

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 18 December 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	Alderman Gregory Jones QC
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)	Shravan Joshi
Munsur Ali	Alderman Nicholas Lyons
Randall Anderson	Deputy Brian Mooney
Peter Bennett	Sylvia Moys
Sir Mark Boleat	Susan Pearson
Mark Bostock	Judith Pleasance
Henry Colthurst	Deputy Henry Pollard
Stuart Fraser	Oliver Sells QC
Alderman Prem Goyal OBE JP	William Upton
Graeme Harrower	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Jennifer Ogunleye	- Town Clerk's Department
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Nick Bodger	- Cultural and Visitor Director
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Beckett	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Bhakti Depala	- Department of the Built Environment
Clive Cornwell	- Department of the Built Environment
Gwyn Richards	- Department of the Built Environment
Catherine Linford	- Department of the Built Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Craig Stansfield	- Department of the Built Environment
Neel Devlia	- Department of the Built Environment
Rianne Gilzeane-Watson	- Department of the Built Environment
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Ted Rayment	- Department of the Built Environment
Richard Steele	- Department of the Built Environment
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Rehana Ameer, Deputy Keith Bottomley, Peter Dunphy, Marianne Fredericks, Christopher Hill, Oliver Lodge, Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd Owen, Graham Packham and James de Sausmarez.

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

Oliver Sells declared an interest in relation to Item 9 stating that he was a Member of the Bar practising at Inner Temple and also a professional and residential tenant there as detailed on his public register of interests. He added that he had consulted the Comptroller and City Solicitor on this matter who had received advice from leading counsel to suggest that no DPI was engaged on this occasion.

Deputy Alistair Moss (Deputy Chairman) declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Item 8 stating that he had served as both Chairman and then Deputy Chairman of the Property Investment Board who had dealt with the transactional aspects of 1 Leadenhall Street in some detail. He therefore proposed to leave the meeting when this item was under consideration so as to draw clear lines between the City's role as landowner and planning authority. He would not speak or vote on the matter.

Alderman Gregory Jones declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Item 9 stating that he was a Barrister, in independent practice at the bar within the Chambers of Andrew Tait QC, FTB, Francis Taylor Building, Temple, as detailed on his public register of interests.

3. **MINUTES**

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 were considered and approved as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Consultation on Noisy Saturday Construction Work Activities in the City of London – In response to a question, the Town Clerk reported that the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee had agreed with this Committee's conclusion and had also voted in favour of restricting noisy works hours to 09:00 to 14:00.

COLPAI Project on former Richard Cloudesley School site – A Member questioned why this matter had not been brought back to the Committee for further discussion as had been suggested at the last meeting. She also asked that the Chairman update the Committee on the result of his discussions with the Chief Planning Officer on the matter. Finally, she asked what consideration had been given to some obvious ways of solving the problem, such as: looking at ways to remove the need for the service trench, investigating alternative positions for gas intake and changing roof falls, and retaining the existing boundary wall.

The Chairman reported that, whilst it had been suggested that the matter be brought back to Committee for further discussion it had not formally been 'called in'. If Members were of the view that this was necessary it would need to be a formal, collective decision. He added that, as the Chief Planning Officer had been absent at the time, he had followed up this matter with the Director of the Built Environment after the last meeting who had subsequently discussed the matter with the Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

The Director of the Built Environment clarified that an application had been submitted in relation to condition 5 of the CoLPAI decision and that the applicant had applied to remove four trees and retain one on the boundary with the neighbouring allotments. It is proposed that three new trees are planted on the boundary. Members were reminded that all of the trees in question are in Islington and, as such, a parallel application has been submitted to the London Borough of Islington.

The Director went on to report that neighbourhood consultations are not carried out in relation to applications to discharge conditions. However, approximately 30 objections have been received. The objections raised a number of issues and the applicant's responses to those have been requested. The Open Spaces Department have also been consulted on the acceptability of the application.

Members were informed that the determination of applications in respect of conditions is delegated to the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director and it is proposed that the application will be determined in this way in accordance with normal procedures once the necessary information has been received. Islington have also indicated that they propose to deal with the application under delegated authority and not to report it to their Committee.

The Director added that, under exceptional circumstances, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director might consider referring the discharge of a planning condition to Committee, however, it was felt that there are no exceptional circumstances in this case.

Notwithstanding the above, the Committee can of course call in the discharge of the condition if they so choose.

Alderman Jones suggested that, given the strength of feeling around this matter, it was his view that it should, indeed, be called in by the Committee. He stated that, whilst he accepted and endorsed the general procedure of delegating the majority of work in this area, this case warranted greater scrutiny. He put the motion to the Committee.

Susan Pearson seconded the motion.

The motion was put with votes cast as follows:

FOR: 12 votes

AGAINST: 3 votes

It was therefore agreed that the matter be called in and brought back to the Committee for further consideration in the New Year.

TfL Control Room Visits – A Member reported that the second of these visits had been to the London Underground Control Centre which had been a very informative visit and useful in terms of building relations.

4. DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director detailing development and advertising applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

RECEIVED.

5. VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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

A Member noted that discharged conditions were mentioned within the report and questioned whether all such conditions featured here or only those which Officers thought were of the most importance. She added that she had not seen the conditions around the COLPAI trees featured here previously.

The Chief Planning Officer clarified that all delegated decisions were listed within these regular reports to Committee. She added that the report listed full planning applications and was not in relation to conditions only.

6. CITY OF LONDON VISITOR STRATEGY 2019/23

The Committee received a report of the Assistant Town Clerk and Culture Mile Director seeking Member comments on the new draft City of London Visitor Strategy 2019/23.

The Chairman reported that the draft strategy had already been endorsed by both the Culture, Heritage and Libraries and the Policy & Resources Committees.

A Member commented that it was important to have some reassurance that the Square Mile would still retain a business focus. He added that there was also no mention of security within the strategy at present which should continue to be a priority in the City. The Cultural and Visitor Director reported that one of the main thrusts of the strategy was timing with particular focus on visitors at evenings and weekends. Any crossover with business – such as lunchtimes – would, however, be looked at as part of this.

In terms of security, the Cultural and Visitor Director reported that arrangements formed part of individual events programmes (like City Arts) but he agreed that this should be explicit within the strategy. He went on to clarify that each event went through a rigorous process in terms of security with input from the City of London Police and Highways in terms of things such as vulnerability, crowd safety and public order.

Another Member commented that she was disappointed to see that Leadenhall Market was not mentioned within the draft strategy given that the Guildhall Yard and Old Bailey were. The Cultural and Visitor Director reported that work was being done alongside the Market to look at increasing visitor numbers here, particularly at weekends. This could be referenced within the strategy but, due to financial constraints, this could not be a direct action at present.

A Member questioned the 'Action Area' around the provision of additional coach parking and dropping off facilities detailed within the draft strategy. She added that she recalled this Committee looking at transport issues around the City and attempting to try and reduce this in the past. The Cultural and Visitor Director reported that the City's larger attractions, such as St Paul's Cathedral, relied on coach parties for much of their income. He added that any work in this area would be carried out in close consultation with all affected parties.

RECEIVED.

7. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor containing details of the three public escalator/lifts that were out of service less than 95% of the time.

The City Surveyor regretfully reported that the lift at Speed House was still out of service and required a new drive board which was set to be delivered this week. It was hoped that the lift would then return to service. Long term, a programme to refurbish the lift was being brought forward to February 2019. This would render the lift out of service for a period of approximately 3 months but would hopefully reduce the number of occasions on which the lift experienced technical failures/difficulties.

The City Surveyor went on to report that a £250,000 project to refurbish and upgrade all of the City's public lifts was also planned in order to make all of them as reliable as possible.

A Member questioned how much routine maintenance was carried out on the public lifts. The City Surveyor reported that routine maintenance was carried out fortnightly on all public lifts. Consideration had previously been given to increasing this to weekly maintenance, but it had been concluded that there would be no real benefit in doing so.

A Member commented that the Speed House lift had been poorly designed from the outset. Another Member commented on the running costs of the public lifts being more expensive than they should be as a result of poor design and

questioned whether the City Corporation had any control over this going forward, in terms of specifying what standards developers should be meeting in the first place. The City Surveyor reported that a public lift specification as now in place and could be shared with developers to ensure that all future public lift installations met the City Corporation's criteria.

A Member questioned whether the City Surveyor stockpiled spare parts and vital components for the public lifts, particularly those that were difficult to procure. The Deputy Chairman added that the Chief Executive of Land Securities had recently announced that they had taken the decision to do just this in view of Brexit and the potential difficulties that may pose around securing parts from abroad speedily. The City Surveyor reported that some critical spare parts were stockpiled but that it was not possible to store all of the spare parts required for all on the City's public lifts. She added that it was hoped that the lift refurbishment programme would reduce the need for this going forward. With regard to the Millennium Inclinorator, where many of the parts were imported, a lot of spare parts were already being stored at Guildhall and the City Surveyor would continue to stockpile these.

RECEIVED.

8. LEADENHALL COURT 1 LEADENHALL STREET LONDON EC3V 1PP

Deputy Alistair Moss (Deputy Chairman) withdrew from the meeting for this Item.

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking approval for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment to provide a 36 storey building with 28 floors for office use (Class B1) with retail floorspace (Class A1-A4) at basement, ground and fourth floor, office lobby and loading bay at ground floor, a publicly accessible terrace at fourth floor, 5 floors of plant and ancillary basement cycle parking (63,613sq.m GIA).

The Assistant Director, Planning and Development reminded Members that this follows a previous permission which was granted by the Planning and Transportation Committee on 25th January 2017, which was the subject of an application for a non-material amendment granted on 22nd February 2018. He went on to highlight that this application differs from the previous proposal in the following ways:

- Reduction in retail provision and increase in office space;
- Relocation of the servicing bay from Whittington Avenue to Gracechurch Street;
- Widening of the pavements on Gracechurch Street and Leadenhall Street;
- Reduction in the basement depth;
- Reduction in height;
- Façade refinements; and
- Relocation of the public terrace from level 2 to level 4.

He added that deliveries would be consolidated and would be restricted through the S106 agreement so that they take place outside pedestrian peaks.

He drew Members' attention to the fact that the planting of five trees was proposed on either side of the loading bay as part of the wind mitigation strategy.

The Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that the development was adjacent to both the Bank and Leadenhall conservation areas. Overall, it was hoped that the scheme would enhance the retail and pedestrian nature of the area and would be a successful addition to the City Cluster – as such Officers recommended that planning permission be granted.

An additional condition aimed at safeguarding the amenity of the adjoining premises and an amended condition 16 was tabled.

Members proceeded to debate the application.

A Member commented that, with the aim being to make the area more pedestrianised, there should be higher tests around wind, particularly in the terrace area where people should expect to be able to sit outside comfortably all year round.

He went on to state that Whittington Avenue was not very aesthetically pleasing and suggested that, in the long term, thought might be given to installing a glass canopy over this to help further transform the area and make it as welcoming as possible.

Another Member questioned whether an assessment of the anticipated increased footfall in the area had been carried out. The Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that pedestrian flow had been assessed alongside TfL and that both parties agreed that this would be acceptable going forward.

A Member raised concerns around noise, dust and vibrations as a result of the works and the possible effects this might have on businesses in the market trying to increase footfall and also on the current drainage system in the Market with mention of surface water drainage within the report. She questioned whether any mitigation would be put in place around these issues. The Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that the developer would be required to provide details around this prior to commencing any works.

Another Member raised concerns around the service bay entrance being moved to Gracechurch Street which could lead to issues with the busy traffic lights at the junction here. He also questioned if access here had been discussed with TfL who might then be able to give further thought to the phasing of the lights. The Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that banksmen would be used around the entrance to help direct and manage traffic and that Officers had fully engaged with TfL on this matter. Both parties were satisfied with the proposed arrangements.

A Member commented that he felt that the revised application appeared to be a real lost opportunity given that Leadenhall Market was supposed to be one of the City's principal shopping areas and a reduction in retail provision was now proposed. He added that he felt that the developer's proposals had therefore gone from too ambitious to not ambitious enough on the retail front.

Another Member disagreed with this point and suggested that the City Corporation needed to look again at retail given the changing nature of this and the increasing number of high street retailers going bust. The Assistant Director, Planning and Development stated that, whilst the amended proposals were for less retail space, they would still result in more retail space than was on site at present. Officers were satisfied that the proposals achieved the right balance here.

In response to questions around the public viewing gallery offer, the Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that this was a very different offer to elsewhere given that it would be at a lower level and would also create some synergy with the 4th floor restaurant proposals. With the development expected to house 4,000 employees, it was also felt that the external space offer was particularly beneficial.

A Member commented that this appeared to be an improvement in comparison to the original application but added that she felt that there were elements which required more discipline on the developer's part. She went on to state that, whilst deliveries were to be capped to a maximum of four per hour in between peak times (10:00 to 12:00 and 14:00 to 16:00), consolidation would still be essential. With regards to wind, the report states that strong winds would only occur for 1.8 hours per year, however, this was very close to the threshold of 2 hours per year and it was therefore felt that more mitigation was needed here.

The Member went on to state that she felt that the developer could make greater efforts with regard to achieving a satisfactory BREEAM rating. With regard to the informative concerning cooking and ventilation, the Member commented that the Committee had considered this matter at their last meeting and had been of the view that all ventilation equipment should be cleaned daily. She asked that this be reflected here. The Assistant Director, Planning and Development agreed with this point and undertook to look at some standard wording around this and attach an appropriate condition.

In response to the comments regarding strong winds and mitigation, the Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that this had been the subject of rigorous testing and that the City's most up to date guidance on this had been used. It was something that would also be revisited after a year from the commencement of works. He added that Officers were satisfied that the wind conditions were suitable in terms of terrace use with the imposed conditions. He also clarified that a consolidation centre would be used for deliveries.

Henry Colthurst moved that an additional condition be added stipulating that acceptable wind measurement on the terrace should be seating standard and standing standard in all other areas.

The motion was seconded by William Upton.

The Assistant Director, Planning and Development reported that, whilst, a condition along these lines could be imposed, the developer had currently met all of the City's existing criteria in this area. He would therefore need the Chairman to agree to some flexible wording around targeting certain wind levels.

A Member commented that, given that the application before the Committee was consistent with the Corporation's current policies, it was an area that Officers should be asked to strengthen in due course as opposed to being asked to make policy 'on the hoof'.

Henry Colthurst withdrew the motion and asked, instead, that Officers look closely at this matter in due course.

The application was then put to the vote where it was unanimously approved with no abstentions.

RESOLVED – That,

(a) The application be referred to the Mayor of London to decide whether to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission as recommended, or to direct refusal, or to determine the application himself (Article 5(1)(a) of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008);

(b) Planning permission be GRANTED for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to the Mayor deciding to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission, the planning obligations and other agreements being entered into in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until such obligations have been executed;

(c) Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in the report under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980.

9. **INNER TEMPLE GARDEN & CAR PARK INNER TEMPLE LONDON EC4Y 7HL**

Deputy Alistair Moss (Deputy Chairman) re-joined the meeting.

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking approval for the erection of two temporary buildings for a period of 22 months to facilitate the development proposed under 17/00077/FULMAJ (one located within the Inner Temple Garden (1100sq.m GEA) and one located within the Inner Temple Car Park (770sq.m

GEA) to provide temporary accommodation for the displaced Treasury Building, Inner Temple Hall and Library functions (Sui Generis use comprising Offices, Education and Training, Hall and Library relating to the Bar and Inner Temple). Associated works to include the dismantling, storage and re-erection of one listed and one unlisted gas lamp and plinth and the provision of a temporary substation and creation of a service compound.

William Upton declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Member of Inner Temple and a tenant at Chambers there. He added that he intended to speak and vote on the matter.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the application. She highlighted that the garden here was a highly valued public amenity. She underlined that, Officers would be in a position to recommend the application for approval if the proposed carpark temporary structure had been smaller and situated further away from the listed buildings.

The Chairman invited the registered objectors to address the Committee, reminding them that they had a total of ten minutes between them to do so. He also drew Members attention to a written objection from Dr. Malecka which had been tabled.

Lord Lloyd of Berwick addressed the Committee, informing Members of the long history of this application. He stated that despite the Inn's Surveyor writing to all in November 2018 to suggest that it was essential to have the proposed temporary buildings in place, if today's application were to be refused, the proposed building works could still proceed as alternative plans were in place.

Lord Lloyd went on to draw Members' attention to two photographs which were submitted alongside his written representation and were shown to Members on the display screen. He commented that these photographs clearly depicted the level of usage of the public gardens. He added that, whilst the temporary buildings were only proposed to be in place for 22 months, their removal would require damage repair to the grass area and the public would therefore likely lose closer to three years of access to the gardens.

Nicholas Asprey concurred with these points and went on to question the need/benefit of these temporary structures. He added that these appeared to be a convenience rather than a must and that there was no evidence to show what action the Inn had taken to obtain alternative accommodation for their activities.

Finally, Robert McCracken referred to the gardens and surrounding area as an oasis of calm. He commented that Kings Bench Walk was popular amongst tourists and film makers and that any work in the gardens could also have a detrimental effect on local wildlife.

The Chairman thanked the objectors for their presentation to Committee and invited questions from Members.

A Member referred to the written representation from Dr. Malecka (tabled) and asked the objectors present if they could confirm the assertion within the written representation that, on the 3rd December, the Inn had been informed that, should this application fail, agreements were in place elsewhere to ensure continuity of the work of the offices, education and training, hall and library during any building works. Mr Asprey confirmed that this was the case and suggested that it was something that the Committee should perhaps question further with the applicant.

The Chairman invited those speaking in favour of the applicant to address the Committee.

The Right Honourable Dame Elizabeth Gloster DBE took the opportunity to stress to Members that the application was extremely important to the Inner Temple with the public benefit of permitting the application clearly outweighing any temporary harm. She went on to state that the Officer recommendation to refuse the application was flawed in that it demonstrated a misunderstanding of the problems that would be faced should these activities be taken off site for a period of almost two years.

Dame Gloster stated that there were no firm agreements in place for all of the Inn's activities for this interim period. What had been agreed was provision for just 22 large events to be held elsewhere as the proposed temporary structures would not provide sufficient space for these. She clarified that contingency plans were in place as this was the responsible thing to do and went on to assert that Dr Malecka's interpretation of what had been reported to benchers at the meeting on 3rd December was therefore wrong.

Dame Gloster went on to state that the disruption to the Inn's activities should these need to be taken off site would be huge. An off-site library would mean that training would be dispersed which would have a particularly adverse impact on both existing and aspiring barristers and, ultimately, the contribution that the Inn makes to ensuring that the City continues to provide world class legal services.

Miss Patricia Robertson QC concurred with these points and stated that the benefits of granting this application outweighed any temporary and entirely reversible harm. She referred to the application as an emotive issue and recognised that there were still dissenters in the Inner Temple. She stated, however, that the displacement of activities elsewhere would affect communal life and could have a permanent effect if students chose, as a result of this, to attend other Inns.

With regard to the garden, Miss Robertson stated that no irreversible harm would be caused here. She added that the gardens were a private space with no right of way allowed for public access and that only a portion of the lawn would be occupied by the proposed temporary structure.

The Chairman thanked those speaking on behalf of the applicant for their presentation to Committee and invited questions from Members.

A Member stated that he found it hard to believe that there were no alternatives off site for these activities and asked that Dame Gloster explain further. Dame Gloster explained that, at present, students could come to the Treasury and all be together for both training and networking purposes. Catering was also available on site. If these activities were to be displaced, there would no longer be any synergy of Education/Training or of people/staff. Barristers who currently volunteered to provide training would also no longer be on hand. With regard to the library, Dame Gloster questioned whether suitable accommodation could be found elsewhere and mentioned concerns around the loading and unloading of material as well as disabled access. All in all, the displacement would lead to a loss of cohesion and collegiality for a period of almost two years. Long-term, this would also impact upon the recruitment programme.

A Member questioned the need for a structure in the garden and asked whether more of the carpark area might be used instead. Miss Robertson stated that she too had initially posed this question. The space that would be occupied in the carpark was, however, rather large and would pose issues around access and the storing of materials.

A Member questioned the impact that the servicing of the temporary buildings would have on the site and whether this had been taken in to consideration. Dame Gloster confirmed that this had been assessed and it had been concluded that this would result in no net change. A lightweight, temporary track would be in place across the lawn for deliveries and a shallow trench would also be required for utility connections and rainwater drainage. The Senior Planning Officer added that servicing and deliveries were referenced within the report and clarified that deliveries for the temporary structures would continue to access the Inner Temple via Tudor Street Gate.

A Member commented that, when he had been a trainee barrister, activities never used to be held on one site. He asserted that this was therefore a preference and a convenience as opposed to a must given that the Inn would not stop functioning should the application be refused. Dame Gloster responded that things had changed with students expecting and having been provided for many years now with on-site educational activities/resources. She stressed the need for efficient, state of the art educational facilities on site which included the library, IT facilities and volunteers on hand to help deliver training.

A Member referred to a previous debate at this Committee on the library building and questioned whether parallels could be drawn here. Dame Gloster stated that there were similar considerations but that these were not necessarily the same. The advantages to this scheme were parallel. She reiterated that any suggested harm to the gardens and views would be temporary.

The Chairman asked that Members move to now debate the application.

A Member stated that he was minded to agree with the Officer recommendation to refuse the application. He added that he felt it was apparent that the applicant had not done enough to prove that these activities could not be successfully carried out elsewhere.

Another Member stated that there was clearly a need for balance here in terms of harm and public benefit. He reported that he had received representations from residents based in King's Bench Walk and intended to relay these to the Committee. Firstly, the gardens were private and only opened voluntarily to the public for 2.5 hours every afternoon. There were also occasions on which a temporary structure was in place here to hold private events in the Summer months. On these occasions the remainder of the gardens provided sufficient space for the public to enjoy. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that this was a temporary, summer, marquee which was erected under permitted development.

With regard to educational activities, the Inn was a collegiate teaching institution and, whilst alternative accommodation had been suggested (including Middle Temple and the Royal Courts of Justice out of hours), this would lead to the teaching offer being disjointed.

A Member commented that the gardens could be easily repaired after a period of 22 months and that any such repair or replacement may actually enhance and improve the area long term. He was convinced that any temporary harm caused here was preferable to displacing the Inn's educational activities.

A Member questioned how the Treasurer had failed to persuade the Inn of the benefits of these temporary structures and why it had therefore fallen to this Committee to resolve what should have been a domestic matter.

Another Member agreed with this point. He added that condition 17 of the permanent development prohibited the use of the Inner Temple Garden for temporary structures and that the present application clearly undermines the basis of this condition. He referred to the need to increase public access to open spaces across the City and stated that he felt it was unnecessary to propose the use of the gardens for this purpose. Failing to make greater use of the carpark for this means was a missed opportunity.

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

A Member stated that she was concerned about the assertion within the report that consultation on the scheme had been very selective. She went on to refer to the point made within one of the written objections received that it was for the developer to make arrangements for its staff during the development of the Treasury Building. In the apparent absence of this, it was now felt that the planning authority were, indeed, being asked to bail out the developer.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that the scheme had been advertised sufficiently on the site and that two separate rounds of consultation had also taken place.

Members proceeded to vote on the application before them with votes cast as follows:

- **Refuse Planning Permission** - 15 Votes
- **Grant Planning Permission** - 4 Votes
- **Abstentions** - 1

RESOLVED – That planning permission be refused for the proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

10. **REVIEW OF PROJECTS WITHIN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment proposing a review and prioritisation of transportation and public realm projects within the Department of the Built Environment (DBE) in order to better utilise available funds to deliver corporate priorities and enable continued development to support economic growth.

The Assistant Director City Public Realm informed Members that additional information regarding the Pre-Project Proposals listed in Table D as requested by the Chairman of the Projects Sub Committee had been tabled. He clarified that this information related to projects that were not yet at the formal project stage but that would be archived for the time being with these being revisited if the opportunity to do so or additional funding should arise.

He went on to remind Members that they had previously requested the prioritisation of these projects in accordance with emerging Corporate policies. Officers were now looking to Members to approve the methodology if the approach.

Members were informed that the report also proposed a spending plan for S106 funds that complies with the terms of the agreements which generated the funds and mitigates the impacts of the related developments.

The Chairman thanked Officers for the huge amount of work that had gone in to drawing this information together.

A Member stated that he was very pleased to receive the additional information (tabled) but highlighted that some of the projects listed here, such as the Christ's Hospital Artwork, had already been delivered by other means. The Assistant Director City Public Realm undertook to review and amend the table accordingly.

A Member asked for further information as to the origin of some of the points raised within the table provided for additional information.

A Member questioned how some of the larger, corporate projects such as the relocation of the Museum of London would be incorporated. The Assistant Director City Public Realm stated that Officers were cognisant of these larger projects which were referenced at Table F.

RESOLVED – That Members:

1. Agree the project prioritisation approach outlined in this report (paragraphs 15-18);
2. Agree that those projects which are fully funded by S278 monies (Table A), have Gateway 5 approval (Table B), are fully funded by Bridge House Estate (Table C) or are fully funded by S106 monies (Table E), fall outside the scope of this review;
3. Agree the allocation of S106 monies as set out in Table E (Appendix 3) and allocate any additional funding associated with the specified S106 agreements as a result of interest or indexation in accordance with Table E;
4. Note that the funding allocation set out in Table E (Appendix 3) is committed to the projects identified and will be transferred to project budgets upon Member approval of individual project reports via the Gateway approval process;
5. Agree to the archiving of 43 pre-project proposals (at Gateway 0) from the *Project Vision* system as set out in Table D;
6. Note that a forthcoming report will be brought to Committees in Quarter 1, 2019 which will outline a list of current projects to be continued, reduced in scope or stopped, for Members' approval;
7. Note that a ten-year plan of future prioritised projects, to be reviewed annually, will be appended to the forthcoming report (described in recommendation 6).

11. LANE RENTAL

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Lane Rental.

The Assistant Director (Highways) reported that this report had been requested by Members following wider government discussions on this matter. He added that whilst there were clearly some intuitive benefits around Lane Rental there were some significant disbenefits for the City Corporation. This was not, however, to say that the matter should be totally dismissed, and the evolving Transport Strategy would be a good opportunity to keep the matter under review going forward.

The Chairman reported that the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee had been supportive of the recommendations.

A Member suggested that the organisation should continue to be in close discussion with utilities working on the City's streets and provide incentives for completing works on time. The Assistant Director (Highways) recognised the need for this but also referred to the lobbying power of the utility industry.

In response to a concern regarding specialist materials like granite setts, the Assistant Director (Highways) reported that some materials were held in a depot in the City.

RESOLVED – That, Members agree:

- that the City work with other highway authorities to establish whether a ‘critical mass’ of Lane Rental streets in Central London can be established (paragraph 12, Option 3);
- to keep matters under review in conjunction with the aims & objectives of the forthcoming Transport Strategy;
- that officers continue to identify & promote safe and effective ways of working that help reduce the duration of works on City streets.

12. STREET NAMING AND NUMBERING SERVICE: INTRODUCTION OF CHARGES

The Committee considered a report of the Policy and Performance Director advising Members of a proposal to introduce charges for the discretionary elements of the City Corporation’s Street Naming and Building Naming Numbering service as a contribution to the running costs of the service.

In response to a question as to why our proposed charges were higher than elsewhere, Members were informed that this was due to costs being slightly higher. He added that this work was essential in order to register all addresses correctly for the benefit of the emergency services.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Approve the introduction of charges for the discretionary elements of the Street Naming and Numbering function; and
- Approve the schedule of charges set out in Appendix 1, to be applicable from 1st April 2019.

13. DEALING WITH WIND IMPACTS FROM DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES: UPDATE

The Committee received a report providing Members with an overview of past, present and future work undertaken to better understand and evaluate the wind microclimate in the City, especially in relation to determining development proposals.

Members received a presentation on the work undertaken to date. Officers reported that they were working alongside the Wind Industry regarding the methodology used. Members were shown a wind model that had been produced depicting all of the City’s existing developments as well as those currently in the pipeline. Comparisons had also been drawn between the City and other major Cities such as New York and Paris where the City had compared favourably in both cases.

Members were informed that international guidelines were also about to be published for the first time around wind and cycling in terms of both safety and comfort. Complex studies had also been carried out combining daylight/sunlight hours with wind studies.

Interestingly, Officers reported a correlation between high polluting highways and areas of enhanced wind conditions.

The Corporation's Wind Effects and Tall Buildings document had now been published and it was hoped that the Microclimate Guidelines document would also be published in the near future.

A Member thanked Officers for all of their work in this area. He requested a before and after study of wind conditions around the Walkie Talkie building. He added that the organisation should also be looking to make standards tougher for developers particularly amidst moves to make the City more pedestrianised.

Some Members called for greater clarity around what targets developers in the City should currently be working to after mitigation.

Another Member stated that he would like to see the organisation taking the opportunity to share and promote its own guidance with other Local Authorities and perhaps internationally given the level of expertise it now had on this.

The Deputy Chairman suggested that future applications might look at the cumulative effect on wind conditions and also look at what positive impacts new buildings could make.

Officers confirmed that whilst there were no public guidelines around targets to date, he accepted that these might be more radical going forward. He added that the organisation was very open to sharing their research and guidance externally.

RECEIVED.

14. MAJOR HIGHWAY ACTIVITIES 2018 & 2019

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to Major Highway Activities 2018 and 2019.

RESOLVED – That Members receive the report.

15. REVISED NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

Officers reported that, generally, there had been a shift towards housing with a reduced focus on the economy which was not necessarily in the City's long-term interests. The City Corporation had responded on the housing delivery test methodology highlighting the risks for the organisation were the government to be inflexible in their approach to this.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the publication of the revised NPPF and the key implications for the City of London set out in the report.

16. **THAMES COURT FOOTBRIDGE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the programme for remedial works to Thames Court Footbridge over Upper Thames Street between Queenhithe and Little Trinity Lane.

RECEIVED.

17. **CHANGE TO BUILDING REGULATIONS FOLLOWING THE FIRE AT GRENFELL TOWER**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on changes in the Building Regulations that will take effect on 21st December 2018, which are the first following the fire at Grenfell Tower on 14th June 2017.

In response to questions, the District Surveyor reported that he was aware of two private residential blocks in the City that had failed the fire test. One was being addressed by Housing and the other was a Hotel that was in the process of being rectified.

RESOLVED – That, the report is received.

18. **DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT RISK MANAGEMENT - QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the risk management procedures in place within the Department of Built Environment.

A query was raised around target scores increasing within the appendix to the report and also to the fact that the current Risk Score for DBE-TP-03 was referred to as both increasing and decreasing within the same report. Officers undertook to respond to these queries in writing to the Member concerned outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the report and the actions taken in the Department of the Built Environment to monitor and manage effectively risks arising from the Department's operations.

19. **BREXIT UPDATE**

The Director of the Built Environment reported that the risks arising from Brexit would be a standard agenda item for all grand committees going forward. In future, it would take the form of a short written report.

The Director referred to issues around recruitment, procurement and supply – all of which were being dealt with at a corporate level as opposed to being specific to this Committee.

In terms of the continuing attractiveness of the City as a place for business, this work was being headed up by Economic Development with input from the

Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources and of this Committee.

Finally, it was highlighted that MIPIM would be taking place just a fortnight ahead of the planned date for Brexit in March.

20. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing outstanding actions since their last meeting.

Updates were provided as follows:

Ludgate Circus

The Transportation and Public Realm Director reported that the surveys had now been completed with the results which detailed the movements of pedestrians, cars and bicycles being analysed at present. It was expected that a report detailing the results would be submitted to the Committee in January 2019 and would go some way to increasing safety awareness.

Committee Tour of the Bloomberg Building

The Chairman reported that this was currently being organised to take place in the New Year. Information would be sent to Members in due course.

Daylight/Sunlight Training

The Chief Planning Officer undertook to arrange this for the New Year.

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

Planning Applications

A Member questioned whether consideration might be given to hearing just one major application each meeting. He also asked if consideration could be given to hearing residential applications in the evening.

The Chairman clarified that it was not always possible to ensure the timing of applications so that only one per meeting was considered. He added that Officers could look to bring forward proposals around residential applications (which were admittedly rare) being considered at evening meetings going forward.

Bowater House, Golden Lane

A Member questioned whether an application for a mobile phone installation had been received for this property. The Chief Planning Officer reported that she was unaware of any such application to date but undertook to look in to this matter further and respond to the Member.

Embankment Works

In response to a question, the Chairman clarified that the planned closure of Embankment would now no longer be necessary.

Crossrail

In response to a question regarding further delays to Crossrail, the Chairman stated that he was not aware of any knock-on effects for the City.

Committee Terms of Reference

A Member questioned whether consideration might be given, in due course, to the introduction of a panel system for the consideration of major applications so that Members might be more significantly involved in the plans from an earlier stage.

He highlighted that the Committee had only recently considered and rejected the option of a panel system. A Member commented that Members did receive sufficient warning of applications coming forward both within the Committee papers and also as Ward Members.

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

Committee Dinner

The Chairman reminded Members that the Annual Committee Dinner was scheduled to take place on 21 February 2019 at Carpenters Hall.

Next Meeting

The Chairman reminded Members that the next Committee meeting was scheduled to take place on 29 January 2019 following the cancellation of the 8 January 2019 meeting.

23. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

Item No.
24 -25

Paragraph(s)
1 & 3

24. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 were considered and approved as a correct record.

25. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising Members of action taken by the Town Clerk since the last meeting of the Committee, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman; in accordance with Standing Orders Nos. 41(a) and 41(b).

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

There were no questions raised in the non-public session.

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

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

The meeting closed at 1.03 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
tel. no.: 020 7332 3414
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk**