

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 19 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)	Alderman Ian David Luder
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chair)	Antony Manchester
Brendan Barns	Alderman Bronek Masojada
Emily Benn	Deputy Brian Mooney
Ian Bishop-Laggett	Deborah Oliver
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Deputy Susan Pearson
John Edwards	Deputy Henry Pollard
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Luis Felipe Tilleria
Jaspreet Hodgson	Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia
Alderman Alastair King DL	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Gwyn Richards	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Paul Monaghan	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Bhakti Depala	- Environment Department
Neel Devlia	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Rachel Pye	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Pearl Figueira	- Environment Department
Joanna Parker	- Environment 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.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Alderman Alexander Barr, Deputy Keith Bottomley, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Deputy John Fletcher, Martha Grekos,

Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Deputy Edward Lord, Deputy Graham Packham, Judith Pleasance, Ian Seaton, Alethea Silk and William Upton.

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

Deputy Marianne Fredericks declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 4 by virtue of membership of the Board of Aldgate & Allhallows Foundation, which convened in the vicinity of the site.

Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Alderman Alistair King, Alderman Bronck Masojada and Deputy Sue Pearson each declared an interest in Items 5 and 6 by virtue of having previously considered the schemes as members of the Community & Children's Services Committee. The Members advised that they would withdraw from the meeting for the consideration of these items.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee noted that Deputy Henry Pollard had been listed within the attendance twice in error.

RESOLVED – That, pending this correction, the public minutes and non-public minutes of the meeting held on Friday 1 July 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

A Member advised that they had received a direct correspondence from a resident regarding the lack of re-consultation on the application in respect of 200 Aldersgate, and asked whether this had been responded to by officers.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that the correspondence in question had been processed as a late representation and that it had been addressed in the officer's report. However, a direct response would also be provided.

4. **BOUNDARY HOUSE, 7-17 JEWRY STREET, LONDON EC3N 2EX**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of Boundary House, 7-17 Jewry Street, London EC3N 2EX – specifically, the demolition of the building and the erection of a basement, ground plus part 14 storey and part six storey building plus plant comprising of a 311 bedroom hotel with a ground floor cafe/bar and roof top restaurant (Use Class C1) and office floorspace (Use Class E) at part ground and part first floor with ancillary community uses, hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking and associated works.

The Town Clerk advised that an addendum containing late representations and an updated whole life carbon assessment, 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.

Rudolf Ploberger, on behalf of the Ploberger Group, addressed the Committee in support of the application. The Committee was provided with an introduction to the applicant and their recent history, which since 2010 had involved a number of schemes in London converting buildings into hotels. The applicant had successfully delivered large international hotels with a focus on community hubs.

Richard Ploberger, on behalf of the Ploberger Group, also addressed the Committee in support of the application. The Committee heard that the applicant had worked with officers to create a new and different scheme focussed on creativity and culture, featuring a combined co-working space and a commitment to making free-to-use spaces available to local groups. The scheme would also target a BREEAM rating of Excellent.

Dan Burr, on behalf of Sheppard Robson, also addressed the Committee in support of the application. The Committee heard that the scheme would support evening and weekend activity, in line with the Destination City initiative. The project would provide an appropriate solution for an infill site and replace a building that was inflexible to change. The new façade would bring better shaping, and the scheme would create seating and greening at ground level, as well as a co-working and cultural facility, restaurant and bar on the fourteenth floor. The design of the scheme reflected and evolved the character of the local area, and the wall colours complemented the listed building nearby.

The Chairman then invited questions of those speaking in support of the application. In response to a question from the Chairman, the applicant advised that the ground floor was intended to have an inclusive and welcoming ethos, with accessible entrances at each end, and provision for disabled parking on Carlisle Avenue. With regards to the impact on daylight, the applicant advised that whilst there was a need to balance this impact, the location could sustain increased density, and this had been accounted for throughout the design development, with studies forming part of the application. Given the location, it was not unusual for such a scheme to have an impact on daylight, and the benefits of the scheme outweighed any harm.

A Member asked what the scheme could contribute towards making the area a destination, either at street level or on site, and commented that the Committee should include within a S278 agreement commitments to improve the surrounding area. The applicant responded that the building had been sculpted in a way that included seating and planting, as well as the community facility on the ground floor.

Another Member commented that the pledge to facilitate ten hours of free use per week for community groups was disappointing and ought to be improved upon. The Member asked when RPI indexing would start being applied to the

discounted provision, and suggested that during periods when the space was not booked, additional discounted community use should be allowed. The Member then then sought assurances that motion detectors would be provided throughout the site to minimise lighting in unoccupied rooms. The applicant confirmed that sensors would be installed to reduce energy consumption and light pollution, and that RPI indexing would start at the granting of planning permission for the scheme. With regards to the community facility, the Committee was advised that ten hours of free use each for community groups and for higher educational use would be provided, but the applicant was committed to working with officers and would consider increasing this provision, to be secured by S106 agreement. The applicant was also willing to offer additional discounted use for these groups when the facility was not booked.

In response to a question from a Member, the applicant advised that the rooftop would not be accessible to the public, with the greening aiming to provide more biodiversity. However, more greening would be provided with the 14th-floor restaurant and bar. Street trees had also been explored as part of the scheme, but the pavement in the vicinity was found to be too narrow, so other greening would be provided at street level. The existing building bridged over Carlisle Avenue, and a vaulted feature would open up and draw people into the area, facilitating further improvement to the area. The Committee was also advised that the stepped seating area would be made up of double-height steps, which would hopefully be clearly for use as seating.

The Chairman then invited the Committee to ask questions of officers. A Member asked whether amendments had been made to the design and massing of the scheme that would minimise the daylight/sunlight impact on the student residential building nearby. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that this was the case, and that officers had worked to reduce the height of the scheme. The massing had also been reduced on the south side which reduced the impact on the student residential building. In response to a supplementary question regarding the co-working space, the Chief Operating Officer advised that the hotel operator would manage the space, which would be secured by S106 agreement, with a management plan.

In response to a question from a Member, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that the applicant had followed the whole life carbon draft advice note, and had considered a range of options. The results provided were reasonable and the scheme would have a lower carbon impact than a completely new building. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director also advised that there was clear demand in the hotel development sector and that both hotel and office accommodation would be needed going forward.

A Member commented that the Committee should not try to outguess the market, and that diversity would be needed in the pipeline, with the market deciding whether particular development was needed. The Member asked whether the configuration could be changed to include more footway and other ways to change the surrounding area. The Chief Planning Officer and

Development Director advised that this could be built into negotiations for the S278 and S106 agreements. In response to a related comment from a Member, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers monitored the percentage of approved applications that proceeded to completion and could compile this data for the Committee's information.

The Committee then proceed to debate the application. A Member commented that the ward was mixed between business, hotels and residents, and that there should be a push to have more greening and pedestrianisation in the area, as the area was very busy at the weekend. The community use aspects of this and other developments should also be pushed to achieve maximum provision.

A Member expressed their support for the application, but urged officers to account for the Committee's comments in negotiating the S106 agreement and conditions around lighting. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that this would be taken into account.

Arising from the discussion, the Chairman moved the Committee to a vote. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations as amended, with 19 Members voting for the recommendation, no Members voting against the amended recommendation, and no Members abstaining. The recommendations were therefore agreed.

RESOLVED – That planning permission be **granted** for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to:

- (a) Planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed; and
- (b) 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.

5. **347 CRESCENT HOUSE, GOLDEN LANE ESTATE, EC1Y 0SN**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of Flat 347, Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, EC1Y 0SN – specifically, the alterations to and replacement of existing single-glazed windows and framing structure for a temporary period of 2 years to sequentially test double and triple glazing options.

The Town Clerk advised that an addendum containing amendments to the report and 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.

Jason Hayes, on behalf of the City of London Corporation, addressed the Committee in support of the application. The proposals represented a once in a lifetime opportunity to undertake a pilot project, with a planned sequence of works aimed for completion within 2 years. The scheme was an important step to resolving current issues, with the existing windows around 60 years old and at the end of their serviceable life. Resident feedback suggested the existing windows contributed towards fuel poverty, poor acoustics, heat loss and solar gain, and the pilot project would seek to address these issues.

Will South, on behalf of Etude, also addressed the Committee in support of the application. The existing units at Crescent House were responsible for significant carbon emissions and needed to improve their efficiency. The proposals aimed to reduce heat loss and improve air quality and energy demand, and would provide quick payback on whole life carbon.

Richard Partington, on behalf of Studio Partington, also addressed the Committee in support of the application. The Committee heard that discussions had demonstrated that there were strong views about the proposals, and that the applicant wished to reconcile differing points being made. The aim of the proposals was to provide substance and demonstrate the need for a wider scheme, within the constraints of a listed building and heritage asset. Whilst it was regrettable that the façade could not be restored as part of the proposals, the replacement option presented was a good one. The two-step pilot process was essential for assessing and demonstrating the need for a wider scheme.

The Chairman then invited questions from those speaking in support of the application. In response to a question from a Member, the Committee was advised that the impact for residents if the scheme were not approved would be demonstrated through the pilot scheme, which would provide the information required on the effect of double or triple glazing options. The pilot scheme would also be used to measure the disruption for residents as well as the impact on the homes. In response to a related question, the applicant confirmed Flat 347 had been chosen as it was a void flat, with good existing timber, which would be informative as to the accuracy of the survey, and as the flat was on the upper floors and on the façade side, it would be useful for assessing noise and other variables.

In response to a question from a Member, the applicant advised that void flats were hard to come by and this was currently the only one available, which fit the requirements for testing. Different ways of undertaking the pilot scheme could be considered with a view to condensing the timeframe or increasing and improving learning from the proposals, with the scheme itself also being a

learning process. The applicant also confirmed that vacuum double-glazing would form part of the pilot installation.

The Chairman then invited those making representations in objection to the scheme to address the Committee. Sarah O'Connor, on behalf of residents, addressed the Committee in objection to the recommendations. The Committee was advised that residents were supportive of improved windows and did not wish to hold up the project, but as the project would affect all of Crescent House, residents wanted to work with the applicant and had already done so to make the scheme acceptable. Residents had looked carefully at the information provided and had reached a collective position. The Committee heard that 81% of residents surveyed wanted the windows to be refurbished, with vacuum double-glazing, and only 4% wanted triple-glazing. The Committee was urged therefore to prevent Stage 2 of the proposals from going ahead.

Gavin Hutchison, on behalf of residents, also addressed the Committee in objection to the recommendations. Whilst residents supported improvements, the building was Grade II* listed and window replacement would cause substantial harm, and did not meet the test for justification on the basis of exceptional circumstances. A condition survey had found the timber to be sound, and the issue had been a lack of maintenance to rectify minor defects. Refurbishment would be faster than replacement, and the triple-glazing option would cause the highest amount of embedded carbon between the available options. The solution proposed was vacuum double-glazing, as it was thin and light, and ideally suited to heritage projects such as this one.

Jacqueline Swanson, on behalf of residents, then addressed the Committee in objection to the recommendations. The Committee heard that residents wanted the work to be undertaken as soon as possible, but triple-glazing would be destructive and cause excessive disruption. The listed status of the building should be respected, and there were multiple benefits to the refurbishment approach. This was an opportunity for all stakeholders and inspire confidence in the scheme. Residents would support vacuum double-glazing, and the approval of the scheme with several conditions attached, which were set out for the Committee.

The Chairman then invited questions of those speaking in objection to the application. In response to a question from a Member regarding repairs, the objectors advised that there had not been a significant maintenance to the windows for fourteen years, despite a history of maintenance issues.

The Chairmen then invited Ward Members to address the Committee. Mark Bostock, in his capacity as a Ward Member, addressed the Committee regarding the application. The Committee heard that the windows were in a bad state due to a lack of maintenance, and this had impacted the wellbeing of residents. This had been a significant issue for some time and had been raised before, which was acknowledged by the City of London Corporation. It was not correct to suggest that the issue had only arisen within the last 2 years. The Committee had received a number of good-quality objections which should be taken into account, as well as the presentations given by residents addressing

the Committee. The survey of residents cited had received a good number of responses and was clear that the will of residents was for repairs and vacuum double-glazing, and it was hoped that the Committee would accept and apply the conditions suggested by residents. If these were not satisfactory, then the scheme could proceed to Stage 2 as planned.

Anne Corbett then addressed the Committee in her capacity as a Ward Member. Whilst there was no doubt that the windows needed improvement, the residents had explained their objections clearly, and the majority of window frames could be replaced. Residents did not want further delay due to the effect of heat loss and high energy bills, but wanted the best solution possible. Mention of a project to repair the windows could be found fourteen years ago, so was long overdue, but triple-glazing was not the solution, as it had no demonstrable benefit, and residents had put forward a good proposal regarding vacuum double-glazing. The Committee was urged to properly consider the residents' proposal and work closely with them, and was shown examples of triple-glazed glass compared with vacuum double-glazed. Cost and environmental factors also needed to be taken into consideration.

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

The Chairman then invited the Committee to ask questions of officers. A Member asked how the situation had gotten to this stage, as it was indicative of a breakdown in communications or a disconnect between officers and residents. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that issue of engagement was more relevant to the applicant, as planning officers had only acted on the submitted application, on which consultation had been carried out. Responses to the application had then been addressed.

A Member asked whether officers had any issue with the conditions proposed by residents, and if not, proposed that the Committee accept them. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers had only received the proposed conditions recently, but did not have an issue with them, adding that they could be incorporated alongside the existing conditions, particularly conditions 6 and 9. Condition 9 could be suitably used to prevent the application proceeding without permission following assessment.

Members noted that there appeared to be agreement on the need for repairs, and that the contentious point was around triple-glazing, and asked whether the applicant objected to the vacuum double-glazing option proposed, and what differences there would be between the two options. The applicant responded that whilst vacuum double-glazing was attractive, the objectors had overlooked the risk of leaking around the frame with vacuum double-glazed windows. Whilst there were advantages and the applicant was not against the technology, it needed to be tested and therefore the application advocated undertaking the necessary testing and making objective measurements.

A Member commented that they were still unclear as to why the pilot scheme testing needed to be done sequentially, and proposed that condition 9 be amended so that any use of the phrase 'double-glazing' meant both conventional and vacuum double-glazing for testing. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers were satisfied with the proposed amendment.

The Committee then proceeded to debate the application. The Chairman commented that there were question marks surrounding the history of the issues at hand and the process which had led to this point, and that the Committee should not be agreeing specifics with this many outstanding questions. However, the proposals were for a pilot project, which would provide an evidence base and address some of the outstanding issues ahead of a more substantive scheme. The Chairman reiterated his support for the proposed amendment to condition 9, commenting that this would increase the scope of the trial and better inform the outcomes.

A Member commented that Stage 2 of the pilot project also seemed to be contentious, and queried whether the matter should return to Committee before proceeding. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that ordinarily this would be delegated, but it was understandable that on this occasion it might be preferred for the matter to return to Committee.

A Member commented that the proposals were for an experiment on a flat suited to that purpose, and that it was not good science to fix an experiment in order to achieve a desired outcome. A number of variables would be measured and assessed as part of the pilot project, including heat, energy, moisture, pollution and noise levels, all of which were connected to the airtightness of the windows, which the project would ultimately seek to maximise. The pilot project was about experimentation and if the results were not good, they would not be rolled out more widely.

Arising from the discussion, the Chairman moved the Committee to vote on the application, beginning with the proposed amendments to the conditions; that condition 9 be amended so that any reference to 'double-glazing' should mean both conventional and vacuum double-glazing. Sixteen Members voted in favour of the amendment, with no Members voting against the amendment, and no abstentions. The amendment was therefore agreed.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the application, with conditions amended as per the Committee's agreement, with 11 Members voting in favour, 4 voting against and no abstentions. The recommendations were therefore agreed.

RESOLVED – That Planning Permission be **granted** for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

a) **Listed Building Consent - 347 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, London EC1Y 0SN**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director requesting listed building consent for the replacement of the existing single glazed windows to Flat 347, Crescent House.

RESOLVED - That Listed Building Consent be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

6. **MIDDLESEX STREET ESTATE, LONDON E1**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director in respect of the Middlesex Street Estate, London E1 – specifically, the installation of external horizontal and vertical pipework across the site including: five vertical risers and pipework at levels two (podium level), four and six; elements of which will be boxed in and painted to match background materials.

The Town Clerk advised that 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.

Jason Hayes, on behalf of the City of London Corporation, addressed the Committee in support of the application. The proposals would facilitate heating and cold water internally, as the existing system was around 50 years old and at the end of its expected lifetime. The new system would be more efficient, save on running costs and make billing more accurate, as well as improving hygiene and reduce the risk of equipment failure.

The Chairman invited questions from the Committee of those speaking in support of the application, and there being none, then moved the Committee to debate the application. A Member commented that they understood why the scheme was being proposed, but that the scheme was hideous, and represented a poor delegation of standards. The Member added that the plans would be different elsewhere and would not be possible on the Barbican or Golden Lane Estates, and for those reasons they could not support it.

Arising from the discussion, the Chairman moved the Committee to a vote. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations, with 8 Members voting in favour of the recommendations, 2 Members voting against the recommendations, and 4 abstentions. The recommendations were therefore agreed.

RESOLVED - That planning permission be **granted** for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

7. PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk, the Executive Director of Environment and the Comptroller and City Solicitor considering how the functions of the Planning and Transportation Committee can be most effectively discharged, and recommending the establishment of a Planning Applications Sub-Committee to address the issues of (i) allowing Planning and Transportation Committee to major on strategic and policy issues; and (ii) planning application decisions on land or buildings for which Planning and Transportation Committee has responsibility. The Comptroller and City Solicitor introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points, adding that it was intended to put the matter to the Court of Common Council for consideration in September, and that the Planning Protocol would be updated if the report were agreed.

The Chairman commented that the proposals offered a chance to improve the Committee's democratic process, ensure a direct focus on applications, and increase time for the Committee to consider strategic and policy matters. The Chairman added that the separation out of planning applications was a positive step and in accordance with the recommendations of the Lisvane Review. The proposals also aimed to prevent overburden with regards to meetings.

A Member commented that they were pleased to see the notion of panels or a regional split dropped, but queried whether the Committee's non-application workload could be condensed into 4 quarterly meetings, given that they approximated that 93% of the Committee's decisions were strategic or non-application decisions. The Member added that they were concerned this would be insufficient and would lead to issues such as missed consultation deadlines, so robust and transparent agenda planning would be required. The Member advised that overall they supported proposals on a trial basis, but advised that if it became apparent that more frequent Grand Committee meetings were required, this should be changed without delay.

A Member commented that they supported the proposals, and that separating applications from other discussions would allow the Committee to do a better job with both and give applications their full commitment and concentration. If more than 4 Grand Committee meetings were needed, then this could be adjusted. Another Member suggested 6 Grand Committee meetings as a starting point, noting that the applications sub-committee may not require 13 meetings a year, although this would not always be possible to plan perfectly.

A Member then queried whether the arrangements for public speaking facilitated a fair balance and suggested that the protocol be reviewed for possible improvements. The Member also suggested whether the current arrangements facilitated sufficient diversity and inclusion, and that arrangements elsewhere could be looked at for any allowances made in respect of this.

The Chairman advised that the necessary assessment on equality, diversity and inclusion with respect to the Planning Protocol and speaking arrangements could be undertaken and brought back separately. The Chairman further noted Members' views regarding the frequency of Grand Committee meetings, and suggested that the proposals be for no less than 4 meetings, to be reviewed after twelve months. The Chairman advised that the Policy & Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council would have discretion to amend the proposals, and added his hope that Members would support the Committee's resolution in those fora.

Arising from the discussion, the Chairman moved the Committee to a vote, with the proposals amended to make explicit that the Grand Committee would meet at least 4 times per year. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations as amended, with 15 Members voting in favour, no Members voting against, and no abstentions. The recommendations were therefore agreed.

RESOLVED - That the Planning and Transportation Committee resolve to recommend to Court of Common Council:

1. The establishment of a Planning Applications Sub-Committee to determine all planning and listed building consent applications not delegated to officers under the Scheme of Delegation (with all other functions within the Terms of Reference of the Planning and Transportation Committee not delegated to officers continuing to be exercised by that Committee or any other Sub-committees to which it delegates functions);
2. That the membership, Chairmanship and Deputy Chairmanship of and arrangements for the Planning Applications Sub-Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee be as set out in the "Proposals" section of this report, as amended to state that the Grand Committee will meet at least 4 times a year;
3. That the Town Clerk, Executive Director Environment and Comptroller and City Solicitor be delegated to prepare such amendments to the Planning Protocol as may be necessary to give effect of Recommendations 1 & 2 and to report them to Planning and Transportation Committee (which shall be delegated the function of approving the Planning Protocol prior to implementation of the arrangements); and
4. That any further updating of the Planning Protocol be delegated to Planning and Transportation Committee.

8. **TRANSPORT FOR LONDON CONSULTATIONS: BUS ROUTE CHANGES CENTRAL LONDON AND ULEZ EXPANSION AND ROAD USER CHARGING**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment setting out the changes to bus routes in the City arising from two Transport for London (TfL) consultation exercises, and potential issues. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and advised that the report had been approved by the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee.

A Member commented that buses were the only form of accessible transport for the elderly and disabled, and the loss of any bus routes would be seriously detrimental. Another Member stated that accessible, affordable infrastructure was important for the City of London, and that the City of London Corporation should be pushing the government to provide more support for TfL. Buses should be properly funded and not cut, and the proposed changes would cause further problems later.

The Deputy Chair commented that the equality of opportunity should be provided as part of the Local Plan, and that a message should be sent to TfL that any reduction to the bus network was an issue, and that buses needed to run continuously throughout the day. The Deputy Chair added that in his view the proposals should not be progressed. A Member commented that the representations agreed by Streets & Walkways Sub Committee included objections to the removal of the 502 route, as a route between Waterloo and the City of London was key, and asked that this be added to the objections.

The Chairman advised that Members' sentiments were being by numerous other London boroughs, and that he was clear, as the organisation's representative on the London Councils Transport and Environment Committee, that the message in respect of TfL needed to be retained and persisted with. The Executive Director of Environment added that affordability and accessibility were referenced in the proposed response, but that this could be strengthened, with a response to TfL to be provided as part of the formal consultations. The Chairman then drew the Committee's attention to the recommendations, which were agreed.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- i) Approve the proposed response to the consultation on proposed changes to bus routes, set out in paragraph 17;
- ii) Delegate the final wording of the response to the Director of City Operations in consultation with the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee and the Planning & Transportation Committee;
- iii) Approve the proposed response to the consultation on proposed expansion of the ULEZ and future road user charging, set out in paragraphs 25 and 26; and

- iv) Delegate the final wording of the response to the Director of City Operations in consultation with the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee and the Planning & Transportation Committee and the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee.

9. **LONDON WALL CAR PARK JOINTS AND WATERPROOFING**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment regarding a project to carry out essential waterproofing and repair works to the highway structure, in order to maintain structural integrity, utility and asset value at London Wall Car Park.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

1. Agree that additional budget of £ 129,000 is approved for staff costs, fees and investigations, as Table 1 below, in order to reach the next Gateway;
 2. Note the revised project budget of £ 141,000 (excluding risk) up to Gateway 5, including for costs expended prior to Gateway 3/4;
 3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £1,784,000 (excluding risk);
 4. Agree that delegated authority is given to Chief Officer to appoint the successful contractor at Gateway 5 and to instruct the Comptroller and City Solicitor to enter into contract, subject to tendered works costs remaining within the £1,600,000 estimate provided by this report (or to instruct under the new highways term contract subject to satisfactory agreement of costs and the same proviso);
 5. That a Costed Risk Provision of £25,000 is approved at this stage to cover unforeseen conditions during further investigations, to be drawn down via delegation to the Assistant Director Engineering;
 6. That a total Costed Risk Provision of £200,000 is approved for use following Gateway 5, subject to tender costs remaining within budget, for expenditure against identified sums from the project risk registers against specified risks at the construction stage and to be drawn down to the Assistant Director Engineering; and
 7. That Option 3 is approved (implementation of waterproofing, expansion joint replacement and internal structural concrete repairs).
10. **CONTINUED SUPPORT OF THE CITY HOSPITALITY SECTOR: AL FRESCO EATING AND DRINKING - BUSINESS AND PLANNING ACT EXTENSION 2022**
- The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment providing a summary of pavement licences currently granted and outlines proposals for the continuation of the pavement licence application process until

30 September 2023. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points, also advising that there would be full consultation regarding a permanent regime.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

1. Agree the continuation of the streamlined reapplication process as outlined in paragraph 11 of this report;
2. Agree the pavement licence duration period as outlined in paragraph 13 (a) of this report; and
3. Agree the continued zero fee for all pavement licence applications as outlined in paragraph 13 (b) of this report.

11. LONDON RENTAL E-SCOOTER TRIAL AND DOCKLESS VEHICLE UPDATE*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Environment providing an update on the London rental e-scooter trial and dockless vehicles.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

12. DISTRICT SURVEYORS ANNUAL REPORT 2021/22*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Environment updating the committee on the workings of the District Surveyor's office which reports to it for the purposes of building control, engineering services for the City's major infrastructure and to provide resilience to buildings and businesses within the square mile that maybe affected by climatic and environmental risks.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13. CONSULTATION STRATEGY FOR THE PLANNING ADVICE NOTE: WHOLE LIFECYCLE CARBON OPTIONEERING*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Environment report providing information on the consultation strategy for the Whole Lifecycle Carbon Optioneering Planning Advice Note and setting out the consultation requirements for this type of document, as well as summarising the bespoke approach that is being taken for this Planning Advice Note.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

14. REVENUE OUTTURN 2021/22*

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain, the Executive Director of Environment and the City Surveyor comparing the revenue outturn for the services overseen by the Committee in 2021/22 with the final budget for the year.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

15. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT***

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 16/06/2022 – 03/07/2022.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

16. **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.

17. **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.

18. **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.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no other business.

21. **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
22, 24	3
23	5
25-26	-

22. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

23. NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX - PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

The Committee considered a non-public appendix in conjunction with Item 7.

24. WALBROOK WHARF FEASIBILITY 2027 AND BEYOND

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor and the Executive Director of Environment.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 1.51 pm

Chairman

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