

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 17 May 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)	Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chair)	Alderman Ian Luder
Deputy Randall Anderson	Antony Manchester
Brendan Barns	Alderman Bronek Masojada
Ian Bishop-Laggett	Deputy Brian Mooney
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deborah Oliver
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Deputy Graham Packham
John Edwards	Deputy Susan Pearson
Anthony David Fitzpatrick	Deputy Henry Pollard
Deputy John Fletcher	Ian Seaton
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Alethea Silk
Martha Grekos	Luis Felipe Tilleria
Jaspreet Hodgson	Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia
Alderman Alastair King DL	William Upton QC

Officers:

Juliemma McLoughlin	- Executive Director, Environment
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Dept.
Gwyn Richards	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Peter Shadbolt	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Shani Annand-Baron	- Town Clerk's Department
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department

Introductions

The Town Clerk opened the meeting, confirming that a quorum of Members were present. The Town Clerk then 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. It was confirmed 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 Chairman then welcome all those in attendance to the meeting, as well members of the public and external stakeholders observing the meeting via YouTube.

The Chairman then moved a vote of thanks to Gemma Stokley for her work supporting the Committee as Committee Clerk since September 2018, a period which had spanned the Covid-19 pandemic, as well as numerous major applications and complicated governance considerations. The Committee thanked and paid tribute to Gemma Stokley for her support and wished her well as she moved on to future challenges.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Alexander Barr, Emily Benn, Natasha Lloyd-Owen and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 26 April 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

In response to a question from a Member on the Bury House application, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers were still awaiting Stage 2 consideration from the GLA, and most recently followed up on this the day before the meeting.

A Member advised that they had a point of accuracy to raise on the non-public minutes, additionally proposing that the reference to consideration of greening proposals relevant to 21 Moorfields be moved into the public minutes for the benefit of the record, which was agreed.

4. **ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk recommending the establishment of a special sub-committee to determine an application in respect of London Wall Car Park. The Comptroller and City Solicitor introduced the report, providing some background and outlining the reasons for the proposal. The Comptroller and City Solicitor added that as the application was unlikely to be ready for the Committee meeting on 7 June, it was proposed that the recommendation be amended to approve the establishment of a sub committee to consider the application at a date to be determined.

A Member suggested that agenda planning be undertaken so that the Special Sub Committee meeting take place after a lighter Grand Committee meeting, as this would facilitate better consideration of the application. The Member then asked the Comptroller and City Solicitor for advice as to whether dispensations were required for those living in the proximity of London Wall. The Comptroller

and City Solicitor advised that they would advise the Member outside the meeting, as there was no universal rule on this matter.

The Chairman added his agreement that the Sub Committee meeting should follow a lighter Grand Committee meeting, or could be scheduled as a separate meeting, before drawing the Committee's attention to the recommendations.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree to:

1. Establish a Special Sub Committee with the following Terms of Reference: to determine planning application reference: 21/00419/FULL;
2. That the Special Sub-committee sits at the rising of the Planning and Transportation on a date to be determined; and
3. That the Special Sub-committee be constituted of all Members of Planning and Transportation Committee.

5. **LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FUNDED SCHEMES 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment covering the provision of Transport for London (TfL) Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding to the City of London Corporation for the year 2022/23. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report, advising of the background to the LIP scheme and outlined the key points for this year for Members.

In response to questions from a Member, the Executive Director of Environment confirmed that approval was not sought for any shortfall arising from funds not being made available from TfL. The amount for approval was the total amount that could be made available with allocations for spending that funding set out, but if funds were not made available by TfL these would not be replaced and the allocations to initiatives would be reconsidered under delegation to officers. The Executive Director of Environment also advised that officers were happy to consider how bids for funding via other means and opportunities to align with other initiatives in order to maximise delivery.

A Member asked whether any provision had been made for the creation of a permanent solution to the Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM) barriers at London Bridge, noting that it was likely some City of London Corporation funding would be required. The Executive Director of Environment responded that the barriers in question were still the subject of discussions involving the City of London Corporation via Bridge House Estates and led by TfL, being currently the responsibility of TfL to maintain, but owned by the Metropolitan Police. The Executive Director of Environment added that this was a complicated situation which sat outside of the LIP.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- i) Approve the allocations up to the maximum set out in table 1 (£1,917k), for the year 2022/23;

- ii) Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chairs and Deputy Chairs of the Planning & Transportation Committee and of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee, to allocate any additional funds which are made available by TfL in 2022/23 financial year;
- iii) Approve to spend any funds awarded for Principal Road Renewal for the year 2022/23; and
- iv) Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to reallocate the TfL grant between the approved LIP schemes should that be necessary during 2022/23 up to a maximum of £150,000.

6. **TRAFFIC ORDER REVIEW - PROCESS AND NEXT STEPS**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Environment providing details of the two main workstreams for the Traffic Order review instructed by the Court of Common Council.

A Member raised a point in respect of Destination City, commenting that the Court of Common Council had approved a wider plan for City Recovery which contained multiple facets applicable to the Committee, including Destination City. The Member commented that it could be problematic to focus on a subset of measures already agreed rather than the whole, as other issues also needed focus in order to fulfil what was agreed, including exercise facilities, which were requested by a significant number of survey respondents. The Member noted that the matter would come back to Committee and suggested that the Committee consider the plan as a whole.

The Executive Director of Environment responded that Destination City was specifically referred to in the original Motion to Court of Common Council, but confirmed that references to Future City could be added and that there was no intention to suggest that outcomes from the City Recovery taskforce would not be incorporated.

With regards to consultation, a Member queried why the City Streets survey referenced in paragraph 12 had been included as part of the engagement, adding their concerns that this could result in overengineering or consultation fatigue. Another Member stressed that experience of previous consultations be taken into account, and that officers should ensure that all relevant user groups were sufficiently consulted, and their responses considered. The Member proposed that a senior party be engaged in the consultation to provide assurance that the line and selection of questioning was appropriate and inclusive of user groups. The Chairman commented that he felt recent projects such as Beech Street had demonstrated that great efforts and diligence were taken in formulating consultation questions, with the assistance of external agencies, and that perceived biases were removed.

The Executive Director of Environment responded that it had been intended to run the City Streets survey again prior to the Traffic Order Review, as it helped understand how effectively the Transport Strategy was being delivered, and on

that basis it had been thought logical to align the survey so that those responses could inform the Traffic Order Review. The Executive Director of Environment assured Members that this would not cause any delay. On the wider consultation point, the Committee was advised that officers were increasingly using consultancies for assistance and to provide a greater degree of independence, but were happy to be led if Members felt an independent scrutineer would be beneficial.

A Member commented that they had some concern on the resources being used and felt that more consideration should be given to future-proofing as part of these exercises. The Member added that they felt more points could have been worked through as part of debate at Court of Common Council. The review would be based on current traffic flows, which may not account for the impact of initiatives such as Destination City further down the line or provide sufficient focus on what the City Corporation and stakeholders wanted the future City to look like. The Member urged officers to consider building in extra work to take forward which would ensure tangible benefits.

The Chairman thanked Members and officers for their comments, adding that the Committee had a clear mandate from the Court of Common Council which they were required to execute, and agreed that this was an ongoing piece of work which would have long-lasting execution.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **CITY OF LONDON ACCESS GROUP (COLAG) BRIEFING NOTE***

The Committee received a report of the Planning and Development Director setting out the membership, constitution and remit of the City of London Access Group (CoLAG) and confirming that a review into the remit, structure and terms of reference of CoLAG was in progress.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT***

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 12/04/22 – 01/05/22. A Member asked for an update on the completion of the redevelopment of Millennium Bridge House, which included a new lift with public access, to be provided outside of the meeting.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the escalators on Wood Street, the City Surveyor confirmed that the escalators in question were not owned or managed by the City Corporation, although there was a public lift managed by the City Corporation at the junction of Wood Street and London Wall. A Member acknowledged that the escalators were managed by the building, but added that they understood that the escalators were supplied as part of a planning condition, and therefore if they were not operational then this became an enforcement matter as the condition was not being met. The City Surveyor advised that they would look into this and respond in writing for circulation to the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

9. **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.

10. **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.

11. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS***

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out its list of Outstanding Actions. The Committee noted that new guidance on Radiance was set to be provided by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) this month, and that officers would analyse changes before reporting to Committee on a way forward.

RESOLVED – That the list of outstanding actions be noted.

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

Salisbury Square

A Member asked if there were any pertinent points arising from the process or outcome of the Judicial Review of the Salisbury Square development of which the Committee should be made aware.

The Chairman commented that the City Corporation had successfully defended their planning decision on the Salisbury Square development from a Judicial Review, and the Court of Appeal had subsequently rejected an application for an appeal. The Chairman added that this was an excellent outcome and gave thanks to the Planning and Legal teams for their work on this, the officer's report having been singled out for particular praise which was testament to the amount of work that had gone in.

Riverside Walk

A Member commented that the new hotel development on the Riverside in Queenhithe Ward had transformed the area and had been a very positive development, but areas around the development were still blocked, despite a lack of ongoing activity. The Member therefore asked for an update on this. The Executive Director of Environment responded that a site visit was scheduled for Thursday that week to review progress. Whilst officers appreciated the

frustrations at the delays, they were confident that the matter was close to resolution and would pick up any outstanding actions as a matter of urgency and confirm a timeframe for completion following the site visit.

Road Signage in Princes Street

A Member raised the road signage at Princes Street, advising that the signage for a vehicle entering Princes Street from the north, turning around and travelling back northwards appeared to be contradictory, which would inhibit access to Grocer's Hall. The Executive Director of Environment responded that this matter had been raised elsewhere and a full response was being prepared. Officers believed the signage to be accurate but were reviewing it to ensure it was sufficiently clear and appropriate. The Chairman of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee added that this matter could be monitored by the Sub Committee going forward.

Crossrail

A Member asked whether there would be City Corporation involvement in the launch of Crossrail the following week, the organisation having been significantly involved in the project. The Chairman replied that he, the Lord Mayor and the Chairman of Policy & Resources had a programme surrounding the launch on Tuesday 24 May, including use of the service from Farringdon. The Chairman added that he hoped there would be lots of coverage, which would include a press release by the City Corporation setting out the organisation's involvement in the project, and that he looked forward to seeing usage statistics, which would be reported through the usual channels.

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

The Executive Director of Environment advised that a full briefing note on the Government's Levelling Up Bill would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee.

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.

Item	Paragraph
15	3
16-17	-

15. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2022.

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

There was one question.

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

There was one item of other business.

The meeting closed at 1.06 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee
joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk**