



Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 27 APRIL 2023

Time: 9.00 am

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM 2 - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Deputy Shравan Joshi (Chairman)	Alderman Ian David Luder
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Graham Packham
Deputy Randall Anderson	Alderwoman Susan Pearson
John Edwards	William Upton KC
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Christopher Hayward, P&R (Ex-Officio Member)
Jaspreet Hodgson	Elizabeth Anne King, PHES (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen	

Enquiries: Zoe Lewis
zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

Ian Thomas
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the draft public minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2022.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 14)

4. **CITY PLAN 2040 - RETROFIT FIRST POLICY**

Report of the Planning & Development Director.

For Discussion
(Pages 15 - 20)

5. **CITY PLAN 2040 - CULTURE, PUBLIC USES AND PUBLIC SPACES**

Report of the Planning & Development Director.

For Discussion
(Pages 21 - 30)

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL PLANS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE Wednesday, 21 September 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation)
Committee held at Committee Room - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on
Wednesday, 21 September 2022 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Shравan Joshi (Chairman)
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
John Edwards
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Martha Grekos
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Alderman Ian David Luder
Deputy Graham Packham
Deputy Susan Pearson
William Upton KC
Elizabeth Anne King (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Peter Shadbolt -
Rob McNicol -

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Christopher Hayward (ex-officio) and Jaspreet Hodgson.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES MATTERS ARISING

Election of Chairman (page 4) – A Member questioned whether the matter of voting rights for ex-officio Members of this Sub-Committee had yet been clarified. The Town Clerk advised that ex-officio Members were those who have been appointed to a body by virtue of the position or office that they hold and that they were not permitted to vote in the elections of a Chairman and Deputy Chairman. The Town Clerk informed the Sub Committee that the status of the two Members concerned here was not that of an ex-officio - they were Members appointed as representatives of the Policy and Resources Committee and the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee respectively. The Town Clerk therefore advised that they did have voting rights.

A Member stated that the terms of reference for the Sub Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee should be updated to reflect this position. The Town Clerk accepted that the current arrangements for this Sub-Committee were implicit and not explicit. She explained that there would be an opportunity for Members to re-consider the constitution of all of the Sub committees reporting into the Grand Committee and their terms of reference in April, as was the case annually, at the first meeting of the Grand Committee each new civic year.

On another matter, a Member stated that, in the interests of transparency, the minutes ought to be amended to record the names of all Members who stood for Chairman and Deputy Chairman as well as the number of votes that each candidate received.

Another Member noted that the City Corporation's minuting style for Committee elections had alternated between recording the names of Members who have stood for various positions and omitting them. The Member was of the view that all committees should adhere to the same minuting style and that this should be considered by the Policy and Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council during the annual review of committee terms of reference and Standing Orders to ensure a consistent approach.

Some Members referred to the Nolan principle of openness to indicate that the names of Members who have stood for elections should be recorded.

The Town Clerk stated that she was of the view that the minutes should reflect the names of those Members who stood for Chairman and Deputy Chairman and the number of votes cast for each Member. She highlighted that this had taken place at a public meeting and was also live streamed and recorded. It was also highlighted that the names of those who stood for various positions on Committees/Outside Bodies at the Court of Common Council and the number of votes that they receive were regularly published on the public summons. This approach was supported by the Sub Committee.

RESOLVED – That the public minutes of the last meeting held virtually on 22 July 2022 be approved as a correct record, subject to the addition of the names of all those Members who had stood for Chairman and Deputy Chairman as well as the number of votes cast for each candidate.

4. **CITY PLAN 2040**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director setting out the potential ways that the City Plan's policies around health, inclusion and wellbeing could be amended based on current evidence, best practice and the responses to the consultation on the draft City Plan 2036. The report also provided an update on the engagement plan and overall work programme for the City Plan.

Officers introduced the area of the report focusing on the health, inclusion and wellbeing policies within the City Plan. They explained that it was essential to ensure that the Plan was as inclusive as possible with a view to putting

independence, access, dignity, comfort, safety and enjoyment at the heart of the document. They went on to set out the background of these policies, their current status and expectations for their development in the future. It was also recognised that there were other policies which dealt with these matters concerning things such as the development of tall buildings, public realm and the Thames Policy Area which also dealt with the need for publicly accessible and inclusive spaces.

Officers highlighted that the report also featured an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA). They clarified that there was a statutory duty to prepare a sustainability appraisal setting out the economic, social and environmental implications of the Plan but that the draft Plan went beyond this and pulled all of this together alongside an equalities impact assessment and a health impact assessment. This had been undertaken in house but was then audited by an experienced external consultant. The Sub Committee were informed that the IIA had not identified any real problems with the way in which the Plan addressed matters of health, inclusion and wellbeing. welcomed the focus on health, inclusion and wellbeing policies. It was highlighted that this was an iterative process with each stage of the plan subject to an IIA intended to flag up any issues and that, at the end of the process, there should not be an IIA that flagged any problems with any part of the Plan.

Officers went on to highlight that the report also flagged some of the broad comments received in response to the consultation on the Plan. Members were informed that there was very strong support overall for the way that health, wellbeing and social inclusion was addressed within the Plan. It was noted that there were some detailed comments around the need for health facilities as well as around daylight/sunlight, air quality and around sports and leisure provision. The Development Industry had also been broadly supportive of the Plan although did feel that there should be more flexibility such that Health Impact Assessments were not necessarily applied to all developments, only larger ones. Having taken all of these comments on board, the report flagged where Officers felt that some further changes could now be made to the Plan to make it more inclusive and better address health and wellbeing. It was recognised that there had long been a focus on physical accessibility but that this now needed to be much wider and to incorporate other forms of accessibility for those with sensory or non-physical disabilities.

The Plan included proposals to make buildings healthier and to create healthier working environments. In addition to this, it was recognised that there were more children coming into the City and that it therefore needed to be more child friendly and welcoming to families. Light pollution and noise pollution were also addressed and the question of whether a specific policy was also needed on sport and recreation provision was tackled. Consideration was also given as to whether developers should also be required to look at equalities impact assessments and produce these as part of a planning application.

Finally, the Plan sought to address safety and security in the City (particularly for women and girls) and considered whether there ought to be a policy on community safety and for this to also be included within assessments going

forward. Officers concluded by underlining that they were looking for a steer from Members today as to whether these were the kinds of areas that they would be content to see worked up into detailed draft policies or whether there were any views as to additional areas of focus.

In response to a query from a Member, the Sub Committee was informed that there has been significant research into the impact that building design can have on the experience of neurodiverse users within buildings and in terms of public realm. Members were informed that developers would be expected to consider utilising inclusive lighting and access features and to consider obtaining expert advice in relation to how aspects of their building design may impact on people with neurodiverse conditions. It was suggested that supplementary guidance on this topic could be drafted to set out these requirements in more detail with the Plan acting as an overarching hook for this. Members were also informed that the Greater London Authority (GLA) was considering reviewing its own accessibility guidance and that the City Corporation would need to liaise with them to ensure a consistent/pan-London approach.

In response to a query from a Member regarding the development of a community safety and security policy that referenced the safety of women and girls in the City specifically, it was explained that there is a need for the City Corporation and developers to engage with this group to ensure that their experiences inform the design of the urban realm going forward. The Sub Committee discussed the importance of being cognisant of the equality issues experienced by different groups with protected characteristics as part of the public sector equality duty and how these issues overlap and intersect – something which Officers suggested could be handled through the IIA process.

A Member pointed out that there is more recent guidance from Public Health England in terms of better health outcomes than that referred to within the report, which was dated as 2017. The Member that the NHS and Public Health England encouraged the public to spend at least 40 minutes per week with an elevated heart rate/undertaking anaerobic exercise and that this responsibility should be put on to individual boroughs. Furthermore, the Member informed the Sub Committee that he had received recurrent feedback from female residents and workers stating that they often found gyms within the City intimidating, particularly those within the workplace. They had indicated that they would therefore welcome outdoor spaces/gym equipment to exercise with friends. The Planning and Development Director informed the Sub Committee that these matters would also be taken on board.

In response to a query from a Members as to the pressures faced by GP surgeries in the City and neighbouring boroughs, the Sub Committee was informed that Officers had met with NHS North-East London in relation to the pressures the City of London's general practitioner (GP) services may face as a result of more new office space being approved, given the entitlement for employees to register with a GP in close proximity to their place of employment. The meeting involved discussions on population growth, housing development and the future need for GP provision. It was highlighted that, at present there

was just one GP surgery within the City which largely catered for people on the western side of the City. Members were informed that currently NHS North-East London were of the view that there is no significant increased demand for GP provision within the City. However, they had now committed to approaching the relevant surgeries directly in order to try and better understand any emerging patterns and any future action that might need to be considered as a result of these. Officers had also taken the opportunity to flag with them the increasing number of students coming into the City as well as workers. However, it was noted that students are more likely to be registered with a GP near their university than their halls of residence. They had also been asked to consider the introduction of a minor injuries clinic in the City and continued to be in active discussion with NHS England on all of these matters, with quarterly meetings in the diary. Finally, it was highlighted that, if there was sufficient demand, the provision of a facility for a GP or dentist could be required through the planning system. However, the planning system could not be used to provide a GP and it was recognised that there was currently a national shortage of these.

A Member made the general point that health, inclusion and wellbeing transcended across many areas of the Corporation's work and encouraged Officers to always keep this much bigger picture in mind in terms of a vision for what the Square Mile should look like. She noted that some additional points to consider further in relation to health, inclusion and wellbeing included the City's offering for teenagers and older school aged children, waste management/cleaning and greening policies, making the City safer for women and girls specifically, including the need for better lighting or CCTV in certain areas/small alleyways, the 15-minute City, restricting take away facilities within close proximity to schools for example and the development of a River Strategy. Members agreed that there were limited play spaces for children within the City. Officers responded to state that they were using 'child friendly' as a catch all term but that, in reality, this would be much wider and include school aged children and teenagers too. They added that they fully intended for this to be an integrated plan as opposed to a series of disjointed policies considered in isolation. With regard to the 15-minute City, Officers commented that this did not sit neatly with the makeup of the City, although they were happy to see how the principles sitting behind this might be further drawn out within the Plan. It was highlighted that there would be a separate policy on the Riverside as a key area of change. Members were informed that the issue of hot food takeaways was looked at in quite a bit of detail when drafting the Plan. It was recognised that the Mayor of London had a policy to restrict these within 400-500 meters of a school which potentially covered large parts of the City in terms of the location of COLPAI and Aldgate School. That being said, there also had to be adequate provisions for City workers and visitors. Officers also cautioned that certain establishments were not considered to be hot food takeaway premises but rather restaurants, albeit with large takeaway elements. Members were informed that consideration had also been given to the introduction of allotments/community gardens in the City.

A Member commented that identifying space for children to play and partake in sport in the City was important. In response to a query from the Member, the

Sub Committee was informed that the City Corporation's Sports Strategy would be available in draft form in January 2023. It was anticipated that leisure facilities would be covered in this strategy. The Member stressed that it would be important for this and the Plan to be interlinked. Officers reported that Hackney had developed an SPD on child friendly cities and that this was considered to be fairly exemplary. It was therefore possible that the City may look to develop something similar and to fold this into the Plan to underpin the high level policy approaches for children and young people.

With regard to IIA's, the Member welcomed these but reiterated previous concerns that she had voiced as to the robustness of the makeup of the current City of London Access Group and whether they were the correct group to be consulting on these issues. The Member went on to flag the importance of access to affordable healthy food for all but commented that there were currently no budget supermarkets within the City. She queried the view that open space provision on rooftop terraces was as valuable as ground floor space, highlighting that not everyone would necessarily know to approach/enter a building and access this. Finally, the Member echoed the importance of safety and security measures for women and girls in particular given that 97% of women aged between 18-24 had reported that they had experienced sexual harassment and 80% of women of all ages had experienced this in public places. The Member highlighted that Wandsworth had a strategy on this out for consultation at present and suggested that Officers also look to consult this.

Officers recognised that there was more to be done in terms of ensuring that all who were able to access roof terrace spaces were feeling more informed about them and more welcome/able to do so. It was suggested that this may form the basis of a Planning Advice Note in order to make these places truly inclusive. It was also highlighted that this was not intended to be a replacement for ground floor public realm as this was always the first priority. However, it was also recognised that, within the City Cluster there just was not great capacity for this, with many spaces at ground floor level being particularly overshadowed and windy. A Member suggested that it would be useful to have some data in terms of numbers accessing these publicly available roof terrace spaces in due course.

The Sub Committee agreed that public toilets should preferably be accessible 24 hours a day to avoid issues concerning antisocial behaviour and cleansing and that this ought to be made clear to developers and secured through the planning process. A Member noted there was a lack of awareness of the Community Toilet Scheme, in which pubs and restaurants in the City allowed public access to their facilities. Another Member was of the view that the Community Toilet Scheme was not helpful for Destination City purposes as most City businesses were closed during the evenings and on the weekends. She added that this was an issue that needed to be addressed in the planning of new developments.

A Member discussed suicide prevention and stated that she felt that it should be more visible within the Plan. Officers highlighted that there was now a Planning Advice Note on suicide prevention in tall buildings and that developers

were required to consider the impact of their buildings and how they could mitigate the risk of suicide as well as to demonstrate how they had done so but it was recognised that there was still work to be done here in terms of all buildings as well as along the River.

Members discussed the process and timeline for the production of the Plan. Officers reiterated that this was an iterative process and that a final draft of the City Plan alongside various policies worked up in detail and would be brought to this Sub-Committee in February 2023, to the grand Committee in March 2023, on to Policy and Resources and the Court of Common Council and then out to formal, regulation 19 consultation in June 2023. This would highlight any changes made as a result of previous discussions with Members. Some Members expressed concern at this approach and stated that they would prefer the opportunity to scrutinise this in more manageable chunks which had been the approach adopted previously.

A Member highlighted that this Sub-Committee had previously underlined the need for meaningful public consultation/engagement on the Plan and stated that she had anticipated a list of potential consultees as well as a timetable for public consultation being brought to this meeting for approval.

Officers reported that they had worked to develop an engagement strategy for the City Plan setting out the stakeholders that Officers intended to engage with over the course of the next year as various policy approaches were reviewed. Members were informed that a Statement of Community Involvement and Developer Engagement Guidance would also be brought to the Planning and Transportation Committee for consideration in October. It was also highlighted that other parts of the organisation were progressing various other pieces of work such as the Climate Action Strategy and that it was therefore important for any engagement strategy to also set out these various projects clearly in the context of the City Plan.

Officers reported that a series of meetings and updates had been put out to various stakeholders on a monthly basis and that the first stage of this would be a meeting with stakeholders next month to update them on the City Plan and provide them with an opportunity to ask questions and highlight how they might want to be involved in its production. In future months, further discussions on some of the key issues raised during the previous consultation and the opportunity to explore the policy approaches in response to those would take place. As the formal consultation stage approached, updates would then be provided on how to respond to this and things such as a Frequently Asked Questions document about the Plan and its development would be provided alongside a quarterly newsletter updating this and other policy documents. Members were informed that Officers were also in the process of procuring an online engagement platform which would significantly improve online presence. Finally, it was reported that, internally, Officers would work on their consultation database and seek to develop a comms strategy for press and social media.

Officers went on to highlight that a stakeholder mapping exercise was currently underway in order to provide a clearer picture as to who the City were/should

be engaging with and how best to engage them including those groups that the organisation had traditionally struggled to communicate effectively with. It was reported that Officers were considering procuring consultancy support on developer engagement work which it was felt might be beneficial for the programming of and facilitating various events.

Members were informed that Officers did not intend to make major adjustments to policies within the City Plan, but that they may redraft the Plan to remove repetition and make it more concise and thereby accessible as a final document.

A Member was concerned that the details of the engagement plan would be submitted to the October Planning and Transportation Committee meeting without this Sub Committee having had the opportunity to scrutinise it. The Member stated that it was important that Members were provided with an explanation of the development of the policies within the plan.

A Member commented that the Plan should be sound and coherent at Regulation 19/Inspection stage and therefore underlined the importance of meaningful engagement having taken place way in advance of this.

Several Members supported scheduling additional meetings of this Sub Committee to scrutinise the draft plan in early 2023 if necessary.

A Member requested an explanation as to why the Sub Committee had not been provided with a list of stakeholders consulted so far and a plan for meaningful engagement, as was requested and discussed at great length at the previous meeting. The Member stated that it was important to obtain the public's views on priorities within the City Plan, particularly where certain objectives/policy areas may conflict with one other and spoke in favour of something more akin to co-production.

In response to Members' concerns about stakeholder engagement, the Sub Committee was informed that Officers recognised the importance of broad and meaningful consultation and underlined that this was very much their intention. Officers apologised for not having provided the documents requested at the previous meeting and informed the Sub Committee that the information about stakeholders consulted so far and intended future stakeholders could be provided in advance of the next meeting.

A Member pointed out that the engagement section of the report stated that engagement would be taking place from September to January, which in her view would leave insufficient time for meaningful engagement to take place in view of the Christmas and New Year period.

A Member requested clarity regarding whether engagement work would be divided by topic and how the prioritisation of policies and policy conflict would be managed for the next Sub Committee meeting. Members were informed that it was important that direct conflicts and any overlap between different policies

were explained to stakeholders and that this would be made clear during the consultation process.

RESOLVED – That Officers continue to progress work on the City Plan based on Members’ views on the proposed policy direction in relation to health, inclusion and wellbeing, and the approach to engagement.

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

Tall Building Modelling

A Member stated that a number of residents had requested whether there could be a requirement for all planning applications to have a physical model available to demonstrate the bulk and scale of the proposals as opposed to just a photograph. The Sub Committee were informed that Officers could ask developers to provide a physical model in certain instances (for tall buildings within the City context – 75m plus) but Officers highlighted that many tended to operate in a digital/3-dimensional manner now and that it may therefore be preferable to look at ways in which the public could access a 3D model for any future, substantial schemes.

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

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

The meeting ended at 3.57 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer:

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee	27/04/2023
Subject: City Plan 2040 – retrofit first policy	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1,2,4,7,9,11,12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	N/A
Report of: Gwyn Richards, Planning & Development Director, Environment Department	For discussion
Report author: Rob McNicol, Environment Department	

Summary

A key objective of the draft City Plan is to ensure that the Square Mile transitions to a zero carbon city by 2040. Since the Plan was drafted, the way whole lifecycle carbon (WLC) of development is measured and assessed through the planning system has evolved significantly (including through strategic planning policy and guidance, and the production of the City Corporation’s Carbon Options Guidance) and increased importance has been given to encouraging the retrofit of existing buildings. This report sets out how policies in the City Plan could be updated to reflect these changes.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Advise on the proposed policy directions in relation to the proposed ‘retrofit first’ policy approach and amendments to the spatial strategy for the draft City Plan.

Main Report

Background

1. The built environment is a major contributor to carbon emissions, both through operational emissions (energy consumption, including heating, cooling, and power) and embodied emissions (the carbon that goes into the production of building materials, and their construction and maintenance). The term ‘whole lifecycle carbon’ (WLC) captures both operational and embodied carbon over the

life cycle of the building (including any demolition and disposal). Policies SI 2 and SI 7 of the London Plan and related London Plan Guidance “Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessments” and “Circular Economy Statements” (March 2022) establish strategic policy and guidance. The guidance advises that re-use/retrofit be prioritised over redevelopment. The City Plan is required to be in general conformity with the London Plan.

2. In recent years, there has been increasing awareness of the need to consider the WLC of new development when assessing the sustainability of a scheme, and in particular to address embodied emissions. As the energy efficiency of buildings improves, and the electricity grid and heating and cooling systems decarbonise, embodied emissions over time become a greater proportion of the whole lifecycle carbon of buildings.
3. The draft City Plan includes objectives to promote a zero carbon city by 2040. Pending adoption of the City Plan and as an intermediate response to evolving strategic policy and guidance, the City Corporation developed the Carbon Options Guidance (COG) planning advice note (adopted by the Planning and Transportation Committee in March 2023.) Through this work, the City Corporation have been at the forefront of seeking to explore different options for sites, with the aim of ensuring options that include retrofit, retention and refurbishment are considered alongside proposals for redevelopment, and using this process to find optimal approaches that take likely carbon impacts for different options into account, as well as exploring wider sustainability issues and other planning aspects of schemes as they progress.
4. This approach, developed through practice and collaborative working, is an innovative one in two key aspects. Firstly, the methodology in the COG moves away from consideration of a single development option for a site, which has traditionally been the approach of the planning system. Secondly, the COG sets out a clear methodology that enables the carbon intensity of different schemes to be compared at an early stage in the design process, rather than having to wait for comprehensive design development work that comes at later stages.
5. The draft City Plan 2040 currently requires proposals for major development to demonstrate that London Plan targets for carbon emissions have been met on site as a minimum, and that they retain embodied carbon within building structures where feasible. The Plan encourages the use of circular economy design approaches, and requires minimum BREEAM ‘excellent’, aiming for ‘outstanding’.
6. To ensure the City Plan is in general conformity with strategic policy and is developed within the principles of sustainable development, and to complement the work on the COG and its implementation, there is the opportunity to expand on this policy to reflect best practice, embedding a ‘retrofit first’ approach into the new City Plan and incentivising retention of existing buildings through a ‘retrofit fast track’.

Spatial Strategy

7. As part of the vision set out in the Plan to shape outstanding environments, the draft City Plan includes an aim that:
 - “The City’s buildings, public realm and transport will be highly sustainable, designed to make efficient use of natural resources, minimise emissions and be resilient to natural and man-made threats. In partnership with public and private sector organisations the City will adopt new technologies to transition to a zero emission City by 2040, in line with the ambitions set out in the City Corporation’s Climate Action Strategy.”
8. The first point of the draft Spatial Strategy for the Plan sets out an aim of:
 - “Ensuring that the City is sustainable and transitions to a zero carbon and zero emission City by 2040, delivering further urban greening and improving air quality”.
9. Paragraph 3.5.1 of the Plan explains that:
 - “To deliver the City Corporation’s Vision and Strategic Objectives, a balance needs to be struck between the competing demands for further commercial and office growth, the rapidly growing workforce, the growing cultural and visitor economies and the needs and expectations of the City’s permanent residential population. An overarching imperative is to ensure that the City of London transitions to a zero carbon and zero emission City, improving air quality and delivering additional greening to the City’s buildings and spaces” (emphasis added.)
10. These parts of the Plan’s spatial strategy could be amended to specifically recognise the importance of the whole lifecycle carbon of new development and the need to promote the retrofit and refurbishment of existing buildings. This approach would reflect the aims of the City Corporation in promoting sustainable development, in line with the Climate Action Strategy, and would allow for greater weight to be applied to the retention of existing buildings and structures in decision-making.

Considering carbon options and taking a ‘retrofit first’ approach

11. Strategic policy S8 (Design) states that design solutions should make effective use of limited land and contribute towards well-being and a greener, zero emission City, through development which (amongst other requirements):
 - “Delivers world class sustainable buildings which are mixed-use, adaptable, adopt circular economy principles and contribute towards a zero emission, zero carbon and climate resilient City.”
12. Supporting text at paragraph 6.1.5 states that “To create a zero-emission, sustainable City, development must be designed to minimise environmental impacts and be resilient to climate change throughout its lifecycle.”

13. Policy DE1 (Sustainability Standards) states that “proposals for major development will be required to demonstrate that London Plan carbon emission and air quality requirements have been met on site, retaining embodied carbon within building structures where feasible.”
14. Policy CE1 (Zero Waste City) of the draft City Plan states that development should be designed to promote circular economy principles throughout the lifecycle of the building through (amongst other things) “re-use and refurbishment of existing buildings, structure and materials to reduce reliance on virgin resources and retain embodied carbon.”
15. An addition could be made to the overarching strategic policy on design (S8), setting out that design solutions should take a ‘retrofit first’ approach by giving great importance to the re-use and refurbishment of existing buildings, structure and materials. This would complement the proposed changes to the draft City Plan’s spatial strategy. Supporting text could also be updated to reflect and explain this approach, setting out the importance of retrofitting existing buildings, retaining embodied carbon and minimising WLC emissions. Relevant parts of policy CE1 (Zero Waste City) could be brought into the design section of the City Plan, to reflect that these have a direct impact on the design of development and are not primarily concerned with the operation and management of waste.
16. It is proposed that an additional clause is added to Policy DE1 (Sustainability Standards), setting out how different options for a site should be explored. This could require all proposals for major development (over 1,000 sqm additional floorspace or 10 or more dwellings) to:
 - demonstrate that multiple options have been considered for the site (including one or more options that would substantially retain existing structures in situ);
 - demonstrate that WLC impacts have been calculated in line with the Carbon Options Guidance PAN; and
 - Seek to minimise the WLC impacts for each option and the proposed scheme.
17. These changes would reflect strategic policy, respond to the aims of the Corporation’s Climate Action Strategy and reflect best practice in sustainable design approaches to development.

Financial implications

18. None.

Staff Resource implications

19. Preparation of the revised pre-submission Regulation 19 City Plan is being carried out in-house by the Development Plans Team, working alongside and supported by Development and Design colleagues in the planning service and by other services as appropriate.

Legal implications

20. There are no specific legal requirements, other than the ongoing requirement to ensure that all relevant statutory processes are complied with during production of the City Plan.

Equalities implications

21. Preparation of the City Plan has been informed by an Integrated Impact Assessment which incorporates an Equality Assessment. Any material changes to the Plan will be subject to further Equality Assessment.

Risk implications

22. The December 2021 report to the Grand Committee identified the risks associating with preparing a revised pre-submission Regulation 19 City Plan as compared to submitting the current version for examination. The Grand Committee agreed to revise the City Plan and officers will continue to monitor and report back on any changes to the risk assessment as the project progresses.

Climate implications

23. The City Plan is one of the key mechanisms for achieving those targets in the Climate Action Strategy which relate to the Square Mile rather than the City Corporation's own operations, in particular the net zero target for the Square Mile by 2040. The inclusion of policies that seek to prioritise and incentivise the retention of existing buildings, as set out in this report, will further strengthen alignment with the Climate Action Strategy.

Security implications

24. There are no direct security implications.

Conclusion

25. This report sets out potential policy amendments for taking a 'retrofit first' approach in considering options for sites. Officers recommend that changes are made to the overall spatial strategy for the City Plan, as well as design and sustainability policies, to give greater emphasis to the retrofit of existing buildings and require the exploration of different options for a site, informed by carbon considerations. These changes would give greater importance to the retention of existing structures in proposed development.

Background Papers

- None

Appendices

- None

Report author

Rob McNicol

Assistant Director – Policy and Strategy

T: 07784 239316

E: rob.mcnicol@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee	27/04/2023
Subject: City Plan 2040 – Culture, public uses and public spaces	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1,2,4,7,9,11,12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	N/A
Report of: Gwyn Richards, Planning & Development Director, Environment Department	For discussion
Report author: Rob McNicol, Environment Department	

Summary

London Plan Policy HC5 requires Development Plans to promote cultural facilities and related uses. Consistent with this, Destination City, the City Corporation’s new flagship strategy sets out a bold new vision for the future of the Square Mile to be a leading destination for workers, visitors and residents.

The City needs to diversify its offer to be more innovative, inclusive and sustainable especially given the fact that ways of working and travel patterns have significantly changed post pandemic.

This report sets out how potential ways that policies in the City Plan could be amended to reflect responses received on this issue during the previous Local Plan consultation and the City Corporation’s Destination City objectives.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Advise on the proposed direction for City Plan policies that seek to secure cultural and other public uses and spaces in new development.

Main Report

Background

1. The City's public realm is rich and diverse with varied public spaces that support City's public life, from riverside walkways to rooftop terraces and the myriad of streets and spaces within – places that offer a distinct sense of place with rich cultural and social experiences. Complementing this is the City's historic environment with its rich cultural offer having a huge concentration of arts and cultural facilities which contribute to its unique identity, character, attractiveness and competitiveness.
2. In recent years, movement patterns and ways of working have, at least temporarily, been significantly affected by the pandemic. The hustle and bustle previously experienced is only returning slowly but with different demands and expectations of what it means to be in the City. The Transport for London (TfL) data on public transport demand indicates considerable growth in ridership in the recent months, however, it still hasn't reached the pre-pandemic levels.
3. The formal Regulation 19 City Plan consultation carried out in March 2021 attracted broad support from a number of arts organisations and from the City Property Association (CPA) and other business respondents in relation to delivering cultural spaces in the City. In particular, the draft City Plan Policy S6 sets out the City Corporation's strategy to enhance the City's cultural offer and requires developers to submit Cultural Plans as part of planning applications for major developments. These plans should set out how the new development will contribute to the enrichment and enhancement of the City's cultural offer and how proposals for cultural deliverables will be resourced, implemented and managed.
4. The City Plan Strategic Policy S6 was seen as transformational for the City in the long term. However, suggestions were made that the policy should go further and consider specific quotas/metrics. While supportive of Cultural Plans in principle, the CPA suggested that CIL and section 106 contributions would be more appropriate than on-site cultural provision for some developments, while British Land highlighted the need for a proportionate cultural offer depending on the scale and nature of the development in question.
5. Furthermore, the City Corporation's aspiration for the City to strengthen its role as a 'Destination' have gained greater prominence through the Destination City initiative – the City Corporation's flagship strategy which sets out a renewed vision to make the City more resilient, ensuring that it continues to be a global business centre and a leading destination for workers and visitors. Its strategic aim is to drive footfall 7 days per week and create places and experiences in the City with an enhanced social and cultural offering.
6. In response to the Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation, the draft City Plan 2040 is currently being amended and there is potential to refresh Strategic Policy S6 to clarify the framework for delivery of cultural and public spaces. The Local Plans Sub-Committee in January 2022 also recognised the significance of the Destination City vision.

7. In addition to Strategic Policy S6, the draft City Plan 2040 currently sets out a range of policies to steer development to deliver cultural and public spaces in the City. These include:

- Strategic Policy S8 (Design): Development to deliver “publicly accessible space within the development by maximising the amount of accessible, inclusive and free to enter roof terraces and spaces, including in tall buildings and along the river and around City landmarks”
- Policy DE5 (Terraces and Viewing Galleries): Development to provide “free to enter, publicly accessible areas will be required as part of all tall building or major developments, which may include roof gardens and terraces or public viewing galleries at upper levels, where appropriate”.
- Strategic Policy S12 (Tall buildings): New tall buildings to enhance permeability, provide the maximum amount of open space at street level and incorporate areas of publicly accessible open space or other facilities, including at upper levels.
- Strategic Policy S14 (Open spaces and Green infrastructure): Seeking the provision of new open and green space through development, public realm or transportation improvements.
- Policy OS1 (Protection and provision of open spaces): Additional publicly accessible open space and pedestrian routes will be sought in major commercial and residential developments.
- Policy HL5 (Location and protection of social and community facilities): Provision of new or enhanced social and community facilities where development results in additional need for them.
- Policy HL8 (Play areas and facilities): Provision of new play facilities as part of major new residential development.
- Policy HL7 (Sport and Recreation): The Plan encourages new sport and recreation facilities.
- Policy OF3 (Meanwhile uses): The Plan permits meanwhile uses in vacant commercial, business and service buildings or sites.

8. Since the Plan was drafted, the City Corporation has successfully secured contributions towards the delivery of cultural and public spaces in the City, informed by Policy S6. The review of the City Plan presents an opportunity to ensure delivery of such spaces becomes more consistent and is informed by the following matters:

- **Culture evidence base:** Though the City Corporation holds a number of existing data sets for cultural infrastructure in the City, to drive forward the delivery of appropriate cultural spaces there is the potential to establish a framework for the different types of cultural space which could be suitable in different locations in the City, building on existing clusters and future developments. It would also be important to identify potential culture areas/sectors within the City to provide a focus for future culture contributions as part of an agreed strategy.
- **Securing meaningful contributions:** A review of the recent Cultural Plans submitted along with planning applications indicates that substantial

contributions towards cultural and public spaces have been mainly delivered through large scale developments. It can be challenging in some instances for smaller scale developments to make on-site contributions owing to physical constraints, while piecemeal financial contributions sought on a case-by-case basis may not contribute meaningfully. It is therefore important to set out how development of different scales and types could contribute towards delivering cultural and public spaces within the City through s106 agreements ensuring all statutory criteria is met.

- **Inclusion and Accessibility:** The City Plan requires development proposals to deliver public spaces that are inclusive and accessible. However, creating an inclusive environment requires not only consideration of the physical design of a space, but also consideration of how it is managed and the rules that govern its access. In the City Plan, there is an opportunity to strengthen policy requirements for the management of public spaces particularly those which are privately owned in order to ensure that all public spaces are genuinely inclusive and accessible and align with the principles of the Mayor's Public London Charter.
 - **Planning balance:** In circumstances where a development is impacting a heritage asset or its setting, the public benefits of improved access, cultural provision or other public uses may (in some circumstances and noting the requirement to give great weight to heritage considerations including relevant legal and policy guidance) outweigh heritage harm. It is therefore important to ensure that public benefits proposed through new development are appropriate, that there is a suitably consistent approach to understanding what public spaces and uses would normally be required and that a robust framework remains in place to conserve and enhance the City's heritage assets.
9. To address some of the above matters, further work is being carried out to prepare a Cultural Planning Framework which would respond to the need to diversify and enhance City's cultural offer post pandemic. The Culture Planning Framework will provide baseline information and mapping of existing cultural infrastructure, reflect on best practice, and set out a vision for the provision of cultural infrastructure within the City, complementing the City Plan.

Cultural Policy approach

10. Alongside the Cultural Planning Framework, there is an opportunity to expand on the Strategic Policy S6 (Culture) in conformity with London Plan Policy HC5 and reflect consultation responses and the City Corporation's Destination City aspirations.
11. A refreshed Policy S6, underpinned by the overarching Destination City theme, is proposed in the City Plan. Through the refreshed Policy S6, there is potential to deliver a wider set of public uses and public spaces within the City, as well as making the scale of such provision more consistent. This could bring cultural and social experiences along with the opportunity of celebrating the City's rich

heritage, and bring together communities in an environment that is inclusive and accessible to all.

12. Therefore, the recommended three overarching priorities for the refreshed Cultural policy include:
- Delivering a range of new public uses/public spaces through development
 - Placing heritage at the heart of placemaking
 - Ensuring new public uses/public spaces are inclusive and accessible to all

Delivering a range of new public uses/public spaces through development

13. The refreshed Cultural policy would set out the kinds of public uses and public spaces that could be delivered at different locations within the City. It would further set out requirements for the amount of floorspace for new public uses/spaces that could be delivered based on the scale and type of the proposed development.
14. The refreshed Cultural policy could be approached in two different ways.
15. The first policy approach could be to maximise on site provision and would require new developments to provide public uses and/or public spaces as defined below:

Public uses – could be defined as publicly accessible indoor spaces within buildings that provide social and cultural experiences

- Museums, art galleries, visitor centres, exhibition spaces, studios
- Art and cultural attractions
- Cultural performance spaces (such as dance, theatre, music venues)
- Viewing galleries
- Leisure facilities
- Indoor sports facilities
- Indoor markets

Public spaces – could be defined as publicly accessible outdoor spaces

- Public open and green spaces
- New pedestrian routes
- Pavement widening and streetscape enhancements
- Public Squares
- Public Gardens
- Parks
- Roof gardens
- Outdoor sports and play facilities

16. This list is not an exhaustive list, but it shows the wide range of uses and spaces that could potentially be delivered. It should be noted that it does not cover uses directly related to the City's primary office function such as office lobbies; or other commercial uses such as retail and hotels; community uses such as nurseries, health clinics; or transport related functions such as servicing or

loading bays. These types of uses are covered separately through other City Plan policies.

17. This policy approach could further set out specific area requirements expected from the proposed development. If a development proposal is over a certain size, it would be expected to make a physical or financial contribution towards provision of new public uses and/or public spaces or enhancement of existing public realm in the City. The amount of this contribution will depend upon the quantity of the floorspace uplift and would be proportionate to the uplift quantity.
18. A benchmarking exercise of the Cultural Plans submitted along with planning applications has been carried out to identify the scale and type of cultural contributions secured till date. The benchmarking data was used to identify threshold values above which developments will be required to deliver new public uses or public spaces. It was noted that large scale developments over 10,000 sqm made substantial contributions, typically between 3 and 5 per cent of total floorspace, while contributions from smaller developments ranging from 1,000 sqm to 10,000 sqm were varied and depended largely on opportunities on specific sites and other material considerations.
19. This policy approach could therefore require all major developments (over 1,000 sqm) to deliver specific amounts (floorspace area) of new public uses/spaces on site or to contribute to wider projects in the City. The policy would give priority to on-site provision and make this a requirement for large scale developments (over 10,000 sqm), with a set proportion of floorspace (and/or equivalent public realm) required to be made available as a public space or for public use.
20. On site provision could be set as a preference for developments between 1,000 and 10,000 sqm, with off-site provision deemed acceptable where there is an identified public space or public use project in the vicinity which would lead to better outcomes than on site provision. If it has been clearly demonstrated that on-site provision is not physically feasible or appropriate, and there is no identified project in the area, a financial contribution could be sought as part of a s106 agreement. These could be pooled and used for delivering a new public use/space somewhere else in the City or for making improvements to the existing public realm in the area.
21. The benefit of this (preferred) approach is that it would ensure effective delivery of public uses/spaces by setting out a clear matrix of floorspace requirements for the type and amount of contribution expected. It would capture different scenarios and clearly define situations in which these requirements apply and at what scale. This option would give priority to on site provision but at the same time ensure offsite or pooled contributions are secured where appropriate. Overall, this approach would be transformational in line with the Destination City aspirations.
22. If this approach is taken, further work would be necessary to establish specific floorspace quantity requirements for public spaces and public uses from new development, and to establish the level of financial contributions that might be appropriate in an offsetting scenario. Policy S27 (planning obligations) would

need to be updated to reflect these new requirements, and they would need to be factored into the whole plan viability testing, to ensure that such additional contributions could be delivered without adversely impacting on the viability of commercial development in the City. The Planning Obligations SPD may also require updating, either directly or (depending on the next stages of the Government's planning reforms) complemented through an appendix to the City Plan.

23. The second option could be to adopt a bespoke approach for different types and scales of development. This option would not set out specific floorspace requirements for provision or enhancement of public uses/spaces. The type/amount of contribution would be determined on a case-by-case basis. In this option, multiple approaches could be explored for securing contributions based on specific circumstances. For example, the approach could be different if development is a refurbishment scheme, or it is linked to a heritage building. If the provision of new public use/space on site is not achievable, then other forms of contributions including off-site or financial contributions would be given equal importance. The drawback of this approach is that there would be inconsistency in the application of the policy and there could potentially be situations where meaningful contributions are not secured.

Inclusion and Accessibility

24. The Local Plan Sub-committee on health, inclusion and wellbeing in September 2022 recognised the need to further strengthen requirements of Local Plan policies in relation to health, wellbeing, equality and diversity. The refreshed Policy S6 would seek to strengthen these requirements to ensure that new public spaces being provided are genuinely inclusive and accessible to all, and that they are places designed for people where they can spend time in and enjoy, in comfort and safety without any hindrance.
25. The draft City Plan sets out a range of policies (in particular Strategic Policy S8 and Policy DE5) seeking provision of publicly accessible spaces such as roof terraces and viewing galleries within new development. Conditions and s106 obligations are used to ensure inclusive access on a case-by-case basis and there is the opportunity to give clarity and additional weight in policy.
26. London Plan Policy D8 Public Realm (part H) seeks to ensure appropriate management and maintenance arrangements are in place for the public realm, which maximise public access and minimise rules governing the space to those required for its safe management in accordance with the Public London Charter.
27. In order to make public spaces within the City fully accessible and inclusive to all, the refreshed Cultural policy could seek to strengthen requirements for the management of public spaces particularly privately owned public spaces (POPs). The policy would outline how public spaces could be used and managed by setting out specific levels of public access requirements for different types of public spaces that are created through new developments, for example setting standards for opening times, management, limitations on commercial operation, accessibility, and inclusive welcome, while ensuring restrictions on the use of

public space if in place are the minimum necessary, and are appropriate and reasonable.

28. If this approach is taken, further work would be required to establish appropriate standards for different broad types of public spaces delivered through new development, which could be set out in the City Plan.

Celebrating the City's Heritage

29. Great places have heritage at their core. It is a vital factor underpinning vibrant and successful places. With the City of London having a unique and rich heritage, there is potential of unlocking and utilising it as a catalyst for driving positive change; getting communities together and giving them the opportunity to enjoy and celebrate their heritage.
30. One of the key priorities of the refreshed Cultural policy would be to place heritage at the heart of placeshaping. To achieve this, the City Plan could require developments to celebrate the City's heritage potential by:
- requiring developments that involve heritage assets to provide access to them and reveal them better to the public
 - adopting a place-based approach to celebrating heritage
 - embedding heritage in the cultural offer
 - incorporating revealed heritage into new developments
 - recognising and reflecting the site/area's history in the design proposal
 - providing access to archaeological features

Corporate & Strategic Implications

The proposed refresh of draft Local Plan policy will be in conformity with strategic policy and complementary to Destination City.

Financial implications

31. None.

Staff Resource implications

32. Preparation of the revised pre-submission Regulation 19 City Plan will be carried out in-house by the Development Plans Team, working alongside and supported by Development and Design colleagues in the Planning Service and by other services as appropriate.

Legal implications

33. There are no specific legal requirements, other than the ongoing requirement to ensure that all relevant statutory processes are complied with during production of the City Plan.

Equalities implications

34. Preparation of the City Plan has been informed by an Integrated Impact Assessment which incorporates an Equality Assessment. Any material changes to the Plan will be subject to further Equality Assessment.

Risk implications

35. The December 2021 report to the Grand Committee identified the risks associating with preparing a revised pre-submission Regulation 19 City Plan as compared to submitting the current version for examination. The Grand Committee agreed to revise the City Plan and officers will continue to monitor and report back on any changes to the risk assessment as the project progresses.

Climate implications

36. The City Plan is one of the key mechanisms for achieving those targets in the Climate Action Strategy which relate to the Square Mile rather than the City Corporation's own operations, in particular the net zero target for the Square Mile by 2040. It is intended that the revised City Plan will further strengthen alignment with the Climate Action Strategy.

Security implications

37. There are no direct security implications.

Conclusion

38. This report sets out potential policy approaches that seek to secure cultural and other public uses and spaces in new development. The recommended policy would give greater importance to on site provision of new public spaces and public uses, while securing off-site and pooled contributions in appropriate circumstances. The policy will also strengthen requirements for embedding culture and heritage into development proposals and contribute towards bringing communities together in an environment which is inclusive and accessible to all.

Background Papers

- None

Appendices

- None

Report author

Rob McNicol

Assistant Director – Policy and Strategy

T: 07784 239316

E: rob.mcnicol@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank