

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 27 October 2020

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on Tuesday 27 October 2020 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair)	Michael Hudson
Oliver Sells QC (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Munsur Ali	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Randall Anderson	Shravan Joshi
Peter Bennett	Alderswoman Susan Langley
Mark Bostock	Oliver Lodge
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Henry Colthurst	Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner)
Deputy Peter Dunphy	Barbara Newman
John Edwards	Graham Packham
Helen Fentimen	Susan Pearson
Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Henry Pollard
Tracey Graham	James de Sausmarez
Graeme Harrower	William Upton QC
Sheriff Christopher Hayward	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Gwyn Richards	- Department of the Built Environment
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Shani Annand-Baron	- Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Delves	- Department of the Built Environment
Bhakti Depala	- Department of the Built Environment
Toni Bright	- Department of the Built Environment
Neel Devlia	- Department of the Built Environment
Kurt Gagen	- Department of the Built Environment
Annie Hampson	- Department of the Built Environment
Elisabeth Hannah	- Department of the Built Environment
James Gibson	- Town Clerk's Department
Liam Hart	- Department of the Built Environment
Jessica Lees	- City Surveyor's Department
Kieran Mackay	- Department of the Built Environment
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department

Emmanuel Ojugo	- Department of the Built Environment
Joanna Parker	- Department of the Built Environment
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Samantha Tharme	- Department of the Built Environment
Sonia Williams	- Department of the Built Environment
Rachel Pye	- Markets and Consumer Protection

Also in attendance:

Andrew Cartmell
Susan Cox
Jeremy Evershed
Glyn Emrys
Andrew Moore

Introductions

The Town Clerk opened the meeting by introducing himself and stating that the Committee was quorate.

A roll call of Members present was undertaken.

The Town Clerk highlighted that the meeting was being recorded as well as live streamed and would be made available on the City Corporation's YouTube page for a period of time after the meeting had concluded. With this in mind, it was confirmed that participants in the meeting had all individually agreed and given their consent to being recorded and that all personal data would be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. The Town Clerk highlighted that, for further information on this, viewers could contact the City Corporation using the details provided on the public webpages.

The Chair then introduced himself and welcomed all those in attendance and viewing the meeting via YouTube. The Chair then welcomed new Members to the Committee, Helen Fentimen and Michael Hudson.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Alderman Emma Edhem and Judith Pleasance.

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

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair) declared a professional conflict of interest in Item 5 – 1-12 Long Lane, London, EC1A 9HF and advised that he would withdraw from the meeting for the duration of this item.

3. MINUTES

A Member noted that the number of votes cast in favour of the recommendation in respect of Swan Lane Pier had not been recorded in error. The Chair noted that the vote had been unanimous and asked that this be corrected.

RESOLVED – That, pending the above correction, the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 6 October be agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

22 Bishopsgate (Page 3) – A Member thanked officers for their work on this matter and advised that the road involved was part of a TfL Red Route. Assurances had been received that the trees on the road were of an appropriate size and would be safe and healthy.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

Daylight/Sunlight – Alternative Guidelines

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that a meeting with BRE would be set up with a view to aligning any guidance changes with the training programme.

Construction Works

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that construction start times were very difficult to control, but a Code of Construction was in place to manage the cumulative impact of multiple developments.

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

A Member advised that a draft SPD would be submitted to the next meetings of Barbican Centre Board, Barbican Residents Committee and Residents Consultative Committee, before submission to the December meeting of Planning & Transportation Committee. A Member asked that the details also be sent to the Golden Lane Residents Association.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

At this point, Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair) withdrew from the meeting, and Oliver Sells QC (Deputy Chairman) assumed the Chair.

5. **1-12 LONG LANE, LONDON, EC1A 9HF**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding an application for 1-12 Long Lane, London EC1A 9HF, specifically the demolition of existing buildings and structures to basement level and construction of a eight storey office (Class B1) building with basement and lower basement with retail (Class A1/A2/A3) at part ground and basement levels together with ancillary cycle parking, associated servicing, plant, amenity terraces, landscaping and other associated works. The Town Clerk drew the Committee's attention to the circulated addendum sheet, which advised of additional representations and a proposed additional condition.

The Director of the Built Environment then introduced the application to Members and presented the officer's report, informing the Committee about the

details of the scheme and its wider implications. The officer's recommendation was that planning permission be approved.

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, then invited questions from the Committee to officers. With regards to the proposed height and massing, Members asked how officers assessed the acceptability of massing, and whether the impact on financial viability and office space justified the consideration of a further reduction of one storey. In response, the Director of the Built Environment advised that framework such as the Local Plan and London Plan set the context and principles for assessing the acceptability of developments. Officers had considered the initial proposal to be inappropriate, but considered the current scheme, which had been considered in isolation, to be of an appropriate size and massing, with acceptable impact on its surroundings.

A Member asked for clarification on pedestrian impact and impact on the wider area, including the Culture Mile. The Director of the Built Environment advised that this impact had been considered and was covered in the Transport section of the report. As part of the scheme the footway would be widened, and the building set further back than at present. Delivery of wider public realm improvements had also been secured as part of the Section 278 agreement. The Director undertook to provide further details for the Committee after the speakers.

In response to a question from a Member about step-free access to Barbican Underground station, the Director of the Built Environment advised that this had been considered and addressed at an early stage. TfL had concluded the site to be impractical, although there would be access to one platform via the new Farringdon Crossrail station.

A Member asked whether the Committee should consider adding a condition to ensure a minimum of 80% reuse of materials. In response the Director of the Built Environment advised that the applicant was seeking 85%, and once submitted this could be monitored. There were some constraints such as fabric that would not meet current building regulations, but whilst the Committee could add a condition on this matter, officers expected that a target of 80% would be met.

The Deputy Chairman then invited the registered speakers to address the Committee.

Susan Cox, speaking on behalf of local residents, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The scheme had been reduced in height and mass, but needed to be reduced further, as the scheme still represented overdevelopment, with a 60% increase on the current footprint. The scheme was on a major thoroughfare and in a Conservation Area, and if approved would be at odds with the buildings in the vicinity. The height of the building should therefore be limited to that of the adjacent buildings, so as not to set further precedent.

The scheme would also have an adverse effect on residential amenity, including loss of light, loss of privacy, and noise pollution. Some of these impacts had been deemed acceptable despite neighbouring properties being affected at levels above those deemed acceptable by BRE guidance. The addition of the sixth and seventh floors would exacerbate the loss of privacy and light, and increase noise levels.

Whilst it was too early to predict the overall impact of Covid-19, according to numerous sources flexible working and working from home would likely continue on a significantly larger scale, and therefore office space requirements would be changing. Consequently, the need for the application and its uplift to the footprint should be questioned, given the amount of existing office space in the area.

Whilst local residents were not against the idea of redevelopment of the site, the height and mass of the scheme in its current form was excessive, with an unacceptably adverse impact on amenity levels, and the Committee was asked to reject the scheme.

The Deputy Chairman invited questions from the Committee to the objector, and as none were raised, invited the next speaker to address the Committee.

Jeremy Evershed, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application. The scheme represented an opportunity and a unique prospect created by multiple parties working together. The development would be a step change in quality for this part of Long Lane, and the applicant wanted to create a valuable asset for the area. The scheme would enhance the local area, and the applicant had worked with officers for several years to achieve a suitable proposal. The scheme would demolish the existing buildings and replace them with sustainable buildings built using rich materials. The scheme would provide a visual asset for the area going forward, with pedestrian numbers increasing. The scheme would also improve the footways and surrounding public highway.

The application presented an opportunity for buildings with attractive frontages, which had been fully assessed for their visual merit and heritage impact, and no overriding impact in other aspects. The proposals were of high quality, would enhance the local area, and provide jobs. In response to the comments on the scheme's height, the applicant had worked hard on the visual impact of the scheme, and it had been agreed that the current proposals were acceptable. Whilst there was some amenity impact on neighbouring windows, this was limited. The scheme had been amended in response to concerns, which it was hoped had been mitigated.

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, then invited questions from the Committee to the applicant. A Member queried why the primary school located in Charterhouse Square, one of the properties most adversely affected by the application, had not objected to the scheme or responded to the consultation, noting that a Land Registry search had indicated the school site was owned by a property company also involved in the application under consideration. Mr

Evershed responded that he believed this connection to be the case, but that no pressure had been put on the school not to respond to the consultation.

The Member then asked how the scheme would benefit the Culture Mile initiative, given the considerable impact of the scheme on the pavement and greening. Mr Evershed responded that the applicant had met with the Culture Mile team and had taken account of the relevant issues. The applicant was involved in another scheme within the Culture Mile area and was highly supportive of the initiative. With regards to the pavement, several options for the application had been considered and it had been decided that widening the pavement was the best option.

A Member asked if further reduction in massing had been considered, given the key planning considerations of the application. Mr Evershed responded that height and massing had been considered together, with massing considered in the context of nearby Aldersgate and neighbouring buildings with car parks behind them. The application sought to optimise footprint by infilling.

In response to questions from a Member, the Committee was advised that all floors were served by lifts to enable the movement of waste and deliveries to and from the lower ground floor, where it would be stored or received. This was a contrast to the existing development where refuse was stored outside before collection. With regards to cycle parking, off-street provision was proposed outside the building as part of the scheme.

A Member asked what work had been undertaken to assess the impact of reducing the height of the scheme by a further storey. Mr Evershed responded that this had been looked at, but noted that the size of the scheme had already been reduced by 20-25%, with the overall increase to floorspace diminished. The applicant sought to make the best use of the land, but their approach had been guided by any adverse impact of the scheme. The impact on views had been studied and other impacts had been given thorough consideration. Further reduction would not necessarily mean the removal of the top floor, and therefore the impact of further reduction was dependent on how the building would be reconfigured.

A Member asked the applicant to clarify what influence the Culture Mile had on the design and use of the scheme. Mr Evershed responded that the Culture Mile had significantly influenced the building footprint, activation on the ground floor, and impact on Barbican station, with further consultation on Culture Mile planned.

A Member queried the proposed provision of cycle parking, particularly short-stay parking where there was a shortfall. Mr Evershed responded that the excess provision reported referred only to long-stay parking, but advised that there would be opportunities to add further short-stay parking provision, with safety and accessibility being high priority.

The Committee then proceeded to debate the application. A Member advised that the scheme would replace poor-quality buildings with better ones, and it

was felt the applicant had listened and responded to representations. Whilst there would be some impact, it would not affect the Barbican Estate, and the officers had judged the impact to be acceptable. Trade-offs were inevitable in planning applications and in this case, the benefits were considered to outweigh any harm.

A Member advised that they would be supporting the application. The existing buildings were of poor quality, and there were no sound reasons forthcoming to reject the application on planning grounds. Officers had been satisfied that the scale of the building was appropriate and the building would fit in with a largely commercial surrounding area.

A Member advised that whilst this was not a planning consideration, the building should be considered in the context of Smithfield public realm. The Member expressed reservations that the scheme had been properly assessed with regards to Strategic Policy S23 and doubted the scheme's benefit to the area and the Culture Mile. Another Member added that whilst the scheme was attractive, and supported the use of materials and restrictions on the use of terraces, they could not support the scheme, due to its bulk and the adverse impact on the occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

The Committee was advised by a Member that the scheme would be a huge improvement on the existing buildings. The impact on light was considered to be a reasonable trade-off, particularly when recalling previous applications. Furthermore, the higher rise buildings to the east of the site diminished the argument against the scheme on the grounds of height.

A Member advised that they had considered both sides of the argument, and noted the efforts made with regards to recycling and reducing carbon footprint, noting the expected upgrade to Citygen. The Member added that they were in favour overall, but the applicant should try to balance out concerns.

A Member argued that the report made several references to the scheme's previous iterations, but these were not relevant, as the Committee should only be assessing the application in front of them. He continued that several Members had raised objections on planning grounds, which should be properly taken into consideration. Furthermore, the impact on the nearby primary school had not been fully accounted for, as there was an absence of information on rooms affected within the school, which meant that the conclusions drawn were premature. The application had not taken all considerations into account, and the Committee was urged to refuse the application, so they could be addressed before it was brought back.

A Member agreed that the project was generally good and an improvement on the existing buildings, but had some concerns and was struggling to support the recommendation. Firstly, the tree planting would effectively narrow the pavement, and the widening of the pavement needed further thought, to account for the opening of Crossrail. Furthermore, the additional storey was a concern, and risked setting a precedent.

A Member then raised the issue of light pollution, explaining that large open plan buildings with PRA lighting systems were a common cause of light pollution. However, in this case this was mitigated by the requirement for a management system for the building's lighting which should allow darkness at night.

A Member commented that they had no issue with redeveloping the site but had concerns over the scheme's massing and height, as well as pedestrian and pavement impact. The Member queried why the building was not set back, as Crossrail traffic would make a significant difference, and that the proposed greening was a token effort. The Member voiced their disappointment and added the scheme could be much better.

A Member advised that they could not support the scheme in its current format. The Member had issues with the proposed greening and wanted a condition to secure further cycle parking. There had been no proper accounting for whole life carbon in the environmental assessments, and the Member had expected to see a condition requiring zero-emission machinery.

At this point, the Deputy Chairman, in 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.

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair then asked the Director of the Built Environment to respond to points raised during the debate. The Director of the Built Environment advised that pedestrian movements had been assessed, and the expected increase in movements was not considered to be significant. The proposals to widen the pavements were indicative and would have to be secured later. The City's Planning Obligations, which included requirement for a Cultural Plan, would be secured through the Section 278 agreement. The daylight impact on the nearby primary school was just over the 20% figure outlined in BRE guidance, but was unlikely to be noticeable and had been adjudged to be acceptable.

In response to a question from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment confirmed that all objections received had been assessed and considered in conjunction with policy requirements. A Member suggested that further work be undertaken to consider the scope for greening, noting that the greening depicted in the proposals was indicative.

Arising from the discussion, the Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, moved that the Committee proceed to vote on the recommendations. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them within the report and addendum. The vote was conducted by roll call, led by the Town Clerk, with those Members present and eligible to vote asked to also confirm that they had been present for and able to hear the entirety of this item.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 16 votes
OPPOSED – 10 votes

There was one abstention.

The application was therefore approved.

At this point Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair) re-joined the meeting.

6. TOWER BRIDGE HV SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AND INCREASING RESILIENCE

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor concerning the electrical infrastructure at Tower Bridge. The City Surveyor introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree:

1. That approval is obtained to proceed straight to Detailed Design stage (G4c). The G4c will be approved by the Planning & Transportation and Project Subs committee Members;
2. That additional budget of **£431,095** is approved for professional fees required between Gateway 4 and Gateway 4c and for the first payment to UKPN for the installation of the new HV intake;
3. Note the revised approved budget will be **£760,155** (excluding risk);
4. That a Costed Risk Provision of **£355,000** is approved for Gateway 4 to Gateway 4c; and
5. That approval of Gateway 4c and Gateway 5 is delegated to the Planning & Transportation and Project Sub Committee Members.

7. CITY CORPORATION RESPONSE TO THE PLANNING WHITE PAPER

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment outlining a proposed response to the MHCLG consultation on the Planning White Paper: Planning for the Future. The Director of the Built Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points. The Committee was advised that overall, the suggested response was that change was welcomed, but that this should be implemented by evolution of the existing system rather than wholesale change.

A Member thanked officers for the draft response, which provided a good response to problematic proposals. Many aspects of the White Paper were illogical, and whilst the officers' response was diplomatic, it was hoped that MPs would apply significant modifications during scrutiny of the White Paper. The Member also sought assurances that City officers were engaging with the right people in Westminster and at City Hall.

The Director of the Built Environment responded that officers continued to work with colleagues and other local authorities, and were looking at responses from the business sector with a view to creating a cohesive response. The Remembrancer would collate the Corporation's wider response and undertake

further external engagement. The Chair endorsed the discussion on the report and commented that it was beneficial to make clear distinctions.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee agree the overall approach set out in this report and in Appendix 1 in relation to the City Corporation’s response to the MHCLG consultation on the Planning White Paper: Planning for the Future.

8. RESETTING OF DEPARTMENTAL BUDGETS 2020/21

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain to relevant Service Committees outlining recommended budget adjustments which, subject to the agreement of the Court of Common Council in December, will be reflected in their detailed Revised Estimates 2020/21 and proposed Budget Estimates 2021/22 reports for their approval.

RESOLVED – That the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- a) Note the report; and
- b) Note the recommended budget adjustment of an increase of £310,000 for the Director of the Built Environment.

9. TRANSPORT STRATEGY KERBSIDE REVIEW - ACTION PLAN

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment summarising the findings of a comprehensive data collection exercise consisting of a number of surveys on the use of the Square Mile’s kerbside and the City Corporation public car parks, and detailed an Action Plan that set out the next steps that would complete the review. The Director of the Built Environment flagged that the data exercise had been undertaken prior to the impact of Covid-19 and advised that further data would be collected. Actions for the next year were set out in the report.

A Member queried the definition and context of kerbsides, particularly with regards to accessibility, and asked how and where accessibility would be assessed. The Director of the Built Environment responded that officers were aware that the junction at Monument/King William Street was causing concern and advised that this would be raised with TfL. Street accessibility was still assessed as standard, including the need for dropped kerbs and raised carriageways. Members were invited to raise any further examples that were causing concern.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

10. PUBLIC LIFT REPORT

The Committee received a report of City Surveyor concerning public lift service between 18 September 2020 and 7 October 2020.

A Member asked if there had been any progress in accessing the lift room at London Wall, and queried whether the statistics in respect of the Millennium Inclinor were correct, as they were confusing. The City Surveyor advised that

officers would confirm the latest position on London Wall, and, with apologies, advised that after the submission of the report an error in the statistics for the Millennium Inclinor had been noted and referred to the relevant officers. The Committee was advised that the first availability statistics set out in the report were correct, and the remaining statistics would be corrected.

Members expressed their dissatisfaction with the long-running issues at both London Wall and the Millennium Inclinor and urged officers to resolve them.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

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

In response to a question from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment advised that an application concerning the Aldersgate Turret was expected at the December meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

13. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

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

A Member commented that the action was welcome, but whilst it was appreciated propane heaters were significantly cheaper, electric infrared heaters were more sustainable. The Member asked what support was available for businesses in this regard. Another Member said that heaters also created a safety issue in their storage, and requested that where applications included them the Fire Brigade should be made aware. The Director of Markets and Consumer Protection responded that this was a temporary measure through to September 2021 to deal with a specific issue. Officers were conscious of the environmental impact of the heaters and would assist with impact assessments.

The Chair added his endorsement of the action taken and advised that officers were working with colleagues in Licensing and would be liaising with the relevant interest groups.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

There were three questions.

Portsoken Community Centre

A Member raised the issue of a breach of the Section 106 agreement by the developer in relation to the community centre in Portsoken. In this case the space had changed significantly, although was reportedly being rectified. However, the Member sought clarification on this as well as more general concerns around enforcing Section 106 agreements.

The Director of the Built Environment advised that in this case the breach had been reported to the Department of Community and Children's Services. However, there was also a proactive due diligence process.

A Member added that they did not think the issue in this case had reached an adequate resolution, and there had been previous instances of changes to developments being made and not discovered until later. The Member asked if there was a requirement for developers to report any changes to the Corporation. Another Member commented that there was a wider issue in monitoring and discharging conditions, and there had been failure in this regard in the past. The Member suggested increasing officer provision in this area.

The Chair added that this was something that had been discussed with developers, and where developers wanted to be part of the process this should be encouraged. The Chair added that self-certification of discharged conditions should be possible with the technology available. The Chair acknowledged Members' concerns, adding that in some cases there was no conceivable way that breaches occurred unintentionally, which was not acceptable.

The Director of the Built Environment advised that there was a dedicated Section 106 office within the Department of the Built Environment, and that whilst breaches were an issue, occurrences were rare. The Committee was advised that the Planning Portal listed all conditions and showed which ones had been discharged.

The Chair thanked the Director of the Built Environment for their response and asked that the points raised by Member be taken on board.

City Planning Policy

A Member, referencing a question about possible reforms to the City's Planning regime asked of the Chair of Policy & Resources at the October Court of Common Council meeting, asked the Chair whether he had discussed the issue with the Chair of Policy & Resources, and whether he intended to propose

recommended amendments to the Planning Protocol and the Committee's terms of reference, with regard to a circulated Transparency International report and recommendations in the Lisvane Review.

The Chair responded that he had discussed the matter with the Chair of Policy & Resources, and advised that ultimately, Planning policy and the Committee's terms of reference were determined by the Policy & Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council. However, the Chair was happy for them to be considered by the Committee in the first instance. The Chair added that he had an entirely open mind with regards to considering proposals for reform, before asking the Comptroller and City Solicitor to add context to the response.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor advised the Committee that a report on the Planning Protocol was being prepared for the next meeting of the Committee, which would account for recent judgement on the Holocaust Memorial case, and the separation of functions. The intention was to make some recommendations for change as part of this report, but the report could be expanded to consider the issues raised by the Member. The Chair responded that this would be appropriate, and the Committee could consider all issues in the round.

The Member thanked the Chair and officers for their response, and proposed a Motion, the terms of which were circulated to the Committee by email. The Member added that the report would necessitate an informed debate, and whilst he felt the points raised in his question could be incorporated in time for the November meeting of the Committee, submission to the December meeting would also be acceptable.

The Motion was then seconded by a Member of the Committee, who added that it would be beneficial for the Committee to review its procedures, and that any revised or updated versions should be dated, so it was clear that they were the most recently agreed.

The terms of the Motion were as follows:

MOTION

That the Director of the Built Environment brings a report to this Committee by no later than its meeting on 15 December 2020 which:

(a) identifies those aspects of the Corporation's planning regime that do not comply with the standards prescribed in the report by Transparency International UK,

(b) makes suggestions as to how the Corporation's Planning Protocol, this Committee's Terms of Reference and any other relevant documents may be amended to comply with those standards, and

(c) makes suggestions as to how this Committee's Terms of Reference and any other relevant documents may be amended so that no member of the Property

Investment Board (or any body to which its functions may be transferred in the future) is eligible for appointment to this Committee,

in order for this Committee to consider making recommendations on (b) and (c) above to the Policy and Resources Committee, Court of Common Council or any other body, as appropriate.

The Committee then proceed to debate the Motion.

The Deputy Chairman advised that he had concerns about the Motion, principally, that he was unfamiliar with Transparency International and therefore its standing with regards to making such recommendations. Furthermore, there had not been sufficient notice of the Motion to be able to give it proper consideration. The Deputy Chairman advised therefore that he did not feel able to support it.

A Member advised that they were against the Motion on principle. The Member added that whilst they were familiar with Transparency International, they understood that their work was mostly overseas. The Member commented that the Motion was predicated to accept any recommendations, which was not appropriate prior to any report. Further to this there were points in the Motion not raised in the Member's initial Question, and there would be adequate opportunity to consider reforms as part of the Lisvane Review.

A Member advised that they were not necessarily opposed to the Motion, as there were relevant issues which should be addressed, particularly with regards to the governance of the Committee. However, as these were treated as part of the Lisvane Review, this should be undertaken first, rather than through the Motion.

A Member commented that Committees were about representing the interests of the people, and public perception was a vital part of this. However, the Member felt that consideration of any changes would be better served after consideration of the Comptroller and City Solicitor's report. Another Member suggested that the Comptroller and City Solicitor address the Transparency International report and its recommendations as part of the upcoming report, which would provide a useful way forward ahead of the Lisvane report. A Member added that consideration of the Transparency International report may be more productive than discussion of the Lisvane Review with regards to making fundamental decisions about changes.

The Member seconding the Motion commented that the Motion should not raise concerns, as it simply asked officers to prepare a report outlining suggestions for decision. The proposed changes, if agreed, would protect Members and improve the management of interests. The Planning Protocol was key and would be in place regardless, and therefore the review by the Comptroller and City Solicitor was timely. Members were urged to support the Motion.

The Member moving the Motion explained that putting the Motion to the Committee ahead of his Question would have been premature, as it was

dependent on the answer to his Question. The substantive propositions of the Motion were also put to the Court of Common Council, and therefore Members had been made aware of the relevant issues in advance of the Motion. The Member added that the Motion sought to enable a fully informed debate, alongside receipt of the anticipated report, and to add points to that report.

The Chair advised that the impact of the judgement on the Holocaust Memorial case was potentially wide-reaching, and may cause difficulty for local authorities, and this should be taken into account. The Chair added that the issues raised in Motion should be debated but should be considered in the context of the Holocaust Memorial case, and should not be conflated with issues raised by the Lisvane Review. The reference to Transparency International was too narrow, and the Committee needed advice across the piece in respect of the Corporation's statutory obligations.

The Chair advised that he did not feel he could support the Motion in its current form, and wanted to instruct the Comptroller and City Solicitor to consider the issues raised, before bringing them back alongside the anticipated Planning Protocol report.

The Member moving the Motion, closing the debate, advised that the Motion would ensure the issues raised were considered as part of the anticipated report, and would not conflate with the Lisvane Review, except in one instance where the recommendations of the Lisvane Review and the Transparency International report were congruous. The Member added that perception was a critical element of the Planning Protocol. Furthermore, Transparency International was a wholly reputable body, and it would be beneficial for the Committee to make use of their work. The Motion sought more information to add to a proper debate, which would be crucial in considering these matters.

Arising from the discussion, the Chair moved that the Committee proceed to vote on the Motion. The vote was conducted by roll call, led by the Town Clerk, with those Members present and eligible to vote asked to also confirm that they had been present for and able to hear the entirety of this item.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 8 votes
OPPOSED – 14 votes

There was one abstention.

The Motion was therefore lost.

Worsening Outlook for Flexible Offices

A Member asked a question regarding access to City offices which did not have off-street parking or loading bays of service operators needed at short notice to ensure the standards of office use which occupiers of City office space expect. Members had been contacted by the operator of buildings in the City, none with off-street parking or loading bays, occupied by small and medium-sized businesses, which tended to have the shortest and therefore most flexible leases. It was reported that the difficulties and extra expense caused by

Corporation policies meant businesses in their buildings were not renewing their leases, and officers were asked whether this apparent consequence of our policies had been accounted for.

The Director of the Built Environment advised that officers were reviewing the issues raised, and the Chair of Policy & Resources was preparing a formal response to the correspondence received by Members. A number of alternate provisions had been considered such as alternative routes, availability of nearby parking, and retiming services. The measures were kept under review and a report would be brought to the December meeting of the Committee.

The Chair advised that he had received correspondence on this issue, like other Members. The Chair added that it had been made clear from the outset that the relevant measures were temporary, and suggested amendments would be considered.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

The Director of the Built Environment advised that the Department of the Built Environment had been working in collaboration with Innovation & Growth to consider how the City could continue to play its part for the recovery of the Square Mile as part of the Covid Recovery Commission. A further report would be submitted to the Policy & Resources Committee and further details would be shared with the Committee.

The Chair then advised Members that he had discussed the ongoing closure of the Waterloo and City line with the Chair of Policy & Resources, and had written to TfL to make clear their expectation that the line should be reopened as soon as possible.

The Chair advised the Committee that the possibility of a hybrid meeting was being explored ahead of the next meeting on 17 November 2020. Whilst there may be some difficulties, it would be beneficial if meetings could take place in this format.

A Member advised that the Covid-19 testing centre in Guildhall Yard was now operational, but there had been some confusion regarding access. The Member reported that they had requested extra signage, as the current provision was not clear.

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(s)</u>	<u>Paragraph No(s)</u>
17 - 19	3
20 - 21	-

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2020 be agreed as a correct record.
18. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX 3 TO AGENDA ITEM 6 - TOWER BRIDGE HV SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AND INCREASING RESILIENCE**
The Committee received a non-public appendix to be considered in conjunction with Item 6.
19. **NON-PUBLIC REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**
The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk.
20. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions raised in the non-public session.
21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no urgent, additional items of business considered in the non-public session.

The meeting closed at 2:06pm.

Chairman

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