

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 5 November 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chairman)
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)
Rehana Ameer
Randall Anderson
Adrian Bastow
Peter Bennett
Mark Bostock
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Henry Colthurst
Alderman Emma Edhem
John Edwards
Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Prem Goyal
Graeme Harrower

Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Shravan Joshi
Oliver Lodge
Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Deputy Brian Mooney
Sylvia Moys
Graham Packham
Susan Pearson
Deputy Henry Pollard
James de Sausmarez
Oliver Sells QC
William Upton QC
Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Gemma Stokley
Sufina Ahmad
Priya Rane
Simon Owen
Alison Bunn
Deborah Cluett
Annie Hampson

Carolyn Dwyer
Elisabeth Hannah
Zahur Khan
David Horkan
Bruce McVean
Craig Stansfield
Gwyn Richards

- Town Clerk's Department
- Town Clerk's Department
- Media Officer
- Chamberlain's Department
- City Surveyor's Department
- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
- Director of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Munsur Ali, Peter Dunphy, Sophie Fernandes, Christopher Hill, Andrew Mayer and Judith Pleasance.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the public minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2019.

MATTERS ARISING

Climate Action Briefing Implementation (page 6) – A Member noted that the Committee were still yet to receive the City Corporation's definition of a zero-carbon building. He asked that this matter be added to the list of Outstanding Actions until the information had been circulated.

The Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy Monitoring Report (page 8) – A Member questioned what progress had been made in terms of affordable housing contributions and brining this forward urgently, as a separate Supplementary Planning Document. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that this was being actively worked on and that an update would be provided at the next meeting of this Committee. The Chair agreed that this should be fast tracked given that Members had pushed for this for a number of years now and that the current numbers were clearly very wrong.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

Members discussed the length of the current document and the level of detail it contained for each item. The majority of Members felt that the background information provided for each item was useful in terms of reflecting the history of a matter and reflecting any nuances. The Chair reiterated that items were removed from the list once they had been dealt with.

It was, however, agreed that the table of actions could be streamlined by removing the column headed 'Officer responsible' and adding this information below the Action title and also combining the 'Progress Update' and 'To be completed/progressed'... columns. The Town Clerk undertook to make these changes for future reports.

RECEIVED.

5. **1-14 LIVERPOOL STREET AND 11-12 BLOMFIELD STREET, LONDON, EC2M 7AW**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding demolition of the existing building and over site development to provide a 10 storey building for office use (Class B1) (24,134sq.m GIA) with retail floorspace (Class A1-A4) at ground floor (615 sq.m GIA), roof plant and two levels of partial basement.

Officers introduced the report and underlined that the site in question was heavily compromised due to nearby Crossrail infrastructure. Members were also informed that the site would require servicing on-street. The Committee

were shown views of the site from various different perspectives and pictures of the existing and proposed buildings.

Officers highlighted the particular concerns raised around the design of the upper storeys of the proposed development. Officers stated that they were of the view that the proposals and proposed use of cast metal – a unique material for the City - was both contemporary and creative. Officers went on to highlight that the nearby 100 Liverpool Street building was of comparable height and that the proposed height of this development, at a location that was very much a gateway to the City was therefore justified.

Members were also informed that Historic England had expressed concern around the view of the proposed development from Liverpool Street, alongside the Great Eastern Hotel.

The Chair thanked Officers for the introduction. He invited the two Members of the Committee who had attended a site visit last week to open with any comments they might have on the application.

A Member who had attended the site visit last week stated that he was generally supportive of the application but that he would appreciate further information on the servicing of the proposed development and the effect that this was likely to have on other businesses also using Blomfield Street for this purpose. He added that he would also like to see whole life carbon impact and the degree of re-use noted within the report.

The second Member who had visited the site stated that he too was supportive of the application and in favour of the mansard design of the upper three storeys.

Another Member stated that the 'opening up' of this area for pedestrians had been a long time coming and he sought assurances that these proposals would not now impinge on pedestrian access here either during construction or once complete. He went on to highlight that the wording in the report seemed to suggest that the developer was not willing to contribute to the cost of cycle hire facilities. He questioned their position on this given that this appeared to be one of few sites in the City where such facilities could potentially be accommodated and the fact that cycling in the City was being increasingly promoted and encouraged.

A Member reported that the City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) had discussed the plans extensively and were generally supportive of them. However, given the servicing issues, he stated that he would like to have genuine certainty around consolidation. With regard to cycle hire immediately next to the Crossrail site, he argued that all bicycles would, inevitably, be gone in the morning and that this would then require additional cycles to be trucked in which would be problematic on this site. The Chair commented that he was grateful to the CAAC for their work and to the Member for regularly attending their meetings.

Officers reported that cycle hire contributions would be negotiated between TfL and the developer and that the City Corporation would be peripheral to these discussions.

A Member commented that this was an application for an office development in a business area and therefore seemingly straightforward. However, he underlined that it was the statutory duty of this Committee to consider all relevant factors when determining the application. He conceded that the design of the proposed building, on the lower floors was a clear improvement on the existing structure. The same could not be said of the top three storeys, something highlighted by the City Heritage Society and the CAAC in their respective submissions but not adequately addressed within the report. The Member went on to state that he was personally of the view that the top three storeys of the proposed development were grotesquely out of keeping with the design on other buildings within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. For this reason, he intended to vote against the application and would prefer the applicant to resubmit plans which were more in keeping with the architectural integrity of the City.

The Deputy Chairman spoke to disagree with this view. He stated that, whilst he understood the nature of the concerns, he personally found the design of the building and the proposed façade treatment particularly interesting and classy. This seemed to be a matter of design perspective and not a large enough issue, in his opinion, to reject the application. He added that the City was not unused to having unique buildings and that he was against the idea that City office buildings should all appear similar. He went on to state that this site was part of a complex jigsaw around Liverpool Street and the Crossrail site and that the application would contribute to meeting aims around the increase of office floorspace in the City.

Another Member spoke to highlight that this was a controversial application which seemed to, unfortunately, attract only marginal support in terms of design. He went on to refer specifically to ventilation and the statement with the report that ventilation systems for extracting and dispersing any emissions and cooking smells to the external air were to be at roof level. He questioned whether this would be true for the entire building, including the proposed retail units at ground floor level. Officers highlighted that this was for the entire building and that this was conditioned at Condition 28.

The Member went on to question how many occupants the finished building was likely to hold and whether a congestion assessment had been undertaken in what was clearly a very difficult and busy area. He finished by stating that he found reference to the constraints of Crossrail infrastructure for the justification of the scale of the building within the report curious. Officers drew Members attention to the 'Trip Generation' paragraphs within the report which indicated that the proposed development would generate a total of 547 two-way person trips during the AM peak hours.

Another Member spoke to reiterate that the site in question was very busy, crowded location – something which the design of the proposed development

did not appear to take into account. She questioned, specifically, the use of long sheets of glass at ground floor level and whether this was appropriate in terms of security and anti-terrorism. She went on to agree that servicing at street level was a huge problem on this site and reiterated the need for a consolidation centre which she added that she would like to see conditioned to ensure that the completed development could not be occupied until these arrangements had been confirmed. She also added that servicing on-site should be possible if stipulated in the design brief.

Officers commented that the façade of the building and glass sheets would be hardened and conditioned.

The Member went on to comment on the mansard roof design stating that mansard roofs were, in her opinion, supposed to be sleek and blend into the skyline. She stated that this was clearly not the case for the upper three storeys of the proposed development and this element therefore required further work.

A Member spoke in favour of the design of the building adding that it was important that the City be innovative and progressive in terms of design, continuing to mix the old and the new. Other Members echoed this same point with one citing 1 Poultry at Bank Junction as an example of an existing contemporary Mansard Roof that was both innovative and interesting.

Officers reported that the proposals for the upper three storeys of the building were a contemporary interpretation of a mansard roof. They also questioned the view that all mansard roofs were designed as subservient and highlighted that this would be a 'bookend' building on the proposed site.

Officers responded to concerns around servicing, highlighting that, due to nearby Crossrail infrastructure, this would need to be on-street. Officers agreed that Liverpool Street West should be fully pedestrianised and highlighted that servicing would be undertaken by small vans accessing the site from Broad Street Avenue. Officers starting point was that there should be a dedicated on-street loading bay for this purpose but that this would need to be the subject of a separate statutory process. Officers highlighted that bus stands currently located on Blomfield Street would need relocating due to the loading bay required for this site. They reported that they were currently working hard to find alternative locations for these.

With regard to consolidation, Officers agreed that this was essential and that the report suggested this be secured through the S106 with a cap on the number of deliveries secured through the DSP. In their opinion, this was the best route to secure this, by way of detailed discussions as opposed to conditions to either 'pass' or 'fail'. The Comptroller and City Solicitor highlighted that consolidation centres were listed amongst the City's Planning Obligations. She added that, in dealing with consolidation at S106 as opposed to conditioning, a range of other arrangements could be explored including monitoring, an opportunity for the City Corporation to request amendments and even financial contributions towards the monitoring of arrangements.

A Member spoke to state that she was disappointed to learn that the proposed development could not use the ground heat pumps from the Crossrail site. She also questioned the route that cyclists would need to take into the new building and whether this would involve them having to pass through the bin store. Finally, she questioned how servicing and waste would be taken in to and out of the building and whether a waste strategy would be in place.

Officers spoke to state that cycle access via the bin stores was not optimum design but reiterated that this was a very constrained site. Members were informed that there was just one potential area for any overlap between cyclists and waste but that it was hoped that the timing of this could be managed to ensure that such instances were minimal.

A Member noted that the ground floor plan of the building showed a lift entrance at Broad Street Avenue and questioned why this might not be used for servicing. Officers suggested that this would be used as much as possible to relieve pressure elsewhere but highlighted that larger trucks were unable to physically access Broad Street Avenue.

Another Member stated that, whilst it was obviously a matter of taste, he was not in favour of the mansard roof design. He also felt that there was insufficient information on the impact of this development at a difficult site which would welcome tens of thousands of people into the City on a daily basis.

Another Member agreed that she felt that this was a premature application in many respects. She suggested that the Committee should therefore push back on this. She added that she was concerned that the points made on energy were only grappled with briefly within the report and stated that she would be keen to see more in terms of feasibility and London Plan targets. She concluded by stating that she did not feel she had seen enough genuine benefits to the scheme to outweigh the concerns raised on it by Historic England and others.

Officers highlighted that carbon emissions were conditioned at Condition 79 which required a detailed assessment to be carried out ahead of any construction works.

A Member raised concerns in terms of Wind Microclimate and that the approach here seemed to be rather 'hit and miss'. Officers agreed that this required further work and would be dealt with both under S106 and conditions.

The Chair asked that the Committee move to a vote on the application before them. Votes were cast as follows:

FOR – 19 Votes

AGAINST – 8 Votes

There were no abstentions.

REOLVED – That:

(a) Planning permission be GRANTED for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to 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; and

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

6. **TRANSPORT STRATEGY UPDATE: QUARTER 1 & QUARTER 2 2019/20**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Department of the Built Environment updating on progress with delivering the City of London Transport Strategy. The report covers Quarters 1 and 2 of 2019/20 (May - September 2019).

The Chair highlighted the relationship between this Committee and the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee in terms of implementing the Transport Strategy and invited the Chairman of the Sub Committee to comment further on this. The Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee reported that a great deal of progress had been made in terms of implementing the Transport Strategy in recent months including further improvements at Ludgate Circus and the successful Lunchtime Streets initiative. He added that the minutes of the Sub Committee were regularly brought to this Committee for information which would allow Members to keep track on future progress here. He added that he felt a great sense of momentum to progress these matters now and a great deal of positive energy behind this. He highlighted, however, that a number of matters continued to be on hold due to the ongoing fundamental review and asked that Members seek to ensure that these projects were not unduly delayed for this reason.

A Member referred to flows coming into the City and questioned if any work had been done to look at how much more the City could reasonably manage/facilitate. He asked that Members receive an annual report looking at the bigger picture and how the Transport Strategy dovetailed with those moving around the City and the capital more generally. Officers reported that the City Corporation was working alongside TfL to improve transport links/connections into the Square Mile. They sought to provide a fuller update on this in future quarters.

Another Member congratulated Officers on moving the Strategy forward. She referred specifically to the project on consolidation of deliveries at COL sites and stated that she would be interested to understand if targets were going to be met here and how many consolidation centres were to be established and operational before buildings were occupied.

The Member went on to refer to cycle parking, something which there was a huge increase in desire for and suggested that pavement space in the City for this purpose was not feasible. Instead, she asked that Officers combine this

with a reduction in carparking spaces in the City where possible. She went on to refer to river transport stating that she would be keen to receive an update on this and consolidation opportunities here. She concluded by highlighting that there were a number of 'quick wins' that Officers could deliver against the Strategy such as addressing the issue of congestion on pavements by reviewing and implementing policies already in place around the positioning of A-boards and external tables and chairs.

The Deputy Chairman seconded the point around river use given that this was a huge asset in the City. He added that the purchase of the Barking and Dagenham site for potential use by the City's markets intended to make use of the river as a means of transportation. Officers stated that future reports would provide further details on potential river use for both freight and passenger transport.

Officer added that it was envisaged that a review of the A-boards policy would be brought to Members this financial year and reported that a review of how on-street parking within the City was currently used and any opportunity to re-purpose/re-allocate spaces for dockless cycle parking was currently underway.

Another Member suggested that he would like to see the pedestrianisation of the entire City Cluster, including Leadenhall Street, pushed forward given the increased development coming forward here, support for this move from local businesses and security implications. The Chair stated that this was already being actively worked on. Officers stated that this was addressed within the City Cluster Vision and that some opportunities for quick wins such as introducing timed vehicle restrictions to certain areas were being identified. Officers clarified that this was the case across the City and not just within the Cluster.

A Member commented that there were approximately 45 projects listed within the Strategy, across the Square Mile, and suggested that Officers should seek to undertake further public consultation on these at specific points to ensure that work was still progressing in the right way, in a 'you said, we did' approach. Officers agreed that it was important that the Strategy did not stand still and that it would therefore be updated every three years incorporating public consultation as suggested.

A Member referred to the West side of the City, more specifically West Smithfield and stated that he was disappointed not to see further detail/progress on this. He sought reassurances that the matter would be dealt with holistically and sufficiently co-ordinated. He went on to reference the Beech Street air quality and public realm enhancements project and questioned progress around this given that we were already in Q4 of 2019/20. The Chair reported that both he and the Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee were very much involved in work around West Smithfield which was being coordinated by Officers. Officers reported that there would be a report on the Beech Street project to the next meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee and that it was hoped the project would be delivered by March 2020.

The Deputy Chair voiced concerns around certain projects being held up by the Fundamental Review. He shared particular concerns about any delay to the Bank Junction project which could prove seriously problematic if improvements were not delivered ahead of the station works here. He suggested that clarity as to what projects could be released ahead of the conclusion of the Fundamental Review was needed as soon as possible. The Chair added that certain projects were also considered politically sensitive and that the programming of these could also be affected given the forthcoming General Election.

Officers reported that the Capital Bids process was now underway and that all projects currently on hold would form part of this. The views of this Committee would also be sought in terms of prioritisation as part of this process.

A Member requested that projects be colour coded in terms of progress in future reports so that the Committee could focus attention on those items flagged as Amber or Red. Officers undertook to introduce this system going forward.

REOSLVED – That, Members note the report.

7. UPDATE ON ENFORCEMENT MONITORING REPORT

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director outlining the issues involved in dealing with short-term lets in residential premises and a procedure note outlining the enforcement process.

A Member noted that 'Air B 'n' B' had, in theory, introduced a policy where residences could not be let for more than 90 days, however, a second listing of a property seemed to effectively overcome this restriction. He questioned whether the City Corporation had discussed the issue with major letting companies and requested information on/access to their registered properties in the City.

Another Members stated that this was clearly a big issue that would, ideally, require a pan-London approach. He added that the organisation should therefore be working alongside others to press for primary legislation on this. He agreed that the issue was easier to address if information on all short-term lets was accessible and suggested that full disclosure should be a requirement for operation going forward.

Another Member suggested that the City Corporation should distribute information alongside future council tax bills to outline their position on this important matter.

The Chair agreed that the organisation should lobby on this matter and also continue to actively tackle the problem. He added that other boroughs had teams of people working consistently on this matter.

Officers informed the Committee that a meeting with adjoining boroughs at which London Councils would present was taking place to discuss this next week. They undertook to update Members further following this meeting.

RECEIVED.

8. 2019/20 BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE Q2

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment setting out the progress made during Q2 of the 2019/20 Departmental Business Plan.

A Member commented that, financial information aside, the report did not offer any real sense, strategically, of progress made against specific objectives for Quarter 3. Officers stated that the approach to feeding back to Committee's was very much a work in progress and thanked Members for their input which would be taken on board for future updates.

A Member referred to the projected overspend and the three reasons offered for this. He questioned how much of the overspend was attributable to incomplete timesheets and what the difference between the first and the third reasons were. A second Member noted that the budget was currently overspent by £345k but that a £357k better than budget position was forecast for 2019/20. He questioned whether this was attributable to not recruiting to staff vacancies and, if so, whether this was a false economy that would lead to standards slipping. Officers clarified that recruitment in the department had not ceased but that selective recruitment was being undertaken and existing staff were also being given opportunities to take on new skills. In response to further questions around stress, Members were assured that the Department had stress management policies in place and that these matters were regularly discussed with staff at 1:1 meetings with their line managers.

The Chamberlain clarified that the majority of costs did relate to staffing. With regard to incomplete timesheets, Members were informed that there had been some delays towards the end of September 2019 around this. He added that there were agreed staffing budgets to charge to Capital Works but that other staff did not pick up costs on non-Capital projects

A Member questioned what a TMAN application was. Officers clarified that this was a Traffic Management system and undertook to provide details of acronyms/abbreviations going forward.

A Member spoke to congratulate Officers on progress made in quarter 2.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the report and appendices.

9. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor containing details of 2 public escalators/lifts that were in service for less than 95% of the time.

In response to a question, the City Surveyor confirmed that the Blackfriars Bridge lift was still out of service to date. It was expected to return to service by the end of this week.

RECEIVED.

10. THE CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION'S DRAFT SPORT AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STRATEGY FOR 2020-25

The Committee received a report of the Head of Corporate Strategy and Performance relative to the City of London Corporation's DRAFT Sport and Physical Activity Strategy for 2020-25.

A Member commented that there are not many City-specific assets and suggested that a soft surface strip could be incorporated on pavements for runners. He commented that this had been done successfully in other countries such as Abu Dhabi and paid for by corporations. The strip could also still be walked across by pedestrians and used for self-promotion. The Member added running was an inexpensive, inclusive sport and something which should be endorsed from a public health point of view. It was felt that this idea was something that could be explored further through the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. Officers responded that there was nothing in the strategy that would prevent this idea being explored, but that ultimately it would come down to Members deciding if it was a priority and resources, as well as ensuring that it supported the Transport Strategy.

A Member stated that he was nervous about the idea of creating a new Working Party around the Strategy, and said that if it were to proceed, it should have a defined term of no more than two years. The Town Clerk reminded the Committee that a Governance Review was now underway and that all such bodies would need to be considered in the round as part of this.

Another Member welcomed the progress made on the new draft of the strategy but noted that it contained references to continued investment and therefore asked that the organisation's total spend on sport was detailed. Whilst he acknowledged that this information might be difficult to gather from across the organisation, he felt that, without this information, it would not be possible to understand if our investment was proportionate or to look at the matter more strategically. Officers responded that they had sought financial information from the four main contributing departments and that this information should be available when the next draft is shared.

At this point, the Chair sought approval from the 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.

Another Member added that we should not lose sight of the fact that there were benefits in kind that the organisation added. Officers reported that there is an in-kind register and that this could be reviewed for sport and physical activity related in kind support with this information included within future drafts of the Strategy.

A Member highlighted that Open Spaces were referenced clearly in the report in terms of them being designed and maintained to encourage positive physical activity. However, she added that such descriptions should be considered carefully given that some of the City's Open Spaces were being asked to identify savings and cut resources. Officers assured the Committee that the wording within the Strategy had been reviewed carefully by the Director of Open Spaces and the Business Manager for that Department to ensure that no commitments were made in the strategy that could not be honoured going forward.

RESOLVED – That, having reviewed the draft version of the Sport and Physical Activity Strategy, Members endorse the document, subject to the comments made today being addressed.

11. 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 advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

RECEIVED.

12. 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.

RECEIVED.

13. DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT: 'BREXIT' UPDATE

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on the potential implications of Brexit for the Department of the Built Environment.

The Chair highlighted that identical reports had now been submitted to the Committee on this matter for some months now. With this in mind it was put to Members, and agreed unanimously, that the report now be removed from future agendas until such time as further updates were necessary.

RESOLVED – That Members note this report and that further update reports will be made to subsequent meetings of the Committee as appropriate.

14. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

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

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

16. **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.

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Paragraph No(s).</u>
17	3
18-19	-

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the last meeting held on 22 October 2019.

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

A Member raised a question on Crossrail progress.

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

Date of next Meeting

The Chair reminded Members that the next meeting of this Committee was scheduled to take place on Thursday 12 December 2019 and that this meeting would proceed in spite the General Election now being held that same day.

The meeting closed at 12.41 pm

Chairman

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