

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Friday, 1 July 2022

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

Present

Members:

Deputy Shравan Joshi (Chairman)	Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chair)	Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Deputy Randall Anderson	Antony Manchester
Brendan Barns	Deputy Graham Packham
Emily Benn	Deputy Susan Pearson
Ian Bishop-Laggett	Judith Pleasance
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Deputy Henry Pollard
John Edwards	Ian Seaton
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Luis Felipe Tilleria
Jaspreet Hodgson	Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia
Alderman Alastair King DL	William Upton QC

Also in attendance:

Deputy Henry Pollard

Officers:

Gwyn Richards	- Chief Planning Officers and Development Director
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Bhakti Depala	- Environment Department
Joanna Parker	- Environment Department
Gemma Delves	- Environment Department
Elisabeth Hannah	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	- Environment Department
Iain Steele	- Environment Department
Andrew Coke	- City Surveyor's Department
Jake Tibbetts	- Open Spaces Department
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department

Introductions

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. 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 advised the Committee that the City Corporation had received notice of the outcome of the Custom House Public Inquiry, which was ruled in the City's favour. The Chairman commented that this was a positive result for the City which reflected well on its aspirations and ambitions. The Chairman then thanked all officers involved for their hard work on this matter, particularly Jessica Robinson, Ben Eley and Fleur Francis for their contributions to the planning, design and legal aspects respectively.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Deputy John Fletcher, Martha Grekos, Alderman Ian Luder, Deputy Brian Mooney, Deborah Oliver and Alethea Silk.

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

Deputy Edward Lord and Deputy Randall Anderson each declared an interest in Item 6 by virtue of having previously considered the scheme as members of the former Corporate Asset Sub Committee, and advised that they would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration of this item.

Ian Seaton declared a personal interest in Item 7 by virtue of his membership of the Girdlers' Company, and advised that he would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration of this item.

3. **MINUTES**

A Member commented that they felt additional detail was required in respect of the minute of Item 8, to be clear that the question was specifically about testing different materials and assessing their suitability for use with a view to using permeable materials for the Public Realm footway other than York Stone.

RESOLVED – That, pending the above amendment, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 7 June 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **THAVIES INN HOUSE, 3-4 HOLBORN CIRCUS, LONDON EC1N 2HA**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of Thavies Inn House, 3-4 Holborn Circus, London EC1N 2HA – specifically, the demolition of the existing building at 1-6 Holborn Circus (known as Thavies Inn House) and the erection of a ten storey Class E building for office use with Class E retail use at part ground floor level with works to include reinstatement and new pedestrian routes through the site; hard and soft landscaping works including removal and replacement trees within the public highway, and creation of pocket park in Thavies Inn; widening of the footway on St Andrew Street; and other works incidental to the proposed development.

The Town Clerk advised that an addendum containing late representations, and the officer's presentation, had been circulated to Members in advance, before outlining the Committee's usual procedure for the consideration of planning applications.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director then introduced the application to Members and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the details of the scheme and its wider implications and outlining the reasons for the officer's recommendation. The officer's recommendation was that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission, in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

In the absence of any registered objectors, Ned Williams, on behalf of Evans Randall Investors, addressed the Committee in support of the recommendations. The Committee heard that the site at Thavies Inn presented an opportunity for regeneration and expansion at the crossroads between the West End and the City of London. Whilst the site had constraints it also had opportunities, and the scheme would look to reuse elements of the current building. However, retention of one or both of the existing London Plane trees had

ultimately not been possible while still delivering enough quality, sustainability and flexibility of space, due to the disjointed and inflexible nature of the existing structure, and the physical dimensions of the current building. The application was supported by extensive analysis on these matters, including a full financial viability assessment of the proposed scheme.

The Committee was told that the application also proposed a significant package of public benefits, including 23 replacement trees and extensive greening on the building, new pedestrian connections through the site, the overprovision of cycle spaces in lieu of existing car parking, expanded pavement and public realm to St Andrew St, and the creation of the south facing, public park within Thavies Inn itself. The development could attract occupiers from SMEs to global institutions, and the ambition was clear, to provide an occupier-focussed and environmentally sensitive office development alongside designed, deliberate and thoughtful public spaces.

Yasmin Al-ani Spence, on behalf of Wilkinson Eyre then addressed the Committee in support of the application, commenting that the site presented a unique opportunity to deliver a leading building in an individual context and a generous revision to the public realm. The proposal sought to create a positive, sustainable, and healthy workplace, and a building that engaged with its urban setting while honouring the history of Holborn Circus and embracing the City of London tradition of pocket parks and alleyways. Due to structural, environmental and user constraints, it was not possible to adapt the buildings to work together as one functional space. The proposed scheme provided efficient floorplates with cores to either side, generous views over London, and natural ventilation on all floors, with greening to provide shading as well as to enhance local biodiversity and climate resilience.

The Committee heard that high-quality materials had been carefully considered to merge the new and the old and for their sustainable credentials, including limestone at the plinth and connection to adjacent buildings. The route through the site path was more prominent, leading to a pocket park providing generous greening, biophilia and seating, with a second alleyway also introduced. 60 bike spaces were provided in the courtyard, while a further 25 are spread around the proposal for short-stay parking, with long-stay bike parking and shower facilities situated within the building. An enlarged pavement onto St. Andrew Street allowed for 4 substantial trees, replacing the existing trees to create a prominent public realm facing the church. The proposal responded well to an important, prominent but constrained site, and the scale, detailing and integration of the public amenity, compliment the history of the location and would deliver a flexible building that is suitable for the future.

Matthew Mapp, on behalf of Sweco UK, then addressed the Committee in support of the application. The application accords with GLA and City sustainability and energy policies and aspirations in the strongest possible terms, with aspiration to prioritise reuse in the first instance before progressing redevelopment. The existing development was appraised through third-party surveys and expert consultant input. A combination of issues led to a single retention option that, while it may initially save embodied carbon, had a significantly constrained operational performance, with a maximum additional life of 30 years before wholesale demolition was required, and was less carbon efficient in intensity terms in comparison compared to the redevelopment target. Studies at pre-application stage showed how carbon-heavy elements of the proposed development supported longevity and future flexibility and adaptability, suggesting a life of over 100 years for the structure.

The Committee heard that the applicant's approach to prioritising longevity was also underlined in embodied carbon targets. The applicant had led with a whole life target rather than focusing just on upfront embodied carbon, as this allowed decisions based on whole life performance, and key strategies would be implemented to reduce embodied emissions. The approach focussed on operational energy performance as the primary driver rather than emissions, with a focus on fabric-first design, including openable vents in facades to facilitate future mixed-mode ventilation in combination with a heating & cooling system that actively addresses both operational energy and embodied carbon. In terms of certification, the applicant was targeting a minimum of BREEAM Excellent with an aspiration to achieve 'Outstanding'.

The Chairman then invited questions from Members to those speaking in support of the application. In response to questions, the Committee was advised that the first priority would be to assess existing materials for reuse on site, reuse elsewhere or recycling, in that order, and that the roof would be an important part of several features of the scheme. The EPC rating of the current site was C, but this did not mean the existing building was energy efficient.

The Chairman then invited the Committee to ask questions of officers and debate the application. In response to points raised by the Chairman regarding the provision of trees as part of the scheme, the Director of Open Spaces

outlined the specifications of the existing London Plane trees, adding that there had been significant discussion on the matter, and whilst it was preferable to retain the existing trees, it was understood that this was not always possible. The proposed replacement trees were smaller in canopy size but this could be improved upon at a later stage, with further work on agreeing a size and species to continue.

A Member noted the stated intentions for the reuse of materials and asked how the Committee could monitor and hold the applicant to account this, before asking for clarification on the graphical information on whole life carbon emissions. The Executive Director of Environment outlined the whole life carbon assessments to be undertaken during the process and their intended impact, and advised that a condition could be attached to facilitate monitoring of the reuse and recycling of materials. In response to a question from a Member, the Executive Director of Environment confirmed that total carbon emissions for the lifetime of the building were given per square metre.

A Member commented that the application reports needed to be written in a more accessible way, with plainer language and less jargon, particularly in the summary and main body of the report. The Member added that a total carbon emissions figure for the development should be given, with a comparison to the existing building, rather than just per square metre. The Member queried whether the car parking space was privately owned by the City Corporation and sought confirmation on this, as more could be done with this space if this were the case. The Executive Director of Environment confirmed that the car parking area was currently owned by the City Corporation.

The Deputy Chair noted that the public realm interacted with the servicing area and queried the extent to which the management plan could guarantee the quality of the public realm. The Executive Director of Environment advised that servicing was currently uncontrolled, but saw around 16 deliveries per day. The development would be capped at 14, with offsite consolidation and a maximum of 8 between 7am and 7pm. The Executive Director of Environment advised that this would be controlled through the delivery and servicing plan and that issues could be managed.

A Member sought clarification on the tree provision under the scheme, and suggested that a condition be added to facilitate enforcement on CO2 targets. The Director of Open Spaces advised that the proposed tree pit would not constrain tree size, but would provide assurance that the trees would reach a minimum height, which they may grow beyond. However, the full extent of the possible provision would not be clear until the tree pits had been installed. The Director of Open Spaces advised that the applicant had indicated they were open to having trees with large canopies and encouraging biodiversity, and that officers would be pushing to ensure this was the case.

The Committee was then advised that the materials would be assessed during the detailed design phase, and a detailed whole life carbon assessment would be undertaken before implementation. Further improvements to the sustainability credentials of the scheme would be made during this process and

it was expected that the GLA targets would be exceeded, which was the key measurement. The Committee was then advised that condition 4 could be used to negotiate improvements if the detailed design did not cover the required information on achieving CO2 targets.

A Member asked why 184 square metres of highway was being handed over as part of the application. The Member commented that loading bays may exacerbate servicing issues and asked how this would be addressed, and that the waste storage was positioned in a way that risked it not being collected, before asking for clarification on how many occupants there would be in the new building and why a condition related to Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM) had not been included. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director clarified the site boundaries as outlined in the officer presentation. The cycle hub was no currently adopted highway, and would become adopted highway for public use. The occupant numbers would increase from 300 to a capacity of 750. The Executive Director of Environment added that some servicing activity took place in relation to other buildings, and this could not be controlled as part of the application. However, the indicate design was subject to further detailed design and officers would make sure there were suitable areas to accommodate other servicing activity safely. The Committee was advised that a HVM condition had been omitted in error and this could be added, although condition 40 asked for details of security measures.

A Member commented that the existing trees were on highway land which was being voluntarily developed, and queried the justification for removing the trees, as there was some inconsistency in the officer's report. The Member added that they were troubled by the idea of removing the trees for the sake of development but could understand if it were on the basis of townscape considerations. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that the viability assessment was a material consideration, which had been independently verified. Whilst the recommendation given was on the basis of balancing the existing trees against their replacements as part of the scheme, the viability argument was also presented to the Committee. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers would have recommended approval without the viability assessment, on the basis of the public realm, landscaping and tree-planting package.

A Member sought assurance that the approval would contain enough teeth to ensure the best possible replacements for the existing trees, and that should the replacement trees die, they could also be replaced. The Director of Open Spaces responded that the proposed tree pit would be larger than that provided for the existing trees near to the site and would be set up so that trees could establish. The trees would also be on City Corporation land so would be in the care of the City Corporation. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director added that condition 25 provided controls and required replacements for the trees if they were damaged or died.

In response to a question from a Member, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that a materials audit would be required as part of the conditions. In response to an earlier query, the Executive Director of

Environment confirmed that the refurbishment option would use around 6000 tonnes fewer total carbon emissions over the lifetime of the building compared to the scheme proposed. However, the refurbishment option would use less operational energy. The existing building would require significant investment over the same period of time, and therefore leaving it as it is was not considered to be an option. A Member commented that approving the scheme as opposed to the refurbishment option would therefore generate more total carbon emissions over the lifetime of the building.

A Member commented that they had concerns over the scheme, particularly around servicing and the use of space around the pocket parks. The Member suggested that deliveries be minimised, and that effort be made to maximise and protect the public benefit of the space. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that the delivery and servicing management plan could be used to restrict movements as agreed in the S106 agreement, which would also be used to secure the restrictions on movements during the peak periods.

Arising from the discussion, the Chairman moved the Committee to a vote. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations as amended, with 16 Members voting for the recommendation, and 3 Members voting against the amended recommendation, and 2 Members abstaining. The recommendations were therefore agreed.

As a point of order, a Member requested the Chairman demarcate more clearly the points in considering the application at which Members were invited to ask questions of officers and to make general points as part of the debate going forward, for clarity.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree:

1. That planning permission be **granted** for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule;
 2. 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 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; and
 3. That Officers be instructed to negotiate the S106 agreement.
5. **200 ALDERSGATE STREET, LONDON EC1A 4HD**
The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of 200 Aldersgate, London EC1A 4HD – specifically, the installation of a new pedestrian access and bridge link to the existing rear courtyard. The Town Clerk advised that an addendum containing

late representations and an additional condition, and the officer's presentation, had been circulated to Members in advance.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director then introduced the application to Members and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the details of the scheme and its wider implications and outlining the reasons for the officer's recommendation. The officer's recommendation was that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission, in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

The Chairman then invited the Committee to ask questions of officers and debate the application. A Member commented that the most contentious aspect of the scheme appeared to be the increase in footfall, and suggested signage making clear to those using the bridge and courtyard that there were residents in the proximity. The Member added that music would not be allowed, but events involving up to 150 people were likely to create excessive noise. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that informatives for the management plan could be added on signage, and that there was scope to reduce the permissions on capacity.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that all statutory consultation had been undertaken and responses represented. There were currently no restrictions on Cross Key Square and no conditions relating to the existing building. Data monitoring with regards to the use of the bridge would form part of the conditions and officers would have access to this data. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director also confirmed that Temporary Event Notice (TEN) applications would be made through the Licensing department, and that there were currently no restrictions on events, with Environmental Health complaints being the only existing recourse. In response to a question from a Member, the Committee was advised that the Environmental Health team had been consulted and were not aware of any previous complaints involving the location, although there had been some concern over plant noise investigated in the past.

A Member raised their concerns about the consultation process, the statutory consultation having been undertaken in 2020 during Covid-19, adding that whilst there may not have been an obligation to do so, the consultation should have been undertaken again as a courtesy, given much could change in two years. The Member queried whether the courtyard space was intended as amenity space for respite, or a hospitality space, as they objected to the implied hospitality element, which could be satisfied elsewhere, such as on roof terraces. A large number of people talking in an enclosed space would create a lot of noise, and noise mitigation measures would be difficult to enforce. The Member added that if the proposal was for a genuine amenity space to provide a peaceful place to the benefit of worker's mental health, this would be acceptable. The Member proposed several conditions to be added to prohibit alcohol, prevent the use of the space for hospitality, and limit access to between 10am and 6pm.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that the application was in respect of the bridge and the door to the courtyard, and that there were currently no restrictions on the use of the courtyard. The management plan would introduce wider restrictions with the current access times in line with office hours at 8am-7pm, with no access at weekends or on bank holidays, and would also allow for a range of measures to assist with management of the space if needed.

A Member commented that they welcomed the proposal as the space was underutilised and residents could be adequately protected. The Member queried what restriction on TEN events were in place, adding that sufficient detail would be required in the management plan to enable an appropriate level of enforcement. Another Member commented that they liked the idea of the proposal and asked whether conditions only applied to access via the bridge, or whether access via the previous route could also be controlled. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that condition 2 related to the link bridge and did not preclude other routes of access, whereas condition 3 related to the courtyard as a whole. The management plan would also cover the use of the courtyard.

A Member queried how much effort reconsulting would have taken, and the amount of prior notice that would have been required, before asking for further detail on enforcement. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that there was one dedicated planning enforcement officer, for whom details could be forwarded to Members. A statutory consultation had been undertaken, with letters, site notices and advertisements being circulated as required. A number of comments were received and were taken on board, although the length of time between the consultation and submission of the application was regrettable and officers had wished for it to be considered in shorter order.

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.

A Member commented that they endorsed the conditions suggested previously by a Member, the presentation having demonstrated residents' immediate proximity to the courtyard, meaning that noise was likely to be substantial. The Member added that there had been no significant use of the courtyard previously, and the purpose of the application was to increase usage. There were currently no restrictions because of the very limited use of the courtyard which was a natural control. The Member added that there had previously been a table tennis table in the courtyard which had had to be removed, and suggested that in addition to the management plan mitigation measures such as planters should be included, as there were listed buildings backing on to the courtyard which would have features such as single-pane windows. The Member said that there needed to be more recognition of the impact on residents in the vicinity and that the applicant could be doing more.

A Member commented that it was positive that the Committee had scope to add conditions on the courtyard, as this would change how the space was used. The Member added that such conditions had not been necessary before, and that they endorsed the conditions suggested and seconded by other Members on hours of access and restricting, also suggesting that condition 2 also be applied to the courtyard, and that numbers be always limited to a maximum of 50 people.

In response to a comment from a Member, the Chairman suggested that officers had received the Committee's steer on what should be included in the management plan, and that the Committee should not need to agree it in its entirety. Upon confirming that the conditions suggested previously around hours of access for the link bridge and courtyard, restricting usage for hospitality, permitted numbers and the consumption of alcohol were formally moved and seconded, the Chairman moved the Committee to a vote on the first three amendments, proposing that the consumption of alcohol be separated out, pending legal advice.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the proposed amendments to the conditions; that condition 2 should restrict use for hospitality and also be applied to the courtyard in addition to the link bridge, that the hours of access stated in condition 2 be amended to 10am-6pm, and that condition 4 be amended so that no more than 50 people were permitted at any time. Nineteen Members voted for the amendments, and 1 Member voted against the amendments, with no abstentions. The amendments were therefore agreed.

With regards to restricting the consumption of alcohol, the Comptroller and City Solicitor advised that this would be difficult to enforce or to justify on planning grounds. A Member commented that measures such as an Open Space Protection Order could be applied, and felt that such a restriction could be implemented successfully. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the proposed amendment to the conditions to prohibit the consumption of alcohol in the space, with 6 Members voting in favour of the amendment, 9 voting against the amendment, and three Members abstaining. The amendment was therefore lost.

A Member then suggested that the management plan also considered informatives on matters such as signage, smoking and lighting. The Deputy Chair responded that condition 5 was clear in this regard, and that the Committee had given its steer on the need to minimise disturbance. The Deputy Chair advised against introducing too many restrictions, as this may open the decision to challenge.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers would draft an informative to accompany the decision which would incorporate Member comments, and that elements such as planting and smoking would be taken into account.

Arising from the discussion, the Committee then proceeded to vote on the application, with conditions amended as per the Committee's agreement, with

12 Members voting in favour of the recommendations as amended, 3 members voting against the recommendations as amended, and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree that planning permission be **granted** for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule, as amended.

6. **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 The Turret, John Wesley Highwalk, Barbican. The Comptroller and City Solicitor introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points, also advising that it had been concluded that the Barbican Residential Committee and former Projects Sub Committee should not be named as having been involved in promoting the proposal. The Comptroller and City Solicitor therefore proposed that the report be amended to remove references to these committees within the recommendations, report and appended Handling Note. The Committee then moved to agree the recommendations, as amended, and these were agreed.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

1. Adopt the Handling Note in the Appendix to this Report, as amended;
2. Establish a Special Sub-committee with the following Terms of Reference: to determine planning application reference: 20/00271/FULL and associated Listed Building Consent application 20/00272/LBC;
3. That the Special Sub-committee sits following the rising of the Planning and Transportation on a date to be determined; and
4. That the Special Sub-committee be constituted of all Members of Planning and Transportation Committee other than those who were past members of the Corporate Asset Sub (Finance) Committee whilst that committees was responsible for bringing forward the planning application/proposal.

7. **BASSISHAW HIGHWALK CITY WALKWAY OBSTRUCTION FOR MORE THAN 3 MONTHS AND ASSOCIATED BRIDGE WORKS**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment requesting authority to grant a license for hoarding between 2 July 2022 - August 2025, which would restrict access to the Bassishaw Highwalk City Walkway over London Wall to enable the redevelopment of City Tower and City Place House which was granted planning permission on 29th September 2021 (21/00116/FULMAJ), and to allow officers to enter into a Bridge Agreement to authorise the construction of the new city walkway bridge over Basinghall Street. The Town Clerk advised that the officer's presentation had been circulated to Members in advance.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director then introduced the application to Members and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the details of the proposal and its wider implications, and outlining the reasons for the officer's recommendation. The officer's recommendation was that the Committee resolve to authorise officers to grant a license for hoarding.

In response to a question from a Member, the Executive Director of Environment advised that officers were working closely with the applicant's team and would make sure the scheme stayed on track in order to reopen by the proposed date. The Executive Director of Environment added that any extension of the closure would need to be brought back to the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- i) Authorises Officers to grant a license for hoarding for a period of three years (2 July 2022 - 31 August 2025) to obstruct access to Bassishaw Highwalk City Walkway over London Wall; and
- ii) That Officers be instructed to negotiate and authorised to enter into a Bridge Agreement with the developers to authorise the construction of the new city walkway bridge.

8. NEW YORK STUDY TRIP

The item was withdrawn.

In response to a question from a Member, the Chairman advised that a broader report on requirements in respect of study trips would be brought back to the Committee at a later stage.

9. MINUTES OF THE STREETS & WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE*

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting on 3 May 2022 and the draft minutes and non-public summary of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting on 31 May 2022 be noted.

10. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT*

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 23/05/2022 – 15/06/2022. In response to a question from a Member, the City Surveyor advised that works were progressing on the London Wall escalators, and that officers were still in dialogue with their owners. The Chairman asked that target dates for completion of the work and reopening of the escalators be provided ahead of the next meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

11. DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT BUSINESS PLAN PROGRESS REPORT Q4 2021/22*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Environment providing an update on progress made during Quarter 4 of 2021/22 against the

Department of the Built Environment's 2021/22 High-Level Business Plan, by the services which fall within the remit of the Committee. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

12. **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.

13. **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.

14. **OUTSTANDING ITEMS***

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out its list of Outstanding Actions and noted the updates provided.

RESOLVED – That the list of outstanding actions be noted.

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

A Member asked, going forward, how procedurally difficult or resource-intensive it would be to re-do a statutory consultation if the scheme had not been progressed after a year or more. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that it would be possible to do so, although officers were also wary of the risks of consultation fatigue, particularly where the proposals in question had not changed from that previously consulted on. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director acknowledged that the application in respect of 200 Aldersgate was an unusual case. The Deputy Chair added that all Members of the Court of Common Council were appraised of applications relevant to their ward and to some extent Ward Members were responsible for keeping their constituents updated.

A Member then requested that the Committee revert to having a distinct section for questions of officers within the procedure for considering applications, as they did not want to anticipate answers to questions asked during the debate. The Chairman responded that there had previously been issues with this previously caused by Members making statements that should have reserved for the debate during this period, creating a degree of conflation. The Chairman

added however that he was always willing to review Committee process and would take this into consideration for the next meeting.

With regards to meeting arrangements, a Member noted that the Chairman had sought the Committee's views on meeting arrangements via email. The Member voiced their strong opposition to any kind of limit on Member contributions, and asked when a public consultation on the Committee's governance arrangements would be undertaken, as well as seeking clarification on the threshold for objections before submitting an application to Committee. The Member then thanked officers for their response in respect of the Bury House application.

The Town Clerk confirmed that the Court of Common Council had agreed to raise the threshold for objections before an application was submitted to Committee as part of the revisions to the corporate Scheme of Delegations agreed at the meeting in December 2021.

The Chairman added that a report on the Committee's governance arrangements would be submitted to the Court of Common Council after the summer recess, adding that he had no intention of stifling debate and aimed to be inclusive, thanking the Member for expressing their view and inviting them to provide their view on other considerations alongside those surveyed.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business.

17. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

Item	Paragraph
18-19	3
20-21	-

18. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

19. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS & WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE*

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting on 3 May 2022 and the draft non-public minutes of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting on 31 May 2022 be noted.

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

There were no questions.

21. **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 1.16 pm

Chairman

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