

## **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 28 January 2020**

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

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chairman)  
Munsur Ali  
Randall Anderson  
Peter Bennett  
Mark Bostock  
Deputy Keith Bottomley  
Henry Colthurst  
Peter Dunphy  
Alderman Emma Edhem  
John Edwards  
Alderman Prem Goyal  
Tracey Graham

Graeme Harrower  
Christopher Hill  
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark  
Shravan Joshi  
Oliver Lodge  
Deputy Brian Mooney  
Graham Packham  
Susan Pearson  
Deputy Henry Pollard  
Oliver Sells QC  
Alderman Sir David Wootton

#### **Officers:**

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Alison Bunn	- City Surveyor's Department
Annie Hampson	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of the Built Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Gwyn Richards	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Samantha Tharme	- Department of the Built Environment
Elisabeth Hannah	- Department of the Built Environment
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Lewis Robinson	- Department of the Built Environment
Neel Devlia	- Department of the Built Environment
Michael Gwyther-Jones	- Department of Community & Children's Services

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman), Rehana Ameer, Sophie Fernandes, Marianne Fredericks, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Andrew Mayer, Sylvia Moys, Judith Pleasance, James de Sausmarez and William Upton QC.

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 and summary of the meeting held on 12 December 2019.

4. **PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the *draft* public minutes and summary of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting held on 3 December 2019.

**MATTERS ARISING**

**Beech Street Transport and Public Realm Improvements** (page 17) – A Member commented on the decision taken by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee on this matter, suggesting that it had brought to light an anomaly in the constitutional working of this grand Committee. She went on to state that the decision to proceed with the Beech Street zero emission project was reported here for information only, not for debate or approval, despite the fact that this was a Ward Committee, meaning that all wards were represented on it, and the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee was not.

The Member commented that there were no Members representing the Ward of Cripplegate on the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee at present although it was her view that it is, in part of Cripplegate, that residents will suffer increased pollution and decreased road safety as a consequence of this project.

The Member concluded by stating that, whilst she was aware that the Sub Committee has authority delegated to it by this Committee to act in accordance with its policies and strategies on certain matters, this did not alter the fact that they were able to make the decision to proceed without any representation from the Ward that will be adversely affected and had therefore effectively subverted the status of this Committee as a Ward Committee. She questioned whether the Chair would therefore support a motion at a future meeting of this Committee that the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee should refer all its major decisions to the Planning and Transportation Committee for debate and approval, in order to respect the status of this Committee as a Ward Committee.

The Town Clerk reported that the Terms of Reference of this Committee would be submitted to the next meeting for annual review. Any proposed changes would then require the approval of the Policy and Resources Committee in March 2020 and, ultimately, the Court of Common Council, when considering the White Paper in April 2020. It was also noted that a Governance Review was also about to be embarked upon and that these were the sort of points that it would be helpful for Members to feed into this.

With reference to this particular scheme, the Chair highlighted that this matter had been discussed by both this Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee ahead of its approval by the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee.

Member engagement on this had been actively encouraged from the outset, with local Ward Members sent direct email correspondence from the Department of the Built Environment's Group Manager for Major Projects and Programmes. He continued by highlighting that this was an experimental scheme that would not commence until March 2020 and would be constantly monitored throughout in the same way that the 'Bank on Safety' scheme had been previously. If there were to be any adverse effects during the trial period, the scheme could simply be stopped. The Chair disagreed with the fact that the way in which this scheme had been progressed highlighted any sort of deficit in either this Committee or the Streets and Walkway Sub Committee's decision making and stated that he was persuaded that both bodies had more than adequately discharged their duties.

The Chair added that any elected Member was able to make representations to any Committee or Sub Committee of the organisation with the permission on the Chairman.

A Member, also current Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee agreed with the points made by the Chair of the grand Committee and added his reassurances by underlining that consultation would continue to take place throughout the experimental trial.

Another Member spoke to state that the question was not around Beech Street specifically but that this had been used as an illustration of concerns around what appeared to be a constitutional anomaly and the way in which future major projects might be managed similarly to this.

It was suggested that the point be considered and debated further at the appropriate meeting in February 2020.

A third Member spoke to disagree with the statement that there had been sufficient consultation around this specific scheme to date. He added that he had been concerned that the draft minutes of the December Streets and Walkways Sub Committee detailing their decision on this matter had not come before this Committee at their December meeting.

Officers spoke to reassure Members that dates for local consultation had now been fixed and that approximately 10,000 letters would be sent to relevant residents this week outlining the scheme and details of these consultation meetings. Lunchtime and evening sessions were set to take place on three separate dates in February 2020 and Officers had also recently attended a meeting of the Golden Lane Residents Association to outline plans. They added that they were happy to continue to meet with and present to any other relevant resident meetings as necessary.

The Chair added that both he and the Deputy Chairman were equally happy to hear any concerns that Members may have on this matter.

**Soft-Surface Running Track** (page 22) – The Member who had presented this proposal to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee at their last meeting

spoke again on the benefits of introducing the scheme. The Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee took onboard the update.

**5. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing outstanding actions.

Daylight/Sunlight – Alternative Guidelines

In response to a question around this action, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the BRE had still not progressed any additional guidelines around this. She added that any future report to the Committee on this matter would ask Members to decide if it was appropriate for the City of London Corporation to go about creating any alternative guidelines of its own.

**RECEIVED.**

**6. 61-65 HOLBORN VIADUCT, LONDON, EC1A 2FD**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director seeking permission for the demolition of an existing building structure and erection of a mixed-use building comprising four basement levels, lower ground, ground and ten upper storeys for (i) hotel use (Class C1) at part basement levels one to four, part lower ground, part ground and part first, and second to tenth floors level; (ii) restaurant/bar use (Class A3 /A4) at part tenth floor level; (iii) office workspace use (Class B1) at part basement levels one to three, part lower ground and part first floor levels; (iv) flexible hotel / café / workspace (Sui Generis) at part ground floor level; (v) a publicly accessible terrace at roof level and (vi) ancillary plant and servicing, hard and soft landscaping and associated enabling works at 61-65 Holborn Viaduct, London, EC1A 2FD.

Officers introduced the report and drew Members' attention to an addendum that had been tabled setting out additional paragraphs to be inserted under 'Residential Amenity' after paragraph 155.

Officers corrected some of the figures in the table at paragraph 145 of the report which sets out the planning obligations that will be secured before the permission is issued. They reported that the 'Total liability in accordance with the City of London's policies', in the 'Contribution' column should now read £2,397,654. Officers also clarified that the site is outside the Newgate Conservation Area as stated in the report

Officers noted that the proposed development was visually quite radical and ground-breaking on what was a very constrained site. It was highlighted that, whilst the long-stay carparking spaces to be provided on site were adequate, the number of short-stay spaces that would be possible fell short of requirements. However, the applicants were looking to work alongside the City Corporation to actively identify other appropriate nearby sites where additional short-stay spaces might be accommodated.

Officers went on to refer to the free public terrace that would be provided at roof level and which would have its own dedicated entrance, accessible through a small 'pocket park' at ground floor level, bringing with it a new public realm element. Visitors would be able to access the roof terrace using two dedicated lifts and there would also be an element of security for those wishing to visit the terrace. It was proposed that the roof terrace would be open from 8am-10pm every day with the exception of Sundays and Bank Holidays where the space would open at 8am and close at 9pm.

The Committee were shown the proposed visuals of the development with Officers commenting on the radical design of the building, incorporating a 'living wall'. It was highlighted that the building would substantially exceed the London Plan's recommendations on greening and that the applicant had reported that, should development go ahead, this would be the greenest building not only in the UK, but in Europe. Officers reported on the many biodiversity and climatic benefits of such a design. They also took the opportunity to reassure Members that there were no particular fire safety issues relating to the living wall, the maintenance of which would be carefully conditioned.

Officers concluded by referring to the importance of the location of the development which would sit at the Gateway to the City Corporation's new 'Culture Mile' and also provide a backdrop to the proposed site of the new Museum of London. They recommended the application for approval.

The Chair reported that one objector had wanted to address the Committee on this application but that he had subsequently written to withdraw his objection following talks with the applicant. He had written to the City Corporation this morning to indicate that he too now supported the proposals and would not be present today. Members were informed that, given this, the applicants were also not proposing to address the Committee but were in attendance and on hand to respond to any technical points that Members might wish to raise.

The Chair opened up to the floor for questions.

A Member questioned whether it was intended that the exterior of the building would resemble the images presented today year-round and over time or whether it was likely that there would be a degree of shedding or wilting as time progressed. He questioned what guarantees were going to be put in place around this. The applicant responded by stating that the maintenance contract for the building would be long-running, over 10-20 years and would also include the replacement of parts of the living wall in this time if required.

The Member came back to question whether there were any existing examples of living walls being used elsewhere and what proof there was to demonstrate that these could be adequately maintained over time. The applicant responded that the concept had been around for 10-15 years now and that a good example of this was at the Reubens at the Palace Hotel, Victoria. They added that the key to successfully maintaining living walls did seem to be having long-term maintenance contracts in place such as that suggested for this development.

Another Member questioned whether Officers could give some thought as to whether the greening of the building might be conditioned more specifically than just maintenance. He also questioned the capacity of the roof terrace, assuming that it would be available for use by both hotel residents as well as the general public. The applicant responded by stating that the capacity of the roof terrace was estimated at 500 which they felt was ample. They added that the penultimate level would also have its own external terrace and that the two would work compatibly with each other. The applicant clarified that hotel occupants would need to exit the building and access the roof terrace area in the same way as the general public, via the dedicated entrance and lifts.

A Member questioned the whole-life carbon footprint of the building and what plans were in place around the degree of re-use of the existing building. The applicant responded by stating that they had undertaken a serious interrogation of the existing structure, including the foundations and had done as much due diligence as possible here. They assured Members that they were meeting standards around carbon footprints but that it was simply not possible to retain the existing building. The Member then questioned whether, once the newly proposed building had reached the end of its life, it was anticipated that that too would need to be demolished. The applicant highlighted that the new building was built around a cantilever design rendering it a more robust and long-term structure.

Another Member spoke to state that he was generally in support of the application but also had some questions around the ongoing monitoring of air quality and the effect that this building would have on this. He questioned whether consideration might be given to reporting back to this Committee on the matter, should the development proceed. The applicant reported that they were working on developing a smart living wall system that would record live data on matters such as air quality. This would be beneficial from both an educational point of view but also in terms of public engagement.

In response to the queries raised around maintenance and greening of the building, Officers clarified that this would be strongly conditioned and highlighted that a very complex document covering matters such as irrigation and fire safety would also be required in writing before any works could commence. This was set out in condition 29 on page 81 of the document pack. Officers added that this would be in place in perpetuity.

A Member highlighted the references to boilers and Combined Heat and Power plants within the report and asked that developers be cognisant of the City Corporation's new Air Quality Strategy and their view on these matters. The Chair seconded this point and asked that Officers check Corporation policy on standby generators as this seemed to be particularly outdated to him.

A Member noted that the proposals were intending to move the existing building from office use to part office/part hotel use. He took on board the point that an equivalent number of desks were to be provided within the new development but questioned whether Officers were satisfied that no sort of

precedent was being set here. Another Member picked up on this point too and questioned whether there was any way that the office space that was to be available could be mandated for use by SME's so as to ensure that there was no danger of this space being used as 'overspill' for the hotel. Officers stated that they were content that this site was sufficiently unique that the proposals did not set any sort of precedent. They added that they would be happy to mandate the use of the office space in the way suggested. Members were reassured that this would also be covered under s106.

A Member questioned the height of the proposed roof terrace barriers and whether these were adequate in terms of health and safety. Officers responded that the barriers were of adequate height and were to be 1.8m tall.

A Member questioned the limited amount of daylight/sunlight that would be experienced by those occupying the lower levels of the building and sought Officers views as to the acceptability of this. Officers responded by highlighting that the applicants had submitted a lot of research to demonstrate that similar issues were encountered in buildings elsewhere. They added that these spaces were generally intended as incubation spaces for start-up businesses who would be offered either a reduced charge or three months of free occupancy in recognition of the lack of natural light here.

A Member questioned how noise from the bar would be managed. Officers stated that this would be managed by Environmental Health and that there would be no use of the external terrace area adjacent to the bar during unsociable hours. In design terms, things such as double entrance doors and the like would be used to minimise any noise nuisance.

The Chair thanked Officers and the applicant for their responses to questions and asked that Members now move to debate the application.

A Member who was also serving as Chairman of the City Corporation's Open Spaces Committee applauded what he viewed as a very exciting development. He recognised that there were very few examples of this type of build in the UK but many elsewhere in the world. He added that this would be a very positive transformation of a building in a key location for the City, close to the Cultural Mile.

Another Member spoke in support of the application highlighting that there was a green wall in place at London Wall, albeit on a smaller scale, that was well maintained. He added that the City's air pollution risk was being examined in more detail by the Audit and Risk Management Committee this afternoon and that it was important to consider how future buildings and innovative design in the City might assist in managing this risk downwards in the future.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application with votes cast as follows:

- IN FAVOUR – 18 votes
- OPPOSED – 0 votes
- There were no abstentions

The application was unanimously approved, and the applicants congratulated on an exciting and efficient application.

**RESOLVED** – That 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 under section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed.

That Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in 'Planning Obligations' under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.

**7. TRAFFIC & PARKING SERVICE PROGRAMME 2020-2022**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the Traffic and Parking Service Programme 2020-2022.

The Assistant Director (Highways) reported that, when this Committee had last considered parking pay and display bays on 2016, they had expressed a desire to retain these in the City. However, cash now accounted for less than 1% (approximately £150 per day) of takings from the City's on-street Pay & Display bays and it was therefore now recommended that a fully cashless on-street parking operation for Pay & Display bays be implemented. Members were informed that other elements of the re-evaluation of the Traffic and Parking Service Programme such as the introduction of new technology and changes in structure and delivery would be put before this Committee for approval as and when different matters progressed.

A Member commented that, at present, parking in the City was free on evenings and weekends. He suggested that this wrongly encouraged people to drive into the square mile when there were good transport links here. He asked that Officers reconsider this and the impact that this was having in terms of air pollution levels. He asked that they look at what other local authorities were doing in this area. The Assistant Director (Highways) commented that the Transport Strategy set the context of this and that it was a matter of balance. He undertook to look into the matter further as requested.

Another Members commented that he was generally supportive of the direction of travel here but sought assurances that these issues, which seemed to be presented as lots of separate pieces of work, would be addressed comprehensively. The Assistant Director (Highways) agreed with the point made and reassured the Committee that Officers were keen to continue to do everything in the round, look at the context of issues and develop a strategic approach that would also include engagement with Members along the way.

A Member commented that whilst there was no denying the move towards cashless parking, it could be that this would have unintended consequences for



some vulnerable road users. She asked that this be balanced, by way of an Equalities Impact Assessment, against the envisaged £25,000 saving referenced within the report. She added that this was a very sensitive and interesting area and highlighted that recent reports from Finland had suggested that they were now beginning to move in the opposite direction on this. The Assistant Director (Highways) reported that a small trial had been undertaken whereby cash metres had been removed around Guildhall and no feedback whatsoever had been received in response.

In response to various further questions, the Assistant Director (Highways) reported that rules around parking were set by the Government and so the introduction of a scheme incentivising the public to report parking offenders, similar to that currently being trialled in New York City, would not be an option. He added that feedback from the public on things such as engine idling had, however, assisted in identifying hotspots for this.

In response to questions around how the performance of sub-contractors was monitored, the Assistant Director (Highways) that there were KPIs associated with the contracts and that inspectors were not incentivised to issue parking tickets. Contracts were monitored very closely, and Officers were pleased to report that they were very satisfied with how these were being operated at present. There would, however, be significant opportunities to revise KPIs and the like going forward as contract retenders arose.

**RESOLVED** – That Members approve the implementation of a fully cashless on-street parking operation for Pay & Display bays subject to a satisfactory Equalities Impact Assessment.

## **8. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS AND HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY BUSINESS PLANS 2020/21**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Chamberlain, the Director of the Built Environment and the Director of Open Spaces presenting, for approval, the revenue and capital budgets for the Planning and Transportation Committee and final high-level summary Business Plans for the Departments of the Built Environment and Open Spaces for 2020/21.

A Member questioned the apparent 50% increase from £16m to £24m relating to Income from 'Customer, Client Receipts' under Central Risk. The Chamberlain reported that this related to a Fundamental Review budget adjustment for "Traffic Restriction Enforcement through improved camera technology, including Beech Street Zero Emission Zone" and that a substantial increase was anticipated for 2021.

In response to further questions, the Director of the Built Environment clarified that staffing costs had increased as more staff were required to deliver the Transport Strategy. The Department were also working hard to make the best possible use of the resources they already have and realign these with emerging priorities.

A Member stated that he felt that it was problematic for grand Committees to only see this budget information annually. He added that it would be helpful for Members to be provided with further information as to how certain figures had been reached and what 'trade-offs' might lie behind these for example. The Chair highlighted that some of these figures had, indeed, emerged from the Fundamental Review but agreed that more narrative would be useful.

Another Member stated that the forthcoming Governance Review would also afford Members the opportunity to comment on the general opacity of Committee budget reports and how these might look to provide Members with greater confidence going forward.

A Member expressed general concern at what Members were being asked to approve today. Particularly under recommendation iii) which then authorised the Chamberlain, in consultation with the Directors of the Built Environment and Open Spaces, to revise the budgets to allow for any further implications arising from Corporate Projects, other reviews and changes to the Cyclical Works Programme. She commented that this seemed to offer quite a wide authority and questioned whether some sort of cap/threshold ought to be added to this so that any adjustments beyond a certain level had to revert back to Committee for approval. The Chamberlain stated that he would be happy to introduce such a cap if that was supported by the Committee. He reassured Members that any changes made were, however, accounted for and detailed in future updates to the Committee and stated that he would be happy to update Members on the budget more frequently if the Committee wished.

A Member referred to the October 2019 meeting of this Committee when Members had received a report on the income received from both Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106. This detailed that £31m had been collected to date with just £500,000 spent in approximately 8 years. He questioned why he was not able to see these figures reflected in the budget. The Chamberlain reported that this money was reflected on the balance sheet and not the revenue account.

In response to further questions around expected income, the Chamberlain reported that income was expected to increase from £33m to £41m which was attributable to an expected increase in enforcement income.

**RESOLVED – That Members:**

- i) Approve the proposed revenue budget for 2020/21 for submission to Finance Committee;
- ii) Approve the proposed capital and supplementary revenue projects for budgets for 2020/21 for submission to Finance Committee;
- iii) Authorise the Chamberlain, in consultation with the Directors of the Built Environment and Open Spaces, to revise these budgets to allow for any further implications arising from Corporate Projects, other reviews and changes to the Cyclical Works Programme;
- iv) Agree that minor amendments for 2019/20 and 2020/21 budgets arising during budget setting be delegated to the Chamberlain;

- v) Note the factors taken into consideration in compiling the Business Plans of the Departments of the Built Environment and Open Spaces, including efficiency measures;
- vi) Approve, subject to the incorporation of any changes sought by this Committee, the final high-level summary Business Plans for 2020/21.

9. **ANNUAL ON-STREET PARKING ACCOUNTS 2018/19 AND RELATED FUNDING OF HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND SCHEMES**

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain on action taken in respect of any deficit or surplus in the City of London's On-Street Parking Account for the financial year 2018/19.

An Alderman questioned why an increase in income of more than 50% was forecast for next year yet the same figure was down over the next three years. The Chamberlain reported that income had dropped in 2019 following a 'spike' in 2018 with the introduction of the Bank on Safety scheme. As compliance with this increased, the related income decreased. The same pattern was now predicted in relation to the Beech Street Zero Emissions Zone. This information was detailed within paragraph 11 of the report.

**RESOLVED** – That Members note the contents of the report for their information before submission to the Mayor of London.

10. **MAJOR HIGHWAY ACTIVITIES 2020**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to major highways activities 2020.

The Assistant Director (Highways) highlighted that this was an annual report setting out major highways activities and the efforts to co-ordinate and minimise the impact of these.

Members were informed that the works by Cadent in Poultry had now started and were having little impact on the overall road usage given that Bank was no longer a through road.

Officers went on to report that the most significant City of London project in this time frame would be the replacement of the waterproofing and bearings on London Bridge. This would commence in March 2020 and last for a period of 6 months. A communications plan was currently being worked on to provide both Members and the general public with further information around these works. The Chair commented that the management of the works on Tower Bridge had been a huge success with regard to communications and he hoped that this would therefore be managed similarly.

The Chair congratulated Officers on the 676 days of disruption saved in 2019 through collaborative working.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director (Highways) stated that feedback from the City's film team had suggested that requests for filming in the City had tailed off in the last year. He added that Officers would always look

to try and manage/accommodate such requests as best they could when they were forthcoming. In response to further questions around checks on-site during filming in the City, the Assistant Director (Highways) reported that on-site visits and checks were the norm in these circumstances and that any issues that arose outside of such visits should be reported to relevant Officers through the usual processes.

**RESOLVED** – That Members receive this report.

**11. PUBLIC LIFT REPORTS**

The Committee received two reports of the City Surveyor containing details of those public escalators/lifts that were operational for less than 95% of the time.

Members regretfully noted that these were some of the worst statistics that had been reported in many years, particularly in relation to the Millennium Inclinor. The Chair spoke to report that he understood that a group of school children had also recently been stuck in the Inclinor.

The City Surveyor reported that the new contractor had now taken over the maintenance of the Inclinor and had reported no issues to date. The new contractor had specialist knowledge of the Inclinor and was willing to take on the maintenance contract as it stood.

A Member questioned if there had been any follow up in terms of the resident who had recently been stuck in the London Wall lift, as discussed at the last meeting. The City Surveyor reported that the issue here had been that the engineer had been unable to access the lift control room at 1 London Wall as it was not City of London property and was therefore deemed a security issue. Members were informed that a new procedure was now in place that would ensure that our engineers had access to the control room at all times although this had not yet had to be tested. The City Surveyor took the opportunity to remind users of this lift that they should follow the signs in the lift itself and use the emergency call point in situ should they experience any difficulties as opposed to trying to dial out on a mobile telephone.

A Member questioned whether Officers were continuing to look at the possibility of introducing a notification system for disabled visitors to the City informing them of what lifts were out of service on any given day. The City Surveyor reported that the procurement of this service was in progress and that it would be trialled, in the first instance, at Blackfriars Bridge before being rolled out.

**RECEIVED.**

12. **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.**

13. **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.**

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

There were no questions.

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

**The Tulip**

The Chair reported that the applicant for 'The Tulip' intended to appeal to the Secretary of State.

In response to questions around the process, the Comptroller and City Solicitor reported that the City Corporation would be required to submit documentation to the Appeal and that objectors and supporters of the scheme would also be notified of the details of this. It was anticipated that the Appeal would take place in June/July and that further details would be communicated with the Committee once they were known.

**Heathrow Expansion**

The Chair reported that further consultation would be taking place on this in April 2020. He added that it was primarily a concern of the Policy and Resources Committee who would be coordinating a formal response on this, but that it should continue to be reported to this Committee for information.

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.

<b><u>Item No(s).</u></b>	<b><u>Paragraph No(s).</u></b>
17 - 21	3
22	7
23	3
24 & 25	-

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2019.

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee received the *draft* non-public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 3 December 2019.

19. **BARBICAN PODIUM WATERPROOFING, DRAINAGE AND LANDSCAPING WORKS (BEN JONSON, BRETON & CROMWELL HIGHWALK) PHASE 2 - 1ST PRIORITY**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of Community & Children's Services relative to Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works (Ben Jonson, Breton & Cromwell Highwalk).

20. **TERM CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR THE INSPECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF HIGHWAY STRUCTURES - TENDER REPORT**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of the Built Environment advising on the results of the current tender process for the provision of Term Consultancy Services for the Inspection and Management of Highway Structures.

21. **TERM CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR THE INSPECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF THAMES RIVER BRIDGES (BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES) - TENDER REPORT**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of the Built Environment advising on the results of the current tender process for the provision of Term Consultancy Services for the Inspection and Management of the Thames River Bridges (Bridge House Estates).

22. **SECURITY PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of the Built Environment relative to the Security Programme.

23. **TOWER BRIDGE SACRIFICIAL GLASS UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Open Spaces informing the Committee on the proposed way forward in relation to the Replacement of Sacrificial Glass Layers at Tower Bridge.

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

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

25. **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 11.43 am**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley**  
**tel. no.: 020 7332 3414**  
**[gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**