

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 18 July 2023

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)	Antony Manchester
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Brian Mooney
Deputy Randall Anderson	Deborah Oliver
Brendan Barns	Deputy Henry Pollard
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Ian Seaton
Mary Durcan	Hugh Selka
John Edwards	Luis Felipe Tilleria
Deputy John Fletcher	Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen	

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Dipti Patel	-	Chamberlain's Department
Ben Eley	-	Environment Department
Pearl Figueira	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	-	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	-	Environment Department
Bob Roberts	-	Environment Department
Michelle Rowland	-	Environment Department
Peter Wilson	-	Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Anthony Fitzpatrick, Dawn Frampton, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Jaspreet Hodgson, Deputy Edward Lord, Deputy Alastair Moss, Alderwoman Jennette Newman and Alderwoman Susan Pearson.

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

In relation to Agenda Item 6 – Proposed Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum and Area, Mary Durcan and Deputy Randall Anderson

stated they lived in the Barbican and Alderman Sir David Wootton stated he owned an apartment in the Barbican and Golden Lane proposed area. They had taken advice from Officers who had confirmed they could take part in the consideration of this item.

In relation to Agenda Item 8 – Creechurch Conservation Area Proposal, Deputy Fredericks stated that she had been appointed as Governor of Aldgate School.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes of the previous meetings held on 11 May 2023 and 21 June 2023, be approved as an accurate record.

MATTERS ARISING

The Clerk stated that in relation to the 11 May 2023 minutes – Appointments to the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee had since been advised that he did not have a conflict of interest and would therefore be taking up his position on the Committee.

4. **WARDMOTE RESOLUTION**

(a) To consider the following resolution from the Ward of Aldersgate – 14 March 2023:

“The Aldersgate Wardmote deplores the dangerous use of pavements and walkways by bicycles and scooters and electric versions thereof and urges the Grand Court of Wardmote to take action to prevent such abuse of the pavements and walkways”

An Officer stated that this related to enforcement and activities to tackle the unsafe and illegal riding of cycles and e-scooters on the pavement. The Officer stated that enforcement was a policing matter, but Officers were working closely with the police, including through regular meetings of the Road Danger Reduction Partnership. In addition, the Vision Zero Plan was due to be considered by the Committee in October 2023 and would contain details of work with the police around safer behaviours. Enforcement figures were also contained in the Annual Report on the Transport Strategy included in the information pack.

Members discussed sharing the resolution with the Police Authority Board and the Chairman requested that an Officer take ownership of the matter to ensure action was taken. An Officer confirmed this would be the case and stated that the Vision Zero Plan would be submitted to both the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Police Authority Board and had been developed jointly with the Police.

A Member raised the issue of dockless cycles, in particular Lime bikes, being left in non-designated parking areas. An Officer stated that the progress made with Lime and Human Forest had been considered by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee recently. Both operators fined those who left bikes in non-designated areas and issued bans for repeated offences. The Officer

stated that the reports considered by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee could be shared with Members. He stated that Officers worked closely with operators to address and improve their compliance and London Councils were also working on this. The Chairman stated that he and the Deputy Chairman had met with Lime in-person and discussed concerns. Lime was working to address these. He also stated that London Councils were trying to formulate a unified approach across all London boroughs. A Member stated the importance of signage that stated the rules, so users were fully informed.

A Member asked how members of the public should report a bike parked in a non-designated parking area and raised concern that if they reported it to Lime, Officers would not know about it or be able to monitor progress. She also raised concern that performance may have improved prior to the contract being extended but it was important this continued afterwards. An Officer stated that the quickest way to have the bike removed would be to notify the operator. Officers received the figures of Lime's response rate and the number of bikes they identified as having been left outside of parking bays and these would continue to be reported back to the Streets and Walkways Committee. Officers also reported bikes and monitored this against the figures provided by the operators. The Member requested that information on contact details for reporting bikes out of bays be provided on the website. She also stated the importance of cost recovery.

A Member suggested that penalty parking notices should be issued. An Officer stated that the recent reports to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee which would be circulated to Members, included the details of legal enforcement. Dockless cycles fell through a legislative gap so there was no way to regulate them without a change in national legislation. This would take some time. The City had always required dockless cycles to be left in designated parking bays, work was taking place with operators to improve compliance and pay for additional parking recovery. In addition to circulating the recent reports, Officers were willing to arrange briefings or meetings with Members if requested. A Member stated that she was supportive of a briefing for Members.

(b) To consider the following resolutions from the Ward of Candlewick – 20 March 2023

(i) “The Ward of Candlewick commented that they were keen to continue working closely and collaboratively with officers at the City Corporation to get the maximum impact for the Ward of Candlewick from a public realm perspective, and to develop and deliver a plan that would work well long term and provide accessible and user-friendly streets across the City.”

An Officer stated that there was a current project looking at King William Street as part of the Pedestrian Priority Programme which would deliver pavement widening and public realm improvements once the Bank Junction works were completed in spring 2024. There would then be further opportunities around Abchurch Lane as the development over the new underground entrance came

forward in the Section 278 opportunities. The Officer stated that these opportunities would be submitted to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee for approval and monitoring.

(ii) “With regard to progress of the building development on Abchurch Lane, the Ward of Candlewick asked that this matter be raised with the City Corporation’s officers and an update provided in a future Candlewick Ward Newsletter. In the event that the project was unlikely to be completed in the near future, scope to have the hoardings updated would also be explored with officers from the Planning and Transportation Department.”

An Officer stated that this item related to the over station development at Bank Station and the existing blue hoardings on Abchurch Lane onto Cannon Street and King William Street. The Ward Members had requested that discussions be undertaken with TfL to improve the hoarding. Discussions were taking place and Officers were awaiting a TfL response and hoped for a positive resolution to improve the aesthetics. Officers would report back in due course.

RESOLVED – That Members note the wardmote resolutions and request Officers to report back to the next meeting on the progress made against the wardmote resolutions.

5. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out the list of Outstanding Actions.

The Chairman stated that there would be a report back and Planning Advice Note by the end of the year in relation to Item 1 Daylight/Sunlight Guidance and therefore this was no longer an outstanding item.

A Member informed the Committee that the Historic England website contained a number of Planning Advice Notes and suggested inviting a representative from Historic England to conduct a Member training session.

An Officer reminded Members of the visit to 8 Bishopsgate on 19 July and encouraged Members to attend. He also stated that in the autumn, there would be a timetable of visits to completed developments including a presentation on site by Mola of the archaeological excavations of the churchyard of All Hallows Staining as part of the 50 Fenchurch Street development where archaeology was currently being unearthed.

A Member requested that, if possible, the proposed Historic England training session and visits be arranged outside of working hours e.g. after 5pm so more Members could attend.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

1. note the report;
2. request Officers remove Item 1 – Daylight/Sunlight Guidance from future Outstanding Actions reports; and

3. request Officers to invite a representative from Historic England to provide a training session for Members.

6. **PROPOSED BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM AND AREA**

The Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director which set out the proposal for a Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum and Area.

Members were informed that an application had been submitted by a group of residents living in the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates, proposing a neighbourhood area and forum. If designated, this would be the first neighbourhood forum and area within the City.

An Officer outlined the statutory framework contained within the report and informed Members that Local Authorities had 13 weeks to determine an application after it being publicised. The date for this application was 8 August 2023.

Members were informed that for a valid application, the proposed forum must have met the four requirements in legislation. Their purpose must be for promoting or improving the social, economic and environmental well-being of an area. Membership would include people who lived or worked in an area and elected Members. It must have a written constitution. The proposed area covered the Barbican and Golden Lane estates and neighbouring areas and the area covered a wide range of uses including, residential, business, cultural and green spaces. Submission of an area application must include a map which identified the area and a statement that the organisation was a relevant body. The application had to provide justification for the boundaries and detail the cohesion of the proposed area including how the community groups operated together, common physical features which defined a natural boundary, the natural setting and the relationship to existing planning policies. The Officer stated that the majority of comments through consultation were in full support of the area and 78% of people agreed with the proposed area unaltered. The key reasons of support for the area were that it focused on an area with important issues to residents such as traffic, the environment and development. It recognised geographically tight relationships between the residential and cultural areas, contained Postman's Park and the Barbican Wildlife Garden as important local green spaces and it followed ward boundaries.

The Officer stated that the Corporation had undertaken public consultation for six weeks from 9 May 2023 to 21 June 2023 to gather public feedback on the proposal. 122 responses were received and then majority were positive and supportive. 93% of respondents were in full support of the application. Approximately three-quarters of respondents who supported the area, supported it as proposed. Officers recommended the forum and area be designated.

Liz Hurst, a member of the neighbourhood forum addressed the Committee. She stated that this was the first neighbourhood forum in the City. The consultation had shown the level of support. Ms Hurst informed Members that the owners of One Silk Street had withdrawn their objection and provided a revised representation of support. She stated that this demonstrated that the forum was not anti-development.

Ms Hurst stated that the constitution met the legislative requirements for designation. Following legal advice, it had been decided that the northern boundary should be the same as the City's boundary as otherwise it would be too complex operationally to work with two planning authorities. Consultation had included talking to representative groups, running briefing meetings, sending out briefing packs and holding a drop-in session at Golden Lane. Stakeholder engagement had included cultural bodies, institutions, workers and local businesses as well as local businesses. Further consultation would take place following designation.

Members of the public and residents who had worked on this proposal were thanked for their work.

Seeing no questions from Members, the Chairman asked that the Committee proceed to vote on the recommendations before them.

The Committee voted on these recommendations.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 19 Votes
OPPOSED – none
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

RESOLVED – That Members designate the proposed Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area.

7. **BLACKFRIAR'S BRIDGEHEAD CITY WALKWAY VARIATION**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning the proposal to exclude from the city walkway the area needed for the relocation of the TfL control cabinet which was being displaced so that Thames Tideway works could be appropriately accommodated.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

1. vary the resolution of the Court of Common Council made on 28 May 1998 by making a resolution in the form appended to the officer report as Appendix 3A and 3B; and
2. delegate to the City Operations Director (City Streets and Spaces) authority to insert into the resolution an appropriate date for the coming into force of the variation.

8. **CREECHURCH CONSERVATION AREA PROPOSAL**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning a proposed draft conservation area boundary and supporting conservation area proposal.

Members were informed that the proposal area had been drawn up following detailed characterisation work that had taken place as part of the evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan and via a specific request from representatives of the Bevis Marks Synagogue.

Members were shown a map of the proposed area which was bound broadly by Bevis Marks, Dukes Place and St Botolph's in the North, Bury Street and Creechurch Lane in the West and Leadenhall and Aldgate High Street in the east.

The Officer stated that the proposed area differed in spatial scope from that proposed by the Synagogue's representatives for the reasons set out in the conservation area proposal report which was appended to the Officer report. Members were shown photographs of the area. The Officer stated that the area comprised a diverse townscape of buildings from the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. There were 19th century warehouses which comprised the core of the conservation area, some of which had been converted to residential with commercial properties at ground floor and some of which were Grade 2 listed. There were three principle places of worship in the area including the Bevis Mark's Synagogue, the Guild Church of St Katharine Cree, and St Botolph's Church, all of which were listed Grade 2.

It was proposed that public consultation be carried out on the proposals for a new 'Creechurch Conservation Area' over late Summer and early Autumn 2023, with the aim of reporting the results back to the Committee before the end of the calendar year. The consultation was proposed to be held for eight weeks and would be carried out in accordance with Historic England guidance and the City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement (2023).

Katherine McCullough who headed up Merchant Land which had owned 33 Creechurch Lane since 1994, addressed the Committee. She stated they were keen to find a future, which would include redevelopment, for the outdated commercial building. Ms McCollough stated that as local landlords and freeholders who were considering development options for their site, they were supportive in principle of the proposals to establish the new Creechurch Conservation Area. She stated that the planning history at their own site had been challenging and complex and therefore they saw this as an opportunity to provide well-considered guidance for decision makers, officers, land-owners and local stakeholders.

Ms McCollough further stated that the assessments undertaken by both Officers and representatives of Bevis Marks Synagogue highlighted the rich history and modern cultural life. She commented that there was much to be celebrated and the new conservation area offered an opportunity to protect heritage assets and identify enhancements to the overall proposed conservation area through redevelopment.

Ms McCollough added that the conservation area would clarify the context and expectations surrounding sensitive redevelopment rather than inhibit buildings such as theirs from evolving. This would help to establish a balance that worked as well as possible for all. She stated that in due course, it was planned to bring forward a fresh proposal for 33 Creechurch Lane, recognising the changed circumstances. Ms McCollough stated the owners of 33 Creechurch Lane were looking forward to positive, collaborative engagement with the City and all other stakeholders, particularly the Bevis Marks Synagogue.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that in a conservation area, certain demolitions required relevant demolition consent.

A Member asked why out of the three modern buildings in and around the conservation area, two had been excluded (One Creechurch Place and 31 Bury Street) and one had been included (33 Creechurch Lane.) The Officer stated that all three buildings had been assessed. One Creechurch Place was deemed not to have a coherent relationship with the surrounding buildings proposed to be within the conservation area. 31 Bury Street was considered to have a detrimental relationship with the surrounding historic urban green fabric and plan form and was therefore excluded. 33 Creechurch Lane was recognised to be of limited inherent interest in its own right but was considered to contribute to the setting of the synagogue and some of the surrounding historical buildings.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that casework, live or emerging applications could not be taken into account when considering a conservation area. The statutory duty was to consider the merits of the area proposed.

In response to a Member's question, the Officer confirmed that discussions about how the conservation area would best reflect the preservation of the Synagogue's significance had taken place with the Synagogue representatives and would continue to take place through the consultation period. Discussions would also take place with other stakeholders with properties or an interest in the area. Stakeholders would have the opportunity to input into the proposals for the conservation area.

A Member asked if the boundary could be amended after consultation depending on the consultation outcomes. An Officer confirmed that this would be the case. Members were informed that the boundary proposed was based on an initial assessment by Officers based on their detailed heritage understanding of the area. It had taken into account historic and architectural merits of the buildings and structures in the area and the historic pattern of development.

The Officer stated that stakeholders and members of the public might consider a different boundary, or the inclusion of different buildings, to be more appropriate. Responses would be welcomed and would be considered by

Officers who would inform Members and provide an Officer recommendation when the consultation results were considered by the Committee.

A Member asked if discussion had taken place with Historic England on the alternative boundaries. It was suggested that along with the Officers' preferred and proposed outline, that alternative boundaries should be outlined in the consultation. It was also suggested that the consultation period be extended to allow full consultation over the summer.

An Officer stated that a question could be included asking people explicitly whether they thought an alternative boundary would be better than the one proposed. The boundary proposed by the Synagogue could be published as part of the consultation and shown as an alternative. The Officer suggested there should be a specific proposal so consultees were clear on the consultation and could comment in favour or against this proposal. Consideration would be given to the questions asked and the material presented during the consultation events. The Officer stated that six weeks was the statutory minimum consultation period for a conservation area proposal. This consultation would last for eight weeks and if the timetable permitted, it could be extended further. It was proposed to bring the consultation results back to the Committee by the end of the year.

In response to a Member's question, the Officer stated that informal discussions would continue with Historic England through the consultation process. They had not provided a formal view but they would also be a statutory consultee and were likely to provide a formal response.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that the peer review had been undertaken by a conservation expert who was formally Head of the London Region at Historic England. They had seen the alternative boundary proposals and concluded that the proposed one was appropriate, in their professional judgement.

A Member commented on the historic warehouses, narrow alleyways and houses of worship in the wider area and stated that by including these in the conservation area, this would protect the setting of the historic buildings. She stated that including 31 Bury Street would ensure it was not demolished as this would have a detrimental impact on a range of historic buildings including the warehouses, Bevis Marks Synagogue and Holland House. She commented that 31 Bury Street was joined to Holland House which was a Grade 2* building. She also suggested the inclusion of Aldgate Station due to the direct impact it had on St Botolph's Church. She also requested that the consultation be accessible to those without access to the internet.

The Chairman stated that having a wide consultation and gaining the views of stakeholders on the proposal would enable the boundary to be redrawn if appropriate. He stated that the consultation should be an exemplar of the Statement of Community Involvement.

The Officer stated that Paragraph 191 of the National Planning Policy Framework stated that when considering the designation of conservation areas, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that an area justified such status because of its special architectural or historic interest and the concept of conservation was not devalued through the designation of areas that lacked special interest. Officers considered that the area outline, subject to consultation and feedback, met this requirement. It included a number of heritage assets that had special architectural and historic interest and the area was informed by the historic development of this area over many centuries. The Officer recognised that this was the first stage of the process, and a broad range of feedback would inform the consultation.

In response to a Member's question, the Officer stated that conservation areas were not in place to prevent change or preserve areas but were there to manage change in a sensitive way. The proposed conservation area along with the Leadenhall Conservation Area and St Helen's Place Conservation Areas were in the city cluster which would continue to consolidate, so the setting of the conservation area would continue to change.

In response to the Chairman's question, the Officer stated that Local Plans Sub-Committee had recently considered a report suggesting that an immediate setting area was set up covering a tightly drawn area immediately around the Bevis Marks Synagogue. This would ensure that its setting as a Grade 1 listed building was recognised by planning policy to ensure that any developments in the immediate area continued to respect its significance. This was part of a separate process and the Local Plan would be consulted on later in the year subject to the Committee's agreement. The conservation area fell under separate legislation and had separate regulatory requirements so there were two separate processes being followed.

In response to a Member's question about the way in which the alternative boundaries would be outlined to consultees, the Officer stated that there would be opportunities in the engagement for people to see alternative boundaries. A Member stated that to be an exemplar consultation, it would need to be accessible, and consultees should be facilitated in being informed of the alternatives rather than technically being allowed to access them. This would enable stakeholders and members of the public to make an assessment of the alternatives.

Following comments from Members, the Officer stated that that it would be made clear that the boundary proposed was a suggested boundary and that a number of alternative boundaries could be outlined as part of the consultation. It would be made clear that the alternative boundaries were not the suggested boundaries informed by the work of Officers but would be included to give members of the public and stakeholders the option to select these or suggest a boundary of their own. The Committee would then be informed of the options selected and Officers would make a recommendation to the Committee.

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

Votes were cast as follows:

Recommendation 1 - That Members consider the assessment;
IN FAVOUR – 17 Votes
OPPOSED – no Votes
There were no abstentions.

Recommendation 2 – That Members agree the area that had the potential to be designated as a Conservation Area, subject to public consultation;
IN FAVOUR – 17 Votes
OPPOSED – no Votes
There were no abstentions.

Recommendation 3 – That Members authorise public consultation to be carried out on the proposal for a new ‘Creechurch Conservation Area’;
IN FAVOUR – 14 Votes
OPPOSED – 3 Votes
There were no abstentions

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Deputy John Fletcher was not present for the vote.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

1. consider the assessment;
2. agree the area that had the potential to be designated as a Conservation Area, subject to public consultation;
3. authorise public consultation to be carried out on the proposal for a new ‘Creechurch Conservation Area’.

9. **UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning the Utility Infrastructure Strategy.

The Officer stated that the draft strategy sought to highlight and drive collaboration, partnership and promotion between the City and the utility sector. The Corporation was responsible for the 5G and Wi-Fi network infrastructure which was being rolled out. It was also responsible for managing the Considerate Contractor Street Work scheme and the pipe subway network. Ground radar surveys would be undertaken to establish where underground constraints lay. The Committee was informed that the City Surveyor had a significant connection with Citygen and the way in which heating and cooling was provided to a significant number of buildings in the City.

The Officer also stated that the Corporation had indirect involvement in working with utility sector to improve their services e.g., in relation to the provision of Superfast Broadband and by providing a test bed for innovation in the utility sector. The Corporation also worked with utilities to ensure there was capacity to meet future demand for tall buildings and growth. Members were informed that the policy context included the Local Area Energy Plan, the Transport

Strategy and the Open Energy Networks. There was a need to ensure that the utility provision was fit for purpose and that capacity was created for the future in a green and sustainable way.

A Member commented that as part of the 5G infrastructure rollout, operators were being persuaded to share kit and this had increased the speed of the rollout as well as removed some of the street clutter.

A Member suggested that a further session on the topics covered by the strategy. The Chairman stated that this could take place post-consultation.

Officers were thanked for their work on the Strategy.

RESOLVED – That Members approve a public consultation exercise to be undertaken on the draft strategy, with the updated final strategy being submitted to the Committee for approval in due course.

10. **CITY OF LONDON LIGHTING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

The Committee received a report of the Director Planning and Development Director concerning a new Lighting Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which provided guidance for developers on lighting buildings and the spaces between them and would help developers meet the requirements of the Development Plan policies which related to lighting.

The Officer stated that the Lighting SPD was understood to be the first of its kind in the UK. It provided guidance and technical requirements for new development. It covered design, delivery, operation and maintenance of artificial light within the City. The SPD also included the Considerate Lighting Charter which existing buildings would be encouraged to sign up to. The SPD had been prepared by a lighting consultant with input from Officers across the Corporation.

The Officer stated that in November 2022, the Committee approved a public consultation exercise for the Lighting SPD which ran from December 2022 to February 2023. The consultation was widely publicised in the press. A comprehensive engagement strategy was undertaken for the public consultation and included residents, workers, consultants and other relevant stakeholders. There were three events including a lighting walking tour around key parts of the City. Following consultation, a further workshop took place with lighting industry professionals. A wide range of responses were received to the consultation and the main issues and responses were summarised in Appendix 2 to the report.

Members were informed that the resident groups consulted included the Barbican Association, Brandon Mews House Group, Gilbert House Group Tenants Association and the Willoughby House Group. In addition, a significant number of technical consultants, lighting designers and businesses responded to the consultation. The responses were broadly supportive and the main issues were around the impact of residential amenity, technical requirements,

the assessment of impacts, implementation of the SPD, the Charter and the impacts on sustainability, biodiversity and heritage.

The Officer stated that the responses informed the final SPD and following the consultation, changes were made to all sections of the documents including the planning process, the guidance and the technical requirements. Tables 10-12 in the SPD were amended to align more closely with established Institute of Lighting Professional (ILP) guidance. In order to protect amenity and respond to the unique City context, the proposed levels and zones were adapted from those included in the ILP guidance and were considered appropriate in the context of the Charter. Members were informed that Officers would work with colleagues to promote this through appropriate channels including working with Business Improvement Districts (BIDs).

In response to a question from a Member about ways in which existing businesses could be encouraged to amend behaviours, the Chairman stated that Members could encourage businesses in their wards to change their behaviours in relation to lighting. Also, there had been much media attention on the matter and this should help to drive good behaviour from existing operators.

An Officer stated that a series of promotional activities was being developed, working with organisations such as the BIDs, who worked with Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and organisations such as the City Property Association.

A Member stated that the Lighting Charter concept originated from Farringdon Within where there were a number of large offices surrounding a residential enclave. In order to reduce light flowing into residential properties, Members encouraged building managers to work together. This idea had them formed the basis for the Charter.

The Chairman thanked Mr Edwards and Deputy Bottomley for the work they had done on the Lighting SPD. Officers were also thanked for their work on this.

RESOLVED – That Members approve the adoption of the Lighting Supplementary Planning Document.

11. **BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGY***

The Committee received a report of the Director Planning and Development Director concerning the way in which biodiversity and ecology was addressed in national, London and City planning policies.

In response to questions from Members, an Officer stated that Open Spaces was consulted as part of the Podium application and the biodiversity and ecology submission was from a leading consultant. Judgement was used when considering when third-party review was required and it would depend on the nature of the impacts, there were experienced diversity and ecology experts in the Natural Environment department. Although consultation had been more informal in the past, this was now being formalised as a more structured way of

consulting the pool of expertise on future applications, especially those with very significant biodiversity and ecology impacts. The Officer stated that the ecological assessment submitted as part of the Podium scheme was a comprehensive and rigorous piece of work in line with government guidance.

A Member asked for clarification on the pathways in the formalisation, when this process would be in place and whether City Gardens were consulted. An Officer stated that City Gardens now came under City Operations and the team had a close working relationship with the Planning team. The contents of the report aligned well with the Biodiversity Action Plan that City Gardens had promoted and agreed through the Natural Environment Board. Officers would confirm the formalisation process.

A Member commented that the report did not reference marine biodiversity and ecology. The Member informed the Committee of a scheme developed by an organisation called Thames Estuary Partnership to utilise the river side to improve marine growth.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

1. note the policy approach for biodiversity and ecology and how this was implemented in the City Corporation; and
2. note the charging legitimate landscape around this issue and the commissioning of a study by Greengage Environmental to inform amended policy approaches.

12. BUSINESS PLANS 2022/23: PROGRESS REPORT - PERIOD 3 - DECEMBER - MARCH*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment providing an update on progress made during period Three (December – March) 2022/23 against the High-Level Business Plan 2022/23 for the service areas of the Environment Department which fell within the remit of the Committee.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

13. RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning the key risks managed by the service areas of the Environment Department which fell within the remit of the Committee.

RESOLVED - That Members note the report and the actions being taken by the Environment Department to monitor, mitigate and effectively manage risks arising from their operations.

14. CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAAC) AND CITY OF LONDON ACCESS GROUP (COLAG)*

The Committee received a report of the Director Planning and Development Director responding to a request from Members for information on the CAAC and the CoLAG which was requested at the meeting of the Committee on 11

May 2023. The report outlined the role, function, and membership of the two groups, referencing their terms of reference and constitutions.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

15. **DISTRICT SURVEYORS ANNUAL REPORT 2022/23***

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning the work of the District Surveyor's office.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

16. **REVENUE OUTTURN 2022/23***

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain, the Executive Director, Environment and the City Surveyor comparing the revenue outturn for the services overseen by the Committee in 2022/23 with the final budget for the year.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report and the carry forward of local risk underspending to 2023/24.

17. **PROPERTY SEARCH INCOME AND EXPENDITURE***

The Committee received a report of the Planning and Development Director setting out the total income and expenditure for 2022/23.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

18. **PUBLIC LIFT AND ESCALATOR REPORT***

The Committee received a report of City Surveyor outlining the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyors, in the reporting period 23 April 2023 to 30 July 2023.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

19. **WHOLE LIFE-CYCLE CARBON EMISSION DATA MONITORING IN MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS***

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment providing information about planning stage whole life cycle carbon emissions calculated for development proposals by applicant teams.

A Member queried the breakdown in the report in operational carbon emissions. An Officer stated that the data that had been monitored was planning application stage data so was likely to change. The carbon emission savings achieved were much higher than the GLA target.

A Member asked when the Committee could expect to receive the Embodied Carbon Action Plan. An Officer stated that this was a commitment in the current financial year. This would take into account a whole host of issues around work that was taking place in the planning system. Much consideration had been given to a retrofit first policy in the new City Plan which would be a significant

step towards dealing with embodied carbon and also how the Corporation could influence government to try and ensure that embodied carbon was being given importance. Members were informed that the climate action strategy dashboards were published online. The climate action strategy points targets were being met. Some of the embodied emissions were operational emissions. There was complexity in working out the best way of publicising and collating the embodied data in applications. This data was published on the website but the mechanism for including this in the climate action strategy and the dashboard was still a work in progress.

A Member asked if consideration was being given to the scope for schemes the City had permitted and whether this could be incorporated into the tracker.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

1. note the report; and
2. agree that this item be added to the Outstanding Items list.

20. TRANSPORT STRATEGY: 2022/23 ANNUAL REPORT AND DELIVERY PLAN 2023/24 - 2028/29 5-YEAR PLAN*

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment concerning the Annual Report which detailed progress with delivering the Transport Strategy in 2022/23 and the Delivery Plan for 2023/24 – 2028/29.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

21. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE*

See Minutes 22 and 23.

22. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 21 FEBRUARY 2023*

The Committee received the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 21 February 2023.

RECEIVED.

23. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 20 MARCH 2023*

The Committee received the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 20 March 2023.

RECEIVED.

23.1 To note the draft minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 27 June 2023*

RESOLVED – That Members:-

1. note the draft minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 27 June 2023; and
2. agree the resolution of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 27 June 2023 that the Planning and Transportation

Committee be requested to instruct the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee to have an oversight role in the project, particularly with regard to wayfinding, signage and marketing.

24. **MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE***

See Minutes 25, 26 and 27.

25. **TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 27 APRIL 2023***

The Committee received the minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting on 27 April 2023.

RECEIVED.

26. **TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 23 MAY 2023***

The Committee received the minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting on 23 May 2023.

RECEIVED.

27. **TO NOTE THE DRAFT PUBLIC MINUTES AND NON-PUBLIC SUMMARY OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 20 JUNE 2023***

The Committee received the draft public minutes and non-public summary of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting on 20 June 2023.

RECEIVED.

28. **MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE***

28.1 **To note the minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee on 23 May 2023***

The Committee received the minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting on 23 May 2023.

RECEIVED.

29. **TO NOTE THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 4 JULY 2023***

The Committee received the draft minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting on 4 July 2023.

RECEIVED.

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

A Member asked for an update on the letter being sent to TfL to ask for the new entrances at Bank Station to be open and available for use. An Officer stated that engagement had occurred at an Officer level. Officers were in the process

of drafting a letter from the Planning and Transportation Committee to the TfL Commissioner.

A Member commented that the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting on 25 July had been cancelled and there were no other scheduled meetings. She requested that the calendar be updated once any further meetings were scheduled.

In response to a Member's question about consultation, an Officer stated that it was vital to engage widely and give appropriate notice of consultations. An event had been rescheduled to get more involvement from the community. Officers would welcome more feedback on how consultation could be improved. Work was taking place to see if information could be packaged to be sent via Whatsapp and email. The Planning Department was working across the Corporation with other departments to ensure there were continual improvements on notification and consultation methods.

31. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

The Chairman updated the Committee as follows:

1. Awards

a) The City's Planning Team was the Winner of the Planning Authority of the Year category at the RTPI London Awards for Planning Excellence.

The Awards judges commented that the City's small Planning team were disproportionately pivotal in delivering the challenging floorspace growth required to maintain the City of London's position as the world's business centre, the engine of London's and the UK's economy, through exceptionally challenging economic times. The Planning team delivered an unprecedented million sqm of floorspace in 2021 including 6 new towers, all with substantial wider, inclusive public benefits. These schemes and ground-breaking initiatives were transforming the City as a 7-day destination, culturally resurgent, providing a resilient economic base to flourish as an inclusive, gentler, welcoming City for all communities, crucially, benefitting all in the UK.

b) The City was the Winner of Best Borough led Project at the Building London Planning Awards for our initiative : Putting the public on top: A view for All — Elevated Public Realm in the City of London

The Awards judges commented that the City of London Corporation had consented 13 free to visit elevated public roof gardens, terraces and viewing galleries in major developments since 2018 borne out of radical new policies to deliver elevated views to all, delivering an inclusive, welcoming City.

c) Pearl Figueira was the winner of Young Planner of the Year at the RTPI London Awards for Planning Excellence

The Awards judges commented that Pearl was an enthusiastic and dedicated planner, working across the development management and policy teams in the City of London. Her most outstanding achievement to date had been leading on

the production of the draft City of London Lighting SPD. Working with industry experts she had produced clear, legible technical guidance for developments to follow. She had transformed the way that lighting was considered in developments, and she had drawn attention to the importance of securing well designed lighting from an environmental and amenity perspective at an early stage in the development process.

d) The Carbon Options Guidance was shortlisted for two awards as well as the Suicide Prevention Guidance but were not successful. They were still a recognition of the ground breaking work of both initiatives.

2. Peter Shadbolt

Peter would be leaving the City Corporation at the end of the month, after 14 and a half years leading the team managing the Corporation's Local Plan work as well as monitoring, land charges, and street naming and numbering. He had played a key role in developing the new City Plan, the adopted Local Plan and earlier development plan documents, as well as many SPDs. He had been a steadfast, thoughtful and extremely knowledgeable member of the planning team, was highly respected across the profession, and greatly valued by members of the Planning & Transportation Committee.

3. First Geothermal Borehole Completed on Salisbury Square Development

This was the first Square Mile scheme to use a standalone borehole cooling and heating system.

32. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

<u>Item Nos</u>	<u>Paragraph No(s)</u>
33	3,5 and 7
34	3

33. DEBT ARREARS - ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE)*

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain.

34. TO NOTE THE DRAFT NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE ON 20 JUNE 2023*

The Committee received the draft non-public minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting on 20 June 2023.

RECEIVED.

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

There were two non-public questions.

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

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting closed at 12.30 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis
zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk