

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 13 December 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 13 December 2022 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Brendan Barns
Emily Benn
Ian Bishop-Laggett
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Deputy Michael Cassidy
Anthony David Fitzpatrick
Jaspreet Hodgson
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Alderman Ian David Luder
Alderman Bronek Masojada
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Graham Packham
Alderwoman Susan Pearson
Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Ben Dunleavy	- Town Clerk's Department
Tim Fletcher	- Media Officer
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Gwyn Richards	- Planning & Development Director
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Julia Smith	- Environment Department
Neel Devlia	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Emmanuel Ojugo	- Environment Department
Joanna Parker	- Environment Department
Peter Shadbolt	- Environment Department
Richard Steele	- Environment Department
Robin Whitehouse	- Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman), Deputy John Fletcher, Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Andrew Mayer, Deputy Brian Mooney, Deputy Edward Lord, Deputy Henry Pollard, Ian Seaton, Alethea Silk and William Upton KC.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered the public minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting held on 22 November 2022 and approved them as a correct record.

4. **IBEX HOUSE 42 - 47 MINORIES LONDON EC3N 1DY**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning Ibex House 42 - 47 Minories London EC3N 1DY – specifically alteration and extension to the existing building at ground and lower ground floor on Haydon Street and Portsoken St with the incorporation of courtyard garden areas, an on-site servicing bay and blue badge parking areas adjacent; Roof level extensions at the 8th and 9th floors; Alterations to the ground floor Minories facade, including level access provision; Alteration and creation of roof terraces and green roofs; replacement / upgrade of balustrades on all elevations; internal reconfiguration of lower levels to incorporate a new mezzanine level, internal cycle storage, and refuse store; creation of a new learning / cultural centre (sui generis) at the ground floor corner of Portsoken Street and Minories;; and retention of existing public house (sui generis) at ground floor / lower ground corner of Haydon Street and Minories including elevational alterations.

The Town Clerk referred to those papers set out within the main agenda pack as well as the Officer presentation slides and an addendum containing additional/late representations that had been separately circulated and published. Members were informed that agenda Items 4 and 5 would be presented and considered alongside each other.

Officers presented the application, explaining that the site was located in the east of the City and bounded by Minories to the west, Haydon Street to the north and Portsoken Street to the south. It was reported that the surrounding area was characterised mainly by commercial uses but also had a consistent presence of hotels, service accommodation and residential uses. Opposite the site on Portsoken Street was Portsoken Street Garden – a site of importance in terms of nature conservation. Members were informed that the existing building is Grade II listed but that the site was not located within a Conservation Area nor within the setting of any nearby statutorily listed buildings.

It was reported that Ibex House was built between 1935-37 and was an important example of an inter-war commercial building at a London-wide and national level and a rare and unique survivor of the streamlines modern style as well as a historic example of the emerging interwar trend for large open-plan office space. The primary pedestrian entrance to the site is from Minories but there is currently no level access to the site from this entrance or the side entrances. Forecourts exist on the southern and northern sides of the building but were currently underutilised for things such as outdoor cycle parking and

bin storage. Internally, the building had been heavily altered over time and was in need of upgrading in line with modern office standards. It was reported that the existing building was not fully occupied with several office floors currently vacant along with the existing public house which had now been vacant since 2018. The commercial gym tenancy on the lower levels had now also ceased. The applicant was now proposing the refurbishment and extension to the lower ground, mezzanine and upper ground levels. Upgrades to terrace balustrades and surface materials on the sixth, seventh and eighth floors and the refurbishment and construction of infill extensions with new terraces at the eighth and ninth floors, complete with green roofs were also proposed. Internally and as part of the works, various alterations to the allocation of existing uses were proposed which would result in an uplift in class E office floorspace with new, flexible reception, meeting areas and new external amenity spaces, public realm improvements, urban greening, a new café use, new cultural use and revitalised pub use also all formed part of the scheme.

Officers reported that a listed building consent was issued in 2021 for the refurbishment works to levels 1-7 which were now currently underway on site. These approved works alongside the application today would lift the office accommodation here from Grade B quality to Grade A quality. Members were shown a proposed lower ground floor plan depicting the northern and southern additions within the forecourts alongside refurbished class E office space in the centre. It was reported that sunken gardens were proposed on either side of the southern extension on Portsoken Street, providing green amenity space and daylight egress to the office accommodation on this level. Part of the proposed on-site cycle parking provision was also shown in the top-right hand corner of this floorplan. Officers reported that the existing building currently contained 89 external cycle parking spaces, with this scheme delivering a significant uplift with 333 long-stay and 53 short-stay spaces alongside shower and locker facilities proposed. This would meet London Plan standards for the building as a whole and not just the floor space uplift.

Next, Members were shown proposed plans for the mezzanine level, depicting cycle parking, shower and storage facilities as well as an internal bin storage area which would approve existing conditions where bins were currently stored externally within the forecourts. On Haydon Street, two blue badge parking spaces would be provided which was an improvement on the existing offering where only one was provided. This too complied with London Plan standards. On the right-hand side of the northern pavilion, an on-site servicing bay was present which would significantly improve upon existing conditions whereby servicing currently took place on Haydon Street with vehicles typically having to reverse out of this location onto Minories. Conditions were recommended to restrict the hours of servicing so that these were not permissible during night-time or peak hours – at present this was unrestricted.

The proposed upper ground-floor plan depicted a new, open-plan reception hub within the centre of the building which would contain various flexible meeting and working spaces for the whole building, level access to the new side entrances along with the main frontage to the building would be provided by the scheme. This would improve accessibility to the site where none currently

existed. It was reported that the extension to the south off of Portsoken Street would be dedicated to a new, publicly accessible café which would help to activate passive surveillance to Portsoken Street and the public garden opposite. In the bottom left-hand corner was a proposed cultural, learning and exhibition space. The unit would occupy a prominent location on the corner of Minories and Portsoken Street and would be fitted with an ancillary café/bar area. It was envisioned to accommodate various exhibitions, events and workshops within this historically significant building. Officers reported that the applicant had been engaging with prospective occupiers and that initial meetings had occurred between a local art and architecture-based charity organisation named 'Store' who had now also visited the site to confirm that the size, layout and proposed fit out would be suitable for their needs and discussions on affordable lease terms had begun. It was highlighted that the cultural offering aligned with Destination City which sought to enable the City's communities to access a range of arts, heritage and cultural experiences. Officers confirmed that specific occupier details alongside a detailed Operational Management Plan and Culture Plan would be procured at a later date as part of the Section 106 agreement.

The Sub-Committee were shown existing and proposed images of the northern elevation of the site from Portsoken Street looking west. This depicted the appearance of the ground-floor addition which would be designed to sensitively reinterpret the streamline, modern features of the main building with cradle glazing, curved corners and black fenestration. It was highlighted that the proposals were amended in October following extensive negotiations with Officers. Some of the key changes included a reduction to the size of the ground floor extensions, refinement of their design and a reduction to the extent of fabric removal. It was noted that Historic England had raised concern with the original iteration of the proposal but, since reviewing the amendments to the scheme, had withdrawn these comments. Officers underlined that this particular image also depicted some of the public realm improvements proposed by the scheme including resurfacing works to the footway, construction of a raised table to slow traffic and provide level access across Portsoken Street and the proposal to replace the existing, partly solid brick wall on the northern side of Portsoken Street Garden – all with a view to improving visual and physical connectivity between the street and the garden.

Members were shown further existing and proposed visuals of the ground floor additions on Haydon Street as well as images depicting the alterations to the façade of The Peacock public house. It was reported that the alterations would open up the appearance of the pub on the main Minories frontage through the insertion of clear glazing, making it more outward facing and improving vibrancy at this key corner location. Existing eighth floor plans indicated the extent of fabric removal proposed which largely related to terrace surfaces and the roof slab. A proposed eighth floor plans showed that the extensions would be built around the eastern and western core of the building with new amenity terraces surrounding these and with refurbished office space in the centre. Proposed ninth floor plans showed the infill extension proposed in the centre which would sit between the two existing western and eastern cores with new, Class E office

floorspace. On the sides of each core, new terraces and urban greening was proposed.

The Committee were shown existing and proposed visualisations of how the roof extensions would wrap around the service cores, tidying up their current appearance. It was clarified that the roof extensions would not extend beyond the maximum height of the existing building and would, in fact, sit below this by over one metre. Officers referred to the fact that the site was within the London View Management Framework (LVMF) protected vista corridor to the Tower of London but that the modest nature of the roof extensions proposed and their virtually indiscernible appearance on the skyline would preserve the ability to recognise and appreciate the Tower as a strategically important landmark.

The Sub-Committee were informed that the proposal considered sustainability standards and targeted BREEAM 'excellent'. It would be adopting circular economy and whole-life carbon principles. Dedicated areas for planting and greening would be incorporated through green roofs, greening on terraces and new, southern winter gardens where possible, increasing the biodiversity of the site.

Members were informed that fourteen representations and objections to the application had been received across the two applications with thirteen of these having been lodged against the original iteration of the proposal advertised in 2021. The main concerns raised by nearby residents concerned existing light pollution, daylight and sunlight impacts, noise and congestion impacts. Officers reported that a daylight and sunlight analysis was submitted with the application and demonstrated that the immediately surrounding residential properties would continue to receive levels of daylight and sunlight in accordance with BRE guidelines with the exception of a very minor and negligible no skyline variation associated with a student accommodation room located at 52-56 Minories. With regard to lighting, a condition was recommended to be included on the planning permission requiring the submission of a full Lighting Strategy. The applicant had also confirmed that sensors were currently being installed within levels 1-7 as part of the refurbishment works. With regard to the terraces, it was recommended that use of these be restricted by conditions limiting hours of use to between 9am-9pm and no use on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Recommended conditions would also restrict the use of amplified music. A scheme of protected works was also recommended to be required as a condition as this would help to mitigate against construction related impacts to surrounding residential and commercial occupiers.

Officers concluded by sharing a number of images of existing and proposed verified views and reporting that the proposed development was underpinned by an overarching objective to revitalise and celebrate Ibex House as an iconic and unique building and to reclaim its prominence and presence within the City of London with increase public access, repairs and refurbishment. The scheme would help to lift the office accommodation from Grade B to Grade A quality, bringing the building back to optimal use and enabling it to compete with newer build office stock in the City. The proposed scheme would revitalise this historic

building which also delivering a number of environmental, social and economic benefits. The applications for planning permission and listed building consent were therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman explained that there were no registered objectors to address the meeting on this occasion and he therefore invited the applicant to speak.

Mr David Whittington, planning consultant for the applicant spoke first setting out a number of fundamental drivers behind the application. He reiterated that this application represented phase two of substantial investment, an upgrade and refurbishment of this iconic building. Phase one had been approved by the City last year and involved the full refurbishment of the building and, importantly, its services on floors 1-7, providing major benefits to the condition of the building including the internal fit out and the replacement of all windows with highly detailed new replacement cradle windows. Overall, this investment significantly lifted the building from Grade B to Grade A category floor space and combined, the two phases would offer a sensitive reimagining of the listed building. It was also hoped that this demonstrated how historic buildings could make a very positive contribution to the City stock as a whole by offering genuinely market-leading, Grade A office accommodation within period and older buildings. The current scheme now submitted for approval sought to provide relatively modest extensions at ground and upper floor levels as well as significant works at the lower ground and mezzanine levels to ensure that Ibox House will provide contemporary, post-pandemic workspace. By refurbishing, adapting and extending the application, the applicant was promoting a highly sustainable and carbon positive form of development, delivering better stock from within the existing stock of the City. He added that the EPC rating of the building would be significantly uplifted from 'D' to 'B' and would target a BREEAM rating of 'excellent' – a significant achievement for an existing, listed building. He underlined that the works now proposed were key to unlocking a multitude of benefits for the building, its surroundings and public realm and, importantly, its neighbours. At this point, Mr Whittington took the opportunity to reiterate the point previously made by Officers in that these proposals presented no material harm to any neighbours or residents surrounding the site. Indeed, substantial revisions had been made to the application in October 2022 in part to respond to a number of the comments made by residents relating to servicing and traffic arrangements at the base of the scheme. He reiterated that no harm would be caused to residents in terms of daylight and sunlight or overlooking and reported that the application would now fall under the control of the City for the first time in terms of servicing hours and the size of vehicles that would service the building. The applicant was of the view that the conditions proposed, and additional controls would provide additional benefits and safeguards for local residents.

Mr Whittington went on to state that the applicant was pleased to use lightweight timber

Construction methods so that heavy demolition and piling would not be a feature at this site – meaning less noise and a shorter construction period for residents. He added that the applicant was pleased to be able to respond positively to concerns around light spillage via the installation of light sensors

throughout the building as part of the current refurbishment works. He added that another major benefit was to be the inclusion of the learning and cultural gallery at ground floor level with the objective of this space being to provide a celebration of the streamlined modern nature of IbeX House as it heads to its first century of its existence. It would be a place to learn of and celebrate the building as well as the rich architectural pedigree of the City. Mr Whittington underlined that the applicant was committed to the delivery of this space with these matters being controlled via the Section 106 agreement in due course.

Mr Philip Turner, lead architect from AHMM Architects, spoke on some of the key design and architectural components of the scheme. He reported that this was a Grade II listed building, built and completed in 1935, a genuinely iconic building that had worn relatively well on the outside despite some bomb damage and some repairs carried out most recently in the 1990s. He commented that this was originally a state-of-the-art building and one of the first air-conditioned buildings in London. However, the interior had worn less well than the exterior and had been less sympathetically treated over time. Crucially, the 1990s refurbishment had resulted in a 'muddled' ground floor offering and a compromised entrance arrangement. The servicing of the building had also been ad hoc over time with the bin stores and cycle parking facilities all currently situated on-street within the original forecourts.

Mr Turner went on to underline that the existing building was very energy inefficient. The ongoing refurbishment works to levels 1-7 included the replacement of 1990s aluminium windows, complete with internal secondary glazing, with new, steel-framed double-glazed, high-quality windows as well as a complete refurbishment of both cores including lift replacement and new fit out to all of the office spaces in a way that was sympathetic to the character of the original building. It was reported that the client had spent £8 million on these works to date and expected to spend a total of £20 million on the middle floors alone. As part of the applicant's commitment to maintaining this building, it was reported that these proposals would bring forward the proper treatment to its exterior.

From an architectural point of view, the ground floor plans were a key element of the proposal and Mr Turner explained that the recent vacation of the basement by a commercial gym during the pandemic had allowed the opportunity to address the lower ground and upper ground floors and plant in one go. These plans would achieve a number of significant improvements that would provide level access on Minories for the first time in this building's life and breathe new life into this historic building and to Portsoken Street opposite the site. All bin and cycle storage facilities would be removed from the street and located within the building with the cycle parking and associated facilities meeting the London Plan requirements for a new building.

The building would be upgraded from an EPC 'D' to an EPC 'B' rating with the insulation of the outside walls. Carbon emissions would also be reduced by 38% with BREEAM 'excellent' targeted by the applicant. The proposed café on Portsoken Street opposite the gardens and associated public realm improvements that were part of a Section 278 agreement would be very

positive and in line with the Aldgate BID Public Realm Strategy document. Finally, it was reported the cultural facility on the corner of Minories and Portsoken Street would be a real 'window' for the scheme and was in line with City initiatives such as Destination City and London recharged.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their contributions and invited any questions that the Sub-Committee might now have of them. The Chair began by seeking to understand more about the proposed cultural space within the building. He questioned what sort of partnerships had been explored with other stakeholders to date and asked how the applicant saw this space being used as well as the square footage assigned for this. Mr Whittington responded to state that the applicant's architects had given a great deal of thought to the functionality and usability of the space taking into account matters such as storage capacity, provision of WCs and disabled access. He added that the applicant had also been in dialogue with a number of bodies including the RIPA and Studio Makers as curators working with the City in terms of Destination City. Discussions had also taken place with Open House and other educational providers. Whilst the curation of this space had not yet been finalised and an operating partner was yet to be selected, it was recognised that this was to be controlled via the Section 106 agreement with the Operational Management Plan to be formulated in due course should the application be approved today. Mr Whittington added that the space would be multifaceted – a space for students, the public and local residents and principally a space to celebrate not only this building but also a design idiom in terms of streamline modern.

A Member referred to proposals around consolidation yet noted that the dashboard presented to the Sub-Committee suggested no change to the number of vehicle movements in terms of deliveries and questioned why this was the case. With regard to the building's BREEAM rating he also questioned what its current status was.

The applicant's transport consultant, Mr Stuart Davies stated that the Servicing Strategy revised a lot and that it was intended that a Service Plan limiting hours would be introduced for motorised vehicles. Servicing would be allowed at all times (aside from overnight) for zero-emission/non-motorised vehicles. There was also a move towards consolidating the last mile of a building's delivery needs into a pedicab style cargo bike. There may therefore be an increase in delivery trips to the building overall but, nevertheless, there would be a decrease in motorised vehicles and goods vehicles. There would also be no need for heavy goods vehicles to service the building as was currently the case. Mr Davies added that, based on the current building's servicing demands, the increase in floorspace pro rata would lead to 3 extra vehicles daily but, as moves were made to consolidate deliveries, the presence of fewer goods and motorised vehicles would manifest itself over time. Deliveries would be managed by an on-site Deliveries Manager and via the Delivery and Servicing Plan so as to avoid multiple companies/occupants ordering similar supplies from the same source but on different days of the week for example. It was underlined that the Plan would be a live document that would be continually monitored and reviewed alongside the tenant and staff profile of the building. The Member responded to state that he would expect to see an ambition around reducing the number of deliveries to the building.

In terms of the current BREEAM rating of the building, the applicant reiterated that the current Energy Performance Certificate rating was 'D'. In terms of how the applicant could affect the building's environmental performance, it was explained that this was two-pronged and could be done via both the work undertaken but also via the way in which the building's use was programmed. The building would be naturally ventilated and mixed mode, it would move from a building that used gas to heat it to one that used electricity. Tenants would be encouraged to use low carbon vehicles of cycles to travel to work and the site also benefitted from excellent public transport links. Increasing the biodiversity of the site with the addition of green roofs would also be important in terms of enhancing ecological value.

Another Member stated that there was much to commend this application but focused on the Construction Management Plan which stated that no diesel, mobile machinery would be used anywhere on site - he questioned whether this would indeed be the case. He also spoke on the Lighting Strategy which it was recognised would not comply fully with the Lighting SPD. He stated that he hoped that the applicant would, however, sign up to the Considerate Lighting Charter. Thirdly, he questioned whether the stand-by power generation in the building would also be non-diesel and a sustainable source. The applicant team confirmed that this was the case in terms of the Construction Management Plan undertaking and also confirmed that they would be happy to sign up to the Charter. They added that they felt in a very positive position to be able to overcome resident concerns relating to lighting spill with the installation of things such as motion timers which would be a real benefit and improvement upon the current situation. In terms of the standby generator, these would also involve no diesel generators to ensure continuity in the event of any power outage.

Another Member stated that he too felt that there was much to commend here. He stated that he was particularly pleased that motion sensors for lighting control were to be installed throughout the building. He went on to question the proposed hours of usage for the open terrace on the roof. He commented that he felt that 9pm was a reasonable terminal hour on weekdays but felt that this may have the potential to be disruptive to local residents on a Saturday, He therefore asked whether the applicant might be amenable to introducing a terminal hour of 5.30pm to the area on Saturdays. The applicant team responded to state that this was in the hands of the Sub-Committee on this matter. They went on to underline that the terraces were an important part of the offering to tenants.

A Member questioned, in relation to the proposed café space, whether this could be signed up to the City's Public Toilet Scheme. Secondly, in terms of cycle spaces, she stated that those currently situated externally might arguably have a wider public benefit and therefore questioned whether these were currently used exclusively by tenants of the building. Under proposals to relocate these internally, she also queried whether there would be an opportunity for these to be used by those who were passing by or using the café facilities for example. In terms of cycle spaces, the applicant responded to

state that the existing 89 spaces were not publicly available and were clearly insufficient for a building of this size. There would be a number of short-stay cycle spaces at street level, external to the café which would be for the general use of those visiting the building. With regard to the café facilities, the applicant reported that this was to be a relatively small space but that the arrangements for the WCs here would be linked to the WC provision for the cultural and learning centre located on the Minorities entrance. They added that they would be happy to consider signing up to the Public Toilet Scheme should that be the wish of the Sub-Committee.

The Chairman suggested that the Committee now move to any questions that they might have of Officers at this stage.

A Member questioned what might be enforced upon the applicant via the Delivery Management Plan in terms of reducing the number of fossil fuel vehicles accessing the site for deliveries and servicing. He also asked again for clarification as to the building's current BREEAM rating. In terms of deliveries, Officers reported that they would be securing a final Delivery and Servicing Plan as part of the Section 106 agreement. Within this, a range of measures would be negotiated to encourage fewer polluting vehicles, methods of consolidation, restricted timings, use of smaller vehicles and the limiting of empty miles. The 33 vehicles noted within the report were representative of a worse-case scenario and did not account for consolidation – a lower number would be expected in due course and with the introduction of the measures incorporated within the Delivery and Servicing Plan. The Member encouraged Officers to be as ambitious as possible here in terms of reducing the number of vehicle movements.

A Member commented on the height of the railings on the terraces as well as the presence of 'mini ladders' here which were a concern in terms of suicide prevention. Officers confirmed that the applicant had considered suicide prevention methods as part of the proposal and that the balustrade height on the terraces would be raised to 1.2m. In addition, the terraces would be passively surveyed from the newly refurbished office spaces at the eighth and ninth floors. The existing terraces could also be surveyed at the sixth and seventh floor levels. CCTV cameras were also to be installed in those areas that were more difficult to view from the office spaces. Finally, it was noted that the stepping of the building would be beneficial in terms of suicide prevention. It was also highlighted that there was a condition relating to balustrades on the planning application and that this would be used specifically to look at measures for reducing opportunities for suicide such as the inclusion of glass panels.

Another Member stated that reference to the Lighting SPD would also be a helpful addition. Officers stated that they would undertake to revise Condition 10 to include specific reference to this and, as an informative, also make reference to the Lighting Charter. They also undertook to make reference to no diesel generation within the conditions.

In terms of the hours of servicing, a Member noted that the proposed area of servicing on Haydon Street was almost opposite a residential block. She therefore asked whether the terminal hour for this might be 22:00 as opposed to 23:00. She also referred to the hours of use proposed for the terraces, noting once more that there were residential blocks nearby. She questioned whether these could be reduced in line with office hours and terminate at 6pm on weekdays. The Chairman commented that this would be possible on both counts should it prove to be the wish of the Sub-Committee.

The Chairman commented that, whilst no objectors had registered to address the meeting today, their concerns were primarily around being protected from disturbance during construction and around light impact. The applicant had outlined their mitigations for this, and the Chairman therefore questioned whether, from an Officers perspective, they too were content with the provisions proposed. Officers stated that, through the Scheme of Protective Works that would be required as a condition and the Construction Logistics Plan, they were satisfied that disruption to residents through construction would be appropriately safeguarded. They added that there was also an additional condition around the need for a Technical Lighting Strategy.

Seeing no further questions of Officers, the Chairman asked that Members now move to debate the application.

MOTION - A Motion was put and seconded around the alteration of Condition 18 and the use of the roof terraces and proposed that the following wording be added here 'or after 17:30 on Saturdays'.

The Motion was put and passed with 12 votes in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

A Member questioned whether it was possible to revise the hours of usage for the roof terraces downwards for Monday-Friday and recollected that similar revisions had been made for other recent applications of this sort. She questioned whether there should therefore be some uniformity of approach. Officers commented that different conditions often needed to be applied in different circumstances around matters such as proximity of residential dwellings but underlined that this was very much within the hands of the Committee.

MOTION – A second motion was proposed suggesting that, during the working week (Mon-Fri) use of the roof terraces be amended downwards to a terminal hour of 18:00.

The Motion was not seconded.

MOTION - Another Member moved that a more sensible approach might be to permit roof terrace access until 21:00 for two days per week from Monday-Friday only with other working days limited to 17:30 or 16:00.

The motion was seconded, put to the vote but not carried with 2 votes in favour, 11 against and 1 abstention.

A Member highlighted that there was a policy in place to deal with noise nuisance should use of the terraces become an issue at any point.

A Member highlighted that these terraces were intended for office use only and cautioned against the unnecessary micromanagement of this aspect of the application.

A Member spoke to state that this was an admirable scheme for this beautiful, listed building whereby the changes proposed would enhance the appearance of this both internally and externally. He also praised the sustainability credentials of the scheme and stated that he would therefore be pleased to vote in favour of it.

Another Member commented that this appeared to be a masterpiece of cooperation between the applicant and the Planning officers. He went on to refer to both location and the needs of the occupier and commented on the applicant's immense sensitivity to the qualities of this building, its context and the needs of occupiers today within the design proposal. In terms of location, the Member commented that the business City was no longer monocultural and centred purely around banking and insurance. It now incorporated the tertiary industries who had traditionally thought of Shoreditch as their natural office location. This building seemed to him to have more in common with recent Shoreditch buildings than with those traditionally associated with the City. From the point of view of potential occupiers of the building, it appeared that the City had begun to diversify its offer and to broaden its appeal for the benefit of its ambitions as a Destination City. He concluded by praising the application as sensitive, clever and relevant to what was needed today.

A Member commented that the scheme was testament to the fact that, where objections were received, these could be adequately addressed with proposals amended. She stated that, as such, she would be supporting the application.

The Chair summed up the points made and stated that he felt that the application addressed an important piece as to the responsible and sympathetic activation of the ground floor of this building.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 14 Votes
OPPOSED – None
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

RESOLVED -

1. That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedules 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 notices not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed;

2. that Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.

5. IBEX HOUSE 42 - 47 MINORIES LONDON EC3N 1DY - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director regarding IbeX House, 42-47 Minories London EC3N 1DY – Listed Building Consent – specifically, alteration and extension to the existing building at ground and lower ground floor on Haydon Street and Portsoken St with the incorporation of courtyard garden areas, an on-site servicing bay and blue badge parking areas adjacent; Roof level extensions at the 8th and 9th floors; Alterations to the ground floor Minories facade, including level access provision; Alteration and creation of roof terraces and green roofs; replacement / upgrade of balustrades on all elevations; internal reconfiguration of lower levels to incorporate a new mezzanine level, internal cycle storage, and refuse store; creation of a new learning / cultural centre at the ground floor corner of Portsoken Street and Minories; and retention of existing public house at ground floor / lower ground corner of Haydon Street and Minories including elevational alterations.

The Committee voted on these recommendations alongside those set out under Agenda Item 4.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 14 Votes
OPPOSED – None
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

1. That listed building consent be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedules 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 notices not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed;

2.that Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.

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

The Sub-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.

7. **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 applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the report to the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

22 Bishopsgate Visit – A Member thanked the Chair and Officers for organising the recent Committee visit to 22 Bishopsgate and stated that it was interesting to see the success of the consolidated logistics on site which they had reported had reduced deliveries here by over 90%. Other important takeaways from the visit were around the demand for the sort of flexible accommodation that they are providing such as the public roof viewing gallery. The Member stated that it was disappointing that this particular visit had been so poorly attended and therefore questioned whether it might be possible to arrange a repeat of this in the near future given the number of questions on these types of matters raised at recent meetings?

The Chair undertook to arrange this ahead of the building opening in Spring 2023.

A Member requested that these visits be considered outside of working hours going forward.

65 Fleet Street and reopening of the Tipperary public house

A Member referred to the refurbishment of 65 Fleet Street which was thought to have now been delayed by at least a year. He noted that this might have a knock-on effect as to the reopening of the Tipperary public house which was an Asset of Community Value (ACV). He therefore asked whether the Chair might consider writing to the owners of the building in conjunction with the Chair of the Fleet Street Quarter (FSQ) BID to see if any pressure could be applied as to the earlier opening of this. The Chair commented that this was not really a

planning matter but added that he would be happy to lend his support and construct a letter jointly with the FSQ BID Chairman as suggested.

Post-Construction Information

A Member commented that she had previously requested this information as to sustainability targets and recounted that a report had been submitted to the Committee pre-pandemic which promised to bring forward a future report as to those buildings that had been constructed had met their BREEAM and other targets. She requested that the original report be recirculated to all current members of the Committee and queried when the updated report would now be forthcoming.

The Chairman asked that this be reported into the next meeting of the grand Committee.

Office Space

A Member queried where the City were in terms of its targets on Office floorspace and how much had been approved/constructed or was already in construction.

The Chairman asked that this also be reported to the next meeting of the grand Committee.

Officers clarified that this was a key priority for them and would also form a key part of the evidence base in terms of data being collected for the Local Plan.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

Awayday

The Chairman commented that all Members should now have received an invitation to and information on a planned January Awayday for the Planning Committee which would offer the opportunity to look at a number of important strategic streams in a more informal setting. The Awayday would be moderated by Professor Peter Sharratt.

The meeting ended at 11.48 am

Chairman

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