

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, 2 July 2024**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery  
Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 2 July 2024 at 10.00 am

**Present**

**Members:**

Deputy Shravan Joshi MBE (Chairman)  
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)  
Ian Bishop-Laggett  
Michael Cassidy  
Deputy Simon Duckworth OBE DL  
Mary Durcan  
Deputy John Edwards  
Anthony David Fitzpatrick  
Deputy John Fletcher  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney  
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen  
Deputy Charles Edward Lord  
Deputy Brian Mooney BEM  
Deputy Alastair Moss  
Eamonn Mullally  
Alderwoman Susan Pearson  
Deputy Henry Pollard  
Hugh Selka  
William Upton KC  
Jacqui Webster

**In attendance (Observing Online):**

Judith Pleasance

**Also in attendance:**

Deputy Peter Dunphy, Chief Commoner

**Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	-	Interim Assistant Town Clerk
Fleur Francis	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Gemma Delves	-	Environment Department
David Horkan	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	-	Environment Department
Georgia McBirney	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	-	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	-	Environment Department

Taluana Patricio	-	Environment Department
Joanna Parker	-	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	-	Environment Department
Robin Whitehouse	-	Environment Department
Peter Wilson	-	Environment Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Deputy Randall Anderson, Jaspreet Hodgson, Antony Manchester, Deborah Oliver, Judith Pleasance, Alderman Simon Pryke, Ian Seaton and Shailendra Umradia.

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

Deputy Edward Lord stated that he had been advised that the Leathersellers Company had an interest in Agenda Item 4 and as he was a member of the Leathersellers Company he would therefore withdraw from the meeting for Agenda Item 4.

Mr Mullally stated he had been in discussion with Legal Officers regarding the risk of an interest between himself, his wife, who was the Church of England prelate for London and Agenda Item 4 in respect of St Helen's Square. Due to the legal separation of the parish and the diocese, he considered there was not a conflict of interest. Legal Officers and the Diocese of London supported this view and therefore he would take part in the consideration of Agenda Item 4.

3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2024 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **1 UNDERSHAFT, LONDON, EC3A 8EE**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning demolition of the existing buildings, retention and partial expansion of existing basement plus construction of a ground, plus 73 storey building (plus plant) for office use (Use Class E(g)); Retail/food and beverage (Use Class E(a)-(b)); Public amenity space (Flexible Class E(a)-(d) / Class F1 / Sui Generis); publicly accessible education space and viewing gallery at levels 72 and 73 (Sui Generis); public cycle hub (Sui Generis); plus podium garden at level 11, public realm improvement works, ancillary basement cycle parking, servicing, plant, highway works and other works associated with the proposed development.

The Town Clerk referred to those papers set out within the main agenda pack as well as the Officer presentation slides and two addenda which had been separately circulated and published.

Officers presented the application stating that the site was bounded to the south by Leadenhall Street, to the east by St Mary Axe and to the north and west by Undershaft. There were heritage assets nearby notably the Grade I listed Lloyd's building to the south, the Grade I listed St Andrew's Undershaft to the east and the Grade I St Helen's Church to the north. The St Helen's Place

Conservation Area was also to the north. The site was within the City Cluster, the strategic outlet for the City's growth to maintain its economic objectives and its international competitiveness. Members were shown the proposed scheme amidst the existing and consented cluster of towers in the location. The location was within the City Cluster policy area in both the adopted 2015 local plan and the proposed City Plan 2040. It was broadly at the heart of the cluster.

Members were shown an aerial view of the site showing the existing building which was the 1960s Commercial Union Tower which had been remodelled in the 1990s and was now subject to a certificate of immunity from listing. Members were shown an image of extensive St Helen's Square, along with the Cheese Grater and St Andrew Undershaft. To the west of the site was a cluttered area of public realm bestrewn with railings and bollards and a large ventilation shaft. The existing road of Undershaft kinked around the site to the north and west. A view was shown with Undershaft to the north and St Mary Axe and the Gherkin off to the east. A view of St Mary Axe, looking south at the Grade I listed Lloyd's building in the distance and the existing Commercial Union Tower in the foreground. Members were shown the servicing ramp from which the existing building and plaza was serviced. It created a rather unsightly rift in the townscape and had an unsympathetic presence in relation to the Grade I listed church in the background.

The Officer informed Members that the application was for a 74-storey office development which would deliver over 154,000 square metres of flexible Grade A best-in-class office floor space with the potential to accommodate nearly 9,500 jobs. It was a proposal of significant strategic importance to the City's international competitiveness. Alongside this, a suite of unique and distinctive public spaces would be woven through the proposal, culminating in the highest public civic space in Britain. The development would have the highest architectural and sustainable credentials. It would transform and enrich the ground floor City around it and would optimise the more strategic site in the cluster.

Members were shown existing and proposed basement plans highlighting long stay cycle parking with approximately 2,200 spaces, 200 short stay spaces and end of trip facilities which were all fully policy compliant.

The proposed building footprint was larger than the existing footprint as it was working hard to optimise the site. It incorporated five separate entrances for the separate functions. The building incorporated three public entrances. There was a dedicated servicing entrance to the northeast of the site and the large office entrance accommodating the rest of the St Mary Axe elevation together with extensive relandscaping and enhancements to the public realm around it. Members were shown an existing floor plate and proposed floor plates to reflect the way the building's mass changed as the building stepped back and recessed to create its distinctive form and deliver a suite of different office floor plates for a range of different users as would befit the central cluster location. As well as the office floor plates there were significant amenity levels breaking up the building and providing generously planted and generously sized

sheltered spaces with spectacular views over the capital, meeting market demand. Architecturally the building would be an outstandingly contextual building in the sense that this was a location in the City where there was a great degree of architectural charisma including the iconic forms of the Lloyd's Building, the Cheese Grater and the Gherkin. The building would introduce a series of interesting architectural approaches and high-quality design ranging from the subtle pale elevations fanning out from the base to the striking podium garden which was suspended 42 m above the ground floor and the zinc and vitreous enamel cladding of the main office tower rising to the apex.

The Officer showed the proposed elevations and stated that the building had been designed with circular economy principles in mind. It reused the extensive basement levels on the site, incorporated facades to optimise shading and it was a fully electric and very sustainable building. The existing and proposed west and north elevation showed the significant optimisation of the site that the scheme would bring forward. An existing and proposed cross-section showed the disposition of those uses throughout the building with the public uses indicated at ground floor at Levels 10,11, 12, 72 and 73 with the office uses interspersed among those. The location of the lifts was shown to indicate how hard the ground floor plane was working to get people around the scheme.

The crown would be picked out in subtle rippling colour to reflect the civic functions there at the apex of the cluster and would form a striking but yet quite modest and understated new presence. In the long-range views, it would be seen as the apex and the backbone of the City Cluster, with the exciting modern skyline presence distinct from and disassociated from the World Heritage Site.

Members were shown a view with the scheme shown rising in the background as the tallest in the clusters. They were also shown the existing and cumulative view from Queen's Walk showing how the building would almost be like the totem pole of the cluster from which all of the other towers would gently descend and would create a distinctive architectural composition. The Officer outlined the public spaces. In relation to those at the top, people would enter from a generously sized lobby at ground floor level to the north to ensure that logistics and queueing were factored in and an optimal visitor experience was delivered. These would be the highest such spaces in Britain and would be curated by the London Museum, a place for members of the public and state school children to learn about their city. It would also deliver a series of different views to the existing suite of elevated public spaces in the cluster.

The Officer highlighted an image of the classroom in the sky with state school children of all backgrounds being able to enjoy the unparalleled views. The Level 11 podium garden presented a significant architectural moment in the scheme and a place of urban theatre. It would be a large and generous elevated public space unparalleled in London. It would be generously planted, would enjoy fine microclimatic conditions and there would be fine new views of heritage assets such as the Lloyds building from there. It would be supported in its function by the Level 10 and Level 12 amenities. The proposal would create a new destination for the City. Members were shown one of the singular

features of this podium garden, the Oculus, a circular area of walk-on structural glazing, allowing people to admire the ground floor level 42 metres below them.

In an image from Lime Street, Members could see the view of the existing building and square and the proposal with the podium garden suspended 42 metres above this space. The Oculus formed an eye-catching new feature when seen from this distance. Members were shown a closer image of the existing cluttered St Helen's Square at present and the proposal with the lower elevations of the proposed scheme gently fanning out from the base and the podium garden soaring above. The cycle entrance would be located to the west side of the scheme and would provide a dedicated entrance for long and short stay cycle parking and end of trip facilities.

Existing and proposed views of the west side of Undershaft, showed how the area would be transformed, tidied up, made more usable with benches and seating introduced in a striking white column, which would be a water feature and a public artwork acting as a focal point for the space. Undershaft would, as a result of this be realigned to the north. There would be a generously proportioned public lobby to those civic uses at the apex.

Members were shown the existing and proposed condition at St Mary Axe. In the servicing arrangements, the unsightly servicing ramp would be removed. A dedicated servicing entrance which would be set back from the street would be introduced so that vehicles could wait there if the need arose. Servicing would be consolidated and off-peak in the usual way other similar schemes in the cluster were expected to operate. The Officer stated that as part of this transformative scheme, an unparalleled Section 278 agreement would be entered into for the entirety of St Mary Axe to enhance this street in line with the principles of the city cluster vision, set out in 2019. Details of this were to be worked through by Officers in the usual way, but an image was shown which gave an indication of the ambition of the scheme and what it would deliver as a minimum with the rebuilding and enhancement of the entire street which was a crucial artery in the City Cluster. The proposed St Helen's Square would be reimagined as a new inclusive and flexible civic space at the heart of the cluster.

The Officer presented the existing and proposed site plans and stated that the proposed building footprint was larger, worked harder and consequently there was a small reduction in the overall area of public realm at grade across the site. There would be an 18% reduction overall with the building footprint principally to the south on St Helen's Square. It was also the case that the reimagined St Helen's Square would deliver a significantly enhanced public space that would be flexible. The existing level changes of St Helen's Square would be removed along with the irregular planting beds and more usable space would be created together with a mixture of 12 semi-mature trees planted and there would be fixed and movable seating to open up this space for everyone. In addition, the proposed Level 11 podium garden delivered a significant amount of new publicly accessible space, so when the scheme was considered as a whole, it provided an uplift both in quality and quantity of publicly accessible space.

In the existing and proposed view across St Helen's Square looking at St Andrew Undershaft, the existing deficiencies of the square could be seen by the multiple changes in the level, the rather cluttered and irregular layout of the square and also the extensive irregular planting beds that occupied much of the space. Under the proposals, a very simple flush area of public realm would be created in front of the building next to the lifts to the podium garden. There would be a grove of 12 semi mature trees interspersed with seating and planting which would be flexible, programmable and inclusive. There would also be some hostile vehicle mitigation required along the eastern side of the site. In the background there would be new views of the Lloyd's building, another heritage asset which remained possible across the reimagined scene. St Helen's Square, would be a space comparable to Guildhall Yard in scale. The Officer stated that the new building, with its elevated podium garden suspended 42 metres above would create a fascinating new architectural urban moment at the heart of the cluster.

Members viewed a slide showing how the square would remain programmable for events and functions much in the same way as now, including the showing of the Wimbledon tournament. They also viewed a slide showing the space by night and at dusk, showing the interplay at this crucial strategic part of the cluster between old and new, ancient and modern and between architectures of supremely charismatic nature.

In summary, the Officer stated that the proposed scheme would deliver over 154,000 square metres of much needed flexible Grade A, best-in-class office floor space, accommodating up to nearly 9,500 jobs. This would be a significant strategic contribution of office floor space of the utmost importance to the City's economic objectives to maintain its international competitiveness, as well as strengthen the economic base of the City Cluster. One Undershaft stood at the heart of insurance, a critical sector that was growing at a phenomenal rate in the City. This scheme, through delivering strategic floor space and amenities, would further strengthen this growth. The scheme would have the highest social and educational credentials, delivering the highest elevated public cultural classroom space in Britain, curated by the London Museum at the apex, symbolic of the City Cluster of tall buildings, and a free to visit seven days a week inclusive to all podium garden at Level 11. The scheme would create an iconic new destination at the heart of the City Cluster, supporting the City's cultural seven day and evening objectives. Architecturally it would be the totemic centre piece and the backbone of the cluster, a rich and humane tall building, an outstanding architectural moment at the heart of the City, adding to the unique urban theatre of this location. The scheme would carry exemplary sustainability credentials, targeting BREEAM outstanding and designed with circular economy principles to address climate adaptation and mitigation. The scheme would provide significant improvements at ground floor level, including the transformation of Undershaft and St Mary Axe.

There would be a reduction in the extent of ground floor public realm as a result of the necessary lift cores and reception areas to service a building of this strategic importance to the City and deliver the floor space needed. However,

the new reimagined public ground floor realm, would provide a significantly more enhanced, inclusive and flexible St Helen's Square in quality terms, a reimagined south facing public space of generous civic scale at the heart of the cluster. The Officer stated that that the City Cluster was the economic engine of the City, London and the UK economy. To keep pace with GLA employment growth projections, research indicated an absolute minimum of 1.2 million square metres of new office floor space had to be delivered. It was estimated that 85% of this would need to be delivered in the City Cluster, which was a geographically modest area. This site was the single most strategic site in the cluster and in the City and it was vital the floor space capacity on this site was optimised to remain internationally competitive in the years ahead. This had to be balanced with local impacts and the provision of high-quality public realm and other planning considerations. Officers firmly believed the scheme achieved this balance and for the reasons set out in the report, the scheme was recommended for approval.

The Chairman stated that as one of the addenda had been received shortly prior to the start of the meeting, the meeting would therefore be paused for Members to read it.

*At this point, at 10.23am, the Chairman adjourned the meeting. The meeting resumed at 10.25am.*

A Member asked for clarification on whether a representation from a neighbouring occupier was relevant. The Chairman and Officers confirmed that all representations were relevant as long as they contained relevant planning arguments.

The Town Clerk explained that there were two registered objectors to address the meeting and she invited the objectors to speak.

Mr John Adams JDA Planning Consultancy, stated the City was defined by its public realm, the free, safe and open spaces, where people could simply enjoy the sky and fresh air regardless of age, wealth or background. He commented that the buildings might be magnificent, but it was the spaces between them at street level that brought the City alive. St Helen's Square was a pivotal primary civic space, was 66 metres long and south facing. Pedestrian routes through the City radiated from the square. People crossed the space constantly and it hummed with life. Open space in the Eastern Cluster was very limited. The few places of scale creating a comfortable place for people to gather and enjoy were especially important. The scheme resulted in the loss of 30% of the square itself. It would be reduced from 66 metres to 37 metres in length, which would not be a generous scale for the hard work it would have to do. 60% of this reduced area would be covered by office space.

Mr Adams stated that the 11th floor terrace would result in the sense of space and sky being lost. The urban moment of generous open sky, dramatically surrounded by medieval churches and some of the most iconic buildings of the time would be lost. He commented that the Officer's report criticised the existing layout of Saint Helen's Square and argued that a third of the square was not

publicly accessible and the layout restricted movement. However, to only compare what was proposed with what existed today was a false assumption. The square would be redesigned in any redevelopment option because the basements of the building were below it. It could be and should be a brilliant inclusive space and programmable and active through the day. It should also be attractive at night. The downplaying of the qualities and scale of the square in the Officer report in the section on public realm was incorrect and led to a misleading conclusion, namely that the 11th floor public terraces were of equivalent quality as the square. As a replacement for street level public space, the 11th floor terrace did not begin to compare with Saint Helen's Square in terms of welcome easy access and equitable public realm of scale, with exceptional views of the sky and buildings that defined the City. The gain in public realm to the west of the building in Undershaft was in full shadow and was not comparable in quality to the square.

Members were informed that Policy OS1 of the City Plan 2040 stated that open space should be protected unless there were wholly exceptional circumstances. It also stated that new space at ground level should be created and supplemented, not substituted, through the addition of publicly accessible roof gardens.

Mr Adams raised concern that the application removed space from St Helen's Square and was dominated by the terrace at the 11th floor. The balance was wrong. Exceptional circumstances had not been demonstrated and could not be found to exist unless alternatives that avoided the harm to the public space at street level and the setting of heritage assets had been tested and they had not been. Mr Adams commented that it was striking that, in relation to assessing the heritage impact of the proposal, the Officer's report reached the exact opposite conclusions to those of Historic England, the statutory adviser on heritage matters. Historic England concluded that the proposal would degrade the public realm, hem in the buildings and streets around it, reduce sight lines and this would directly compromise an appreciation of the setting of the exceptional heritage assets and the broad experience of the City around them. The Officer's report stated that Historic England's conclusion was without foundation. This was a stark departure from the advice of the statutory body responsible for advising on the historic environment. This was a cause for concern and should give Members significant pause for thought. He urged Members to consider Historic England's advice that the base of the building should be redesigned to protect and enhance St Helen's Square and the historic environment. He added that their advice and the representations of CC Land should be given considerable weight.

Mr Justin Black, head of the UK development CC Land stated that CC Land understood the strategic importance of the One Undershaft site to the future of the City of London. They fully supported its redevelopment, but not at any cost. He stated it was understood that the applicant commenced engagement with Officers in early 2022. However, their first briefing did not occur until 18 months later on the 31 October 2023, seven weeks prior to the planning application submission. Mr Black stated that CC Land, along with other stakeholders believed these plans to be flawed, resulting in unnecessary harm to the public



realm, townscape and setting of heritage assets. He added that this harm would be irrecoverable, if progressed and was completely avoidable. Redevelopment of One Undershaft did not necessitate the loss of street level public open space and did not necessitate the demotion and the size and stature of St Helen's Square. He added that the harm created by these proposals could be averted through redesign with minimal commercial impact to the applicant.

Mr Black informed Members that as evidenced by the applicant's 2019 consent, there were other solutions. The current plans were not the only way to deliver a fully accessible St Helen's Square with more public seating. The applicant benefited from a world class professional team capable of overcoming most challenges and concerns could be resolved if the applicant redesigned the lower third of the building. Cutting back massing from the ground floor to Level 11 would remove the overhang and add back floor space consented under the 2019 scheme with a reconfiguration of the core. St Helen's Square would be protected and enhanced. Local workers could access the square for impromptu amenity and respite would be protected and enhanced. The vision for an exemplary centrepiece for the City Cluster would be achieved. The resultant loss of floor space would be less than 4%.

Mr Black commented that comprising 13% of the projected demand for office floor space in the City, the applicant's proposals could be perceived as too important not to receive approval. He stated that CC Land, along with other stakeholders, strongly believed that the One Undershaft opportunity was too important not to get absolutely right and that the redevelopment plans should be first class on all aspects.

He stated that the current proposals fell short, particularly in relation to the street level place making. The applicant's 2019 consent recognised the importance of street level public open space and the need to protect and enhance St Helen's Square. The need to preserve and enhance the limited supply of public realm in the City of London has become more acute since the 2019 consent.

The concerns detailed in the representations were not unique to CC Land and statutory bodies. The worries were widely shared by workers, residents, businesses, industries and property owners in the local area. They were legitimate concerns raised by those who would be directly affected by the One Undershaft proposals and must be fully considered and evaluated as part of the decision-making process.

Mr Black stated the Sub-Committee should refuse to endorse any loss of street level public open space to private commercial use and any demotion of the size and stature of St. Helen's Square.

Members were informed that the current form of the lower third of the building was a choice by the applicant, which could be changed and improved upon at the direction of Members and Officers. The resultant loss of floor space would be less than 4%. Mr Black stated that believing that the harm created by these

proposals was compulsory or an unacceptable price for the City of London to pay for the redevelopment of One Undershaft was a mistake that could and should be avoided. He requested that Members deferred determination of this application and that the applicant be required to progress revisions to the proposals which would deliver no loss of street level public open space compared to the existing situation and which would preserve and enhance St Helen's Square as a vitally important civic space and focus for placemaking, for workers, residents and visitors.

The Chairman stated that there were four ward Members registered to speak, Mr Dominic Christian, Ms Irem Yerdelen, Alderman Sir Charles Bowman and Deputy Henry Colthurst. A Member advised that Deputy Henry Colthurst would not be speaking.

Mr Christian stated that there had been an insurance centre in the City of London that uniquely brought together the qualities of an insurance campus, a trading area and a client services model. He stated that the London market was one of history's more resilient and enduring business operations and was almost precisely in the same location.

He stated that insurance central was not just national it was global. Spontaneity, creativity and connectivity stood at the core of the 52,000 people who worked around the square in this very area, 59 managing agents, 92 Lloyds syndicates, 250 insurance companies, over 330 insurance insurer technology companies as counting all these businesses with their 52,000 employees working within metres of each other. They had a common fascination with risk, analysing, assessing, translating and transmitting risk and much of the time they worked together on this, as members of the community respecting competition but acting as one.

Mr Christian stated that for 40 years, he had been working in the City of London, always next to and within sight of this building. He had been working as a broker throughout that time, going to Lloyds on a daily basis along with 5,000 other people, visiting the myriad of underwriting offices clustered around lawyers. He added that the City of London was an ecosystem. Buildings were not independent of each other. For the last 10 years he had been the global chairman of Aon, with 3,500 people working in the Cheese Grater building next door to this building which equated to 60% of the employees who worked in that building.

Members were informed that Mr Christian had also been the deputy chairman of Lloyd's and stated the chairman of Lloyds had made comments in the press opposing what had been proposed. Mr Christian stated Members and Officers had advised, agreed and authorised many of the fantastic buildings in EC3 and the insurance community was grateful. He listed several companies and stated the insurance community including leaders from all of the large insurance companies of the world, all of whom had bases of operations in the City were all opposed. He suggested that an estimated 40,000 out of 52,000 were opposed. The ward in which this building was proposed was Lime Street Ward

and approximately 90% of the voters worked in the insurance community, many of them for the companies he had referred to.

Mr Christian requested that the Sub-Committee defer the decision and seek further consultation. He stated that a consultation meeting had been held on 14 February but nothing had changed. He advocated for postponement and further consultation.

Ms Irem Yerdelen spoke about the open space benefits, especially from an environmental perspective and the health benefits perspective. She stated there was a significant open ground floor space in front of this building currently and it provided groundwater storage, flood control, air and water pollution abatements, recreation, habitat and ecological and aesthetic benefits. Most importantly, such open ground floor space in cities such as London mitigated the effects of pollution and could reduce the phenomenon known as the urban heat island effect, the heat trapped in built areas. There were lots of built areas around this building already and the effect should not be extended by taking away the ground floor space.

Ms Yerdelen stated that this ground floor space created solitude for herself and her team every time they stepped into that space. It helped them to reflect, to pause, to soak up the sun and simply connect with other people. This space particularly benefitted younger people and less senior people in the industry and the surrounding offices. They could eat their lunch there and connect with their colleagues. Ms Yerdelen commented that we did not inherit the earth from our ancestors; we borrowed it from our children. She stated that the open ground floor spaces should not been taken away.

Alderman Sir Charles Bowman stated that in his 11 years as Alderman of Lime Street, he had been reminded most days of the importance of the insurance sector and cluster to the City's economy and its importance to the City's future. As Lord Mayor in 2017/18, when promoting UK financial and professional services internationally, he witnessed firsthand the role that London played as the world leader in specialist and other insurance, and the admiration that the international community had for the unique insurance cluster. He also witnessed the global competitiveness within the sector and the related fragility of the City's position as market leader and the need to do the right thing to sustain that number one position.

Alderman Bowman stated he was part qualified as an architect. He had a deep admiration for Eric Parry and his work, past and present. He was a very firm believer in place-based development within the City and based on 11 years as an Alderman, believed strongly that One Undershaft should be redeveloped. However, with equal strength, he believed that the proposed building was not the right answer as designed and would damage the insurance sector. He had spoken to many in the sector, including the chairman of Lloyd's. He had also spoken to fellow elected Members who were heavily engaged in the insurance sector and in promoting the financial and professional services sector. The views from this engagement had been unanimous, that the site should be developed but not with the building as currently designed. It would damage the

sector built up. Alderman Bowman stated the preeminent insurance sector and cluster was a prized asset in the City and EC3 and there was a responsibility to listen.

The Chairman asked if Members of the Sub-Committee had any questions of the objectors.

A Member asked for clarification on the loss of space related specifically to St Helen's Square. An objector stated that the space was being reduced by 30%. The 18% reduction referred to the loss of public realm around One Undershaft, including the space to the west and to the north of the building. The objector stated their focus was on St Helen's Square and the 30% loss of what they regarded as the primary civic space and the most useful usable public open space.

A Member queried why there were not more objections from insurance companies. Mr Christian stated that at the consultation meeting on 14 February 2024, not a single member of the insurance community attending, was in favour. They objected on grounds of footprint, aesthetics, the thoroughfare, how people lived their lives and worked and the ease with which they did that. The Chairman stated that he was at the meeting, along with Officers. He was not aware that anyone at the meeting objected to the building itself or the requirement for office space and comments were in relation to security, access and the ground floor plane. Mr Christian stated that objectors were not objecting to the overall building, just elements of the scheme. They were not trying to stop the scheme but to help improve it.

A Member asked a question in relation to the floor plate at ground level and the 11th floor public realm. She stated that on the site visit, it was helpful to see the way the space was used, with people using the ground floor space to eat lunch. She asked if, with the loss of public space at ground level, the space at podium level would be used by the same people in the same way. Ms Yerdelen stated that people eating lunch and chatting in the ground floor space was the day-to-day reality. The ground floor space was evidence of the socioeconomic variety coming together every day. Office workers, construction workers and tourists all sat there. This socialising provided value in this part of the City. Ms Yerdelen stated that she was not against the building but was keen the building provided the same benefits as before. She raised concern that the 11th floor space would not be used in the same way as people were often short of time and therefore it would not be equivalent to the ground floor space.

A Member asked Mr Adams to give his assessment in planning terms of the quality of the proposed public space with the new podium level and the proposed new ground level public space, compared to the existing public space. Mr Adams stated the report on the City Cluster vision was a key report looking at public realm in the City which stated that spaces such as St Helen's Square provided the canvas for active and engaging public life to flourish and were supported by a range of social and cultural activities and events. He commented that a similar description could be applied to the 11th floor terrace. In his opinion, St Helen's Square was a blank canvas which could be designed

to the same quality as the 11th floor terrace. The square had been awaiting redevelopment for some years. He stated that he was not criticising the quality of the 11th floor terrace but was saying it was not an equivalent replacement because it required users to go into the building and take a lift up 11 storeys which presented quite a significant barrier to movement. Therefore this space had a different role. He added that St Helen's Square could achieve the same quality but be more accessible for all.

A Member asked about the difference between the ground floor space and the upper floor space, particularly in regard to the Tulip enquiry with comments made by the inspector and the Mayor for London. She asked objectors to expand on the comments and relevant case law the objector had mentioned about the difference in ground floor open space and upper-level open spaces. An objector stated his understanding of the Tulip inquiry was that one of the grounds of objection was the loss of part of the civic space that surrounded the Gherkin which was also regarded as a very important civic primary space. The conclusion of the inspector was that there was concern about the loss of ground floor space which was regarded as an important canvas for social and public life. The decision did not actually turn on that, but it was recorded as a ground of refusal. The objector considered that the purpose of the Tulip viewing platform was very different to the 11th floor terrace, which was different in design and purpose and was more of an international destination than regarded as a public space to serve the City.

A Member asked the objectors who spoke on behalf of the industry to comment on the quality of the consultation and asked them if they considered that the concerns of the industry had been reflected in the proposal. Mr Christian raised concerns but stated but this might be the fault of Members campaigning. He commented that this might not have been anything to do with how the consultation was organised or arranged but he did not know anyone in the area he worked in who supported this proposal.

A Member asked about consultation and what changes to the proposal would have satisfied the objectors. Mr Christian stated that security, access to the 11th floor and the removal of the footprint were the main issues that were clearly aired at the consultation meeting on 14 February 2024, and they remained concerns. Ms Yerdelen stated that she had an email feeding back points from the 14 February meeting to the committee Chairman and Officers. She read some of the email out and stated that there were no adverse comments made about the height or appearance of the main building which emitted a consensus that the end result should be suitably iconic to match the attractions of the Lloyd's Building and also the Gherkin. There were a number of concerns about how any development would be managed over the plus five-year build in an area which had already experienced major works during disruption for at least 15 years and resulting impact of workers in the immediate area. There were also comments made that however attractive the garden podium, it would provide little or no benefit to workers in the area and would join an increasingly crowded market of raised viewing and other areas. Ms Yerdelen stated there was a request for honesty about no security procedures being needed for raised areas and such claim was regarded with huge scepticism by

firms and workers in the area, which suffered two terrorist attacks in the early 1990s. One Undershaft was a major casualty of the first attack. There were also material worries about a huge loss of open public space at street level, which provided light and air at Lime Street and Leadenhall Street in an area which was hugely appreciated by 3,000 plus workers, particularly in the insurance sector and in summer months.

A Member stated he would have expected more objections and referred to the public realm under the Leadenhall Building which had engendered a lot of public comment. The Chairman stated the Officers could provide more detail on how the consultation was run.

The Chairman invited the applicants to speak.

Mr Andrew Highton, Stanhope, stated he was speaking on behalf of his client, Aroland, who were represented at the meeting by Mr Lim. Mr Harton thanked Officers for their input over the 18-month pre-application period, and the determination period and all their hard work in preparing their comprehensive committee report. He thanked Members for attending briefings, visiting the site, asking questions, embracing virtual reality and reading, digesting and considering the report. He stated there were three areas he wanted to cover in his introduction; -1) The current status of the project; 2) why new proposals were being brought forward; and 3) how the development was a fantastic contribution to the City and the wider London. Members were informed that Aroland acquired the site from Aviva in 2011. The same design team developed the scheme, which was approved by this committee in 2016 and granted planning consent in 2019. During this time, Aviva and their sub tenants remained in occupation until the end of April of this year and it was hoped full vacant possession would be secured by the autumn.

Mr Highton stated his client had committed funding to allow preparatory works, including deconstruction and enabling works. Stanhope were now assisting them to secure full development finance.

Mr Highton stated that he would now focus on why the new proposals had been brought forward. 12 million square feet of additional office space would be required in the Square Mile by 2040.

Stanhope's own research recently shared with the City's investment team showed 5,000,000 square feet of leases which came to an end within this period, and this did not account for new entrants to the City to meet their occupied demands or those companies who were likely to return from Canary Wharf. Buildings which had strong energy and carbon performance and a mixture of sizes of flexible floors, extensive landlord amenities and access to external spaces, were vital to meeting the occupier demand, to encourage people back into the office and attract the very best talent. Neither the existing building nor the consented scheme designed 10 years ago could deliver this.

Mr Highton stated he would now focus on how assurance could be given that this development would be amazing for the city and the capital as a whole. The

client with Stanhope's support was fully committed to making this a world class democratic development, to be enjoyed by workers, their friends and families, residents and visitors alike. The landscape was key and the team had been strengthened with SLA from Denmark who were a fantastic international designer. This building embodied the Destination City policy and no other building had come close to offering such a wealth of benefits to the workforce in the wider public.

Mr Highton informed Members that he was pleased to be able to confirm that the partnership agreement made between the client and the Museum of London had been renewed. He stated he hoped his words had demonstrated the client's commitment to the project.

Mr Eric Parry, Eric Parry Architects, stated that this was not an easy jigsaw puzzle to solve. However, it was a huge honour to be designing the city's designated crown of the cluster buildings as a whole. It had a remarkable and visionary urban concentration and it was an extraordinary grouping of buildings, many of which were of remarkable quality. It provided a setting that had both a sense of awe and intimacy.

Mr Parry stated that since designing the consented scheme 10 years ago, much had changed both physically and psychologically. The proposal was a response to the resulting opportunities. He stated that going back to 2016, 100 Leadenhall had been open for about three years and the building at 52 to 54 Lime Street was under construction. Since then, there had been the development of 40 Leadenhall and 100 Leadenhall. The sense of accumulation was very palpable and meant the response needed to take that into consideration.

Members were informed that the space was very much three dimensional. The square itself had less daylight and fell short in terms of BRE standards. The building was configured as a series of elements that were broken horizontally. There was a lightness to the base so that the buildings around it both to the northwest, east and south had interest. The building connected all the way to Liverpool Street.

Members were shown a view of the consented scheme and the proposed scheme. The proposed scheme was closer by 50m to allow for the security to be taken into account. There was a triple height space which was very generous at the bottom. To the north there was the new double height entrance opposite St Helen's Bishopsgate that would give access to the top of the building, the 72nd and 73rd floors of the London Museum's curated spaces. There was a quietness to the 11th floor garden which was a large area, and very easily accessible from the lifts at the base taking less than half a minute and it could accommodate 1000 people.

Amenity for the building would be created at the 30th and 48th floor, which was important for the office workers and uniquely there would be a sense of terraces to the middle sections of the building.

Ms Sharon Amant, Director at the London Museum stated that the museum had been involved in this project since it began in 2016 and the opportunity to curate a classroom in the sky on the 72nd floor of One Undershaft was unparalleled. It would be a significant building, the most stand out in the city. The top floors had been designed as a free learning space and this had been embedded in the scheme. The London Museum's commitment to this idea came from a scheme in Smithfield and the ambition here equalled that. The proposed scheme was about young Londoners and there was an ambition for all the young people who lived in the City by the time One Undershaft opened, an estimated 1.3 million school pupils between the ages of 5 and 17, would engage at one point during their 12 years in education with the classroom in the sky. It was anticipated that it would be a rite of passage, something they would remember and would have a positive impact. It was expected that there would be people visiting during term time as part of their education, educational visits organised by schools and family visits during the holidays and weekends.

The Chairman asked Members if they had any questions of the applicants.

A Member commented that considering the numbers of people using the open space, the current arrangements provided about 1.2 square metres per person and the new development provided 0.25 square metres per person at ground level, increasing to 0.75 square metres per person if the platform was included. He asked the applicants to comment on this. The applicant stated that external spaces had been created specifically for the occupants of the building. The building at the moment had no external space, so focused on the public use and the use by all of the external amenity. The applicants had sought to achieve the same or better amenity than the current amenity. 300 seats were proposed with 250 in the front and a further 50 in the west. Currently there were about 200 in the front and 60 in the west. The proposals would hopefully allow anyone who wanted to dwell, relax there and meet there to do so.

In relation to the representation from St Helen's, the Member asked about commitments to accept, embrace and engage with their requirements about noise including that from school children especially in quiet periods. He was conscious that they had services and other meetings, not just on Sunday mornings, but also had a very active midweek community. The Chairman stated this question could be asked of Officers.

A Member asked if the public realm would be more user friendly to people with mobility issues than the existing public realm. The applicant stated this would be the case. Currently there was stepping down and planters. The proposal would provide a clear space and accessibility had been paramount when designing the landscape and spaces.

The Chairman asked the applicant to outline the journey to the 11th floor, outlining the accessibility and ease of access. The applicant stated that when accessing the square from the south, there would be a grove of trees with a raised canopy. Hostile vehicle mitigation was incorporated into the seating. People would see through to a triple height space with a curved triple height glazed section that allowed great porosity. At heightened times of security,



security could be allowed for within that space. It was 165 square metres and so a large space. Directly in front would be the lift. There were three 17 persons to take people up to the 10th or 11th floor within 30 seconds so 1000 people could be accommodated in terms of lift movements within an hour.

Mr Rasmus Astrup, SLA, stated there would be yorkstone in the ground floor public realm, through the lobby, inside the lifts and out into the podium. The yorkstone was a historical reference and also created a shared public space.

A Member who was also a ward Member, stated that it had been good to meet some of the team at the public consultations. He queried whether the fundamental issues given in feedback had been addressed following consultation or if the changes had been minor. The applicants stated they had done as much as they could to strike a balance between all the uses so the scheme had not changed materially. Although the changes were minor, they had been made with a great deal of depth of thought and analysis.

A Member asked if the education space for the London Museum would be fitted out and how the staff would be funded. Ms Amant stated she expected the education space to be fully fitted out. The technology was yet to be confirmed as it would be a number of years before the space was constructed and could be used. It would be a highly immersive space with views of London. It would not be object rich like the museum in Smithfield. The space would sit neatly beside the new museum in Smithfield and was part of the museum's dynamic desire to become a financially sustainable organisation and the museum would look for new operating partners and new ways to make the museum economically viable.

The applicants confirmed they would fit out the viewing space and the museum classroom space. It would be a partnership between the owner of the building and the museum. The viewing space would hopefully be better than any other viewing space because it would be the tallest and was now designed to provide a 360 degree panorama.

The Member also asked if the amenity space would just be available to people working in the space. The applicants confirmed that the amenity spaces at levels 30 and 48 were double height and their garden spaces were accessible. The Member asked how translucent the Oculus would be. The applicants stated that the Oculus would be constructed of 50 millimetre laminated glass, 40 metres square.

In response to a Member's question about servicing, the applicants stated that they had committed to serve a much bigger building with the same number of vehicle movements. The maximum number of vehicle movements was not expected to be reached each day. The vehicle lifts would be located directly abutting St Mary Axe. The applicants were also willing to work cooperatively with adjoining owners to see how vehicle movements could be better managed.

A Member asked why the previous consented scheme was not constructed, and whether if granted, the proposed scheme would be constructed and what

the time limit would be. The applicants stated that the previous application was designed in 2014 when the world was different. Offices now had to work a lot harder to provide amenities for their occupiers. One size floor plates over multiple floors was not what occupiers required. The total project time would be 6-7 years. The client had secured funding for the preparatory 2-year period and was working hard to put in place funding for the development.

Members asked about toilet provision and access for the public. The applicants stated there would be public toilets at ground level. There would be further public toilets up at the public areas. The intention was that the toilet facilities would be open during the opening hours of the 11th floor garden, which were 7am - 11pm. This was based on dialogue with the police about antisocial behaviours. It was anticipated that the toilets would be closed from 11pm - 7am.

A Member asked whether there was funding in place to curate the cultural space. Ms Amant stated that from the London Museum's perspective, an internal development team was being set up to support this project. The longer-term business planning for this space would be considered by the Board and would require partnership as well as public funding. The museum had already received grant aid from the GLA and the City of London and Arts Council England, so it could be possible to reshape the proportion of money spent on Smithfield, the museum in Docklands and this museum. This would be considered as part of the financial planning in future years.

The Member also asked about the demolition strategy and for further details on recycling and reuse of materials. Mr Michael Trousdell WSP advised that the demolition process had been developed very carefully considering circular economy principles and had been included within the circular economy statement. An extensive pre-demolition audit had been developed. The client was working hard to achieve best practise, an example of which would be delivering a closed loop recycling on aluminium elements in the facade and also more broadly reusing as much as possible of the foundation and the substructure of the building for the support of the new scheme.

A Member asked questions in relation to the design of the building. The applicants stated that the profile at the top of the building was the same as it was in the consented scheme. The garden space was organic without sharp corners. It was a perambulation that allowed people to continuously move 330 metres with views to Saint Paul's. The element of cantilever was the element to the south. There was an edge around the building and from the 10th floor, the floor below the garden, it was suspended lantern-like. It stepped back and allowed transparency and sunlight at the base at these three and two storey levels of glass, so it was very porous at the bottom. The structure had 30 metre spacings, holding a 300 metre building above, like the arch of an amazing structure. These were trident in form and were closely engineered like giant redwoods holding the garden above and the area that protruded and gave a view through the Oculus of the public space as well as the space at the ground. The lantern would be of stone colour and that material continued into the soffit and had a softness.

In response to a Member's questions about the design of the building, the applicants stated that significant occupiers would struggle to fit their occupation into the floorplates in the previous scheme. Private amenity was a way of encouraging people back into the workplace. The public garden was for everyone. Private spaces were provided for companies to carry out their internal affairs. The scheme was not just a building but an urban space. Some of the decisions were taken according to biodiversity and the quality of space. Urban heat had also been considered.

*There was a pause in proceedings between 11.58am and 12.25pm.*

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

A Member thanked the applicants and the Officers for their preparatory work. He asked about the evidence suggesting people would use the lifts and access the space at the 10th and 11th floors in the way outlined. The applicants stated that people would not have to walk very far to access the open space via the lifts. People would go to the podium because they could accomplish something they could not on the ground floor. The ground floor was the shared space. The 11th floor gave a new perspective of the City, yet it was still informal. People could see the historical layers and potentially sunlight and there would be no vehicles. This would be a destination and would be unique.

A Member asked if, considering the London Museum and the 60-year life cycle of the buildings, there would be funding for staff and maintaining the site. Ms Amant stated that there was a high expectation of this and the detail of the business would be considered by the museum's Board in due course. The applicants stated this would be a partnership and the applicants as the landlord representatives, would provide the funding to allow the museum to go about their business.

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

The Chairman asked Officers to explain the context of the scheme in terms of expectations and the densification of the Eastern Cluster as well as the size of the ground floor plane and how the scheme fitted in with St Mary Axe.

The Director of Planning and Development stated that the biggest challenge that the City currently faced was maintaining its international position both in the City itself, in London and as the engine of the UK economy. To withstand the GLA projected employment increases up to 2040, a minimum of 1.2 million square metres of office floorspace had to be provided. The development industry suggested much more would be required. Modelling had shown 85% of that uplift would need to take place in the cluster which was a tiny area that could be walked through in 5 minutes.

Within the cluster there were limited sites. The site at One Undershaft was the biggest strategic site both in the cluster and in the City, to generate and optimise the amount of floor space needed to maintain the global position. This was the focus of the local plan, to ensure the City was competitive and able to provide the required floor space. It was estimated that in net terms, as there was an existing tall building on the site, 8.7% of the target would be achieved. The massing scenarios involved buildings which were much bigger, and had much more strategic level floor space but there was a need to strike a balance to optimise the site to its utmost. The floor space delivery of this site, was 150,000 square metres but had to be balanced with other planning considerations such as an appropriate design and the ground floor public realm. There was a reduction in the ground floor public realm as outlined in the Officer report. The reason for this was to accommodate the building and the floor space of this quantity, which at 150,000 square metres would employ almost 10,000 people. 30 lift cores were required, otherwise it would not be possible to lease the building for best in class Grade A space. The lift cores had to be accessed through reception areas to ensure the flow of workers into that area. The additional reception areas were required to manage the visitor experience, ensure it was pleasant, and also to prevent people queuing outside and into the public realm. The worst case scenario was planned for in terms of security. Baggage scanners could be provided in the space.

Members were informed that the loss of ground floor plane had to be seen within that context of optimising the ability of this site to generate floor space. The Director of Planning and Development commented that Officers had not stated that the elevated areas were comparable in terms of the ground floor plane and optimising the ground floor plane was important. The development had been amended to try to gain as much of the ground floor plane as possible whilst delivering a building which worked as a building and could be leased. This was a challenge. The elevated areas added another element and diversified the choice of experience. It was busy at ground floor level and many people would prefer to use the elevated areas.

Evidence statistics suggested that elevated areas were hugely popular with 1.5 million visitors to Fen Court, which was a similar scheme, half a million to 8 and 22 Bishopsgate in 10 months and 11 million visitors to the Sky Garden. Members were reminded that the site had to be optimised for Grade A office floor space.

The Chairman queried the size of the reimagined St Helens Square and was informed that this would be comparable in size to Guildhall Yard and would have several advantages over the existing space, notably 12 semi-mature trees where there were currently none. There would be 300 capacity seating where there was currently 260 capacity seating, and there would be a rich and inclusive space at the heart of the City.

The Chairman asked the Director of Planning and Development if the Officer advice was that effectively the market was demanding the floor plates and that the building needed the outlined set up within it, which would take up that space. He also queried if to get democratic space open to all and inviting to all,

there was a need to be using this space and whether in the view of Officers, the public space itself was being enhanced. The Director of Planning and Development stated that this was correct in terms of the strategic value of the site. The previous scheme was designed in 2014. More sustainable or electric buildings were now required as were more roof gardens and diversity of floor plates.

A Member queried if there had been a representation from the Eastern Cluster Business Improvement District. The Officer stated there had not been. There had been 14 objections in total; 8 from members of the public, 4 from building owners, 1 from a livery company and 1 from a building occupier. In response to a point of order from a Member that the Business Improvement Districts had a policy of not commenting, the Director of Planning and Development stated the BIDS often submitted representations on planning applications, often in support.

A Member queried if the actual loss of public realm on the ground floor was 735 square metres, which equated to more than half the size of Manchester Cathedral. An Officer confirmed 735 square metres of public realm on the ground floor would be lost.

The Member also asked about the average size of a pocket park. An Officer stated that the most comparable pocket park that had recently been granted permission was Friary Court.

The Member asked for clarification on the figures in the Officer report relating to carbon.

She stated that for Option 2, the total figure over the 60-year life cycle was 81,404, for Option 3 it was 238,736 and for Option 4 it was 310,847. Option 4, the option chosen at pre application stage was therefore 3.5 times approximately that of Option 2. Once Option 4 was chosen, further detailed work was done and the best estimate figure was now 405,000. The Officer confirmed these figures were correct and stated total figures would be included in future reports.

In relation to a question on air quality, an Officer stated that the air quality impact had been assessed already and there would be air quality impacts in terms of dust and NO<sub>2</sub> from plant. Protective works would include controls. There were also controls through the condition relating to the quality of plant that would be used in order to minimise emissions. There would be construction controls and operational controls to ensure air quality impacts were minimised.

The Member queried if the air quality impact of the construction would be greater because the Option 4 had been developed rather than the other options. The Director of Planning and Development stated it was not possible to comment on this as retrofit schemes could have high air quality impacts.

The Member asked about upfront embodied carbon. An Officer stated that the figure in the report was as it stood currently. The development would go

through a detailed design phase and the applicants had identified numerous carbon reduction opportunities through construction materials. It was likely that the carbon impact would reduce from there, but Officers required a detailed carbon assessment after the detailed design stage.

A Member asked if the EC1 BID was proactively contacted. An Officer stated it was consulted and was aware of this application.

The Member also asked Officers to clarify what further recourse there would be if the scheme was granted permission. The Director of Planning and Development stated that the GLA had already written in on what was known as stage one. Subject to the Sub-Committee granting the application, it would be then referred to stage two. It was then within their right to intervene or refer the application. From past experience he had not seen any signs that this would be the case. In that event, permission would then be issued and there would not be any further recourse.

A Member asked for assurance that any withdrawal of the elevated public spaces would come back to the Sub-Committee. The Director of Planning and Development gave this assurance.

In response to a Member's question about the loss of ground floor space and whether the provision of alternatives at higher levels was policy compliant, an Officer confirmed that it complied with the policies as a whole.

A Member stated the operational energy figures assumed a 60-year life of the building. He was not aware of any skyscrapers of this magnitude ever having been demolished. He asked Officers to comment on the importance of the operational energy and usage per square metre. An Officer stated that Option 1 had a retained and updated gas boiler heating system so the operational carbon was high over the 60 year period. Option 2 had an updated electric system but this was likely not to perform quite so well because of restrictions of the existing building in terms of the way it was constructed and the floor plates and plant location. Options 3 and 4 provided the best operational carbon performance as the floor plates were new and facades had been designed to perform at their best.

In response to a Member's question about St Mary Axe and the Section 278, an Officer stated that this was a separate legislative process. The entire stretch of St Mary Axe could be transformed in the urban realm and by the enhancements of that area.

A Member asked for guidance on the current footfall in St Helen's Square. An Officer stated that during the application process, there had been an extensive survey on pedestrian assessment which helped analyse comfort levels and ensure that they were maintained and improved wherever possible. This had shown that there would not be a significant increase in footfall levels so pedestrian comforts would be maintained and throughout different areas, improved. The space was designed to optimise pedestrian flow as well as create areas for people to dwell. The proposals for the square would be a

transformation both in terms of the physical appearance, but also in terms of permeability and the usability of that space.

**MOTION:** - A Member proposed that the Sub-Committee now move to vote on the recommendations.

The Chairman asked if there was a seconder and a Member seconded the proposal to move to the vote.

The Chairman ruled the motion to be premature at this juncture and stated that the Sub-Committee would finish questioning Officers as there were still new points emerging.

A Member commented that those working above the 11th floor were likely to stop off at the 11th floor for their lunch so this would take pressure off the ground floor space at peak times. He asked for clarification on the lift movements. An Officer stated that there were three lifts in the southern lobby area. The public lifts, each took 17 people. The round trip was 106 seconds to Level 11. 95 passengers could be accommodated per five minutes, and over 1000 people per hour.

A Member asked a question in relation to waste and servicing. She raised concern about the lack of information in relation to a waste, recycling and servicing strategy. An Officer stated that the waste management team had been consulted and the issue was the size of vehicle, not actually the operation. The team wanted to review the size of vehicles so this would be dealt with by condition. They had recommended a smaller vehicle be used which would increase the collection by one to three vehicles a week. The Officer confirmed that the waste and servicing vehicles would equate to 10 vehicles an hour. However, the vehicle movements and the servicing movements set out in the Officer report represented the worst-case scenario. They would be subject to consolidation as part of the servicing management strategy. The applicant had also been in discussions with the City's refuse team regarding the refuse collection and storage arrangements and this was covered by conditions.

The Member raised concern that the surveys were undertaken in summer 2023 when numbers of pedestrians were likely to be lower than at other times. An Officer confirmed that modelling had also taken place at other times. The motion modelling with TfL had been ongoing and approved in principle. As the project progressed, further modelling would be undertaken.

The Member also asked about the provision of short stay cycle parking at ground floor level. An Officer stated that 20 cycle racks were proposed at ground level.

A Member asked for reassurance that workers in the area would be able to get instant access to the elevated public spaces in the event of queues as elevated public places were popular. The Director of Planning and Development stated that lessons had been learnt from Fenn Court and this scheme embodied the

lessons learnt about getting people up to the elevated area promptly and spontaneously. There would also be no pre-booking.

In response to a Member's question about consultation, The Director of Planning and Development stated that Officers were comfortable that the consultation that had been carried out by the applicant was in line with the developer guidance note and the Statement of Community Involvement. It had been very thorough. Officers were surprised how few representations were received, in particular objections.

A Member asked what amendments were made to the proposal following 14 February consultation meeting. The Director of Planning and Development stated he was in attendance at the meeting along with the Chairman and others from within industry. It was clearly set out that those concerned should make their representations in writing and only one was received following this. The Director stated that to reduce the number of lift cores or the reception area would substantially reduce the floor space and that would mean the space could not be optimised. The applicants considered making amendments but as a reduction in floor space would have implications on this strategic scheme, they considered that the application had to be kept largely to the proposal.

**MOTION:** - The Chairman proposed a motion that the application be deferred, subject to the applicant considering the matters raised as part of the application this day, notably minor adjustments in relation to the ground floor public realm. He stated that there did not seem to be a major issue with the need for this building or the need for the delivery of office space on this site, from members or objectors. The issue seemed to be around minor aspects, in square footage terms, that could be defined, and by deferring, Officers could be asked to negotiate with the applicant on some of the aspects brought forward by Members.

The Chairman asked if there was a seconder and the Deputy Chairman seconded the proposal to defer the application.

In response to further Member questions, the Chairman asked the Town Clerk to confirm that Members were debating the motion and not the full application. The Town Clerk stated that Members were invited to debate the amendment put forward by the Chairman and seconded by the Deputy Chairman, specifically on the deferral and the merits therein.

A Member stated that if deferred, this application should be brought back to the Sub-Committee for further discussion at the earliest opportunity.

A Member stated he supported deferral and he considered that if St Mary Axe had zoned pedestrianisation this would overcome the 18% loss of part of St Helen's Square.

A Member stated that if the application was refused rather than deferred, the applicant could return with a revised scheme. She considered that addressing the issues the industry was asking for would not be a minor redesign.



The Director of Planning and Development stated that if deferred, when this returned to the Sub-Committee, Members could consider the scheme in its entirety. Deferral allowed the applicant to reflect on concerns that had been raised by Members in terms of the loss of part of St Helen's Square and to reconfigure the space if they wanted to. This would be a minor amendment.

A Member queried what would happen if the motion fell and the proposal was then refused. The Director of Planning and Development stated that the applicant could reflect and submit a revised scheme or alternatively they could appeal the decision.

A Member stated he would support the motion to defer. He considered that deferral would allow processes to be faster than an absolute rejection. Huge amounts of work had gone into the application and the Sub-Committee would be supporting both the developers, Officers and objectors in finding an answer.

A Member stated that she considered that major rather than minor changes were required and there should be a large consultation piece undertaken. She stated that clear feedback should be given to allow the developer to submit a completely new proposal.

A Member stated that no one had spoken in principle against this development and no one had provided a solution so he considered deferral would be appropriate.

The Chairman stated that a deferral would not be a message to the industry or the applicant that the City was not in favour of development or that densification of office space in the Eastern Cluster was not required. The motion for the application to be deferred was for the applicant to consider the matters raised as part of the discussion, notably the minor adjustments in relation to the ground floor public realm.

Having debated the motion, Members proceeded to vote on the motion.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 9 votes

OPPOSED – 6 votes

There were 2 abstentions.

The motion to defer the application was therefore carried.

[Deputy Edward Lord who was not in attendance for this item and Deputy Michael Cassidy, Ian Bishop-Laggett and Deputy Henry Pollard who had left the meeting, did not vote.]

**RESOLVED** - That the application be deferred, subject to the applicant considering the matters raised as part of the application this day, notably minor adjustments in relation to the ground floor public realm.

The Chairman urge you the Officers to work as swiftly as possible to bring this back to the Sub-Committee.

5. **CROMWELL TOWER, BARBICAN ESTATE, LONDON, EC2 8DD**

The Chairman asked if Members had any questions of Officers.

A Member stated that the Barbican Estate already had fibre optic internet so there was no need for the antennas to serve the residents. He stated that 5G small cell infrastructure was proceeding at pace in the Square Mile as well as FTTP Fibre to the Premise Services so it was hard to see a need for this technology outside the Barbican either. Given the large buildings in the City and with the line of sight requirement this would not benefit buildings in the Square Mile. The Member added that there were problematic heritage considerations with the proposal to locate the equipment on a listed building. He invited Officers to confirm whether any of these assertions were incorrect. The stated that he understood why this application had to come to the Sub-Committee but he would be supporting the Officer's recommendation to reject the application.

Seeing no further questions the Chairman moved to the vote.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 12 votes

OPPOSED – 0 votes

There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

[Deputy Michael Cassidy, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Alderman Hughes-Penney, Deputy Edward Lord, Deputy Brian Mooney, Deputy Alastair Moss, and Deputy Henry Pollard were not in attendance for this item and therefore did not vote.]

**RESOLVED** - That the Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice refusing to grant planning permission for the above proposal for the following reasons:

1. No evidence of consultation with nearby schools has been submitted and the applicant has failed to certify that the proposed equipment together with the existing equipment when operational, would not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection, contrary to paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposals would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest and setting of Cromwell Tower as part of the Barbican Estate (Grade II) and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, causing less than substantial harm to their heritage significance as a result of direct and indirect impacts on the heritage assets. The harm would not be outweighed by public benefits. The proposal is not in accordance with London Plan Policy HC1; Local Plan Policies CS 12, DM 12.1, DM 12.3; HE1; Draft City Plan Policies S11 and HE1 and the NPPF.

3. The proposals would fail to protect and enhance views of the Barbican Towers as identified city landmarks and is not in accordance with Local Plan policy CS13 (2), emerging City Plan 2040 S13 and guidance in the Protected Views SPD.

6. **CROMWELL TOWER, BARBICAN ESTATE, LONDON, EC2 8DD - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows:           IN FAVOUR – 12 votes

  OPPOSED – 0 votes

  There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

[Deputy Michael Cassidy, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Alderman Hughes-Penney, Deputy Edward Lord, Deputy Brian Mooney, Deputy Alastair Moss, and Deputy Henry Pollard were not in attendance for this item and therefore did not vote.]

**RESOLVED** - That the Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice refusing to Listed Building Consent for the above proposal for the following reasons:

1. The proposals would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest and setting of Cromwell Tower as part of the Barbican Estate (Grade II) and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, causing less than substantial harm to their heritage significance as a result of direct and indirect impacts on the heritage assets. The harm would not be outweighed by public benefits. The proposal is not in accordance with London Plan Policy HC1; Local Plan Policies CS 12, DM 12.1, DM 12.3; HE1; Draft City Plan Policies S11 and HE1 and the NPPF.

2. The proposals would fail to protect and enhance views of the Barbican Towers as identified city landmarks and is not in accordance with Local Plan policy CS13 (2), emerging City Plan 2040 S13 and guidance in the Protected Views SPD.

7. **\* VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director detailing development applications received by the Department of the Environment since the report to the last meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

8. **\* DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

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.

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

There were no questions.

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

Alderman Susan Pearson

The Chairman stated that this would be the last meeting of Alderman Susan Pearson. He thanked her for her valuable input over her years on the Planning and Transportation Committee and Planning Applications Sub-Committee both as a Common Councillor and more recently as an Alderman.

**The meeting ended at 1.31 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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