastle Close which was bound to increase air pollution levels here. The Member also expressed disappointment at the stopping up of Turnagain Lane and the fact that this area had not been more creatively reimaged. This would also give 332 square meters of airspace to the developer which would equal a rental of just under £3 million per annum (based on an average City of London rent) – a considerable extra benefit in exchange for one public lift, some digital screens, an archivist post funded for four years, and some greening further along Farringdon Street. The Member was of the view that this was not a good deal for the City Corporation and underlined that she would therefore be voting against this application.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 17 Votes
OPPOSED – 3 Votes
There were no abstentions.

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 and 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 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 City Corporation to refuse planning permission (under Article 5(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008).
- (4) That the Committee agree in principle that the land affected by the proposal which is currently public highway and land over which the public have right of access (comprising the entire area of Turnagain Lane) may be stopped up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers be instructed to proceed with arrangements for advertising and making of a Stopping-up Order for the various areas under the delegation arrangements approved by the Court of Common Council.

5. **STOPPING UP APPLICATION: SITE BOUNDED BY FENCHURCH STREET, MARK LANE, DUNSTER COURT AND MINCING LANE, LONDON EC3M 3JY**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning an application for stopping up of public highway for areas Fenchurch Street, Mark Lane, Mincing Lane and Star Alley, relating to the development of the site bound by these streets for which this Committee resolved to grant planning permission on 14 May 2020.

Officers explained that this report followed a report to this Committee on 26 January 2021 where Members had authorised the commencement of the process for the stopping up of the highway to enable the development of 50 Fenchurch Street. They had also agreed that unresolved objections to the proposed stopping up should be reported back to this Committee for their consideration. This report therefore considered the two unresolved objections and provided recommendations at paragraph 26 on how to now proceed.

RESOLVED – That the Committee:

1. Agrees that it is minded to make the order;
2. Acknowledges the objections and accepts that the objectors appear to be affected by the order;
3. Authorises the Executive Director Environment to notify the Mayor of London of the objections;
4. Authorises the Executive Director Environment to arrange for a local inquiry to be held, unless the Mayor of London decides that, in the special circumstances of the case, the holding of such an inquiry is unnecessary or the objection is withdrawn;
5. Instructs the Executive Director Environment to report to this Committee on the report of the person holding the local inquiry should such an inquiry take place; and
6. Instructs the Executive Director Environment to make the order should the Mayor of London decide that a local inquiry be dispensed with or the objection is withdrawn.

6. **CITY FUND HIGHWAY DECLARATION: 50 FENCHURCH STREET, EC3M 3JY**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor seeking approval to declare a portion of City Fund freehold land/subsoil (421 sq. ft.) and a volume of airspace (741 sq. ft.) situated around 50 Fenchurch Street, EC3M 3JY to be surplus to highway requirements to allow its disposal in conjunction with the permitted development.

A Member stated that she understood that airspace above the streets could have a value in places such as New York and questioned whether the City also placed a value on this and, if so, whether this was a standard value or one which changed according to location. Officers reported that they did seek best value from the developer for highway transactions but that there was no fixed rate applied. Officers looked at individual schemes and site rates – if this involved airspace only then it was slightly discounted but, where land was required, a full site rate was charged. Officers undertook to provide greater

detail on this outside of the meeting to those Members who would like it. The Chair highlighted that it would be for the Corporate Asset Sub and Finance Committees to look at the financial implications of this matter as detailed at paragraph 15 of the report.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Resolve to declare a volume of City Fund land (held for highway purposes) measuring a total of 421 sq. ft. situated around 50 Fenchurch Street, EC3M, to be surplus to highway requirements to enable its disposal upon terms to be approved by the Corporate Asset Sub Committee and Finance Committee.
- Resolve to declare a volume of City Fund airspace (held for highway purposes) measuring a total of 741 sq. ft. situated around 50 Fenchurch Street, EC3M, to be surplus to highway requirements to enable its disposal upon terms to be approved by the Corporate Asset Sub and Finance Committee, subject to the vertical extent of the airspace being first agreed by the Deputy Director of Transportation and Public Realm.
- Delegate authority to the City Surveyor and the Deputy Director of Transportation and Public Realm to determine the relevant ordnance datum levels to suitably restrict the vertical extent of the leasehold airspace demise.

7. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2022/23

The Committee considered a joint report of the Chamberlain and the Executive Director Environment presenting for approval the revenue and capital budgets for the Planning and Transportation Committee for 2022/23.

The Chamberlain reported that the budget proposed for 2022/23 had seen a net reduction of just under £1.1 million. In setting the budget, Officers had stayed within the resource envelope set by the Resource Allocation Sub Committee. This included a 2% update for inflation, offset by 2% efficiency savings and therefore a flat cash budget. Pay increases for staff at grades A-C only of 1.525%, employer national insurance contribution increases of 1.25% and some budget adjustments for previously agreed Fundamental Review savings had also been factored in. As detailed at paragraph 7 of the report, this Committee currently had a budget of £1.885 million to identify for next year. In other areas under the Director's remit, Port Health had a further £1million to identify, giving an overall budget pressure of just under £3 million still to identify. Members were informed that this did not, however, take into account the recent work being undertaken on the Target Operating Model where the Director had earmarked a number of initiatives concerning salary restructuring, efficiency savings and increased income streams which would enable the Department as a whole to reduce this budget pressure to approximately £0.5 million. This had recently been highlighted at the Member 'Deep Dive' sessions hosted by the Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee. It was reported that the Director was looking to further balance the budgets once she had been through the details of the Target Operating Model with the Open Spaces Department. Consideration was also being given to commencing a five-year plan to address various working practices and opportunities for the Department with a view to further negating budget pressures.

Officers went on to report that things had been steadily improving this year and that previously forecast large overspends had been addressed by keeping a

number of staff posts vacant and with some large upturns in some income streams – most notably planning, building control and other areas such as the Heathrow Animal Reception Centre and the Ports. However, with the recent onset of Omicron and recovery from the pandemic, there were still uncertain times ahead.

A number of capital bids that the Department had proposed as detailed at paragraph 14 had successfully passed through the Corporate Asset Sub and Finance Committee subject to some amendments to fine-tune what was essential and these were now progressing to the Court of Common Council for final agreement.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- i) Approve the proposed revenue budget for 2022/23 for submission to the Finance Committee;
- ii) Approve the proposed capital budgets for 2022/23 for submission to the Finance Committee;
- iii) Authorise the Chamberlain, in consultation with Executive Director Environment, to revise the budgets to allow for any further implications arising from subsequently approved savings proposals, Target Operating Model (TOM) implementation, changes to the Cyclical Works Programme (CWP), or changes to the resource envelope, and
- iv) Agree that any amendments for 2021/22 and 2022/23 budgets arising from changes to recharges during budget setting be delegated to the Chamberlain.

8. CITY PLAN: UPDATE ON PROGRESS AND NEXT STEPS

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment summarising the outcome of the consultation exercise on the City Plan and highlighting the key issues arising.

Officers reminded the Committee that they had agreed a draft plan for public consultation last Spring. Consultation had had to take place virtually owing to the ongoing pandemic and a very high number of responses had been received to this – over 1,300 representations which were summarised within the appendix to this report. Among these responses, it was highlighted that the Mayor of London considered that the Plan needed to be more prescriptive in terms of the City Corporation's approach to tall buildings in order to achieve general conformity with the London Plan. It was noted that there was also a substantive group of responses in relation to heritage concerns and the need to strike the correct balance between development pressures and heritage issues. It was reported that the result of all of this was that it was now felt appropriate to pause the process and revisit the draft Plan accordingly to ensure that it was found to be sound at examination and did take into account new issues that have arisen in the past 12 months. The report set out six policy areas where it was suggested that the Plan now be sense checked – tall buildings as per the Mayor's concerns, climate change where Officers could now build upon the momentum of COP26 and further embed the organisation's own Climate Action Strategy, offices and office floor space given the changing nature of work and the increase in hybrid working, the role of retail and town centres in a changing

environment, housing and housing delivery and finally health and inclusivity which the pandemic had brought to the forefront more so than ever before. Officers proposed that next steps would involve refining the Plan, consulting on it further in 2022 and then submitting this to the Secretary of State. A draft timetable for the Plan preparation process was suggested at Appendix B. This included the need to ensure that evidence collected pre-pandemic was updated and still valid. This would also include a call for housing sites to ensure that if there was private sector interest in more housing in the City, Officers were made aware of this. The process also encouraged member involvement to help steer any policy refinements. The proposal that the end date for the Plan be rolled forward to 2040 would mean that it was consistent with the end date for the London Plan and would also bring it into line with the evolving end date for the Transport Strategy.

A Member commented that he was pleased that there would now be a further opportunity to consider the housing issues. He went on to refer to the risks stipulated within the report particularly around the weight attached to the emerging City Plan. He expressed the view that the emerging Plan was a lot better than the existing Plan in a number of areas such as carbon and therefore questioned how, during this pause, the emerging Plan policies might still be applied. Officers responded to clarify that the emerging plan would, unfortunately, now carry less weight than when it had been intended to submit it. However, Members were provided with some reassurance in that the policies within the draft plan did carry some weight given that many were hung upon strategic policies within the London Plan or national policy guidance. Officers added that it was the case that, when an application was considered, the development Plan and any other material considerations were relevant.

Another Member commented that the responses to the consultation had come as no surprise, particularly in relation to tall buildings, heritage and residential amenity. She added that she was, however, surprised that, given that the Secretary of State had directed the Mayor of London to amend the London Plan with regard to tall buildings back in December 2020 and that this consultation exercise had concluded in May 2021, it had taken this report seven months to be brought to this Committee. She expressed concern that, in the meantime, this Committee had approved planning applications for the construction of seven tall office buildings which would impact upon heritage assets and residential amenity. With regard to the comments on health and wellbeing, the Member stressed the need to use the planning system to ensure that proper gains were made for the City of London in terms of health centres and the like. She added that she was pleased to see the number of responses received and hoped that those respondents would continue to engage with the process. Officers apologised for the delay in bringing forward this report but explained that there were 1300 responses to process before that could happen. In relation to the tall buildings implications, Officers reiterated that the GLA's comment was that the City should be more prescriptive in its policy approach here and not necessarily that tall buildings should not be permitted per se.

A Member noted that the Barbican association had responded to note that the spatial strategy aspirations did not include protecting residential amenity. He

questioned whether Officers had subsequently made any adjustment to the Plan as a result of this representation. Officers clarified that this would be a process for Members to work through when considering all of the responses received and changes to the Plan in 2022. It was highlighted that there were policies within the draft Plan to protect residential amenity and that it would be for Members to decide upon the degree of importance that those policies should have when weighed against other policies.

A Member raised a question on office space, recognising that the organisation were aiming for a cumulative total. She questioned where the City were in this process at present and how close they were to reaching this target. She queried how the provision might be more evenly spread throughout the lifetime of the Plan. Officers reported that the existing Local Plan had a target of 2 million square meters of growth and that, at present, this target was halfway met. The existing, adopted 2015 Plan contained phasing to reflect what the pipeline looked like at the time of adoption and progress was being made broadly in line with this. Going forward, a key consideration would be what type of office space would be needed and how much of it. It was recognised that the introduction of hybrid working may well have consequences. Officers added that their professional opinion was that the City would continue to be an attractive place to do business and that it would therefore continue to need more office space and not less. However, this proposed pause would now allow this matter to be revisited and for further evidence gathering to take place so that an informed decision could be taken as to the appropriate amount and type of office space required going forward.

Another Member questioned the City Corporation's real ability to control the pace of office delivery in the City. He stated that once an application had been approved, whether or not it then proceeded presumably depended upon economic conditions and the developer's view as to whether or not it was actually needed. Officers stated that this was correct and that the pace of delivery was a private sector driven process. This was seen as a positive in terms of surplus stock not being needlessly delivered with developers taking a view as to viability. One consequence of this however was that a healthy pipeline of schemes permitted was needed, in excess of the target, to allow for those schemes which subsequently fell away.

A Member questioned the sources that were to be used as part of the intelligence gathering exercise to estimate future office demand. He referred back to the fact that the City was already halfway to meeting its target of 2 million square meters of growth in office floorspace from 2015-2035. Officers reported that one key component of office needs in the future was how office floorspace would be used and the nature of office occupation going forward. A second key component would be employment projections – how many would be working in the City and on what basis/how often. It was noted that the GLA employment projections were due to be revised and reissued in the New Year which would be the first indication from such a body as to the impact of the pandemic on employment in London as a whole and its key sub-markets such as the City.

A Member stated that this future Plan would seek to guide developers, something which the current Plan did not seem to do given the number of times that planning applications that were in contradiction to its policies were brought forward. He questioned how this Committee and Officers could ensure that any future Plan was more stringently upheld. He went on to express concern that the end date for the future plan was to be moved from 2036 to 2040 and stated that he hoped that this would not unduly delay its adoption. He added that there was a clear need to have the Plan in place to protect the City's genuine heritage assets. Officers stressed that the Plan was a large document containing various different policies and that was to be read as a whole. Members were informed that it was inevitable that most applications were a compromise that complied with many but not all policies. Officers made recommendations based on this and it was then for Members to make a judgement as to whether or not the correct balance had been achieved in terms of policy application.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Note the summary of key issues raised during consultation on the Proposed Submission draft City Plan 2036 set out in Appendix A;
- Agree the revised City Plan timetable proposed at Appendix B; and
- Agree to amend the City Plan end date to 2040 to align with the Climate Action Strategy.

Thank you to Paul Beckett

The Chair wished to place on record his thanks to Paul Beckett for his counsel ahead of his imminent retirement. He reported that Paul had started at the Corporation 33 years ago, initially on a temporary contract. He added that Paul had served under numerous Chairs of this Committee as well as several different Chief Planning Officers and described him as very wise, persuasive and steady with an encyclopaedic knowledge which had been hugely appreciated by all. In terms of the City's position on planning policy, the Chair highlighted that the Corporation was seen as a leader in London and that much of this was due to Paul and his team's very hard work and dedication. The Chair, on behalf of the Committee, wished Paul a very happy retirement.

9. TRANSPORT STRATEGY UPDATE: QUARTER 2 2021/22

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director Environment providing an update on delivering the City of London Transport Strategy for quarter 2 of 2021/22 (July-September 2021).

A Member spoke to praise the continued efforts of Officers in attempting to introduce a 15mph speed limit and described it as one of the best ways to guarantee that the City would achieve its vision zero in terms of deaths and serious injuries on its roads.

Another Member commented that he felt that vision zero was an aspirational target but was not necessarily achievable. He added that a big part of working towards this was emphasising personal responsibility.

Officers thanked Members for their words of support on the 15mph campaign, stating that they were disappointed with the outcome of this. They highlighted that they remained committed to vision zero which was about saying that no deaths were acceptable on the City's road and that they would therefore continue to work hard alongside City Police and consider what other work could be done around design speeds to improve the way that people move around the City.

A Member questioned work on St Paul's Gyratory stating that he had thought that this was now dormant and was therefore surprised to see mention of delays affecting the existing programme within the appendix to the report. He also referred to the Barbican & Golden Lane Zero Emission Zone and Healthy Streets Plan where the end date was marked as 2021/22 and questioned whether this was correct given that the works had hardly begun at present. Officers reported that it was still hoped that the Barbican & Golden Lane works would be significantly progressed during this financial year but that it was accepted that this might now also lapse into 2022/23. With regard to St Paul's Gyratory, Officers clarified that the project was previously on hold because of the uncertainty around the Centre for Music but that this had been restarted in April 2021 following a report to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and progress with the London Wall West project on the former Museum of London site and the redevelopment of 81 Newgate Street. It was underlined that these two developments presented a great opportunity to rethink how this space (one of the priority areas for road danger reduction initiatives) worked, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Deputy Chairman referred to a recent report on air quality in the City which had indicated a reduction of 42% in the past 18 months and questioned if Officers could confirm this. Officers reported that they did not have the up-to-date figures to hand today but undertook to follow up on this. They added that this reduction was not surprising due to the changes in traffic flow throughout the pandemic. A report on traffic figures gathered this Autumn would be brought to this Committee early in the new year and details of air quality could be incorporated into this.

A Member referred to the pedestrian priority scheme at Kings Street where posts had now been removed and replaced with painted lines to denote the carriageway, pedestrian and cyclist lanes. She commented that cyclists here failed to understand that pedestrians could also use the carriageway and that she had some concerns as to pedestrian safety here as a result. She went on to refer to TfL's bus gates at Bishopsgate and stated that she understood that these would be consulted upon. She questioned when this matter would come back to this Committee for comment. Officers reported that the approach taken when the Covid-19 measures had originally been rolled out was that, in areas where there was space for walking or a cycle lane against live traffic, posts would be installed. Where cycle lanes were next to walking space, posts/'wands' had not been installed. Officers were now progressing towards experimental schemes as part of the pedestrian priority programme funded through the Climate Action Strategy and, as part of this, pavements would be

properly built out so that painted lines would not need to be relied upon to secure additional walking space. It was envisaged that this would address many of these concerns and avoid any ongoing confusion. With regard to Bishopsgate, Members were informed that TfL were progressing with an experimental scheme that would largely replicate what was originally introduced as part of the street space scheme. A report on this was recently submitted to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to outline the approach being taken. Officers clarified that, with experimental traffic orders, a six-month public consultation and monitoring period was necessary. They clarified that they would be working with TfL throughout this period to understand how the changes on Bishopsgate related to the City's own projects and aspirations. Reports with further details on this would come forward to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee in due course.

A Member referred to Moor Lane stating that it was of great concern to residents that the originally proposed project in 2011, funded by Section 106 monies from London Wall Place, had been refined down to what was now being presented as a result of Deutsche Bank now requiring security which would take up road space which they did not appear to be paying any extra for. The Member sought further clarification on this.

Another Member spoke on this, adding that he understood that the original plan had been for the very substantial greening of Moor Lane and building out into the highway, expanding the pavement. What appeared to be happening now was that consultation was being undertaken on just a part of this proceeding which was extremely disappointing. The Member continued by stating that his understanding of security measures was that these should be designed into the building from the outset and not outside of it. Officers reported that this scheme had indeed been in the pipeline since 2011 now and that they had been patiently waiting for Deutsche Bank and the scheme at 21 Moorfields to reach a point where it was possible to access the space and deliver the permanent scheme. Officers confirmed that they had recently received a number of questions from residents regarding the funding available including the interest on the Section 106 balance and that this figure was currently awaiting confirmation from the Chamberlain. It was also reported that ongoing discussions were being had with the developer at 21 Moorfields and that Members were correct in stating that the current proposals which would predominantly affect the eastern footway had meant that Officers had had to adapt the original scheme. It was, however, felt that a significant amount of greening could still be delivered in Moor Lane, particularly on the western side. Options for security measures were being discussed with developers which included things such as low-level planters and other greening elements. Officers were still keen to see as much greening as possible delivered here and welcomed any support that the Chair, Deputy Chair and other members of the Committee might be able to offer in these negotiations. Members underlined their political support for Officers to push back on this. It was suggested that the Chair and Deputy Chairmen of this and the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee further engage with this in the first instance.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

10. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

RECEIVED.

11. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 30/10/2021 – 26/11/2021.

A Member observed that the London Wall down escalator had been available for 97.83% of the time during this period according to the report but questioned how this was calculated since he had known it to be out of operation very frequently in recent months. Officers stated that the Member appeared to be referring to the escalators that came down onto Wood Street which were not the responsibility of the City but of the developer. Officers undertook to follow up on this matter.

Members were informed that there was currently an issue with one of the escalators on London Wall which was out of operation at present and would therefore feature on the next public lift report. It was however expected that the fault would be fixed later this week.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

Thanks to Alison Bunn

The Chair reported that Alison was soon to leave her post as Head of Facilities at the City Corporation after securing a senior role at Cambridge University looking at how they use their workspace. He thanked her for her attendance at this Committee on this matter and, on behalf of the Committee, wished Alison lots of luck in her new role.

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

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

Barbican Podium Phase Two Works

A Member stated that he was concerned about the messaging going to the public and residents about these works highlighting that those living nearby had received nothing in the mail pertaining to the public consultation that was taking place on this. An email as part of the regular, monthly City Resident newsletter had been sent describing the waterproofing membrane priority and pinpointing where residents could view plans or ask questions had been distributed but, again, this failed to reference the public consultation. The Member remarked that this seemed very odd and insensitive.

The Chair reported that he and the Deputy Chairman would soon be meeting with Officers and others to discuss how this matter could be progressed governance wise. The Comptroller and City Solicitor reiterated that the issue here was around separation of functions as discussed at the last meeting and concerns that the Committee could not be the promoting Committee as well as the Committee that decided the planning application – something which applied to Officers and Members alike. She added that, ultimately, the question being posed today related to the promotion of the application and should therefore be put to the Committee responsible for advancing this in due course. Officers cautioned that, for this Committee to engage in the way in which the proposals were being developed prior to the submission of the planning application would risk it being involved in the promotion of the proposals and thereby remove any possibility of it being able to eventually consider the application itself.

The Chair undertook to keep the Committee informed of any progress around governance arrangements for this matter going forward.

Suspended Parking Bays

A Member stated that she had received a number of complaints from residents who had legally parked and paid to park for the duration of the weekend on a Friday evening only to find that they had been ticketed the following day and to see a suspension notice in place. This often led to residents appealing these tickets and having to provide evidence of suspension signs having been erected at 7 o'clock in the evening. The Member stressed that bays should only be suspended with plenty of notice and not once people had already parked.

Officers undertook to look into these specific cases in greater detail outside of the meeting but explained that the basis of suspensions was that there was still a Saturday paid for period in terms of pay and display parking. This meant that suspensions in place on a Friday evening would only be enforceable from Saturday morning. Officers clarified that the processes around this had not changed for some time now and that this was something that they traditionally received very few complaints about.

Department of the Built Environment Users Panel

A Member stated that she had only recently discovered that this group existed and asked for further clarification as to its role and membership. She also questioned whether there were any other similar user groups within the

Department which Members ought to be aware of and how it was possible to join these. The Chief Planning Officer reported that the DBE Users Panel was made up of residents in the form of the residents' associations, developers, agents and the CPA as well as anybody with an interface within the department and its services. It was essentially a sounding board to share ideas and any issues. He undertook to send the Member further details on the Panel composition and objectives.

At this point, the Chair 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.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

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

16. 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>
17	3, 5 & 7
18	3 & 5
19 – 20	-

17. DEBT ARREARS - ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT (P&T COMMITTEE)

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director Environment informing Members of arrears of invoiced income as at 30th September and providing an analysis of this debt.

18. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

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

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

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

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

Target Operating Model Proposals

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Director, Environment in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman to take these proposals forward owing to time pressures. It was requested that all Members of the Committee be given the opportunity to view and comment upon the detailed proposals prior to their sign-off.

The meeting closed at 12.35 pm

Chair

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