

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Thursday, 16 May 2024

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at Livery
Hall - Guildhall on Thursday, 16 May 2024 at 9.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi MBE (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Ian Bishop-Laggett
Michael Cassidy
Mary Durcan
Deputy John Edwards
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Jaspreet Hodgson
Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Deputy Charles Edward Lord
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Henry Pollard
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster

Officers:

Polly Dunn	-	Interim Assistant Town Clerk
Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Bob Roberts	-	Interim Executive Director, Environment
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Roy Gordon	-	Environment Department
Gillian Howard	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	-	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Rachel Pye	-	Environment Department
Taluana Patricio	-	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	-	Environment Department
Samantha Tharme	-	Environment Department
Peter Wilson	-	Environment Department

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. He stated this would be Bob Roberts' last meeting of the Planning & Transportation Committee before retiring. On behalf of the whole Committee, he thanked Bob for his stewardship of the department during his time as Interim Executive Director, Environment.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy John Fletcher, Alderman Hughes-Penney, Eamonn Mullally, Deputy Brian Mooney, Alderwoman Jennette Newman, Judith Pleasance, Alderwoman Susan Pearson, Alderman Simon Pryke, Hugh Selka and Shailendra Umrada.

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

In relation to Agenda Item 7, William Upton stated he was a cyclist and taxi user.

In relation to item 16, Natasha Lloyd-Owen declared that London Wall West site was within view of her home. She stated she had not been on the Planning Applications Sub-Committee when the item was considered.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes of the previous meeting held on 30 April 2024, be approved as an accurate record.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS***

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk, setting out a list of the outstanding actions.

A Member asked that the upcoming heritage training session be recorded. The Chairman asked that it also be uploaded to the file with previous training sessions and the link to the file be sent to Members.

A Member queried the amount and content of the base level training and asked Officers to benchmark the base level training against that of other Local Authorities. Another Member asked that external training also be considered. The Director of Planning and Development stated that training was broken down into an overview and then into topics e.g. thermal comfort. Officers could benchmark looking at the robustness of training and whether other Local Authorities used external or inhouse training and update the Committee.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee

1. Note the report;
2. Request Officers to record the heritage training session be recorded, upload it to the file containing previous training sessions and send the link to Members; and
3. Request Officers to benchmark the base level training and update the Committee.

5. **APPOINTMENTS TO THE CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

RESOLVED – That the Committee appoint Deputy Shravan Joshi and Graham Packham as Members of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee.

6. **BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS (ALL CHANGE AT BANK): TRAFFIC MIX AND TIMING REVIEW CONCLUSION**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director of Environment which provided the Committee with information needed to make a recommendation to the Court on whether to pursue a change to the restrictions.

The Interim Director of Environment stated that the Court of Common Council had requested a review of traffic restrictions at Bank junction and the report delivered on that request. He stated that the data was mixed and the arguments were finally balanced. The Chairman suggested the Committee ask for clarifications and technical questions with debate taking place at the Court of Common Council meeting in order to avoid repetition.

In response to a Member's question about governance, the Interim Assistant Town Clerk advised that the Committee was required to choose one of the two options outlined in the Officer report to recommend to the Court of Common Council. The Court could then either choose to support the recommendation or not support it.

In response to a Member's suggestion that the Court of Common Council could consider a report with options, the Interim Assistant Town Clerk advised that this would not be in the spirit in which the Court had set out its standing orders and the way it had chosen to conduct debate. She added that with the Committee recommending an option, the merits of the other option would still be presented to Court and Members could support or not support the recommended option.

A number of Members spoke in support of having a debate at the Committee meeting and the Chairman therefore opened up the debate.

A Member commented that the report only included highway considerations in detail, although it briefly mentioned other relevant considerations and he stated this was a finely balanced matter. He commented that another consideration was the purpose of any transport mode and taxis assisted the business of the City. The Member stated that not being able to get taxis through the City inhibited business. He commented that the impact on finances and business should be considered and added that if weight had not been given to the financial considerations that Option Two had to be considered. An Officer stated that the report referenced equalities, mixed economic evidence which was largely anecdotal, the strength of feeling amongst taxi drivers and the wardmote so all these factors had been taken into account in reaching the Officer recommendation.

In response to a Member's question about an experimental traffic order, an Officer confirmed that the traffic order at Bank junction currently was a permanent traffic order and added that experimental traffic orders could only be in place for a maximum of 18 months.

A Member stated he had made a Freedom of Information request on the number of infringements of vehicles going through the junction. He stated that

some vehicles had gone through three times and one had gone through 61 times in the year. 151 vehicles had gone through the junction 675 times. He suggested that this could be limousines taking business people from the airport to offices. An Officer responded that it was a challenge to find the detail of the repeat offenders. There was no evidence to suggest it was limousine drivers. The one vehicle that had gone through over 60 times was a commercial vehicle. He stated that some people knowingly committed contraventions. There was also some evidence that some people committed a contravention repeatedly until they received a series of penalty charge notices (PCNs) and then they changed their behaviour.

A Member stated that the junction had been transformed and was now a much more pleasant environment to walk and cycle through. He stated that when taxis were going through the junction, there was much more congestion and therefore letting them back through would increase congestion again. The Member asked Officers if they could look at just opening the junction to taxis east-west with no turning in the junction. The Chairman stated that the scope of the motion at the Court of Common Council was not to specify which arms would be opened. The Chairman added that following the decision to be made at the Court of Common Council, subsequent decisions would then be the remit of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee. An Officer confirmed that after the Court decision, Streets and Walkways would then determine whether all routes or some of them would be reopened as part of the modelling process and decision on the specific highways changes.

A Member commented on the positive transformation of Bank junction. She stated socioeconomic disadvantage had been included in the report but not explicitly. She stated that Wheels for Wellbeing had a proposal to clarify the substance of the equalities argument by allowing those with a blue badge to put that in the front of the taxi and not trigger the ANPR. An Officer stated this was currently not possible as there was not the technology to enable ANPRs to recognise blue badges. This could be looked at if the technology was available in the future.

In response to a question about the TfL taxi card, an Officer stated that there was a taxi card system in place that was administered by TfL* and was funded through the On Street Parking Reserve. Officers were unable to comment on how easy to use the system or how many people used the scheme as the scheme was administered by TfL but confirmed it did apply to black cabs and private hire vehicles. Officers had asked for data to understand how many taxi card journeys finished in the Bank area but had not received this. The Chairman asked Officers to request this data again.

*[*An Officer later advised that it was London Councils rather than TfL who administered the taxi card scheme.]*

The Member stated there would be a financial cost to not making a decision and seeking more information.

A Member asked about the status of representations received by Members of the Committee. The Chairman stated that representations were not treated in the same way as for planning applications and people could lobby Members on Court.

A Member commented on the aims of the project to transform Bank junction and stated that it was now much safer. She added that maintaining the quality of the space was essential to meet the needs of Destination City and the aim to attract more people into the City. She stated that removing the traffic from Bank Junction at the weekends would improve visitors' experience of visiting the City at the weekend. She commented that the Officer recommendation was not to change the current restrictions and stated the importance on not reversing change and undoing the street improvements that had been made in recent years.

The Member also stated that a representation from Wheels for Wellbeing suggested supporting Option One. She stated that the organisation represented people with disabilities and therefore the knowledge and insight was valuable. She suggested this should be provided to Court Members. The Interim Executive Director of Environment stated he would look into this.

The Member stated that she considered that a small increase in traffic would heighten the risk element.

The Member raised concern about the Court decision taken in 2022, with an amendment to the motion and a lack of debate. She stated that this had increased the costs in terms of other projects delayed. She asked Officers for the cost figure and details of the projects which had been delayed. An Officer stated he would not want to guesstimate the figure. Costs expended so far were however, included in the Officer report. There was an additional request agreed through due diligence and the normal governance process to deal with all the aspects Court asked to be looked at. So far, £277,000 had been spent, leaving £327,000 to get to the point where a change (if Court decided to implement the change) could be implemented. As experimental traffic orders were monitored for 18 months and there was public consultation during that time, it was likely that further funding would need to be sought to deliver this through the usual processes.

The Chairman commended Officers on the report which considered many factors. He stated that the economic impacts had not been considered in the same way as the highways impacts and these should be considered. He added that there had been conversations with individual businesses around Bank junction and some of their feedback had been included in the report. He commended Officers for the quality and pace of the work.

The Chairman stated that the pedestrian space at Bank junction had been well received by all users and he asked for clarification that any potential changes would be within what was already in place. An Officer stated that the decision related to the traffic mix and not the traffic design and therefore the junction would remain unchanged regardless of the decision made at Court.

The Chairman referred to the equalities reference in the report which mentioned specific groups having concerns but not necessarily enough of a concern to warrant a change in decision. He stated the importance of not excluding any groups. Members were informed that an equalities impact assessment had been undertaken. The report acknowledged there were benefits and disbenefits but Officers did not consider that any groups would be excluded as a result of changes.

A Member stated that there might be an indirect link between the inclusion of taxis and safety as there would be more traffic, turns, complexity and less crossing time for pedestrians.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 8 votes
OPPOSED – 4 votes
There were 2 abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee

1. Note the content of the report, which concludes the review of traffic and timing mix at Bank junction; and
2. Endorse the findings of the review and recommend to the Court of Common Council Option 1: - No change to current restrictions, with Bank junction continuing to operate as it currently does, i.e. bus and cycle only, 7am - 7pm, Monday – Friday, except for access to Cornhill from Princes Street.

7. **UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY**

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

Members were informed that growth and prosperity was underpinned by, and relied upon, high quality utility infrastructure. The Strategy sought to bring together a holistic and co-ordinated approach to support and influence the operations of the utilities within the square mile.

Members were informed that consultation had taken place and a Member workshop had been held. There had also been positive engagement and response from the utility companies. The strategy had been updated following the consultation.

The Chairman stated the importance of having a forward plan in relation to utilities and stated the engagement with utility companies was welcomed.

A Member thanked Officers for highlighting the need to push for faster broadband coverage in the square mile for residents not living on the main

estates as many experienced poor internet connections and WiFi. She asked that this work continue.

RESOLVED - That following recent public consultation, Members recommend the final strategy to the Court of Common Council for adoption.

8. **INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT CIL/S106 2022-23**

The Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director which presented the City's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 (S106) planning obligations infrastructure funding statement at the end of the financial year 2022/23. The report summarised the City's CIL and S106 balances, allocations and spend at the end of the financial year and updated the list of infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure the City would be wholly or partly funding by CIL. The CIL regulations require collecting authorities to produce an annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) for publication on the City's website.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee note the contents of the report and approve the infrastructure list at paragraph 19, repeated at section 4 of Appendix 1 of the Officer report, for publication on the City's web site.

9. **BUILDING CONTROL CHARGES REPORT 2023/24**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which advised Members of the findings of the Building Control's review into their previous fees and charges increases and recommended revised fees for 2024/25.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee

1. Approve Option 3 - Agree an hourly rate, based on cost recovery for chargeable works including work undertaken on behalf of the Building Safety Regulator based on a cost recovery rate, plus a 20% surcharge to reduce the accumulated Trading Statement deficit, over the next five years. The hourly rate will be £163. Charges for other Building Control activities to be based on cost recovery basis at £136. Work to assist the Building Safety Regulator will be charged at £170 per hour. Work to deal with a dangerous structure when the Corporation has to carry out works with their contractor, will be charged at £170 per hour; and
2. Agree a new "City of London Building Regulations Charges Scheme No 7: 2024".

10. **STONECUTTER COURT S278**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the Section 278 (S278) Highways and public realm works required to integrate the new building at 1 Stonecutter Street into the surrounding public highway.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee agree to enter into an agreement under Section 38 (S38) of the Highways Act 1980 to dedicate areas of private land (by the steps at Harp Alley as shown on Appendix 2 of the Officer report) as public highway maintainable at public expense. The cost to

maintain the adopted area for 20 years has been included in the commuted maintenance sum as detailed in paragraph 4, and in Section 3 of the Officer report.

11. RECISSION OF CITY WALKWAY AT 125 LONDON WALL (ALBAN HIGHWALK)

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment which recommended the recission of part of the existing city walkway known as the Alban Highwalk City Walkway at 125 London Wall.

Members were informed that the recission was to enable the redevelopment of Alban Gate, 125 - 130 London Wall, London EC2 which was approved by the Planning Applications Sub-Committee on the 9 May 2024.

In response to a Member's question about whether the new walkway should be adopted in parallel, an Officer stated that this could not be done until the walkway had been laid out, had been inspected and met standards and that Members were being asked to give Officers the authority to do that once the inspection had been undertaken.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee

- a. Conditionally on the grant of planning permission (Registered No. 23/01115/FUL) for alterations at Alban Gate, 125 London Wall and the linked Section 106 Agreement having completed, resolve to vary the resolution of Court of Common Council made on 1st April 1993 to alter the city walkway known as Alban Highwalk City Walkway so as to exclude the area shown shaded pink on the City Walkway Variation Drawing number D6228D0702 Rev12 (Appendix 2B to this report) in accordance with the resolution set out in Appendix 2A to this report.
- b. Delegate to the City Operations Director authority to insert into the resolution an appropriate date for the coming into force of the resolution at (a) above.
- c. Conditionally on the grant of planning permission (Registered No. 23/01115/FUL) for alterations at Alban Gate, 125 London Wall and the linked Section 106 Agreement having completed, approve the use of non-standard materials in line with the existing Alban Highwalk City Walkway for the new city walkway to be declared by the resolution at (d) below.
- d. Delegate to the City Operations Director authority to make a resolution declaring the replacement walkway shown shaded green on Drawing Number D6228D0902 Rev I3 in Appendix 3 to be city walkway on being satisfied that the new walkway:
 - i. has been laid out or is otherwise suitable for a city walkway within the meaning of section 5 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1967,
 - ii. that access to it is available directly from a street or another way or place that is a city walkway, and

- iii. that it has been laid out or rendered suitable for a city walkway in accordance with one of the provisions specified in subsection (1) of section 6 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1967.

12. DRAFT AIR QUALITY STRATEGY 2025 TO 2030*

A Member asked a question about the addition of air pollution considerations to the developers' carbon options of refurbishment versus demolition/rebuild.

An Officer stated that this was a complex matter and that discussions were taking place between the air quality and planning policy teams about pathways and solutions. These would continue and Officers would report back to the Committee. She stated the Air Quality SPD would be refreshed and this could be taken forward as part of this work.

RESOLVED - To note the report.

13. PUBLIC LIFT & ESCALATOR REPORT*

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor on the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyor's, in the reporting period 16 February 2024 to 1 May 2024.

RESOLVED – To note the report.

14. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 13 FEBRUARY 2024*

The Committee received the public minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2024.

RECEIVED.

15. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 9 APRIL 2024*

The Committee received the public minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2024.

Natasha Lloyd-Owen stated that she attended the meeting but was not on the list of attendees. An Officer stated the minutes would be amended accordingly.

MATTERS ARISING

The Inclusion Of Representations In Agenda Packs

A Member stated that there was a suggestion under Minute 8 that the approach taken to the inclusion of representations in agenda packs should be raised as a matter of policy at a meeting of the Grand Committee. She asked for clarity on the approach taken as well as the approach to be taken forward. She also asked which documents were required to be included by law and which were optional. She asked if all representations and environmental statements could be included.

The Deputy Chairman, who was in the Chair at the meeting on 9 April 2024 stated that the Officer summaries were useful and helped Members to navigate the documents. He suggested that if all responses were to be included, this should be in a separate pack.

The Chairman stated that for Planning Applications Sub-Committee after the 9 April meeting, Officers had included all representations.

The Director of Planning and Development stated that all representations could be included. He added that he could not commit to include the environmental statements as they were very large and this would be an onerous task.

The Legal Officer stated that there was not a legal position on which documents should be included other than the Officer report and a list of background papers i.e. papers relied on to a material extent to write the report. She stated that the papers included by Officers were beyond what they were required to include in law.

In response to a Member's comment about the organisation of representations, the Chairman commended Officers by organising the reports by topic matter.

In response to a Member's suggestion about publishing the documents and printing the minimum, the Chairman stated that this was outside the remit of the sub-committee.

A Member suggested that responses should be categorised. A member raised concern about categorising or prioritising representations. Another Member suggested that they be categorised into statutory consultee representations and other representations.

MOTION: - A motion was put and seconded that Members continue to have included with their planning papers, all the representations received from third parties including individuals and bodies such as Historic England.

A Member requested that representations from the same consultee be grouped together. Officers stated they would consider this approach.

The Chairman asked Members if they were content to vote on the principle, with Officers coming back with a solution to the organisation of representations.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the motion.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 10 votes
OPPOSED – 3 votes
There was 1 abstention.

The motion was therefore carried.

[Jaspreet Hodgson, was not present for this item and therefore did not vote.]

Questions About The Work Of The Sub-Committee And AOB Items

The Member asked for clarification on the items which could be raised. She stated that Members should be able to raise items of concern at Planning Applications Sub-Committee meetings that did not relate to the specific planning application but instead related to the broader work of the Planning and Transportation Committee. The Member stated that when the number of grand committees were reduced and separate Planning Applications Sub-Committees were set up, she understood that any urgent items could be dealt with under AOB.

The Interim Assistant Town Clerk stated that the practice of having questions and AOB as agenda items was not a statutory requirement but was long-standing Corporation practice. The agenda items were explicitly for matters relating to the work of the sub-committee for Planning Applications Sub-Committee and matters relating to the work of the committee for the Planning and Transportation Committee. The terms of reference of the Planning Application Sub-Committee were expressly based around the determination of planning applications and therefore broader strategic questions and AOB should be raised at the Planning and Transportation Committee.

Members were informed that there were other forums for questions to be asked and Members were welcome to ask questions of Officers between meetings, questions could be asked at the Planning and Transportation Committee, the Chairman could be emailed with questions and if the matter was of interest to the wider committee, an answer could be facilitated and circulated. These options would ensure questions were answered in a timely manner. If Members wanted the answer in the public domain, they could seek an answer and then raise it at the next Planning and Transportation Committee so that it could be put on public record.

The Chairman stated that if there were policy matters that needed clarification in relation to a planning application, these would be valid questions to put at the Planning Applications Sub-Committee. He stated that Members could contact the Director of Planning and Development with questions between meetings.

In relation to answers being put in the public domain, a Member raised concern in relation to possible delays between receiving answers to questions and being able to raise the matter at the next Planning and Transportation Committee. She suggested Members should be able to ask a brief question at the next Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting and this would aid openness and transparency.

A Member raised concern that the opportunity for asking questions had reduced when the number of Planning and Transportation Committees had been reduced to 4 per year as a result of separating the Planning and Transportation and Planning Applications Sub-Committee. She stated that if Members had questions answered by email, the responses should be placed on the website so they were in the public domain. The Chairman advised that 9 Planning and Transportation Committees had been held in the previous 12 months.

A Member stated that it was important not to try and turn the Planning Applications Sub-Committee into a Planning and Transportation Committee through increasing the scope of questions. He suggested that if there was a way to report on questions between meetings in an efficient way, this could be useful. He stated that the lift report was no longer timely and suggested it could be published on the website as a monthly report. The Chairman asked Officers to provide more regular lift reports.

RECEIVED.

16. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17 APRIL 2024*

Deborah Oliver stated that in relation to the declarations she and Steve Goodman made, they had been given dispensations to vote as well as speak and the minutes should be amended accordingly.

A Member stated that she had some amendments to the minutes to suggest. The Chairman stated these could be sent to the clerk and that the minutes would be submitted to the next Planning Applications Sub-Committee for approval.

Matters Arising

A Member asked for clarification on the point raised in relation to a climate emergency. She stated the motion in 2020 in relation to declaring a climate emergency failed, not because Members disagreed that there was a climate crisis but it was suggested that it was better to take action via the robust Climate Action Strategy rather than focus on a declaration. She raised concern that the comment made suggested that the Corporation did not consider there to be a climate emergency was an incorrect understanding of the motion.

The Chairman clarified that the Member was not suggesting an inaccuracy in the minutes and that this was being raised as a matter arising and the Member confirmed this was the case. The Chairman stated at the meeting where the motion was put, the City's fully funded time marked climate action plan was approved. He asked the Director of Planning and Development to clarify that this was still in place. The Director confirmed it was and the comment was a reflection of the Court of Common Council's decision not to declare a climate emergency.

RECEIVED.

17. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 19 MARCH 2024*

The Committee received the public minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2024.

RECEIVED.

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

Blackfriars Undercroft

A Member asked about the plans for Blackfriars Undercroft and the disused rifle range. He asked if Officers could work with the Sports Strategy Team and City Surveyors as the Sports Board was keen to allocate this space to an outside sporting facility. He added that the Sports Strategy team were locating areas as public exercise facilities. There was funding available for three years and this space could be available within a year. The Member stated that Thames Water wanted the space to be used. An Officer stated that work would take place with the Sports Strategy team.

Standing Orders

A Member asked a question about the standing orders. She stated that they were currently silent on time for debate and the time by which materials should be submitted in order to be taken into account by Members. She raised concern that representations for the meeting on 17 April 2024 had been submitted just before the meeting and she stated the lack of debate was not in line with the Nolan principles. She stated that the protocol should state that there would always be time for debate and she considered that it was inappropriate to have a motion to move straight to the vote at a quasi-judicial meeting. She asked if this could be looked at. The Member stated that other local authorities had a cut-off and whilst she welcomed the City being more generous, there was a need to consider if there should be a cut-off to enable Members to read the representations.

The Interim Assistant Town Clerk stated that under the Court of Common Council's Standing Order 37, Members could put a motion on moving to the vote and there were no exceptions made for Planning Applications Sub-Committees.

The Director of Planning and Development stated that late representations were provided to Members, however it was not helpful when they were submitted very late. He stated that at the meeting on 17 April 2024, the meeting was adjourned and Members were given time to read the late representations.

A Member stated that at the meeting, a majority of Members were in favour of moving to the vote. He considered that after 3.5 hours of consideration, he was in a position to vote. He stated he was in favour of a cut-off for representations of 24 hours before the meeting.

A Member stated the importance of debate in informing Members' decisions and the importance of public perception. She stated that holding meetings in the afternoon could help with any timing issues.

The Chairman stated that the timing of meetings had previously been considered and there had been agreement that the timing of meetings worked well.

A Member suggested that to manage the debate, there could be a limit of one contribution per Member.

The Chairman stated that the correct protocols had been followed and there had been a democratic decision by the Sub-Committee to move to the vote.

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.

19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

The Chairman stated that he was pleased to announce that an appointment had been made to the position of Environment Director and a press release would be made shortly with further details.

The Chairman stated that the Planning Division has been shortlisted for 6 awards in the prestigious Planning Awards and Building London Planning Awards including National Planning Authority of the Year.

It had also been shortlisted for groundbreaking initiatives on:

- Free to visit inclusive public elevated areas in developments (A view for all)
- Carbon Options Planning Advice Note
- Suicide Prevention Planning Advice Note
- Thermal Comfort Guidelines

20. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

21. NON-DOCKED MICROMOBILITY SCHEME STATEMENT OF INTENT

The Committee considered a non-public report of the Interim Executive Director, Environment concerning the Non-docked Micromobility Scheme Statement of Intent.

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

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no urgent business to be considered in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 11.10 am

Chairman

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